This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

69-21,986

OSBURN, John Douglas, 1931-
LLOYD JONES, LABOUR JOURNALIST, 1871-1878: A STUDY IN BRITISH WORKING-CLASS THOUGHT.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1969
History, modern

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2624

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

LLOYD JONES, LABOUR JOURNALIST, 1871-1878: A STUDY IN BRITISH WORKING-CLASS THOUGHT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JOHN DOUGLAS OSBURN

Norman, Oklahoma

1969

LLOYD JONES, LABOUR JOURNALIST, 1871-1878:

A STUDY IN BRITISH WORKING-CLASS THOUGHT

APPROVED BY

William H. Maehl Jr.

Lane A. Brunkin

John S. Egger

N. T. Phillips

Bruce D. Tovell

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work attempts to study the thought, not the life, of Lloyd Jones during the period of his most effective journalism, from 1871 to 1878. It thus provides biographical information only as supplementary to his expressions of opinion.

While a doctoral dissertation is expected to be original, the writer cannot but be aware of how many persons aided him in his task. He is indebted to the English-Speaking Union of Oklahoma City for a scholarship which enabled him to engage in research on Jones in Britain; and to the Oklahoma Consortium for Research Development for a grant which aided in a research trip to library collections in the United States which were important for his topic.

And I must express appreciation to the helpful staffs of many libraries: In London to the newspaper, manuscripts, and printed books divisions of the British Museum, to the Bishopsgate Institute, and to the London School of Economics; in Manchester to the library of the Co-operative Union Ltd.; in Newcastle-upon-Tyne to the Central Library; in New York to Columbia University

library and the New York Public Library; in Chicago to the library of the University of Chicago, to the Center for Research Libraries, and to the Newberry Library; in St. Paul to the library of the University of Minnesota; in Norman to the library of the University of Oklahoma; and in Goodwell, Oklahoma, to the patient people who handle interlibrary loans at the library of Panhandle State College.

It is a pleasure to thank the members of my committee for their kind consideration, and especially my dissertation director, Dr. W. H. Maehl, for innumerable acts of kindness and advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
Chapter		
I.	"IN HISTORY, AS IN LIFE, ONE FACT THROWS LIGHT ON ANOTHER.	1
II.	"CO-OPERATION . . . MAY BE REGARDED AS THE HIGHEST DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT AND PRACTICE EVER KNOWN IN CONNECTION WITH THE LABOUR INTERESTS OF THE WORLD"	39
III.	"THE GREAT TRADE UNION MOVEMENT"	55
IV.	"WE WHO AIM AT A DEMOCRATIC TRANSFORMATION".	83
V.	"LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE".	96
VI.	"TODAY THE EARTH IS RED WITH THE BLOOD OF COUNTLESS THOUSANDS OF CHRISTIAN MEN"	120
VII.	"FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THOSE WHO SUFFER".	148
CONCLUSIONS.		192
BIBLIOGRAPHY		195

LLOYD JONES, LABOUR JOURNALIST, 1871-1878: A STUDY IN BRITISH WORKING-CLASS THOUGHT

CHAPTER I

"IN HISTORY, AS IN LIFE, ONE FACT SHEDS LIGHT ON ANOTHER"

When Lloyd Jones wrote these words in 1873[1] his full stature in the nineteenth-century British working-class movement had almost been attained. For all his adult life, Jones had been prominently involved in almost all of the working-class projects that were proved important. This was recognized by his contemporaries as well as by subsequent historians. Sidney and Beatrice Webb, in their pioneering History of Trade Unionism, describe Jones as "one of the ablest and most loyal friends of Trade Unionism."[2] But his efforts on behalf of trade unionism were but one side of a surprisingly many-faceted working-class career.

---

[1]Lloyd Jones, "Intrigues against Popular Government," Bee-Hive, April 19, 1873.

[2]Sidney and Beatrice Webb, The History of Trade Unionism, 1660-1920 (rev. ed.; London: Sidney and Beatrice Webb, 1920), p. 341, n. 2.

The present inquiry investigates Jones's role as a journalist in the eighteen-seventies. His signed articles in the Bee-Hive and Industrial Review newspapers during the period 1871 to 1878 are the most numerous and fullest source of his views. They can be supplemented by his articles and letters in other newspapers, and by his pamphlets. But these articles built his reputation as the chief working-class journalist of the eighteen-seventies; and these must form the core of any examination of his ideas at that time.

The eighteen-seventies were an important decade in British history, and a time of considerable concern to the working-class. The skilled urban workers had been enfranchised in 1867; so a period of adjustment to the new electoral system followed, in which organized labor searched for an effective place in the new system. New political alignments were taking shape, as the old Whigs and Tories were replaced by the newer Liberal and Conservative parties, with considerable tension in politics and within parties, especially the Liberal Party. It was a time of ferment, as many reform questions were considered, both within and without Parliament; with decisions made which affected Britain for decades to come. And at mid-decade the economy crested and dropped sharply off, producing a crisis of policy within the working-class. So the eighteen-seventies were a period of significance, and warrant additional study.

Many prominent working-class figures have been studied, either in books or in shorter monographs. Their actions are presented, rather than the framework of ideas and values through which they saw the world and from which they received motivation. Lloyd Jones's numerous articles permit an inquiry into the entire intellectual outlook of a man who was welcome in the inner circles of the working-class movement, and sought to be the movement's apologist and advisor. This is then a study of working-class thought in nineteenth-century Great Britain.

Easily the most important feature of Jones's outlook was the philosophy of Robert Owen. Jones was permeated by it, and it colored both his thought and his actions for all the decades of his adult life. He sometimes modified strict Owenite doctrine; occasionally he departed from it; but its influence on Jones far exceeded any other.

Because of this, perhaps a glance at Robert Owen's gospel of world regeneration is in order.[3] Owen

---

[3]The brief interpretation of Owen which follows is indebted to these sources: Robert Owen, A New View of Society: Essays on the Formation of Character; Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System; Report to the County of Lanark; in A New View of Society and Other Writings, ed. with intro. by G. D. H. Cole (London: Dent, 1963); Max Beer, A History of British Socialism (2 vols.; London: Bell, 1921), I; G. D. H. Cole, A Century of Co-operation (Manchester: Co-operative Union, n.d.); _____, A History of Socialist Thought,

(1771-1858), of Welsh extraction, rose from a shop boy in Lancashire to become manager and part-owner of a profitable factory complex in New Lanark, Scotland.

At New Lanark, he first attracted favorable public attention by his successful policy of humane capitalism. He demonstrated that a profit could still be made while reducing the working-hours and improving the living conditions and general environment of his operatives. The results attracted considerable approval, more especially outside of factory-owning circles. Even Lord Sidmouth, the reactionary Tory Home Secretary, and H.R.H. the Duke of Kent, were sympathetic.

Owen set forth some of his ideas in A New View of Society (1813). In it he showed himself to be a strong environmentalist. He believed that man's character was plastic, determined by training and experience. Thus, if a child were raised in poverty, squalor, and what was more important for Owen--in erroneous values and precepts, the child would simply develop into a squalid and destructive specimen of human life. On the other hand, decent living and working conditions, along with an

---

vol. I: Socialist Thought: the Forerunners, 1789-1850 (London: Macmillan, 1953); _____, A Short History of the British Working-Class Movement, 1789-1947 (rev. ed.; London: Allen and Unwin, 1952); _____, The Life of Robert Owen, intro. by Margaret Cole (London: Frank Cass, 1965); Lloyd Jones, The Life Times, and Labours of Robert Owen, ed. with sketch of the author by William Cairns Jones (3rd ed.; London: Swan Sonneschein, 1900); Frank Podmore, Robert Owen: a Biography (New York: Appleton, 1924).

altruistic instruction, would produce good men and a good world.

Moreover, Owen believed men to be basically rational: they could and would apprehend and accept "true" principles if they were but presented to them, at least in the early years of life. This is where the Owenite stress on education came in. Not only did Owen write books and appear in public to advance his views, but he put in operation an active propaganda organization that canvassed the country by the spoken and printed word.

Owen initially refrained from setting forth some of his deeper and more controversial principles. He had received surprisingly sympathetic reaction to his New Lanark capitalism. But this soured as the public learned of some of its more bizarre features, such as the collective rearing of children and dancing instruction; and as Owen's deeper views became evident.

Owen actually desired to abandon capitalism. He believed that man would labor more productively for the common good than for wages and his employer. Thus he conceived of "villages of co-operation" into which communities would be organized to meet the agricultural and industrial needs of society. The collective mode of living and operation would produce social as well as economic returns. The villages of co-operation would

produce a more abundant and a more decent and pleasant society.

Even a more sensitive British nerve was touched by Owen's expressions on religion. He was tactless enough to express this once in a "Denunciation of All Religions." Owen believed that organized Christianity was an impediment to the implementation of his program. Not only was it inherently erroneous, but various of its precepts, such as its view of man's nature, ran counter to Owenite teachings. Owen himself was a deist. He was highly idealistic and compassionate. But his views produced predictable results, partly because of the sensational nature of some of them. In addition to allowing for divorce and civil marriages, he disliked the traditional concept of the family. This was for collectivist reasons: he feared that the rearing of children within the confines of the family would militate against their learning Owenite values and gaining a concern for the lot of mankind apart from the ties of kinship. He was, of course, denounced by clergymen as an athiest who was in favor of sheer licence.

Surprisingly, political action had only a modest place in Robert Owen's scheme of things. He did, it is true, aim at achieving a number of his reforms by parliamentary statute. But to him, politics in general was superficial; he was interested in the economic realities which underlay the political arena.

The Owenites made various attempts to implement these ideas. The larger projects included the inauguration of villages of co-operation. The two most important were Queenwood, or Harmony Hall, in Hampshire; and New Harmony, in Indiana. A scheme for "labour exchanges" was attempted. In each exchange, an Owenite currency, issued in denominations of hours of work, was used, while the products were valued on the basis of the cost of raw goods and the time spent in manufacture. In 1833 Owen unfolded his plan for a Grand National Consolidated Trades Union which would, he believed, bring production into the hands of the British workers. It came into being in 1834, as weak as it was large; and it did not last out the year.

Owen's labors were not limited to the welfare of the working-class. He sought the general amelioration of society. Yet the working-class alone listened to him, though not with an uncritical ear. And they learned from his and their own mistakes, eventually attaining success in more than one old Owenite concern. Working-class acceptance of Owenism was limited, however; and they never accepted all his views. Still, Owen is today considered to be the Father of British Socialism; and it is worth noting that the first use of the term "socialism" as an economic doctrine appeared in 1827 in an Owenite

publication, the Co-operative Magazine and Monthly Herald.[4]

Owenism pulled together in systematic and meaningful fashion most of the important values and attitudes of Lloyd Jones, such as a deep sense of compassion, an activist nature, optimism, and social protest.

Jones learned some of these values in his father's home in Ireland. His father had fought against the English in the Irish Rebellion of 1798, and had known Robert Emmet, who in 1803 had led a smaller insurrection. He seems to have taken pride in having once spoken to Wolfe Tone and in having seen Lord Edward Fitzgerald, leaders of the 1798 revolt. Later, one of Lloyd Jones's earliest memories was of being disturbed in bed as a child by soldiers searching for arms.[5] It is more than likely that his father's revolutionary actions were accompanied by a credence in the "rights of man" as understood by the age of the French revolution. Jones

---

[4]Edwin R. A. Seligman, "Owen and the Christian Socialists," Essays in Economics (New York: Macmillan, 1925), p. 28, n. 2.

[5][Joseph Cowen], "The Late Mr. Lloyd Jones," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, June 5, 1886. The article is unsigned, but its authorship is revealed by the Co-operative News which printed part of the same article under Cowen's name. Since the dates of both papers are the same, it can be inferred that Cowen, in London as an M.P., but who published the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle and was interested in co-operative affairs, sent a manuscript copy of his Newcastle article to the Co-operative News.

could hardly have been raised without absorbing an influence from so committed a parent. Foundations were laid early for his compassion, his activism, and his acts and writings of protest. Owenism gave Jones a vision of a "new moral world" of voluntary collectivism toward which he could give self-satisfying and coherent vent to his values, indignation, and activism. For it protested the evils of the present world; it sought through education and evangelism to turn men to a true understanding (in their estimation) of their problems; and it offered solutions, often implemented as sponsored projects by the Owenites.

As with Owen, Lloyd Jones was of Welsh extraction. An ancestor had left Wales as a cavalry officer in the service of William III during his subjugation of Ireland; and he remained in the island. Jones's family had settled at Bandon, County Cork, after supporting the Rebellion of 1798. His father's strong views on revolution and the rights of man must have had an impact on the values of young Lloyd Jones. After Lloyd's birth in 1811, his father hoped for a priestly career for his son. Young Lloyd was given some formal schooling, but depressed economic conditions forced him to leave it for fustian-cutting, a profitable branch of the cotton trade. An undescribed "accident" shook young Lloyd's confidence in the Catholic faith while a choir boy, and skepticism

grew. Before he left Ireland, his father disowned him for this. Bad economic conditions led Jones to move to Dublin to practice his trade in 1825; but since he found conditions little better there, he immigrated to England in 1827, landing penniless at Liverpool. His destination was Manchester, the center of the cotton trade.[6]

For the next ten years he practiced his trade of fustian-cutting in the north of England. Jones was in the midst of young men who discussed the economic and political questions of the time; he listened, and by stages he became involved. He joined a fustian-cutting union in 1827, and became its secretary in 1830. Jones initially was adverse to the ideas of the Owenites he heard discussed; but in 1831 or 1832 he was converted by one John Greene, a disciple of the venerable E. T. Craig, one of the most respectable and longest lived Owenites in England.[7]

---

[6]William Cairns Jones, "Sketch of the Author," in Lloyd Jones, The Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen, ed. with sketch of the author by William Cairns Jones (3rd ed.; London: Swan Sonneschein, 1900); J. M. Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years," II, Economic Review (London), IV (January, 1894), 39-40; "The Late Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, June 5, 1886; "Lloyd Jones, President of the Co-operative Congress," ibid., May 30, 1885.

[7]E. T. Craig, "Lloyd Jones, his Oratory and his Work," Co-operative News, May 9, 1886; "Life of Lloyd Jones," ibid., May 29, 1886.

In 1831 he moved to Salford where he and other young Owenite bachelors opened a co-operative store. It failed, as early Owenite ventures did. Then the group opened an Owenite evening school which lasted for six years. Jones served as writing master in a curriculum that offered both the elementary fields of instruction and the doctrines of Robert Owen. The Owenites canvassed the working-people of the neighborhood to send their children, and to come themselves. Late in life, Jones recalled that 170 students were attending after six months' operation. They were mainly girl and boy factory operatives. The school charged no tuition and paid no salaries. On Sundays, the Owenite instructors held meetings at which they read essays and presented lectures about Owen's vision for society. Jones found his wife among his students. This was Mary Dring, a pretty young girl anxious to improve herself, who enrolled for instruction in writing.[8]

Jones's enthusiasm and ability brought him to the attention of the Owenite leadership, including the notice and approval of Robert Owen. In the latter 1830's,

---

[8] J. M. Ludlow, "Lloyd Jones--a Sequel," Spectator (London), June 5, 1886; J. M. Ludlow, "Lloyd Jones--a Sequel," ibid., June 12, 1886; Jones, Robert Owen, pp. 287-88; Jones, Co-operation: its Policy and its Prospects (London: Central Co-operative Board, 1877), [1]; George Jacob Holyoake, "Lloyd Jones," Dictionary of National Biography, eds. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (22 vols.; London: Oxford, 1917ff), X, 1035.

the emphasis in Owenism shifted from working-class projects to a more moral and utopian approach, as evinced by their new periodical, the New Moral World. A major embodiment of the new attitude was its propaganda arm, the Social Missionary and Tract Society, created in 1837. It sent out six "social missionaries" to carry the vision of the New Moral World to the nation, each in his own district. Lloyd Jones was one of the first men selected; and he became in the words of Holyoake, himself one of the leading Owenite missionaries, "the foremost man on the social warpath."[9]

Lloyd Jones travelled, lectured, and debated with clergyman in the north of England, Scotland, and sometimes in London and the south for eight years. As a result, he became well-known among the working-class, especially in the north, and recognized as one of the leading Owenites. As Holyoake said, when a new challenger to the movement arose, "it was Lloyd Jones to whom we all looked in such cases."[10]

Owenism faded in the early 1840's. Jones remained one of the last two missionaries in the field until the

---

[9]George Jacob Holyoake, Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life (2 vols.; London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1892), I, 141; Joseph McCabe, Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake (2 vols.; London: Watts, 1908), I, 44; E. T. Craig, "Lloyd Jones, his Oratory and his Work," Co-operative News, May 9, 1886.

[10]"The Eighteenth Annual Co-operative Congress," Co-operative News, June 19, 1886.

end. But the formal Owenite organization dissolved in 1845. Within a year Jones had established himself as a master tailor and "draper" on Oxford Street, London. His letters reveal that he kept in touch with the Owenite co-operators, and by this time the course of Jones's commitment had been fixed.[11] As Holyoake, the most commanding figure in nineteenth century British co-operation has said, "from 1837 to his death in 1886, Jones was officially connected with the co-operative movement, and had a chief part in its organization and development."[12]

From the many experiments of the Owenites, one solid achievement endured: the retail co-operative store; and this launched the co-operative movement that showed growth (although not at a constant rate) during the rest of the century despite fluctuations in the British economy.

Impetus and prominence was given to co-operation by the Christian Socialists, whose organized movement lasted from 1848 to 1854. They were led by reform minded

---

[11]Lloyd Jones to G. J. Holyoake, 158 Oxford Street [London], December 22, 1847; Jones to Holyoake, 158 Oxford Street [London], March 1, 1849, Holyoake Papers, Library, Co-operative Union Ltd., Manchester. Certified copy of entry of birth of William Cairns Jones, October 1, 1846, no. 238, Cavendish Square sub district, Marylebone registration district, at General Register Office, Somerset House, London. Podmore, Robert Owen, pp. 556 and 581.

[12]Holyoake, "Lloyd Jones," 1035.

Anglicans, especially the Rev. F. D. Maurice, the Rev. Charles Kingsley, and the barrister J. M. Ludlow, who had been much influenced by French socialism through long residence in that country.

Prior to the arrival of Jones in the camp of Christian Socialism, their knowledge of socialism had come from French theorists such as Fourier, Blanc, Leroux, and Proudhon, through J. M. Ludlow, They had virtually no knowledge of British experience and theory. Lloyd Jones became their most important link with Owenism, as Charles Raven, their best historian, attests.[13]

The Christian Socialists welcomed Jones, despite the fact that he was not a Christian. Though it surprised some contemporaries, neither he nor they found his Owenite rational religion an impediment nor made it an issue. As Jones himself explained when attacked by the secularist Holyoake, he was as interested in practical results as he was uninterested in theoretical dilemmas.[14]

In Christian Socialism Lloyd Jones attained a prominence equal to his role as a lieutenant of Robert

---

[13]Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years," II, 39; Charles E. Raven, Christian Socialism, 1848-1854 (London: Macmillan, 1920), p. 140.

[14]Jones, "Mr. Jones Addresseth the Editor of the 'Reasoner' as a God," Reasoner, X, no. 15 (n.d. [1851]), 266.

Owen. He was admitted into the inner circle of the leadership, the Council of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations. It was this body which aimed at implementing the socialist side of the movement, co-operative production.[15] Jones was made manager of the London Co-operative Stores (actually only one store) in 1850, but was soon sent north, because of his excellent Owenite contacts there, to build up interest and participation in the movement. He made Manchester his headquarters, set up a co-operative store there, and was active in canvassing the region. But Chartism had greater appeal to the working-men than Christian Socialism, and no great success in planting Christian Socialist co-operative ventures was achieved.[16] But here again, the old Owenite missionary is at work.

Jones was one of the first to see the possibilities of wholesale co-operation, and induced a co-operative conference at Bury in 1851 to adopt a resolution in favor of the establishment of such an organization. While plans were developing for this, E. V. Neale, a wealthy and influential Christian Socialist, opened the almost identical Co-operative Wholesale Agency, of which Jones,

---

[15]Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years," II, 39; Raven, Christian Socialism, pp. 188-89.

[16]Raven, Christian Socialism, pp. 259-71; Cole, Century of Co-operation, pp. 103, 129, 130, 133.

James Woodlin, and A. J. L. le Chevalier were made managers. But in 1852 Jones again went on the stump, about London and in the north, seeking to evoke a broad basis of support for the Agency. It never received consistent support, and eventually diminished to become a commercial wholesale firm under the name of Jones and Woodlin. Because of legal restriction on co-operatives the C.C.A. throughout had to legally act through the firm of Jones and Woodlin.[17]

The Christian Socialists discovered the handicaps that their co-operative societies faced because of the disabilities before the law which co-operative bodies faced. They could possess no real property, nor personal property except through trustees. They could trade only with their own members, and could not federate. Attempts to remedy this situation had been made previously, but none had met with success before the support of the Christian Socialists, who had influential friends in Parliament. Many of the leaders, including Lloyd Jones, Ludlow, Neale, and Thomas Hughes, gave testimony before R. A. Slaney's committee on the subject. Slaney, an Irish reformer, steered through the resulting Industrial and Provident Societies Act through Parliament

---

[17]Cole, Century of Co-operation, pp. 103-104, 111, 112, 130, 131, 138.

in 1852.[18] None of the Christian Socialist co-operative societies themselves endured.[19] One by one these small, undercapitalized groups failed. Apart from the experience and propaganda produced by Christian Socialism, the Industrial and Provident Societies Act stands as its monument.

The disintegration of Christian Socialism was but a distance-marker in Jones's life long support of co-operation. For him, it was the vehicle of the Owenite vision of the New Moral World. He worked the rest of his life for it, writing innumerable articles, speaking to co-operative bodies all over the country, and appearing to deliver his mind on current topics on the platform of the annual co-operative congresses. He helped to establish the co-operative congress, was a perennial occupant of the platform, and was elected president of the 1885 Congress, shortly before his death.[20]

A reading of Jones's very numerous writings on co-operation, and his numerous activities on its behalf, convey forcefully that he saw this as THE means of attaining the New Moral World. Co-operation was at the

---

[18]"Report from the Select Committee on Investments for the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes," House of Commons Sessional Papers, 1850, XIX, 176, 267-69; Cole, Century of Co-operation, p. 118.

[19]Cole, Century of Co-operation, p. 113.

[20]Testimonial Committee, Lloyd Jones. Notice of his Life (? Oldham: Seventeenth Co-operative Congress, 1885), p. 8; J. M. Ludlow to Editor, Spectator, May 29, 1886.

heart of his values and his goals. As an Owenite, he thus wished to apply co-operation to all phases of life, not content with the pure products and cash savings available at the co-operative retail store. He saw in co-operation the possibility for the regeneration of society he had been taught by Robert Owen.

Co-operation led Jones into journalism, and in one real sense Jones became a missionary of the written rather than of the spoken word. Jones and the editor of the old Owenite New Moral World, Robert Buchanan, launched the Spirit of the Age (July 1, 1848 to November 17, 1848), which was dedicated to Owenite principles. This was sold to W. H. Ashurst, Solicitor to the Post Office, whom Holyoake advised to discharge Jones and Buchanan. Holyoake and Jones had engaged in a bitter dispute over missionary methods in the early 1850's, and the two clashed periodically for the next thirty years. Jones and Buchanan were not dismissed, but the paper soon failed. In 1849 Jones wrote articles under the pseudonym of Cromwell in a similar short-lived venture, the Spirit of the Times (1849). It seems likely that he also contributed to its successor, the Weekly Tribune (1849-1850).[21]

---

[21] Ibid., p. 10; The Times, Tercentenary Handlist of English and Welsh Newspapers, Magazines, and Reviews (London: The Times, 1920), pp. 78-79; McCabe, Holyoake, I, 124, 144-46.

Jones helped to sustain himself and his family for the first two years of his newspaper novitiate by keeping in his trade as a tailor, since Jones himself stated that he became a journalist by 1850. But long after he had abandoned the shears for the pen, his old trade was remembered. Twenty years later, Marx in a letter to Engels identified J. M. Ludlow as a friend of Jones, whom he referred to, rather contemptuously, as der Schneider.[22]

From 1850 to the spring of 1862, Jones worked for the Glasgow Sentinel, the most important working-class journal in Scotland. It was "one of my best jobs," he wrote to Charles Kingsley, but he resigned rather than to express editorial support for the Confederate States.[23]

Jones frequently was connected with more than one paper. In 1857 he founded the Leeds Express (1857-1901). Though he was forced to sell out before it became financially established, he contributed to it for years. From 1859 to 1865 he wrote for the North British Daily Mail of

---

[22]Marx to Engels, London, April 15, 1869, in Karl Marx--Friedrich Engels: Werke (34 vols. and index; Berlin: Deitz, 1961-1966), XXXII, 303; McCabe, Holyoake, I, 138, 144.

[23]Jones to Kingsley, Glasgow, April 21, 1862, Kingsley Papers, British Museum Add. Ms. 41299, fol. 81; Royden Harrison, "British Labour and the Confederacy: a Note on the Southern Sympathies of some British Working-Class Journalists and Leaders during the American Civil War," International Review Social History, II, pt. 1 (1957), 86; Testimonial Committee, Lloyd Jones. Notice of his Life, pp. 10-11.

Glasgow; and in 1863 he became an editor of the London Reader of Literature, Science, Art, and General Information. This was a weekly which printed serialized novels, with columns on science, amusements, advise to the lovelorn and miscellaneous topics. With others of the staff, Jones subsequently left it over a policy dispute.[24]

Jones's famous articles in the Bee-Hive newspaper of London (and its successor, the Industrial Review) began in 1871. This was the single most important working-class paper of nineteenth-century Britain, and Jones was its most prolific contributor. It is on this series that his reputation in working-class journalism rests.

In 1876 he became a writer on the staff of the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle and Daily Chronicle; and he continued to work for these radical papers until his last days. In 1878 he became the editor of the Miners' Watchman and Labour Sentinel.[25] Jones also contributed to various co-operative publications, but not for a living.

Although Jones left his name upon numerous pamphlets and two books, his reputation as the leading working-class journalist of his time rests on his newspaper articles,

---

[24]"Death of Mr. Lloyd Jones," Leeds Weekly Express, May 29, 1886; J. M. Ludlow to Editor, Spectator, May 29, 1886; Testimonial Committee, Lloyd Jones. Notice of his Life, pp. 10-11.

[25]Testimonial Committee, Lloyd Jones, Notice of his Life, p. 11.

especially in the Bee-Hive and Industrial Review from 1871 to 1878. Though the heart of his commitment was with co-operation, the greater number of his articles dealt with trade unionism, its problems and policy. He viewed all sorts of questions, both foreign and domestic, from a strictly working-class standpoint. In his writing, he resumed his old Owenite role of a missionary and teacher, rather than a reporter or a detached observer. He wrote to interpret events and issues according to trade union values and interests; to advise the working-class; and to act as an apologist when most of the realm's papers were hostile to trade unionism. His style was vigorous, often incisive, and conveyed a sense of relevance to the immediate situation. As the Webbs have observed, his articles were "uniformly distinguished by literary ability, exact knowledge of industrial facts and shrewd foresight."[26]

Of Jones's books and pamphlets, the most pretentious is his Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen, published posthumously in 1889. It passed through five editions. G. D. H. Cole's evaluation of the work must be acknowledged: "Lloyd Jones is disappointing; though he was closely associated with Owen, he presents no intelligible picture of him."[27] The treatment is spotty,

---

[26]Webbs, Trade Unionism, p. 341, n. 1.

[27]Cole, Robert Owen, p. 340.

and is too often apologetic, occasionally even becoming evasive or misleading. Moreover, it simply represents his worst writing. At least part of the book was written in 1882.[28] It is unlikely that the quality is due to his age, since his pamphlet of 1880, Co-operation in Danger!, displays his writing at its best; and his Newcastle Weekly Chronicle articles of the period compare favorably. The Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen is an interpretation of the spirit which animated Owenite socialism, and it contains some, if too few, details of Owen and of Jones himself which might otherwise have vanished from remembrance.

The Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867 (1867),[29] a work of collaboration with J. M. Ludlow, is an excellent work. It is a compact presentation of facts, statutes, and statistics, and is still of value as a work of reference. The style is clear and to the point. Unfortunately it is very scarce.

Jones's pamphlets were largely printed during two widely separated periods of his life. The most numerous pamphlets are from the period of his Owenite evangelism, and mainly consist of versions of debates, usually touching

---

[28] Jones, Robert Owen, p. 159.

[29] J. M. Ludlow and Lloyd Jones, The Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867 (London: A. Strahan, 1867).

on religion.[30] The remainder were produced in the last decade of his life, and most deal with the co-operative movement: dangers it faced, and its true policy.[31] Also there is a pamphlet-like article by Jones entitled Die

---

[30]Socialism Examined. Report of a Public Discussion which took Place at Huddersfield on the Evenings of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, December 13th, 14th, and 15th, 1837, between the Rev. T. Dalton, of the Methodist New Connexion, Huddersfield, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, of Manchester, upon "The Five Fundamental Facts, and the Twenty Laws of Human Nature, as found in the Book of the New Moral World, written by R. Owen, Esq." (Manchester: Cave and Sever, 1838); The Influence of Christianity. Report of a Public Discussion which took Place at Oldham, on the Evenings of Tuesday and Wednesday, February 19th and 20th, 1839, between the Rev. J. Barker, of the Methodist New Connexion, Mossley, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, of Manchester, Social Missionary, on the Influence of Christianity (Manchester: Cave and Sever, 1839); Report of the Discussion betwixt Mr. Troup, Editor of the Montrose Review, on the Part of the Philalethean Society, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, on the Evenings of Tuesday and Wednesday, 17th and 18th September, 1839, on the Propositions, I. That Socialism is Atheistical; and II. That Atheism is Incredible and Absurd (Dundee: James Chalmers and Alexander Reid, 1839); The Freaks of Faith: an Account of Some of the many Messiahs who have deluded Mankind (2nd ed.; Manchester: A. Heywood, 1840); Report of the Discussion on Marriage, as advocated by Robert Owen, between L. Jones and J. Bowes, in the Queen's Theatre, Christian-Street, Liverpool, on Wednesday, May 27, 1840 (Liverpool: James Stewart, 1840); A Reply to Mr. R. Carlile's Objections to the Five Fundamental Facts as laid down by Mr. Owen (Manchester: A. Heywood, 1837); Christianity versus Socialism: Report of a Discussion between the Rev. Alexander Harvey, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, social missionary, in the Relief Church, Calton, Glasgow, on December 24, 1839, on the vast Superiority of Christianity over the Religion of the New Moral World (Revised by the Speakers)(Glasgow: Robert Miller, 1840).

[31]Co-operation; its Position, its Policy, and its Prospects (London: Central Co-operative Board, 1877); Co-operation in Danger! An Appeal to the British Public (London: Simpkin Marshall, 1880); A Letter from Lloyd Jones to George Jacob Holyoake (n.d., n.p.); Trade Unions:

jüngste Landarbeiterbewegung in England, The Most Recent Agricultural Laborers' Movement in England, which appears in a German agricultural yearbook in 1875.[32] A specialist in English agricultural history, Dr. Wilhelm Hasbach, has judged this as "a short objective article, emphasizing all the points of importance for the understanding of the movement."[33] Almost certainly this was rendered into German by a translator; there is no evidence that Jones knew a foreign language, and inferential evidence against it.[34] But the article does not stand alone; a German edition of his and Ludlow's Progress of the Working Class was published in Berlin in 1867. The British Museum possesses the best collection of Jones's pamphlets.

On all of Lloyd Jones's printed works, only two names of the author are given. And only thus is he listed

---

Two Lectures by Lloyd Jones (London: George Potter, 1877); Inaugural Address delivered at the seventeenth annual Co-operative Congress, held at Oldham, May 25, 26 & 27, 1885 (Manchester: Central Co-operative Board, n.d.).

[32]Lloyd Jones, "Die jüngste Landarbeiterbewegung in England," Landwirthschaftliche Jahrbucher: Zeitschrift fur Küniglich Preussischen Landes-Oekonomie-Kultegiums, ed. H. von Nathusius and H. Thiel, IV (Berlin: Wiegandt, Kempel, & Pareh, 1875).

[33]Wilhelm Hasbach, A History of the English Agricultural Labourer, trans. by Ruth Kenyon (Westminster: R. S. King, 1908), p. 274, n. 1.

[34]George Howell, "Lloyd Jones," The Autobiography of a Toiler, with an Account of the Movements with which he was connected, of the Persons whom he knew, of his Aspirations and Achievements during Fifty Years of Active Political and Industrial Life, J. 2, MS (1898), George Howell Collection, Bishopsgate Institute, London.

in the bibliographical references to him, as in the British Museum's Catalogue of Printed Books and the Library of Congress's Catalog of Printed Cards. The same is true for Holyoake's article on him in the Dictionary of National Biography. And yet he was given the forename of Patrick, being born on St. Patrick's day in 1811. His employer and friend, Joseph Cowen, knew this, and a few legal documents show it.[35]

Jones even went so far as to deny the forename Patrick, when a political enemy attributed it to him in 1875.[36] Why? If the adversary, Thomas Mottershead, was correctly informed, he dropped the name in 1838, about the time he entered public life as an Owenite missionary. Concrete evidence as to his motive is lacking. But it can be speculated that Jones dropped the name either as part of his eschewal of Roman Catholicism, or, as an Owenite, representative and speaker, to remove the image of Irish Catholicism from himself. But

---

[35]Letters of Administration of the Estate of Patrick Lloyd Jones, December 24, 1886, Estate Duty Office, Minford House, London; Certified copy of Entry of Death for Mary Jones, May 31, 1886, no. 243, Kennington Second sub-district, Lambeth registration district, General Register Office, Somerset House, London; [Joseph Cowen], "The Late Mr. Lloyd Jones," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, June 5, 1886.

[36]Jones, "An Electioneering Story," Bee-Hive, July 17, 1875. This embodies Mottershead's letter, and gives Jones's reply. Mottershead wrote under the pseudonym of David Williams. Also cf. Thomas Mottershead, "An Election Story," Bee-Hive, July 31, 1875, and the editor's reply following it.

why should he lie about his name in 1875? Jones and George Odger were both interested in standing for the same parliamentary seat in Wales. Odger and Mottershead, his political agent, were both stalwarts of the First International, with which Jones took issue. In his letter "exposing" Jones's name of Patrick, Mottershead also asserted that Jones was raised a Roman Catholic and had been a "Secularist debater." The obvious aim was to alienate nonconformist Welsh support from Jones. Jones had some grounds technically for denying the charges. It is true that he was raised a Roman Catholic. It is true that he was named Patrick. But it was not true, as Mottershead alleged, that he had been born "Patrick Lloyd." Jones never bore this name, and never used it. Mottershead apparently was using second-hand information, and did not know Jones's full name of Patrick Lloyd Jones. And he was not true that Jones had been a "Secularist debater." He had been an Owenite debater, but Jones never followed Holyoake into the secularist movement; indeed, this was a cause of dissension between them. Virtually all men who have assessed Jones's character have remarked on its integrity; and more than once he subordinated self-interest to principle, as when he resigned a good job rather than write in favor of the Confederacy. Evidence is lacking on Jones's motives. But it is possible that Jones decided that rather than allow Mottershead to capitalize

upon the religious prejudice of the times, he would deny the whole of the charges rather than quibble over details, leaving Mottershead with the initiative.

Jones possessed initiative, and this occasionally but importantly led him beyond the usual scope of Owenism. Jones was a proper Owenite in considering Chartism to mislead the working-class toward political rather than economic action. Indeed, one of the long-remembered triumphs of his life was a victory over Chartism in 1839. He was deputed by the Owenites to appear at a Chartist called meeting of 5,000 workers in Carpenters' Hall, Manchester, which was expected to endorse a resolution in favor of a one month general strike, or "Sacred Month," as favored by one faction of the Chartists. Against police advice, he appeared and spoke against the measure. He obtained its defeat and the adoption of an alternate resolution which combined a "peaceful suasion" position with an expression against the sacred month.[37] And in a debate in 1842, Jones contended that Chartist goals were both diffuse and too limited, not coming to

---

[37]Holyoake, "Lloyd Jones," 1035; Testimonial Committee, Lloyd Jones. Notice of his Life, p. 6. Although the Northern Star of Leeds had a correspondent in Manchester at this time (cf. "Representation in Manchester," September 7, 1839), no mention of this episode is reported. However, Feargus O'Connor may not have wished to advertise the effectiveness of an Owenite speaker over his kind of Chartists.

grips with the larger and more basic problems facing the working man.[38]

In its later period, Chartism began to fragment and to become assimilated in other movements. Jones showed more interest in a few features of it that touched his own values. In 1849 Jones joined Feargus O'Connor, Holyoake, and other speakers at a large meeting in London which memorialized Queen Victoria to grant amnesty to political prisoners because of the evil conditions in jail, which appeared to them to have contributed to recent Chartist deaths.[39] This was one of many instances which revealed Jones to be far more politically active than was customary for Owenites.

His Owenite instincts led him to support the Chartists Bronterre O'Brien and G. W. M. Reynolds in launching the National Reform League. While O'Brien intended this to rival Feargue O'Connor's National Charter Association, it was planned to embrace Owenites and Radicals as well as Chartists. In addition to the six points of the People's Charter, the league stood for such things as a new Poor Law which would provide either public employment or decent public maintenance; state loans to

---

[38]Podmore, Robert Owen, p. 456.

[39]"The Political Prisoners. Meeting to Memorialize for a General Amnesty," Northern Star, September 29, 1849; R. G. Gammage, History of the Chartist Movement, 1837-1854 (Newcastle: Browne & Browne, 1894), pp. 349-50.

the industrious poor; nationalization of land, mines, and fisheries; and the inauguration of an Owenite type of currency and of state-owned stores not unlike Owen's labor exchanges.[40] But the league was short-lived, and Jones was already interested in Christian Socialism.

Jones's activities beyond the Owenite scope of interest involved two large areas of working-class concern, politics and trade unionism. He was to become prominent in these about the time that his famous series of articles in the Bee-Hive began to appear, the decade of the eighteen-seventies.

Jones's connection with trade unionism was an old one, pre-dating his conversion to the ideas of Robert Owen. For years he had championed the cause of the working-class and of trade unionism with his pen. And he entered into the circle of the London trade union leaders, such as William Allan, Robert Applegarth, George Howell, George Odger, and William Newton. In the aftermath of the Second Reform Act of 1867 and of the election of 1868, which failed to project working-class influence into the chambers at Westminster, this London-based group of union leaders was one of several bodies which wished to

---

[40] G. D. H. Cole, Chartist Portraits, intro. by Asa Briggs (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), pp. 263-64, 348; Frances Elma Gillespie, Labor and Politics in England, 1850-1867 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1927), p. 70; Beer, British Socialism, II, 174; Gammage, Chartist Movement, p. 351.

politically organize to mobilize the labor vote and gain parliamentary benefits for the working-class. A second group was led by George Potter, who had joined Edward Hartwell in playing a leading role in the short-lived and recently-deceased London Working-Men's Association. A third element consisted of W. R. Cremer and members of the British section of the First International.

The three groups were brought together in 1869 into a rather uneasy alliance largely through the initiative of R. M. Latham, a barrister connected with the Potter faction. Latham was chosen president of the Labour Representation League, Lloyd Jones its secretary, and William Allan its treasurer. This was the first considerable working-class effort to get out the working-class vote and to elect working men to Parliament. More and more, the Labour Representation League became a trade union organization; thus in 1872 Jones was replaced by Henry Broadhurst of the Operative Stonemasons, who had arrived at a position in the front rank of trade union leaders. And William Allan of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers moved up to the presidency.[41]

As a politically active trade unionist, Jones was one of the five named by the Trades Union Congress of

---

[41]Cole, Working-Class Politics, pp. 48-50, 71; Webbs, Trade Unionism, pp. 362; 280, n. 1; "Labour Representation League," Bee-Hive, November 9, 1869.

1871 to its Parliamentary Committee, which it created that year to look after trade union legislation in Parliament. This became an important body in the formulation of trade union political policy. Jones took quite an active role in this Trades Union Congress of 1871, representing the fustian-cutters of Manchester. For instance, it was his resolution, passed unanimously, which condemned the proposed (and then undivided) Trade Union Bill of that year.[42]

Although Jones's degree of involvement in trade union and political affairs was not customary for Owenites, his participation in both carried an Owenite flavor. He was not a mere participant: he was a teacher, advisor, and interpreter of events to the working-class. As he figured in trade unionism and politics, he did not shed his old cloak of a social missionary. As the Leeds Weekly Express observed, "he not only stimulated and encouraged activity . . . he taught clearly and effectively the first principles of the various working class movements. . . . He was emphatically a teacher."[43]

As we shall see later, Jones held that the central Owenite thrust of co-operation and trade unionism led men

---

[42]"The Annual Trade Union Congress," Bee-Hive, March 11, 1871; "The Trades Congress," ibid., March 18, 1871.

[43]"Industrial Jottings," Leeds Weekly Express, May 29, 1886.

in the same direction; and besides, Jones's attachment to trade unionism began prior to his conversion to Owenism. Trade unionism, to protect its own interests, was led into politics, an area of sensitivity dating from his father's home. That his father's early influence was enduring is illustrated by his actions in 1832 when the First Great Reform Act of 1832 was the raging national question. He and about a dozen other young men set up a weekly subscription fund to purchase pistols, ammunition, and "good steel pike heads manufactured by the man who made the steel knives with which in our fustian trade we performed our work." Why? Jones tells us that there was no armed conspiracy against the government, as some alleged, but a desire to prevent a repetition of Peterloo, when in 1819 an unarmed crowd of the working-class was sabred by the local yeomanry.[44] So Jones's views on man's political rights were deeply seated and deeply held.

In 1873 Jones was one of a number of Labour Representation League men who planned to stand for Parliament in the anticipated election of that year; his intended seat was Gateshead, in County Durham where working-men had requested his candidacy and a committee had been formed on his behalf. The election did not materialize but Jones

---

[44]Jones, "The Struggle for Reform, 1832," To-day, the monthly Magazine of scientific Socialism (London), II (New Series), 1884, 239-40.

was again a candidate as a Liberal in the election which Gladstone called for early 1874 on the issue of the reduction of the income tax, in an effort to unify his party and gloss over popular disaffection. As the election neared, however, Jones withdrew for fear of dividing the Liberal vote. There were originally four Liberals in the race, and the seat had never voted Tory.[45]

After going to Norfolk to help George Howell in 1875 campaign for a seat which many mistakenly expected the Conservatives to call,[46] Jones fought an election of his own in 1885. This was the Chester-le-Street division of County Durham, where he was well-known to the miners. As a result of the Third Reform Act of 1885, Jones had recently been advocating the formation of a radical "People's Party." He stood as an independent Radical

---

[45]William Henry Maehl, "Gladstone, the Liberals, and the Election of 1874," Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research, XXXVI (1963), 66; T. J. Bayfield to Editor, Bee-Hive, May 3, 1873; "Representation at Gateshead," ibid., April 19, 1873; "The Approaching Election," Times (London), January 27, 1874; "The Approaching Election, ibid., January 28, 1874; "The Approaching Election," ibid., January 30, 1874.

[46]Great Britain. "Return of Charges made to Candidates at the General Election in 1885, in England and Wales, by Returning Officers, specifying in each Case the Number of Members Returned, and, in cases of Contests, the Number of Candidates; also the Total Expenses of each Candidate (both exclusive and inclusive of Returning Officer's Charges) delivered to the Returning Officers pursuant to 'the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act, 1883,' and the Number of Votes Polled for each Candidate." House of Commons Sessional Papers, 1886, LII, 407. Cole, Century of Co-operation, p. 195.

candidate, and came in second with 3,606 to the Liberal's 4,409 and the Tory's 2,018. While it was a good showing for a man of seventy-five whose campaign had been seriously underfinanced (he spent £180.19.10 to the winning Liberal's £891.6.8), it was a serious disappointment to the old man.

The campaign exertions, plus a serious fall, were thought to have contributed to the growth of cancer of the bowels and liver. From this "painful illness" which followed the campaign of 1885, Jones died on May 22, 1886.[47] A numerous body of working-class leaders and representatives of working-class bodies attended the funeral. Their sentiments were expressed by a newspaper he founded when the Leeds Weekly Express wrote that "a great mental force has departed from the side of the working classes."[48]

In addition to his wife, who followed him to the grave in about a week,[49] Lloyd Jones left two sons and two daughters--William Cairns and Malcolm, Mary and Kate. A

---

[47]Kate Jones to George Howell, Stockwell, Surrey, May 23, 1886, MS, George Howell Collection, Bishopsgate Institute, London; Oath and Bond of William Cairns Jones, et al., as Executors of the Estate of Patrick Lloyd Jones, December 22, 1886, Estate Duty Office, Inland Revenue, Minford House, London: Letter of George Philip Rugg, M.D., quoted in "Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, May 29, 1886.

[48]Death of Mr. Lloyd Jones," Leeds Weekly Express, May 29, 1886; "Funeral of Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, June 5, 1886.

[49]Certified copy of Entry of Death for Mary Jones, May 31, 1886, no. 243, Kennington Second sub-district, Lambeth registration district, General Register Office, Somerset House, London.

third son, Lloyd, predeceased his parents.[50] In 1894, the surviving children appear to have been observing a form of "domestic co-operation," for J. M. Ludlow reported that "his four children . . . have for the last seven years been living together in the same house, in perfect harmony, each devoted to the others' interests."[51]

Ludlow remembered Lloyd Jones as "one of the most delightful of companions."[52] George Howell recalled him in the same light, writing that he was "at his best in a social circle, amongst those with whom he loved to associate. And he was ever welcome among a host of friends, in all parts of the country."[53] Often included in Jones's conversation were almost numberless anecdotes gathered in a lifetime of wide reading, and preserved by an excellent memory. For instance, his son W. C. Jones recollected that Lloyd Jones could remember lines of minor English poets which he had read many years past. He loved to haunt book shops and purchase books. He accumulated a personal library of some size and value more than once,

---

[50]Certified copy of Entry of Death for Lloyd Jones, September 18, 1877, no. 99, Kennington Second sub-district, Lambeth registration district, General Register Office, Somerset House, London.

[51]Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the following Years," II, 41.

[52]Ibid., 42.

[53]Howell, "Lloyd Jones," J. 3.

which later had to be sold because of financial exigencies.[54]

An essential quality for a man of Jones's activities was the ability to speak effectively on the platform. Holyoake has written that Jones "was the best debater of his day;"[55] and Ludlow that Jones "appeared to excel . . . Cobden, the greatest master in that line whom I have heard."[56]

In his later life, he became quite impressive. His tall, erect figure, silvery-white hair, and a moustache gave him a soldierly air which often caused him to be mistaken for a retired officer.[57]

The quality of Jones's life which perhaps is most impressive is his humanity: his deep sense of decency and concern. It radiates out through his writings a century later. So Ludlow, who knew him well, could write that he "never knew a man of more high [sic] purpose, full of more genuine enthusiasm for the good."[58] Thus, being highly value-oriented, his career reflects that nonconformist

---

[54]Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years," II, 41.

[55]Holyoake, "Jones, Lloyd," 1035.

[56]Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years," II, 41.

[57]Ibid.

[58]Ibid., 40-41.

sense of moral judgment and appeal which has been a feature of the British working-class movement, although Jones was not, however, a Christian, at least for a considerable part of his adult life.

Whether Jones ever abandoned his Owenite rational religion is not possible to determine. J. M. Ludlow asserts that, later in life, Jones told a mutual clerical friend that after his connection with the Rev. F. D. Maurice, he "became convinced that Jesus Christ was the Master of the hearts and consciences of men."[59] If this be accurate, it still leaves unanswered questions.

The debit entries in the ledger of Jones's life are not serious. His son W. C. Jones tells us that he had a tendency to trust men without qualification, until they gave him reason to be sorry.[60] George Howell has expressed regret that he never turned his powers to the creation of a literary work of a length and importance commensurate with his abilities. He felt that financial needs turned his writing to other tasks.[61]

The decades of Jones life spent in the working-class movement had the effect of trying to open doors of opportunity in life to the common man. Not all these

---

[59] Ibid., 42.

[60] William Cairns Jones, "Sketch of the Author," x.

[61] Howell, "Lloyd Jones," J. 3.

doors are fully open in Britain even today. Yet who could deny that the goal is worth the fight? Jones's efforts in this direction did not go unnoticed. For James Fitzpatrick could write in 1878:

> In the [Industrial] Review of Dec. 7 I was favored with the notice of Mr. Lloyd Jones, and it is something to be noticed by a gentleman whom the Trade Unionists of this country so deservedly respect, even if such notice is in the form of a castigation.[62]

---

[62] James Fitzpatrick, "The Depression of Trade," Industrial Review (London), December 21, 1878.

CHAPTER II

"CO-OPERATION . . . MAY BE REGARDED AS THE HIGHEST DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT AND PRACTICE YET KNOWN IN CONNECTION WITH THE LABOUR INTERESTS OF THE WORLD"

Co-operation formed the core of Lloyd Jones's scheme of things. As an old Owenite, he saw co-operation as the seed of regeneration of the world. Thus for him, it had benefits beyond the pure food and cash benefits of the retail co-operative store. It was the avenue leading to the New Moral World.

But the generation of co-operators following the eclipse of the Owenite movement was less idealistic. And it was these men who launched co-operation on its successful basis in Britain, beginning with the establishment of the first enduring retail store at Rochdale in 1844.

Thus by the eighteen-seventies, two different views had emerged as the proper course for co-operation. The one was the old Owenite vision of transforming the world; the other was the concept of shopkeeping co-operation.

The pragmatic British pointed in this second direction. But Lloyd Jones was the most prominent spokesman for the first point of view, as George Holyoake said of him at the Co-operative Congress just following his death: "He fought for a larger thing than we have in our minds now. It was not only for co-operative institutions, it was for co-operative life that he contended."[1]

Nevertheless Jones was interested in the practical side of co-operation as well, and gave much advice as to how to improve this aspect of co-operation on the retail as well as on the wholesale and productive levels. This illustrates his fundamental Owenite role of a teacher once again. For he sought to advise, warn, and lead the co-operators, especially down the road toward which Robert Owen had pointed, and away from the pitfalls about which in his long experience he had learned.

On the practical level, Jones believed that the first successful form of co-operation, the retail store, was an "antidote to the old fraudulent system of business" operating on the poor which included adulteration of products, short weights and measures, high prices connected with a servile (as he saw it) credit arrangement, and "any other form of wrong shop-keeping" which proprietors "thought proper to practice."[2]

---

[1]"The Eighteenth Annual Co-operative Congress . . . The Late Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, June 19, 1886.

[2]Jones, Co-operation in Danger! An Appeal to the British Public, p. 4.

On its positive side, in addition to correcting these evils, co-operation permitted working class investment in co-operatives and the receipt of annual dividends, which offered a means of bringing comfort into the homes of workers which under capitalism would remain deprived and whose stability would hinge upon the uncertainties of the market.[3]

Yet as a good Owenite, Jones saw a higher purpose in retail co-operation; and it was in this area of theory that the older Owenites parted company with their newer associates. Co-operation moved men away from the "horrible fight for personal gain" and from the "gospel of selfishness" in favor of a higher and more decent relationship of men to men.[4] And very importantly to Jones, it involved the "power of association for fellow help,"[5] or a concrete and meaningful form of fraternity.

In keeping with his idea of a decent society, Lloyd Jones saw a negative advantage to retail co-operation in that it would not have as immediate an adverse impact upon shopkeepers as he believed that the outright rebate or discount store, as operated by civil servants of the Crown,

---

[3]Jones, "Co-operation in England," Bee-Hive, April 29, 1871.

[4]Jones, "The Co-operative Congress," ibid., April 29, 1876.

[5]Jones, Inaugural Address delivered to the seventeenth Annual Co-operative Congress, held at Oldham, May 25, 26, & 27, 1885, p. 4.

had. Jones argued that if co-operation's successful retail operation for the twenty years preceeding 1871 had been the counterpart of the civil service rebate store, hundreds of tradesmen would have been driven into bankruptcy. Jones was proud that this had not happened.[6]

Jones took a dislike to such variants of co-operation as the out-right discount establishment. Such a policy amounted to "a dismal gospel of selfishness" which failed to help reconcile the conflict between individual and collective rights in society.[7]

Retail shopkeeping for the co-operative store was different, taking the form successfully adopted at Rochdale in 1844. According to the usual form of "distributive" co-operation, the retail outlet was able to accumulate a surplus of capital by charging retail prices, but removing the profit of the shopkeeper.[8] The "profits" from the operation of the store were annually divided severally. As a first charge against the profit, the working-class subscribers of shares of capital would receive 7-1/2 percent interest. The remainder of the profit would be divided equally with 50 percent of the balance being returned to the co-operative customers as a rebate,

---

[6]Jones, "Co-operation as Practiced by the Working People. Distribution," Bee-Hive, April 22, 1871.

[7]Jones, "The Co-operative Congress," ibid., April 29, 1876.

[8]Jones, "To the Co-operators of Great Britain. Letter II," ibid., May 20, 1876.

and 50 percent being divided among the shareholders in proportion to their investment.[9] This obviously would encourage working-class thrift and savings. Some co-operative stores set aside 2-1/2 percent of their annual profits for the establishment and development of libraries, as at Rochdale, Bury, and Oldham. And this, of course, pleased Jones and reflected the moral side of co-operation.[10]

Jones was aware of the temptation of the buyer to seek bargains, and he advised co-operators not to abandon co-operative products for a few cheap buys at commercial establishments, for he argued that the co-operative outlet could not continue without regular patronage; and the closing of co-operative stores would assuredly cost working-people money in the long run.[11]

Distributive co-operation was only part of the whole; as he once said while a Christian Socialist, the other form was productive co-operation.[12] To Lloyd Jones, this was fundamental; and this can be understood when it is recalled that the essence of Owenite co-operation was the productive "village of co-operation." And it was

---

[9]Jones, "Co-operation in England," ibid., April 29, 1876.

[10]Jones, "Co-operation as Practiced by the Working People. Distribution," ibid., April 22, 1871.

[11]Jones, "Principle and No Principle," Co-operative News, October 13, 1877.

[12]"The Padiham Discussion on Co-operation," Christian Socialist, December 20, 1851.

productive, not retail, co-operation that the Christian Socialists primarily developed.

"The great secret of co-operation is the organization of consumption and production."[13] On a practical level, this would correlate demand and supply, and in a time of depression, it would militate against over-production,[14] to which the working-class ascribed the economic slump which developed in the mid-eighteen-seventies.

In order for Jones's scheme of the correlation of co-operative supply and demand to operate, some over-all supervisory agency must be given authority to regulate all aspects of the system. This would run counter to the voluntarist nature of Jones's conception of socialism, and certainly counter to the attitude of the co-operators of the seventies.

Co-operative production had social and moral benefits beyond its economic advantages. It would "harmonize individual rights and individual work in an understanding of the rights and work of the collective body."[15] It would, in other words, reconcile labor and capital by

---

[13]"Annual Co-operative Congress. Second Day," Co-operative News, May 4, 1878.

[14]Jones, "Co-operation in England," Bee-Hive, April 29, 1871.

[15]Jones, "The Co-operative Congress," ibid., April 29, 1876.

allowing the worker to become, in the collective sense, his own employer. Not only this, but it would obviously promote industrial peace.[16]

While there were to be many experiments in co-operative production in the eighteen-seventies, this was to prove to be the least successful side of co-operation, although the depression which commenced in the seventies played a role in killing such projects.[17]

Borrowing an idea from the Amalgamated Society of Miners, which was interested in setting up a co-operative colliery, Jones suggested that a first step toward establishing a productive co-operative venture would be to purchase stock in a similar going commercial concern, which would serve as an avenue of knowledge into the realities of the trade,[18] presumably through stockholders' meetings and inquiries to company officers.

The typical co-operative productive factory at this time, however, was operated simply as a commercial concern, whose products went to co-operative purchasing bodies. "But true co-operators feel that the best form of productive co-operation is that which

---

[16] Jones, "Co-operation in England," ibid., April 29, 1871.

[17] Cole, A Century of Co-operation, pp. 159, 162.

[18] Jones, "Trade Unionism and Co-operation," Bee-Hive, April 12, 1873.

makes it a fundamental and unchangeable rule to give labour a right of participation in the profit."[19]

This was part of the famous "bonus to labor" issue that vexed the co-operative movement in the eighteen-seventies. Beginning in the wholesale branch of co-operation and spreading into other branches was the question of whether employees of co-operative enterprises should share in the profit. The question divided the co-operative movement, and was first answered affirmatively, and then negatively. It was ultimately seen as a form of wage supplement, and it came to be felt that good regular wages in the stores would be preferable to an uncertain "bonus."[20]

Jones condemned the "bonus to labor" scheme when adopted by capitalist enterprises, since he believed that it was a trap to evoke thrice as much labor as the bonus paid for from the unwary workman.[21] But in co-operative enterprises, it was necessary as a "practical first step in . . . reconcilement between workmen and their employees."[22] Jones was prepared to be dogmatic on the importance

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Cole, Century of Co-operation, p. 168.

[21] Jones, "Co-operators and Trade Unionists," Bee-Hive, February 17, 1877.

[22] Jones, "Mr. Archibald Briggs and the Miners," ibid., August 24, 1872.

of this point, and asserted that co-operative factories which rejected the bonus to labor rejected one facet of co-operation.[23] Jones was quite serious about co-operation serving as the means to achieve the New Moral World.

The link between productive and co-operative production was the wholesale organization. As we have seen elsewhere, it was late in Lloyd Jones's career in Christian Socialism that he advocated at a conference at Bury that such a central body be established and the following year he served as a manager of E. V. Neale's Central Co-operative Agency and stumped the north of England to develop support for it. This represents some development in his thought from the days of Owenism, when co-operatively produced goods were to be delivered for sale at the "labour exchange."

An additional overall saving might be made in the movement if wholesale co-operation were practiced by retail stores, for the profit of the middle-man might be removed; and this was in fact the reason for the development of the movement as represented by the Co-operative Wholesale Society.[24] Jones believed that in addition to cheapening wholesale prices, large purchases for ready money made in the best markets would ultimately reduce

---

[23]Jones, "A Few Stray Thoughts," Co-operative News, November 10, 1877.

[24]Cole, Century of Co-operation, p. 143.

the cost of the working-class purchaser.[25] Moreover, wholesale co-operation helped to cement the productive and retail aspects of co-operation into a greater whole; it aided the cause of organized production and consumption.[26]

So he took to task retail store buyers who failed to buy as much as they could from their co-operative wholesaler. Jones doubted the allegations of "practical men" that they could buy more cheaply on the open market, and argued that it was economically in their interest to buy from the co-operative wholesaler since it was owned by the retail stores, and it was thus in their own interests not to let their stocks rot and go unsold. Jones himself acknowledged that a good amount of buying for retail stores was not made from the co-operative wholesale center,[27] and he believed that a reason for this was that the buyers for the retail outlets were former journeymen grocers with no commitment to co-operation, and who enjoyed bestowing their patronage broadly.[28]

However, Jones was not uncritical of the wholesale center at Manchester, and in the eighteen-seventies there

---

[25]Jones, "The Co-operators of Great Britain. Letter II," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1876.

[26]"Spennymoor," Co-operative News, July 21, 1877. This is a report of a lecture by Lloyd Jones.

[27]Jones, "Principle and No Principle," ibid., October 13, 1877.

[28]Jones, Co-operation; its Position, its Policy, and its Prospects, p. 8.

was considerable criticism of it on grounds of the quality of its goods and because of its management. Jones avoided making charges of incompetence, but he did suggest that a front-office-nepotism did occur by which wholesale managerial personnel was recruited from the locality of Manchester, which Jones doubted possessed a monopoly of the best talent among co-operators.[29] Moreover, he pointed out that co-operative buyers could not be expected to purchase inferior goods, and that both competency and honesty in wholesale management were essential.[30]

British co-operation never really went beyond the stage of productive, wholesale, and retail co-operation, as Jones hoped it would. It remained a bread-and-butter proposition, although Jones did his best to dissuade it from lassitude in retreating from the old Owenite vision.

As a good disciple of Robert Owen, he believed that the true scope of co-operation made it apply "to all things in life," and was a moral principle and a regenerative process.[31] Again true to his Owenite heritage, he sought repeatedly to inculcate these views, for "teaching in the movement has been too slight and desultory."[32] He

---

[29]Jones, "Letters to the Co-operators of the United Kingdom. No. III. - Patronage," Bee-Hive, May 5, 1877.

[30]Jones, "To the Co-operators of Great Britain. Letter II," ibid., May 20, 1876.

[31]Jones, "To the Co-operators of Great Britain. Letter I," ibid., May 13, 1876.

[32]"The Annual Co-operative Congress. The Third Day's Proceedings," Co-operative News, April 4, 1872.

was thus interested in extending the scope of co-operation to new projects, and urged co-operators to "work in a wider field of experiment."[33]

Thus Jones was one of several co-operative writers who sought to adapt co-operation to the emigration question, which was an issue for decades among nineteenth century British workers. Jones believed that the British working-class owed a duty to that part of itself which felt it necessary to seek opportunities overseas. Writing in 1871, he believed that emigration even in such relatively good times could not be halted, but only guided; and he believed that the distress among agricultural workers was already serious.

With his sense of collective responsibility, Jones suggested that the co-operative movement possessed the ability to be of distinct aid to workers leaving the country; for he saw these emigrants as British workers of the diaspora. Local societies could establish contributory funds sustained by intended emigrants on a weekly basis so as to build up their travel money. The national organization could gather information about such details of actual travel as concerning the most satisfactory means of transportation and how to make arrangements cheaply and in the shortest time.[34]

---

[33]Jones, "A Few Words to Co-operators," ibid., September 22, 1877.

[34]Cf. Milway Vanes numerous articles on the subject, e.g., "Co-operative Colonization," ibid., September 8, 1877.

Co-operative farming had deep Owenite roots, and Jones was interested in this. Still largely untried in 1872, Jones believed that it would provide the "redemption of the masses" once it was put into operation. Jones was very interested in the method by which the scheme was to be undertaken. In harsh language, he condemned the landowning classes for taking without giving, the result of which was to beggar the people. He therefore proposed that the landowners provide the land, and the wealthy middle class provide the money to set up experiments in co-operative farming, since both groups, he contended, had "grown great by the labour of the people." For the ruling classes to fail to do this amounted to an abdication of responsibility. But in this case, Jones believed that the co-operative movement itself could launch such ventures, since there was "a certain market for the produce" and "little risk to run."[35]

In keeping with his old role as a social missionary, Jones joined others in feeling a need for "co-operative propaganda." He recognized that the general public inadequately understood the principles and the operation of co-operation. He believed that the areas of the country in which co-operation was most commonly practiced was most likely to be familiar with its beneficient operation,

---

[35]Jones, "Another Word with Lord Derby," Bee-Hive, October 19, 1872.

for half-crowns had a persuasiveness that theory alone lacks. In more remote regions, tracts could be distributed, setting forth the advantages of co-operation, both moral and practical.[36]

It was in the character of a teacher that Jones performed one of his most valuable services in co-operation. This was to interpret trade unionism to co-operators of the eighteen-seventies when some were becoming impatient at organized labor for failing to discern co-operation's superior merits. Occasional attacks upon trade unionism were made both by the central board of the co-operative movement, and by individuals. Thus in 1877 the Central Co-operative Board condemned a strike at Bolton by cotton spinners as "social warfare,"[37] while the North-Western Section of the same board issued a "Strike Manifesto" denouncing the union's actions.[38] And "Mutual Help" was the pseudonym for the writer of a leading article in the Co-operative News which condemned organized labor for the alleged view that the less work the workman does, the more work remains for others; and that skilled labor received more wages than it deserved.[39]

---

[36]Jones, "To the Co-operators of Great Britain. Co-operative Propagandism. Letter VI," ibid., June 17, 1876.

[37]"Central Co-operative Board," Co-operative News, December 22, 1877.

[38]"Central Co-operative Board . . . North-Western Section," ibid., December 1, 1877.

[39]Mutual Help, "A Co-operative Lesson and Suggestion," ibid., August 25, 1877; cf. Joseph Chretien to Editor, ibid., March 4, 1876.

Jones devoted many articles to the task of explaining the true purposes and operation of trade unionism. He recognized the antagonisms, and his duty in the situation:

> . . . it is impossible to mix on either side without noticing the jealousies and suspicions--the result of ignorance. There is no duty therefore more imperatively called for, on the part of those who occupy the position of leadership in both bodies, than of promoting between them a true knowledge of each other, as regards ideas, acts, and objects. . . .[40]

Jones rejected the criticism of the co-operative opponents of trade unions on various grounds. He pointed out that trade unionists were "the men who were first most active in co-operative effort in the old days;" and were, at his time of writing in 1877, among the "most intelligent shareholders" of co-operative societies.[41]

Beyond this, Jones in numerous articles recounted numerous advantages which trade unions conferred on its members, to be enumerated in the chapter following. He thus sought to show that whatever may be said of the theoretical superiority of co-operation over trade unionism, it did improve the situation of the working man on a practical level in a way that counted.[42] As Jones saw

---

[40]"Annual Co-operative Dinner . . . Trades Societies' Funds and Co-operative Production," ibid., April 3, 1875.

[41]Jones, "Co-operators and Trade Unionists," Bee-Hive, February 17, 1877.

[42]Jones, "Co-operation versus Trade Unionism," ibid., August 31, 1872.

it, trade unionism was needed to deal with the present problems of the bulk of British labor vis a vis capitalism, while co-operation pointed the way toward a better future economic relationship among men in society:[43] "Both are in the same direction, though one moves on a higher and more advanced ground than the other. . . . Both rest on the foundation of a tacitly-acknowledged brotherhood."

---

[43]Jones, "Co-operation and Trade Unionism," ibid., July 8, 1876.

[44]Jones, "London Letter," Co-operative News, July 18, 1874.

CHAPTER III

"THE GREAT TRADE UNION MOVEMENT"

"Trade almost everywhere is admitted to be good. . . ."[1] The summer of 1871, when Lloyd Jones wrote these words, was also the late summer of British working-class prosperity (at least conscious prosperity), which had lasted since the working-class had emerged from the "hungry forties." In 1873 trade began a slump which lasted until the very last years of the nineteenth century.[2] Ironically, real wages for the workers, at least the skilled ones, rose during the depression, as prices dropped more drastically than wages.[3]

There were many causes for the depression, especially growing competition from Europe and the newer continents, and better transportation; but ours is a study

---

[1]Lloyd Jones, "The Fight between Capital and Labour," Bee-Hive, August 26, 1871.

[2]B. M. Mitchell and Phyllis Deane, Abstract of British Historical Statistics (Cambridge: University Press, 1962), pp. 304-305, 472; Sir John H. Clapham, Economic History of Modern Britain, Vol. II: Free Trade and Steel, 1850-1886 (Cambridge: University Press, 1929), pp. 55-57.

[3]Cole, British Working-Class, p. 267.

of British working-class thought on the subject. At the time, manufacturers wished to cut prices and thus wages on the theory that cheapness creates demand. British workers agreed neither with the causes of the depression as seen by later scholars, nor with the remedies proposed by their employers at the time.

Jones took up the question in his usual capacity as a tutor and advisor, seeking to analyze the issues for his readers and to bring the right answers to the problems to their attention.

Lloyd Jones's explanation for poor trade was over-production, and this was the common working-class view.[4] "Supply is increasing without an increased demand; and prices, profits, and wages are becoming less daily."[5] Oversupply was a theme which Jones repeated almost endlessly in the middle and later eighteen-seventies.

He was frustrated that his diagnosis was not accepted by the manufacturers, and he urged the workers to take steps themselves to remedy the malady. He suggested to the men that they "slacken an output acting injuriously on the value" of their labor.[6] By the end of our period

---

[4]Jones, "How to Enrich the Nation," Industrial Review, October 5, 1878.

[5]Jones, "Long Hours of Work," ibid., August 25, 1877.

[6]Jones, "John Bright on Trades Unions," Bee-Hive, May 5, 1875.

of study in 1878, Jones was strongly urging the men to regulate the output of their labor, as the class most adversely affected by the economic conditions.[7] But this advice was not accompanied by concrete suggestions as to how this was to be done without affecting the wage level.

Since the manufacturers were uninterested in reducing production, their remedy was the opposite of Jones's. Among their nostrums was the goal of increasing working hours--"long hours" as the issue was called at the time--without an increase in pay. Jones predicted that a move from the nine-hour day back to a ten-hour one would serve merely to further glut the market.[8]

As can be seen, the competition of other countries keenly concerned British manufacturers. Regarding this, they made several claims of harm to British industry brought by union policy toward wages and hours. They asserted that foreign goods in general,[9] and such products as iron and cotton in particular,[10] were being imported into Britain; and that British industry was moving

---

[7]Jones, "Reduction of Wages in the Cotton Trade," Industrial Review, March 30, 1878.

[8]Jones, "Long Hours," Bee-Hive, December 26, 1874; Jones, "Nine versus Ten Hours' Work," ibid., July 22, 1876.

[9]Jones, "Foreign Competition 'Burst Up,'" ibid., August 29, 1874.

[10]Ibid.; Jones, "English Wages and Foreign Labour," Industrial Review, November 10, 1877.

into other countries to do their manufacturing more cheaply, thus pitting the foreign worker against the British worker, all because of the policies of British unions.[11]

Jones developed a variety of replies. He demanded to see proof that industry was leaving the country.[12] On the contrary, he pointed out that Britain's largest export, cottons, which amounted to one-third of the annual exports, were increasing their markets abroad, although he admitted that money income from sales was declining.[13] If cotton was in trouble, he quoted a British consul to the effect that poor quality and weighted cloth proved harmful in Chinese markets.[14] Jones demanded concrete examples of proof that foreign competitors were marketing their products in Britain.[15] And when he learned that a type of American cloth was on sale in Manchester, he sought to explain this away by stating that it was simply surplus stock whose owners wished to

---

[11]Jones, "The Worth of Wages," Industrial Review, January 6, 1877; Jones, "New Proofs of Foreign Competition," ibid., April 7, 1877.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Jones, "Proposed Reduction of Wages in the Cotton Trade," ibid., November 24, 1877.

[14]Jones, "Respectable Rogues," Bee-Hive, December 19, 1874.

[15]Jones, "The Worth of Wages," Industrial Review, January 6, 1877.

convert into cash.[16] Jones obviously wrote this without knowing details regarding the product, and it can hardly have appeared as more than conjecture.

He held that British labor was efficient[17] and could produce goods more cheaply than American competition,[18] which he refused to take seriously because of its small percentage of world trade compared to the British.[19] He believed that British goods would compete successfully in America except for her protected market.[20]

For Jones was a free trader.[21] He has left no evidence as to the source of his views, but he may well have been one of the thousands touched by the arguments on behalf of free trade by the Anti-Corn Law League and, indeed, the Manchester School of Economics, since they worked strenuously, especially between 1839 and 1842,

---

[16]Jones, "How to Protect the Interests of Trade," Bee-Hive, December 4, 1875.

[17]Jones, "Mr. Mundella on British Workmen," Industrial Review, March 2, 1878.

[18]Jones, "A Dead Heat for Superiority," ibid., March 31, 1877.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Jones, "American Competition," Bee-Hive, October 14, 1876.

[21]Jones, "English and French Manufacture," Industrial Review, August 17, 1878.

to persuade the working-class that free trade in corn would raise both money and real wages.[22]

It is ironic that the heirs of the businessmen of Manchester in the eighteen-seventies should consider protective tariffs in their search for economic remedies for their troubles. Jones labeled this policy "fraud,"[23] and took his stand upon what for him were empirical grounds: British workmen could produce "better and cheaper than they can be produced elsewhere, and they should take their stand boldly upon this fact and let their appeal for open markets go forth to the world justified by it."[24] Jones did not seek to analyze how persuasive this appeal would be in foreign parts.

Jones was more realistic when he sized up the future prospects in 1877: "It is right that the working men of Great Britain should understand that this state of things bids fair to become permanent."[25] Men are fortunate if they can prophesy a quarter-century ahead: and his prediction held good for almost exactly that space of time.

---

[22]William D. Grampp, The Manchester School of Economics (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960), p. 66.

[23]Jones, "Free Trade and Reciprocity," Industrial Review, January 19, 1878.

[24]Jones, "Free Trade," ibid., July 14, 1877.

[25]Jones, "Co-operative Production," Co-operative News, October 20, 1877.

It is interesting that such a dismal assessment did not goad Jones into embracing more drastic economic programs and alternatives, such as Marxism. But he remained true to his theme that trade unions would be helpful in current bread-and-butter ways, and co-operation would slowly build a better future. The working-class in the late seventies were of a similar mind. They stood by their moderate union leaders, and co-operation grew slowly as Marxism dwindled into insignificance, though it was to enjoy a revival in the eighties.

Despite Jones's deep commitment to co-operation, the bulk of Jones's writings in the Bee-Hive and Industrial Review dealt with trade union subjects; and the feeling with which he wrote made it evident that he wrote from grounds of deep commitment. Co-operation itself recognized Jones's dual commitment when the Co-operative News wrote that

> of Lloyd Jones's labours on behalf of trade union organization, it may be sufficient here to say that they commenced in 1827, when he became a trade unionist, being appointed secretary to the journeymen's union of the trade in which he worked in 1830, and were never discontinued. . . .[26]

And Ludlow said much the same thing: "Two great movements, the Co-operative movement and the Trade Union movement, always commanded the best of his powers."[27]

---

[26]"Life of Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, May 29, 1886.

[27]J. M. Ludlow to Editor, Spectator, May 29, 1886.

Lloyd Jones used the pen of an Owenite journalist. He advised the workers as to their true policy, and sought to explain and defend trade union principles, which themselves constituted an old Owenite goal, to a suspicious outside world.

Jones wrote in the latter days of the Manchester School of Economics--primarily businessmen, and of the classical economists. Neither group was strictly laissez-faire in all its aspects, but both groups had grave reservations about the operation of trade unions.[28] Lloyd Jones accepted that businessmen were sincere even when they challenged the idea of the "combination" of employees for purposes of bettering their working lot.[29] Unlike Marx with his theory of the class struggle, Jones did not believe that the interests of British labor were in theory incompatible with those of capital: he hoped that "solid grounds of agreement" might be reached to "permanently arrange matters which now most seriously divide them."[30] This is strange doctrine from a man who made co-operation

---

[28]Grampp, The Manchester School of Economics, pp. 36, 37, 80, 86; Marian Bowley, Nassau Senior and Classical Economics (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937), pp. 244, 257, 269, 277-79; Leslie Stephen, Life of Henry Fawcett (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1885), pp. 150, 160, 161.

[29]Jones, "The Coming Struggle on the Clyde," Bee-Hive, November 21, 1874.

[30]Jones, "Trade Unionism and Internationalism," ibid., September 20, 1873.

the core of his life, unless by rearranging matters he meant the triumph of co-operation over ordinary business. Yet it is not strange in the light of the general Owenite principle of seeking to compose and harmonize the interests of mankind. And this is gospel as far as his friends many of the secretaries of the British trade unions were concerned in the eighteen-seventies. This was a continuation of the doctrines of the "Junta" of the eighteen-sixties--the London-based Union leaders who wished to accept the economic system of Britain but to find a larger place in it for their working men.

What benefits accrued or were expected to accrue from trade unionism? Jones said he was a practical man, holding it wiser to struggle "for the nearest attainable goal."[31] He thus believed that joint bargains made between the men and employers were better than single ones,[32] the reverse of which meant the absence of men competing against one another, making for lower wages.[33] Union meant power and a better distribution of profits in the form of wages for men.[34]

---

[31]Jones, "Mr. Ellis and Myself. The Nine Hours' Bill," ibid., September 13, 1873.

[32]Jones, "Co-operative Congress at Newcastle," ibid., April 25, 1873.

[33]Jones, "Pauperized Labour," ibid., December 18, 1875.

[34]Jones, "The Colliers in South Wales," ibid., January 1, 1873.

However, Owenite moralist that he was, there was more in the cultural, collective, and democratic spheres. In general, he hoped that unionism would be accompanied by such employment changes as to provide more culture, rest, and recreation for the workers,[35] and would generally elevate them.[36] How?

> They tend to give him a sense of independence of character, and . . . definite ideas of duty in common with his fellows for common ends. They also discipline him so as to enable him to act with men situated like himself under a leadership of his own choice, and thus gives him opportunities of considering and understanding what he gives up and what he gains by acting with others for the attainment of common ends.[37]

Since Jones, at least by his own standards, viewed events with a practical eye, he believed that there were rules of trade union operation which must be observed, if success were to be attained. Union leaders should keep their eyes on the state of the business of their employer, in order to know whether the time was favorable to take action.[38] Jones also stressed loyalty to the union and the avoidance of excess in setting forth

---

[35]Jones, "Mr. Ellis and Myself. The Nine Hours' Bill," ibid., September 13, 1873.

[36]Jones, "The Amalgamated Engineers at Newcastle," ibid., July 4, 1874.

[37]Jones, "Bonus on Labour," Co-operative News, November 3, 1877.

[38]Jones, "Advise to Trade Unionists," Bee-Hive, March 21, 1874.

goals; he believed that unions should avoid seeking the impossible.[39] And a good treasury and persistence were needed.[40]

With regard to union policy, one of the major problems of the mid- and later eighteen-seventies with its economic slump was the decline of wages. Jones by no means accepted the idea that wages should decrease in proportion to the drop in prices. A wage minimum should be demanded "such as will secure sufficiency of food and some degree of personal and home comfort to the workers; not a miserable allowance to starve on. . . ."[41] Moreover, Jones was not moved by employers' allegations that wages were barriers to British foreign competition. He delighted in the use of statistics, upon which he drew frequently, to show that British trade was expanding,[42] rather than being driven from the country by unionism.[43]

When trade was good, wrote Jones, excessive profits were made by employers, who now used the excuse of

---

[39]Jones, "The Amalgamated Engineers at Newcastle," ibid., July 4, 1874.

[40]Jones, "Advise to Trade Unionists," ibid., March 21, 1874.

[41]Jones, "Should Wages be Regulated by Market Prices," ibid., July 18, 1874.

[42]Jones, "Foreign Competition and the Nine Hours' Bill," ibid., August 23, 1874.

[43]Jones, "Strike in the Ship-Building Trade," ibid., June 13, 1874.

a changing economy to drop wages.[44] Jones in 1876 doubted whether profits had done more than gradually diminish; but by 1878 he accepted the fact of short profits.[45] But in any event he believed that wages should be considered a fixed cost, and reductions should come from profits, not wages.[46]

As a humane man, Jones was also concerned for the fate of the "less efficient worker" in the poorer-paid industries, which he defined as the old, the ailing, and the inefficient worker. If wages dropped too much for these, they would be thrown on the rates, which Jones felt would be harmful both to the workers and to the general public.[47]

If an agreement on wages could not be reached between the master and the men, several roads lay open. Jones preferred arbitration and conciliation,[48] as will be shown later. But strikes, though costly in any

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Jones, "Co-operation and Trade Unionism," ibid., July 8, 1876; Jones, "The Lancashire Lock-Out and American Competition," Industrial Review, May 4, 1878.

[46] Jones, "Strike in the Ship-Building Trade," Bee-Hive, June 13, 1874.

[47] Jones, "Pauperized Labour," ibid., December 18, 1875.

[48] Jones, "The Difficulty Not Explained," ibid., March 11, 1876.

event,[49] were sometimes unavoidable.[50] This was precisely the view of the London-based trade union leadership.

Jones believed that strikes inherently contained a factor which worked against unions. Speaking of a miner's strike, he wrote that "every hungry man, woman, and child in South Wales is practically on the side of the employers";[51] and that "hunger and cold tell on women and little ones," thus eroding away the resolve of the men.[52]

Strikes were theoretically defensible, Jones contended, for labor was a commodity held by the workers. It could either be sold or left unsold as its owners chose; and they naturally desired to make a good bargain for themselves.[53] A strike was thus not unlike a business transaction: a refusal to sell except at a satisfactory price.[54]

---

[49]Jones, "Professor Kirk on Unionism," ibid., December 11, 1875.

[50]Jones, "The Great South Wales Lockout," ibid., January 11, 1873.

[51]Jones, "The South Wales Lock-out and Non-Unionists," ibid., April 10, 1875.

[52]Jones, "The Labour Conflict in South Wales," ibid., January 9, 1875.

[53]Jones, "The Clergy and Trade Unionism. Letter 2: Limits of the Hours of Labour," Industrial Review, August 4, 1877.

[54]Jones, "Strike Ship-Building Trade," Bee-Hive, June 13, 1874.

As Lloyd Jones recognized, strikes were weapons that could cut two ways, and during the great depression of trade the issue was a particularly sensitive and important one. During the economic slump, the most positive and important role that Jones played was his constant and influential advocacy of arbitration, perhaps following the lead of this policy's most prominent national exponent, A. J. Mundella, a liberal Member of Parliament of Sheffield.[55] The idea was not new at the time,[56] but Jones gave it marked prominence in his writings; and arbitration certainly became more widely practiced during his advocacy of this.

Jones believed that arbitration had several advantages. This made for industrial peace, and there was no issue that arbitration could not handle which a strike or lock-out could. And it made for fairness or equity in industrial relation.[57] This was, moreover, a civilized method of composing differences, by rejecting "brute force" and "arbitrary authority" in trades disputes.[58]

---

[55] V. L. Allen, "The Origins of Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration," International Review of Social History, IX, pt. 2 (1964), 245, 254.

[56] Ibid., 242-43; William Warrender Mackenzie Amulee, Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain (London: Oxford, 1929), pp. 55-57.

[57] Jones, "The Great South Wales Lockout," Bee-Hive, January 11, 1873; Jones, "Hints for the Coming Congress," ibid., January 2, 1875.

[58] Jones, "The Great South Wales Lockout," ibid., January 11, 1873.

It was to the advantage of labor to utilize this device; for in their clashes, capital had the advantage over the men, Jones asserted.[59] Perhaps because of this advantage, the men more often than the employers sought its services.[60] One management criticism of it was that it was unenforceable: its decisions could not be made compulsory. Jones rejected this by observing that in practice, the decisions were in fact accepted.[61]

Jones was very hopeful for arbitration in 1876. He observed at the beginning of the year that nearly every important industrial dispute for the previous eighteen to twenty-four months had been settled by arbitration.[62] He himself, by the summer of 1875, had served as arbitrator in disputes involving nearly 100,000 men.[63] But by 1877, Jones was less optimistic; and this was a year of strikes. To him, management was becoming less enthusiastic than ever about arbitration, thus losing an opportunity to establish friendly relations

---

[59]Jones, "The Cumulative Vote and Town Councils," ibid., July 26, 1873.

[60]"New Phases in the Labour Struggle," ibid., February 20, 1875.

[61]Jones, "The Employers' Organ and Arbitration," ibid., June 26, 1875.

[62]Jones, "Working Men's Teachers," ibid., January 8, 1876.

[63]Jones, "An Electioneering Story," ibid., July 17, 1875.

with the men.[64] But by this time, the British economy was entering a trough in its depression, which doubtless contributed to the growing inflexibility of British industry.

A sign of industrial hardening to changing economic conditions, even before 1878, was the "discharge note." This was a certificate given by coal mines in Wales, under an agreement reached by mine operators in 1873, without which further employment was impossible in the mine fields. Jones labeled this arrangement as an act of tyranny which must be resisted, for the workers' manly self-respect was at stake. Jones pointed out that the discharge note involved a power over the subsequent employment of adults which was lacked by the sovereign of Great Britain herself. And he warned that it was capable of serious abuse at great human cost, for it could be withheld for trade union activities or perhaps for "offending against any under-strapper in any way."[65]

Jones took a fair amount of trouble to apologize for the trade union movement when it was accused of a number of harmful practices. One of these was the restriction of apprentices in trades, even to the point

---

[64]Jones, "Peace or War--Arbitration or Strikes," Industrial Review, August 4, 1877.

[65]Jones, "The Rights of the Working Men in Danger," Bee-Hive, September 13, 1873.

of denying entry to workers' own children, thus depriving them of earning a living in their own trade. Jones denied that children of the men were kept out; and observed that only some unions engaged in restricting apprentices, which he justified on historical grounds. It was a habit traceable to medieval guilds.[66] Jones was on weak ground here, for he was the last to accept custom as a defense under other circumstances.

He also defended the closed shop, which he believed to prevail in a "very limited number of small trades." He again pointed to medieval guilds as precedents; and suggested that non-unionists sought a free-ride at the cost and expense of union members. He could understand how unionists would not wish to work alongside such men.[67]

A charge frequently made in uninformed or hostile circles was that trade unions engaged in coercion and even murder as a routine procedure against non-unionists. Jones not only denied this, but observed that well-organized unions were powerful factors in militating against such intimidation. Jones claimed that violence

---

[66]Jones, "The 'Financial Reformer' and Trades Unions," ibid., November 22, 1873; cf. Jones, Trade Unions. Two Lectures (London: George Potter, 1877), pp. 15-19.

[67]Jones, "The Clergy and Trade Unionism. Letter 5: Do Union Men Refuse to Work with Non-union Men," Bee-Hive, August 25, 1875.

among the men was more common in the days before the repeal of the combination acts.[68]

Another charge was that unions limited their men's work to less than a half-day's fair production. Here Jones divided the honors. He denied that unions limited work to less than a half day's real output, but did agree that there was a difference of opinion "as to how much work should be done for four, five, or six shillings."[69]

A similar accusation was that shorter hours meant reduced productivity. This was the kind of attack which Jones relished answering, as his writings reveal. He could draw both upon the record and upon paradox. And he did so by pointing out that since the trade union movement had reduced working hours and improved conditions, England had never enjoyed such prosperity.[70] When Jones joined battle on this issue, neither side took account of the role of invention and artificial power in production.

Opponents of unions also charged that unions sought a uniform pay scale which had the effect of

---

[68] Jones, "The 'Financial Reformer' and Trades Unions," ibid., November 22, 1873; Jones, "Professor Newman and Trades Union Leaders," ibid., October 2, 1875.

[69] Jones, "The 'Financial Reformer' and Trades Unions," ibid., November 22, 1873.

[70] "Trade Unions," ibid., March 24, 1877. This is a report of two lectures by Lloyd Jones.

driving the ablest men from the trade. Jones saw this as the unions' seeking only a minimum wage for all workers, without in the least precluding additional pay for superior work.[71]

Jones also denied that trade unionism was such an impediment to production that British capital left the country. He in fact argued that the contrary was the case, and made an appeal to statistics. He pointed out that during twenty good years of unionism--twenty years "that weigh like a succession of ugly nightmares" on trade union critics--London's rateable valuation rose from eleven million pounds sterling to more than twenty-three millions sterling.[72] And he showed statistically that Britain's cotton trade, as late as 1875, was increasing at a time when that of France was in decline.[73]

Jones concluded one defense of trade unions with these words: "If those who criticize trade unions knew better the actual condition of our national industries in the workshops these things would need no explanation." In another place he gave concrete illustration to this by an unforgettable description of a trip of 1873 into a Welsh coal mine:

---

[71]Jones, "The 'Financial Reformer' and Trades Unions," ibid., November 22, 1873.

[72]Jones, "A Word to the Cassandras," ibid., December 30, 1876.

[73]Jones, Trade Unions. Two Lectures, p. 44.

> . . . the ascent through the down draft and in an open iron cage wet and dirty, where we had to squat down and hold on by a wet and muddy chain, was excrutiatingly uncomfortable. . . . The passage from the shaft, I think it is called the air way, is right enough, if you do not bring your forehead into contact with the timbering at the top, which sometimes is forced down in a rather dangerous way by the superincumbent pressure. . . . The heat was intolerable, and the man's blows were so rapid as to involve great exertion. . . . He was earning his bread by the sweat of his brow it is true, but he was earning it also in the sweat of every pore in his skin, and in such a way as to produce wonder and pity, to think that any human creature, under any pretense whatever, should have to lead such a life.[74]

But if Jones defended trade unionism he also felt called upon, as an old Owenite teacher would do, to point out its failings. In particular, he took an interest in the Trades Union Congress, an annual assemblage since 1868. Jones took issue with the session of 1873. The fullest account of its proceedings appeared in the Bee-Hive. No doubt its coverage was intended to avoid any embarrassment to the affair, so suggestive words that it used may conceal stronger events. It reported that "animated debate" occurred on the second day of the congress when C. E. Yardley of Oldham criticized the miners' leadership to the effect that they had really betrayed the interests of the men. Not unnaturally Alexander MacDonald of the miners "warmly protested" such

---

[74]Jones, "Coal Mine Explosions," Bee-Hive, March 22, 1875.

sentiments.[75] And the list of delegates do show that there was no close correlation between the number of men who sent delegates, and the number of delegates sent.

Jones considered the T.U.C. of 1873 to be virtually scandalous.[76] He wrote that its proceedings were more uproarious than parliamentary,[77] and went so far as to suggest that a better quality of delegates would have been desirable.[78] But his main concern was with malrepresentation. He pointed out that no real democratic system of representation of union groups existed under the rules, and that this resulted in over-, under-, and multiple representation.[79] Jones suggested with a tone of urgency that a proper method of selection of delegates in proportion to those workers represented, and also a dignified procedure, needed to be adopted for the next congress. There is no evidence that his procedural recommendations received any official action.

---

[75] "Annual Trades Congress," ibid., January 18, 1875.

[76] Jones, "The Sheffield Congress. Letter II: To the Trades Unionists of Great Britain," ibid., January 31, 1874.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Jones, "The Sheffield Congress. Letter I: To the Trades Unionists of Great Britain," ibid., January 24, 1874.

[79] Jones, "The Sheffield Congress. Letter II: To the Trades Unionists of Great Britain," ibid., January 31, 1874.

So in 1875 Jones's impatience with the T.U.C. remained. He did not see it developing into the cohesive, powerful force in labor that he hoped for. He believed that federations of similar unions (such as miners) should develop, probably three in number. He felt that this would enhance the power of the unionists.[80] Jones was vague about details, and in any event, his suggestions were not taken up for action. In a time of declining trade, his proposals meant division, while most saw the need for unity and solidarity. But in a time of trade union problems, it is not unnatural that Jones looked to alternatives when he was disappointed with current solutions.

Jones showed much greater impatience with the International Working Men's Association in the one instance that he dealt with it. It will be recalled that it was organized in London in 1864 with a moderate policy, but one which soon became Marxist.[81] By 1873 the First International was in its last days, and even Marx and

---

[80] Jones, "Federation of Trades Societies," ibid., May 29, 1875; Jones, "Federation of Trades Unions," ibid., October 16, 1875.

[81] George Howell, "History of the International Association," Nineteenth Century, July, 1878, p. 29. Howell was its secretary for a time. Cf. Henry Collins and Chimen Abramsky, Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement: Year of the First International (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), pp. 35, 36-37, 39.

Engels recognized this.[82] But a thinly-attended sixth international Congress met in Geneva in September of that year. It mainly consisted of local residents, but to which the anarchist-secessionist British Federal Council of the First International sent John Hales and John George Eccarius. Hales was the real organizer of the British section of the International, and Eccarius was an old comrade of Marx and general secretary of the International before Marx broke with them.[83] The Congress was anarchist in character, and Jones, without going into particulars, described its deliberations as "absolutely insane." He believed that the Congress, with its British representation, would give the enemies of labor weapons to use against the British working-man who nonetheless rejected the principles discussed at Geneva. Jones lashed out at the two British delegates, Hales and Eccarius, asserting that they were unknown to the British labor movement, and delegates of no one.[84]

---

[82]Henry Collins, "The English Branches of the First International," Essays in Labour History, eds. Asa Briggs and John Saville (London: Macmillan, 1960), p. 274.

[83]Julius Braunthal, History of the International, 1864-1914, tr. Henry Collins and Kenneth Mitchell (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1966), p. 191; Collins and Abramsky, Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement, pp. 32, 270, 299; Collins, "The English Branches of the First International," pp. 257, 274.

[84]Jones, "Trade Unionism and Internationalism," Bee-Hive, September 20, 1873; cf. Robert Rawson, "Mr. Mottershead and the Geneva Address," ibid., February 21, 1874, and Jones, "The International and the English Delegates," ibid., October 4, 1873.

In this he was hardly fair, since both men had made places for themselves in the left wing of the English labor movement and neither was a nonentity. As mentioned, Jones did not go into specifics as to his objections to the proceedings at Geneva. As was often his custom, he dealt only with generalities. He has left no editorial reactions to the earlier policies of the First International.

But a phase of trade unionism about which Jones left a wealth of opinion was agricultural unionism. The subject seems to have interested him both because he saw in it the class issue, which always provoked him; and because of his natural compassion or fraternity for persons in abject situations in life.

Agricultural unionism had been dormant since the eighteen-thirties and the days of the "Tolpuddle Martyrs," when the law had been used to beat down a local union by penal servitude in the colonies. In 1871 a new movement developed in the fields, and developed rapidly. By 1872 Joseph Arch, a laborer and lay Primative Methodist preacher, organized the National Agricultural Labourers' Union, on whose consulting committee Lloyd Jones held a seat.[85] Many local and one additional national union developed. After

---

[85]Broadsheet and address of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union to the Trades' Unionists of Great Britain and Ireland, no. B152, Joseph Cowen Collection, Newcastle Central Library, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

an initial impressive growth, agricultural unionism faced a serious farmers' lock-out in 1874, and a lingering death began, intensified in 1876-1877 by the beginning of a depression in farming.

Lloyd Jones took much interest in the burgeoning efforts to organize. He believed that the agricultural worker lived in such abject, unendurable misery as to be a race apart, and that the advent of modern times produced more privation for him than the middle ages had provided his medieval counterpart. He was nothing more than an English "helot."[86] Jones described at length the poor living conditions and the dire financial difficulties of these workers.[87]

He saw agricultural unionism offer promise of "something approaching . . . a fair remuneration, something sufficient to put some slight degree of comfort and independence" into the lives of the laboring family.[88]

Jones believed that the demands of the workers were being resisted by the landholders not only because

---

[86]Jones, "Our Agricultural Labourers," Bee-Hive, December 23, 1871; Jones, "The Agricultural Labourer," ibid., January 12, 1872; Jones, "The Movement in the Agricultural Districts," ibid., March 30, 1872; Jones, "Movement among Agricultural Labourers," ibid., May 11, 1872.

[87]Jones, "The Agricultural Labourer," ibid, January 13, 1872; Jones, "Our Social Puzzles," ibid., May 30, 1874.

[88]Jones, "The Movement in the Agricultural Districts," ibid., March 30, 1872.

they involved advanced wages, but because unionism itself was an issue--more of an issue than wages, he thought.[89] Jones was the more indignant about agrarian conditions because of the contrast in living circumstances between the workers and their landed social betters.[90]

The possession of the land by the landed classes was a national grievance, Jones contended. He pointed out that much land was feudal in origin and thus in the middle ages its possession was contingent on military service.[91] Jones strongly condemned the abolition of feudal tenures in 1646 by the Long Parliament, describing it as "a great crime committed by an English parliament of landholders against the people of England,"[92] especially since it was unaccompanied by any compensation. Jones believed that the "rent-charge" was thus lost to the nation, which justly should have resulted in the forfeiture of all such estates. A result was that the landed classes made "war at other people's expense" which had cost the nation £800,000,000 in the form of public debt.[93]

---

[89]Jones, "The Fight in the Agricultural Districts," ibid., April 18, 1874; Jones, "The Fight of the Farm Labourers," ibid., May 9, 1874.

[90]Jones, "Landlords and Farmers," ibid., April 6, 1872.

[91]Jones, "Labourers and Lords," ibid., April 25, 1874.

[92]Jones, "British Slaves and British Masters," ibid., August 4, 1874.

[93]Jones, "Labourers and Lords," ibid., April 25, 1874.

If Jones's understandings regarding the financing of wars and the raising of troops is one-sided and naive, we can remember that he wrote in 1874, when the lock-out of the workers by the farmers made emotions run high.

As an old Owenite, Jones made favorable passing allusions to a peasant land tenure[94] and to land socialization,[95] but he had no expectation of achieving these in England. But he did believe that a social revolt, perhaps as drastic as that of Jack Cade in the fourteenth century, was possible if corrective action toward the farm laborers was not taken.[96]

He took cognizance of various specific issues which arose in connection with the agricultural movement. He grudgingly approved, as if surprised and unbelieving, the Liberal government's decision of 1872 and thereafter not to hire out soldiers to farmers for field work where local labor was available or when a labor disturbance existed. But implementation was another matter and he admonished his readers that local authorities needed to be watched lest they circumvent this ruling.[97]

---

[94]Jones, "Stein's Statute--the Land Question," ibid., November 20, 1875.

[95]Jones, "Great Meeting in Exeter Hall," ibid., December 14, 1872.

[96]Jones, "Our Agricultural Labourers," ibid., December 23, 1871; Jones, "The Agricultural Labourer," ibid., January 13, 1872; Jones, "Soldiers in the Harvest Fields," ibid., November 30, 1872.

[97]Ibid.; cf. especially "Soldiers in the Harvest Fields."

During the lock-out of 1874, Lloyd Jones urged that urban trade unions send funds to their rural counterparts, and he praised the Amalgamated Society of Engineers for their aid in this regard.[98] This relief movement was successful in getting a considerable amount of relief funds into the hands of farm workers.

The lock-out of 1874 was the crisis for the farm laborers, and it broke their movement. But it did not break Lloyd Jones's confidence in unionism. Time later proved his judgment right that "trade Unions . . . are excellent in their effect on the condition of working men."[99]

---

[98]Jones, "The Fight of the Farm Labourers," ibid., May 9, 1874.

[99]Jones, "Bonus on Labour," Co-operative News, November 3, 1877.

CHAPTER IV

"WE AIM AT A DEMOCRATIC TRANSFORMATION"

Politics intensely interested Lloyd Jones. In part this was simply because in his make-up he was a highly politically-sensitive political being. But in part there were Owenite implications. For British politics, as Jones saw it, was in large measure the politics of class; and Jones's deep Owenite sense of humanity and fraternity were outraged by the operation of the class system, and the way it treated people, in nineteenth century Britain. But Jones had more than compassion; he had an activist nature; and the old social missionary had recently become the secretary of the Labour Representation League. And he felt that class produced serious problems for the working-man in the British political system.

England was a country with a "habit of class preference and class exclusion" which would require serious efforts at remedy.[1] The aristocracy was guilty of

---

[1]Lloyd Jones, "The Duty of the Hour," Bee-Hive, January 14, 1871.

"bleeding" England for the benefit of family interest,[2] and the middle-class, by their actions, scoffed at the Christian faith by their denial of brotherhood.[3] Jones resented criticisms of the working-class, such as those of the celebrated Dr. Samuel Smiles, the famed Victorian exponent of self-help, unless these were accompanied by criticisms of other classes in Britain as well.[4]

Jones contended--naively if judged by the standards of twentieth-century economics--that the workers were the producers of the country's wealth; but because of the operation of the class system, the urban artisans were able to eat only "scant" meals while the agricultural laborers' condition was "one of almost continual famine."[5] In more places than one, Jones hinted that the tensions engendered by the class divisions might end in civil strife or social revolution. He once asked, " . . . do we not know that the very ground under the feet of these people [the upper classes] is hot with the smouldering fires of discontent?"[6] And he warned:

---

[2]Jones, "The House of Lords," ibid., December 16, 1871.

[3]Jones, "German Socialism," Industrial Review, April 6, 1878.

[4]Jones, "The Way the World Goes," ibid., June 2, 1877.

[5]Jones, "Our Millionaires and our Workers," Bee-Hive, November 23, 1872.

[6]Jones, "High Life in the Hunting Field," ibid., October 26, 1872.

> There is no use trying to hide the fact that we are in the midst of danger--that such a system of ours, with its shocking moral anomalies, necessarily carried danger in it. Woe to the nation when the magnificence of the few displays itself in the face of the misery of the many; and that woe will most assuredly come to England, unless her statesmen can discover some way of rectifying so inhuman a condition of things, or if the masses of her people, made wise by their sufferings, do not set themselves quietly and thoughtfully to work, with the view of putting a higher spirit of justice into the business of life.[7]

Jones did not leave a full assessment of the British constitution. But he did comment upon aspects of it, notably the monarchy, the House of Lords, the House of Commons, and the electoral system with special application to the Liberal Party.

With respect to the political system as it operated in the eighteen-seventies, Jones took a position quite similar to Marx. The British class system

> . . . implies . . . employment of law, custom, and intelligence as agencies for the plunder of the masses. Good government means the pursuit of policies calculated to promote the general welfare of the people. . . . It is the merest nonsense to boast of the wealth of a nation in which the masses have no security of life from one day to another.[8]

Because of the stringency of his views on class, it is surprising that the tone of Jones's views towards the British monarchy was so moderate. Jones was never attracted to republicanism although the movement excited

---

[7]Jones, "Our Millionaires and our Workers," ibid., November 23, 1872.

[8]Ibid.

as much interest among the working-class in the eighteen-seventies as it was ever to do.[9] He basically felt that the British monarchy was "without motion, will, or even life." He did not like the way the republican issue was presented. Jones believed that the matter was presented to the public on "low ground," by questioning the incomes of the royal family. He did not develop his criticisms of the republicans further. In his general attitude toward the monarchy, Jones stood with the bulk of the working-class leadership; they did not join George Odger and a few others in their crusade against it. But Jones had criticism in abundance for Parliament and especially for the House of Lords. "The laws made in Parliament for working-men are almost necessarily one-sided,"[10] and he thought that this was notably true in the House of Lords.

Jones saw the House of Lords as the preserve of the aristocracy; and the House of Commons dominated by the middle-class. Unlike some observers today, Jones did not recognize that the same interests were represented in both houses, if in differing degrees in the eighteen-seventies.

---

[9]Norbert J. Gossman, "Republicanism in Nineteenth Century England," International Review of Social History, VII, pt. 1 (1962), 51.

[10]Jones, "The Trades Union Bill," Bee-Hive, February 25, 1871.

With respect to constitutional structure, a second house might be desirable for the practical side of legislation, but Jones believed that the House of Lords did not satisfy the public interest in this way at the time. There were many objections to it. "The Upper House originated in the predominance of caste, and always ruled in the interest of family and class." It exercised power "by the influence of prejudice, wealth, and ignorance." The peers never, even at the time of the drafting of Magna Carta, demanded "national rights" or worked for national liberty. He cited examples of their opposing the repeal of the "taxes on knowledge" at mid-nineteenth century. Indeed, he argued that the main function rendered by the Lords was to thwart the wishes of the people. He believed that the only arguable benefit derived from the Lords was in its capacity of a deliberative body, which, however, by describing voting in a thinly-attended session, he sought to discredit. Thus, because the peers "fight the old, selfish class battle," they must be reformed.[11] However, Jones did not specify the manner of reform he wished to see imposed upon the second chamber of the British Parliament.

Lloyd Jones's objection to the House of Commons was on the same order. Due to the operation of the class

---

[11]Jones, "The House of Lords," ibid., December 16, 1871.

system in the political parties in the wake even of the Reform Act of 1867, when many urban working-men received the franchise, working-men were not able to find seats in the Commons. This had a practical urgency:

> We have pressing on us now questions connected with the conditions of labour, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated. Pauper questions, prison labour conditions, agricultural labour questions, questions connected with the employment of women and children of the poor, . . .[12]

Yet it was the country squires, manufacturers, sons of peers, lawyers, and speculators who decided these matters "in such a manner as may seem to them best." "Not one working man," he wrote in 1871, "who understands such questions by the daily experiences of his life can open his lips in the national assembly where they are practically dealt with and decided."[13]

This was one factor which led Jones, along with others, into the advocacy of legislative reapportionment, or redistribution, as it was called. Jones was highly dissatisfied with the apportionment of constituencies made by the Tory-sponsored Second Reform Act of 1867. He denied that, because of its anomalies, it could be called a representative "system" at all, for "it neither aims at representing the property or the intelligence of the Country," and consequently "it serves no

---

[12]Jones, "Parliamentary Ballot Gabble," ibid., May 4, 1871.

[13]Ibid.

understood purpose."[14] He was particularly annoyed at urban under-representation, so that in 1873 he showed that 46 Members of Parliament were chosen by less than two million voters, while 35 Members of Parliament were sent by over five million voters.[15]

This was not without practical consequences. Thus a sewage bill for Birmingham was defeated by 150 Members of Parliament, representing 1,063,000 voters, while the minority of 147 M.P.'s represented 1,455,000.[16]

The urban under-representation which Jones was protesting was all the more disadvantageous, to Jones's mind, since he believed that "the most active and enterprising people in the country belong to our great cities and towns."[17]

Consequently Lloyd Jones urged working-men in 1873 to act speedily in joining reformers and push Parliament rapidly toward a correction of mal-representation.[18] And he was not prepared to accept criticism of working-class enfranchisement. Jones said that the classes that,

---

[14]Jones, "Redistribution of Electoral Power, ibid., May 10, 1873.

[15]Jones, "The Constitution of the Trades Congress," ibid., January 30, 1875.

[16]Jones, "Redistribution of Electoral Power," ibid., May 10, 1873.

[17]Jones, "Popular Power," ibid., January 6, 1872.

[18]Jones, "Redistribution of Electoral Power," ibid., May 10, 1873.

in effect, were locked-out of enfranchisement were the very ones which consistently gave support "to those Liberal measures from which the nation . . . had derived so much advantage. . . ."[19]

Allied to this was the issue of the expansion of the suffrage to include the agricultural workers. This was accomplished in 1884. But in 1872 he praised the work of the Electoral Reform Association for pressure in this direction, and offered some practical advice.

Jones believed that agricultural suffrage was a most important question, and that its attainment would have strong if indirect advantageous social implications for the farm laborers. Jones was less specific than we may desire; but he urged that the provisions of the Association's plans be clearly and widely stated to the general public. He believed that if this were done, popular acceptance would prepare the Members of Parliament to accept the reform; and that candidates for Parliament could be closely questioned on this issue. Also, Jones said that a special, non-partisan effort should be made to obtain the backing of the working-class for this measure. He advised the Electoral Reform Association not to be concerned if slight differences in opinion or program appeared in their membership. This, he said,

---

[19]Jones, "Should Trades Unionists Be Political," ibid., January 17, 1874.

was inevitable in such a movement, and total conformity in all things could not be expected.[20]

A third parliamentary reform which Jones sought was the public financing, from the rates, of parliamentary campaigns. He believed that a race between candidates of unequal financial strength was plainly an unequal contest.[21] In effect, the privately-financed electoral system amounted to a de facto disqualification of workingmen from membership in the House of Commons.[22] As things stood in 1871, Parliament was a closed corporation in which "middle and upper class interests" shaped public policy.[23] Thus this point was more of a class than a party question.[24]

Class tainted labor's relations with the parties, Jones believed. Jones, a "Radical of what is commonly called an 'advanced type,'"[25] and a long affinity for what he called Liberal principles, and thus, though to

---

[20]Jones, "Electoral Reform Conference," ibid., November 16, 1872.

[21]Jones, "Mr. Gladstone and the Ballot Question," ibid., November 4, 1871.

[22]Jones, "Parliamentary Ballot Gabble," ibid., May 4, 1872.

[23]Jones, "Mr. Gladstone and the Ballot Question," ibid., November 4, 1871.

[24]Jones, "Parliamentary Ballot Gabble," ibid., May 4, 1872.

[25]"Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, May 29, 1886.

a lesser degree, for the Liberal party. When he began to serve as first secretary of the Labour Representation League, it merely sought to bring working-men to the polls to stand as Liberals.[26] But as disappointment with the Liberal Party increased in the early eighteen-seventies, the Labour Representation League and others came to desire independent political action, "a great Labour party," as one of its manifestoes declared.[27]

Lloyd Jones in general felt that labor's welfare would be best served through the Liberal party; and his articles reflect this. His articles both before and after 1873-74 reflect this. But during 1873-1874 his silence on this issue, plus his subscribing to the 1873 manifesto in favor of "a great Labour Party" suggest a disaffection and disillusionment in these years. But he soon returned to the fold, as did the first two candidates of the Labour Representation League to win election to the House of Commons, Thomas Burt and Alexander Macdonald in 1874. These men sat as Liberals, as did the third man, Henry Broadhurst in 1880. In all this, Jones was running with the tide.

---

[26]Cole, British Working-Class Movement, p. 211.

[27]"The Labour Representation League. To the Trades Unionists of the United Kingdom and Working Men Generally," Bee-Hive, May 1, 1873; cf. H. W. McCready, "The British Election of 1874; Frederic Harrison and the Liberal-Labor Dilemma," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XX, no. 2 (May, 1954), 169, 170, 174.

At any rate, the burden of Jones's writings was one of direct[28] but not separate[29] labor representation. This would merely secure for the working-class such direct representation of their interest as every other interest in the realm possessed.[30]

Jones believed that such a program was necessary because of the class criteria employed by the Liberal Party in selecting candidates:

> If he is a lord by courtesy, so much the better; if an honourable, not so well; a baronet, or even a knight, not all they would wish, still good. These failing, a fine fat old manufacturer, who had made plenty of money. . . .[31]

Jones urged the working-men not to accept in a docile fashion any Liberal candidate offered to them. They should bargain with the Liberal leadership in the constituency, and offer votes as their answer to an assertion that their candidate lacked the requisite finances for the campaign. Let the party supply the funds and the men would supply the votes.[32]

---

[28]Jones, "Mr. Bright on Labour Representation," ibid., February 6, 1875; Jones, "Working Men and Parliamentary Candidates," ibid., August 12, 1876.

[29]Jones, "John Bright and Labour Representation," ibid., January 20, 1876.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Jones, "The Oldham Election and its Moral," ibid., June 7, 1872.

[32]Jones, "The Working Men and Liberal Tactics," Industrial Review, December 29, 1877.

Jones also admonished the workers to have nothing to do with the new Liberal local electoral organization called the "caucus." "Caucus" was the name of an effective Liberal political organization developed in Birmingham. It was a large, hierarchial body but based on members chosen from the grass-roots level of city politics, the ward committee.[33] It disseminated party propaganda and adopted candidates for Parliament and for the local school board. In Birmingham, however, it was controlled by a small executive committee and a still smaller management subcommittee which really operated as a local party cabinet.[34]

Many persons, both within and without Parliament, and for different reasons, excoriated the caucus; and Lloyd Jones belonged to these ranks. In 1878 he correctly reported that the caucus had developed in Birmingham and was spreading to other quarters. He was vehement in his opposition to it. "A caucus . . . simply means destruction to advanced liberal thought," because "shopkeepers and manufacturers" would never accept a working-class candidate in preference to one who could finance his own campaign and thus keep the caucus free of debt.[35]

---

[33]Conrad Gill and Asa Briggs, History of Birmingham, Vol. II: Borough and City, 1865-1938 (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 166.

[34]Ibid., p. 169.

[35]Jones, "The Caucus Question and Working Men," Industrial Review, August 31, 1878.

Jones feared that "a few" working-class leaders would be led to accept this view; and as a consequence the middle-class, which could "never get above the lowest level of political thought,"[36] would "carry off the votes of the poor bamboozled working men voters."[37]

These opinions were expressed when the life of the Labour Representation League was ebbing away. The spread of the caucus in constituencies accelerated this trend, for it tended to absorb L.R.L. branches; indeed, at Leeds it absorbed every L.R.L. branch.[38] An advocate of increased working-class representation and former secretary of the L.R.L. would naturally not view such a development with indifference.

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Jones, "Political Position of Working Men," ibid., July 27, 1878.

[38] J. H. Hanham, Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone (n.p.: Longmans, 1959), p. 327.

CHAPTER V

"LIBERAL OR CONSERVATIVE"

Jones's affiliation and support of the Labour Representation League did not alienate him for long from Liberal principles or the "great Liberal party."[1] The old Owenite social missionary was anxious that working-men understand where the true path to political progress lay; and he wrote copiously to aid them to this end.

To do this, he described the Liberal working-men. These were they who gave their support to works of progress, to broaden liberties, and to "develope [sic] the life of the country." He wrote that in the past, Liberal working-men aided in such projects as the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Catholic Emancipation, free trade, and the repeal of the newspaper taxes. Goals that remained in 1876 included "perfecting" freedom of conscience and free education, putting an end to pauperism, improving industry so as to eradicate "the worst assaults of poverty," narrowing the

---

[1]Jones, "The New Political Alliance," Bee-Hive August 17, 1872.

gap between classes, and making "the pursuit of wealth compatible with the growth of public morality."[2]

On the other hand, the fragment of the working-class which supported the Conservative party was derived from the least educated segment of labor. They were "dupes";[3] but after all, "the mud gods still have a few worshippers here and there."[4]

Jones contended that it was the conservative segment of the working group two thousand years ago that found the "new doctrine of brotherhood" beyond their capacity for understanding, and who thus supported Barabbas. Tory working-men in 1780 were involved in the anti-Catholic Gordon riots in London: and it was Conservative laborers who wrecked the Birmingham home and library of the celebrated Dr. Joseph Priestly.[5]

What policies did Conservative working-men have? Resistance to change.[6] Yet this would not lead to their

---

[2]Jones, "The Liberal Working Man," ibid., April 8, 1876.

[3]Jones, "The Conservative Working Man," ibid., March 4, 1876.

[4]Jones, "Redistribution of Electoral Power," ibid., May 10, 1873.

[5]Jones, "The Conservative Working Man," ibid., March 4, 1876.

[6]Jones, "The Liberal Working Man," ibid., April 8, 1876.

real acceptance by the Tory party.[7] In this, Jones was being less than just to Disraeli's real effort to win working-class support by showing legislative solicitude for him.

It was, however, the Liberals who were in power when Jones began writing his famous series of articles in 1871 for the Bee-Hive. Britain was in the midst of Gladstone's "great ministry" from 1868 to early 1874. And if his Liberal party had deep divisions within it, it nonetheless carried out an impressive list of reforms, primarily institutional in nature. These included disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, passage of the Irish Land Act of 1870 and of the Education Act of 1870, reform of the civil service, abolition of university religious tests, reform in the army, enactment of the secret ballot, and reform of the judicial system. Although Gladstone's Liberal government became increasingly unpopular in 1871 and thereafter, one would not have thought that the critics would have included Lloyd Jones to the degree that this was the case. It was natural that the adoption in 1871 of an unpopular and punitive trade union measure, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, would be disappointing. Yet Jones's criticism of the government exceeded the level of simple disappointment.

---

[7]Jones, "The Conservative Working Man," ibid., March 4, 1876.

That Jones could write in 1871 that the record of the Liberals, when their term of office expired, would be a "blank leaf,"[8] and that he could write in 1872 that the working-class expected more practical legislation from "the great Liberal party,"[9] clearly shows that Jones's criterion of needful legislation plainly put working-class interests first. And in fact the Liberals had not done much for the working-man. Jones made that point plain in 1873 when he wrote that

> the last hours of the session were marked by the failure of two Bills about which workmen cared infinitely more than about all the measures put together for which Mr. Gladstone takes credit since his accession to office. I mean Mr. [W.G.G.V.V] Harcourt's Conspiracy Bill, and Mr. [A. J.] Mundella's Nine Hours Bill.[10]

Jones put his finger on a major reason for his disappointment when he wrote in 1871 that meaningful working-class legislation could not pass the House of Commons because the Government depended for its life on "employers and their friends" who held seats there.[11] By 1873 Jones wrote in exasperation that

> the workman . . . has at length come to the conclusion that the difference between Liberal and

---

[8]Jones, "Drifting--Where," ibid., September 2, 1871.

[9]Jones, "The New Political Alliance," ibid., August 17, 1872.

[10]Jones, "Greenwich Election," ibid., August 9, 1873.

[11]Jones, "The Government and the Working Man," ibid., March 18, 1871.

> Tory is pretty much that between upper and nether millstones. The quality of the two is essentially the same. They are sections of the sole wealth producing-class. . . .[12]

Jones's words were more the product of pique than of reality. While Disraeli's revitalized Conservative party sought to purchase by legislation the support of the working-class, they still remained sufficiently aristocratic and Tory to distinguish them from the middle-class Liberal and Radical elements in the Liberal party. He wrote, of course, during his brief period of alienation from the Liberal party.

Despite his hot words, Jones hoped that the working-class could yet find its proper place in "the great Liberal army," and he held that whoever could bring agreement between the working-class and the Liberal party would "perform a very necessary and important work."[13]

What kind of legislative program would this involve? As usual, Jones dealt in generalities; but he explained that this would include questions that "affect land and labor, and above all, . . . a vigourous grappling with the frightful expenditure of public money. . . ."[14]

---

[12]Jones, "Greenwich Election," ibid., August 9, 1873.

[13]Jones, "The New Political Alliance," ibid., August 17, 1872.

[14]Jones, "Tendency of Public Opinion," ibid., November 11, 1871.

His stress on economy showed that he had true Liberal as well as socialist principles.

In the absence of such a policy as Jones outlined, he denied that the Liberal party had a policy at all;[15] and he expressed himself bitterly toward the Liberal ministers under whom events took their course. They were a "very inefficient group of office-holders"[16] who had a "stupid, half-hearted way of dealing with great public questions."[17] The Prime Minister, Gladstone, had traits of character that could not fail to evoke respect, but he had failed as an administrator.[18] Robert Lowe, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (before being moved to the Home Office in 1873),[19] was a brilliant man in debate, but possessed "intense" contempt for the working-class. His performance as Chancellor of the Exchequer was fortunate. If England possessed ample revenue, the credit was due to England, not to the Chancellor.[20] The Home Secretary, H. A. Bruce, was

---

[15]Jones, "The New Political Alliance," ibid., August 17, 1872.

[16]Jones, "Tendency of Public Opinion," ibid., November 11, 1871.

[17]Jones, "Mr. Gladstone's Whitby Speech," ibid., September 9, 1871.

[18]Ibid.

[19]R. C. K. Ensor, England, 1870-1914, The Oxford History of England, Vol. XIV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 606.

[20]Jones, "Quarrels in the Government," Bee-Hive, August 3, 1873.

"a decent, well-meaning nobody."[21] Edward Cardwell, Secretary of State for War, evoked the comment that he had attempted a difficult job in trying to destroy the commission-purchase system in the army, but his labors were not concluded.[22] G. J. Goschen, as First Lord of Admiralty, had shown himself to be a "smart city man in a position where his faculties have failed him."[23]

Moreover, certain Liberal policies were specifically defective. Writing in 1873, he believed that the Education Act of 1870 had been framed "out of the old wormed rotten material" of sectarian education; and that "Ireland still stands where she did, the 'rocks ahead.'"[24]

But if these policies produced a loss of working-class support to the Liberal party, which Jones asserted that it had,[25] he contended that the "intelligent portion" of the working-class would not transfer allegiance to the Conservatives. For he believed as early as 1871, when sentiment was moving against the Liberals, that the next election would produce a Tory victory,[26] but that given a trial, Disraeli and his "poor bemuddled

---

[21] Ibid. [22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid. [24] Ibid.

[25] Jones, "Tendency of Public Opinion," ibid., November 11, 1871.

[26] Jones, "Drifting--Where," ibid., September 2, 1871.

followers" would prove "how utterly worthless they are as guides or legislators in a country where every day presents something new which must be fitted in and made to work in harmony with the old."[27]

After the Liberal party went into opposition in 1874, Jones appraised its situation dismally. "The tide has turned and now flows in the direction of Toryism and away from Liberalism," he wrote in 1878. He held that the party itself, under Lord Hartington, lacked "intelligent leadership," and that new men and new issues were needed.[28]

Jones was to return to the view that the Conservative party, in opposition to Gladstone from 1868 to 1874, was not a cohesive force with a policy, but a "broken rabble,"[29] And he repeated John Stuart Mill to the effect that they were the party of "stupidity."[30] Jones believed that with respect to working-class policy, the Liberals in 1872 and the Tories differed only on the Irish question involving public aid to

---

[27]Jones, "The Ministry and the Country," ibid., August 16, 1873.

[28]Jones, "Political Position of Working Men," Industrial Review, July 27, 1878.

[29]Jones, "The Government and the Opposition," Bee-Hive, May 27, 1871.

[30]Ibid.

sectarian education.[31] Whereas the Liberals opposed public aid to Catholic schools, Jones believed that in due course the Tories would grant it, because they were opportunists: "They have no qualms about violating a principle, if there is any profit to be got by it."[32]

Yet the Conservative tenure of power from 1874 to 1880 was accompanied by a number of socially-oriented acts congenial to the interests of the working-class. This included the replacement of the odious Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871 by the Trade Union Act of 1875 which legalized picketing and laid down the principle that a trade combination might perform all acts legal for an individual to perform; and such statutes as the Public Health Act, Artisan's Dwellings Act, and a Sale of Food and Drugs Act.[33]

Jones did not view the Tory victory of 1874 with the bleakness that is to be expected from his previous utterances. "It would be very ungenerous on the part of the country not to give the Conservatives a fair trial."[34] He was cheered by an editorial in the

---

[31]Jones, "The Coming Session," ibid., January 27, 1872.

[32]Jones, "The Government Going Down," ibid., May 18, 1872.

[33]Anthony Wood, Nineteenth Century Britain, 1815-1914 ([London] Longmans, 1960), p. 295.

[34]Jones, "Political and Social Reform," Bee-Hive, March 7, 1874.

Standard of London, a Tory journal which predicted government policy. While it indicated that political reforms were not to be expected, it offered hope for social ones, especially by cleaning up slums which caused sickness in bread-winners and thus induced poverty. Jones asked: "Does Mr. Disraeli and his friends really mean to grapple with the evil here pointed out? If so, even the extremist political reformers will look with favour on such a work."[35]

The reason Jones had reservations was that

> there are rights of property in these courts and alleys, and we are anxious to see how the present Prime Minister, who is so tenacious of these rights in the land, will deal with the owners of the crowded and filthy houses in our large towns.

But Jones added that

> if cleanliness and pure air can be carried into these dens, and if those who dwell in them can be made more human and less brutal, Mr. Disraeli will be fully entitled to the lasting gratitude of the country.

By this time, Jones was sanguine of the political influence of the working man:

> The working men of the country can now seat which party they like in power, and they must not permit themselves to be trifled with by Whigs or Tories. If the Tories, who are not likely to touch political reforms, do not grapple with our social evils, they are worse than useless. If Mr. Disraeli and his friends, however, can disinfect the back slums of our big towns and cities, if they can put the

---

[35] Ibid.

> conditions of decent and healthy lives within the reach of the poorest, they will do a work above all praise.[36]

Jones believed that if Disraeli carried through on such a program, it would relieve the poor rates of a huge expense. Jones wished such a saving of public funds then to be devoted to the "development of science and the discovery of a more equitable system in the distribution of wealth than that prevailing at present."[37] But he realized that this latter program was "premature."[38]

Eighteen months later, in December of 1875, after a number of working-class reforms had passed Parliament, Jones was disappointed with the Tory performance. "Conservative influences . . . always stood in the way," he wrote. Of the Artisans' Dwelling Act, the only one dealt with specifically, Jones held that the meaningful provisions were not inspired by Conservative sources, and he held that the improved labor laws "never were a party question."[39]

His displeasure continued into 1876, when he expressed disappointment that the Queen's speech opening Parliament did not contain allusions to domestic problems or difficulties of the working people. He was

---

[36] Ibid. [37] Ibid. [38] Ibid.

[39] Jones, "Earl Derby and the Edinburgh Conservative Working Men," ibid., December 25, 1875.

unimpressed by the purchase of the Suez Shares from the Khedive of Egypt or by the new title of Empress of India for the Queen. He was concerned with the growing tensions in the Balkans, in which the Slavs were in arms against the misrule of the Turks. He believed that the war was likely, and that something more than voluntary enlistment would be necessary for Britain's military effort. But, he asked, "how can this be done;" for in the boasted national progress "the working people have had a stinted share."[40]

He was also unhappy that the Government was unwilling to broaden the franchise. He pointed out that two large industries, coal and iron, operated largely outside the limits of the boroughs, and thus the workers did not enjoy the benefits of borough suffrage. Also, he regretted that the government was not going to address itself to the "pauper system" in the country.[41]

Eighteen seventy-six was the last year that Jones editorially reviewed the British political situation. As the depression began soon to worsen, his journalistic interests turned to the economic difficulties faced by the working men.

---

[40]Jones, "The New Session and the Working Man," ibid., February 12, 1876.

[41]Ibid.

If Jones was not impressed with the Conservative record in office, he was equally unimpressed with its leadership. In the early eighteen-seventies, while the Tories were awaiting the fall of Gladstone and the Liberals, Jones expressed disappointment at the lack of content in Disraeli's parliamentary utterances. Of one speech in 1872, Jones wrote that "we all know that Mr. Disraeli is very clever"; he was a "political Romeo." But while this speech told the listener what the speaker was not for, it failed to inform him as to what its author was seeking. Jones did express satisfaction, however, in Disraeli's recognition that some change might produce improvement.[42]

About the same time, Jones gave him impressions of Disraeli's maneuvering for power:

> Every word he utters now is meant to skillfully prepare the way for his anticipated accession to office. For years his rhetorical efforts have only been training exercises. Now he is about to throw his hat into the ring, and therefore every step is measured, every guard prepared. . . . There is much pleasure in watching his graceful movements, and examining the skillful manoeuvres by which he seems to be preparing himself for his final spring. He, however, somewhat overdoes his part.[43]

A year later, in 1873,Jones editorially reacted to Disraeli's inaugural address as chancellor of the

---

[42]Jones, "Mr. Disraeli--The Coming Man," ibid., April 13, 1872.

[43]Jones, "Mr. Disraeli," ibid., July 6, 1872.

University of Glasgow. The speech was interesting in that it represented Disraeli's advocacy of new conservatism in place of old Toryism, involving a willingness to blend the new with the old. In it, Disraeli readily accepted the idea of the civil equality of subjects, but repudiated social equality, which he linked with the ideal that "every living being has a right to share in physical . . . welfare." Both Disraeli, a part of whose speech Jones quoted, and Jones himself, drew evidence and inferences from France just prior to, and during her revolution in the late eighteenth century. Jones held that Disraeli's argument against social equality was "the language of an excited bigot." And to Disraeli's charge that advocates of social equality wished to replace the rights of property with the right of labor, Jones replied moderately that "Liberal men" did not harbor such views, but rather wished to gain respect for both sets of rights.[44]

Much later, after Prime Minister Disraeli had been created Lord Beaconsfield, Jones raised a question regarding his statesmanship. He believed that Disraeli's elevation to the peerage marked the end of his political career. In this judgment, Jones reflected more hope than accuracy.

---

[44]Jones, "The Great Schoolmaster--B. Disraeli," ibid., November 29, 1873.

Lloyd Jones attacked the earl's record on four counts. With respect to Disraeli's early change from Whig to Tory, he asserted that "there is always suspicion . . . when a man leaves the Haves-not, to join the Haves." Jones's readers may have smiled at the description of the Whigs, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, as "Haves-not."

He condemned Disraeli for his bitter attacks in 1846 upon Sir Robert Peel's repeal of the corn duty act. In this, Disraeli had been acting "on behalf of his insanely selfish and most unpatriotic friends the Protectionists."

Disraeli, to Jones's mind, also exhibited intellectual dishonesty by an early denial of his authorship of the "Revolutionary Epic," and by slyly deleting a regicide sentiment from a subsequent version which he admitted. And turning to contemporary events, Jones condemned Disraeli for "his profound ignorance of the Turkish atrocities at a moment when he ought to have been fully acquainted with them."

Jones found little beyond perseverance and patience to enroll in a neutral or favorable column. As a consequence, Jones judged that Beaconsfield "has left less behind him noteworthy as a statesman . . . than any man ever placed in the same exalted position."[45]

---

[45]Jones, "Is Lord Beaconsfield a Great Statesman," Bee-Hive, September 9, 1876; cf. Jones, "The Factory

Of Disraeli's colleague in the Foreign Office,[46] Jones could write with some irony that "Lord Derby is a model statesman." He was

> sedate and unimpassioned. He never abuses his opponents, nor greatly overstates his case. He knows what can be said on both sides of every disputed question, and seems only to take the Conservative rather than the Liberal view, because it would be indecorous in so moderate and sensible a person to shock anybody's feelings by doing what nobody expected him to do.[47]

Lord Derby, in Jones's estimation, "has a taste for social reforms, and in a mild way is willing enough to countenance changes which do not disturb one of our respectable British interests."[48] While Jones acknowledged that his speeches were regarded generally with admiration,[49] it is clear from reading Jones's estimation of his utterances that he found them bland and highly unsatisfactory from the working-class viewpoint.[50]

Workers and Lord Beaconsfield," Industrial Review, March 17, 1877.

[46]Ensor, England, 1870-1914, p. 607.

[47]Jones, "A Modern Statesman," Bee-Hive, January 20, 1872.

[48]Jones, "Lord Derby on the House of Peers," ibid., June 14, 1873.

[49]Jones, "A Modern Statesman," ibid., January 20, 1872.

[50]Ibid.; Jones, "Lord Derby on the Labour Question," ibid., September 14, 1872; Jones, "Lord Derby Again," ibid., October 12, 1872; Jones, "Another word Lord Derby," ibid., October 19, 1872; Jones, "Lord Derby on the House of Peers," ibid., June 14, 1873.

Of Lord Salisbury, who was to become Prime Minister by 1885 and who served Disraeli as Secretary of State for India beginning in 1874,[51] Jones wrote that here was a man esteemed by his party. Jones believed that he was one of the ablest and most honest of the Tories, but had "a very high opinion of himself and his position. . . ."[52] This portrait would seem the most accurate of Jones's Conservative adversaries.

As can be seen, Jones's political writings were more directed toward general policy than toward specific questions. But he did take notice of several issues of broad significance to the working-class.

One of these was the Trade Unions Act of 1871. Origins of the pressure behind the legislation of 1871 are found in acts of 1824 and 1825 which legalized trades unions, hitherto considered as illegal combinations in restraint of trade, a common-law criminal offense.[53] But in 1867 the Court of Queen's Bench rendered the decision of Hornby vs. Close, which in effect deprived unions of any legal standing under the law.[54] Obviously, both the funds and the actions of the unions

---

[51]Ensor, England, 1870-1914, p. 607.

[52]Jones, "The Marquis of Salisbury and the Conservatives," Bee-Hive, December 7, 1872.

[53]Cole, British Working-Class Movement, pp. 59-61.

[54]Ibid., pp. 201-202.

were placed in jeopardy, and remedial legislation was needed. While the Gladstone government was willing to grant legal status to unions, it also reacted against isolated union misdeeds of violence, and to pressure within the party, for limiting the scope of union action. It framed a bill granting legal status, but also imposed penalities for intimidation, obstruction, and picketing. Because of trade union opposition, the bill was eventually split in twain, allowing the friends of trade unionism to vote for the Trades Union Act of 1871 which extended legal status to the unions, but not for the Criminal Law Amendment Act, which contained the penal provisions. Both bills passed into law in 1871.[55]

Jones addressed himself to the undivided bill early in 1871. In a retrospective glance, Jones declared that the old Combination acts, which had prohibited unionism prior to 1824, in effect told the workers to

> submit yourselves to your employers, take the beggar's wages they may think proper to offer for your work, and starve quietly with your families without disturbing the community by loud talk or painful writhings.[56]

Both these laws, and the combined Trade Union Bill of

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 206-207.

[56] Jones, "The Trades Union Bill," Bee-Hive, February 25, 1871.

1871 showed that "the laws made in Parliament for working men, as such, are almost necessarily one-sided."[57] He contended that the bill was not only injurious to working-class interests, but degrading to the men as citizens. He pointed out that in some trades, a strike cannot be effective without picketing, illegal under the new act. He said it was obvious that picketing was intended to intimidate. But he did not believe that special legislation was required. He felt that the ordinary legislation against crime was sufficient to prevent abuse: "Let an offender be punished for his offence as a citizen, not a trade unionist."[58] For unionists were entitled to the fullest protection and the highest rights the law can give. Finally, Jones argued that the punitive provisions should be dropped, since time would produce their eradication, in any event.[59] But both bills did pass; and Jones wrote late in 1871 that it would have been better had neither been adopted, than receiving both.[60]

Jones felt differently about the Gladstone government's abolition of the purchase of military commissions in 1871. Allowing military commissions to be purchased in effect kept the officers' ranks an

---

[57] Ibid. [58] Ibid. [59] Ibid.

[60] Jones, "Drifting--Where," ibid., September 2, 1871.

upper class gentlemen's preserve, and prevented its development into a professional organization.[61] Other evils which it entailed were to prevent the revamping of regiments, promotion for merit, and the enabling of young but untrained rich youths to gain positions of responsibility.[62] A bill to abolish the "purchase system," with ample compensation to commission-holders, passed the House of Commons, but was stalled in the Lords, whereupon the Government used a royal warrant to abolish military purchase, under authority of a statute of George III.[63]

Opponents of the Government's action tried to make it appear that the issue at stake was not the question of abolition of the purchase-system of obtaining military commissions, but the operation of parliamentary government in contrast to rule by royal warrant. Lloyd Jones wrote that the House of Lords spoke in this vein. Jones was as interested in the position of the House of Lords on this question as he was in the question itself. He pointed out that the House of Lords possessed the power to "paralyze the action of the nation," and that its opposition to

---

[61] Ensor, England, 1870-1914, p. 12.

[62] Ibid., p. 10.

[63] Ibid., p. 12; Wood, Nineteenth Century Britain, pp. 327-28.

the measure in question was not based on a concern for national liberties but for class interests:[64] for the military purchase-system amounted to "a feeding ground for their relatives."[65] He also pointed out that the House of Lords itself had consented to the act of George III under which the new royal warrant had been issued. He argued that the abolition of the military purchase-system would open the officers' ranks to middle-class and some working-men,[66] and put an end to the "great personal injustice to poor but deserving officers."[67] And he denied that the government was using high-handed methods:

> There is no possible Minister, Liberal or Conservative, who would dare attempt such a thing as a raid against popular liberty. . . . The thought of England, the new life of England, move in the direction of national liberty, and against personal and class privilege.[68]

Jones concluded:

> Let no liberal man . . . say that Mr. Gladstone has made an attack on the liberties of his country.

---

[64] Jones, "Mr. Gladstone and the Army Bill," ibid., July 29, 1871.

[65] Jones, "The People's House and the People's Wants," ibid., August 19, 1871.

[66] Jones, "Mr. Gladstone and the Army Bill," ibid., July 29, 1871.

[67] Jones, "The People's House and the People's Wants," ibid., August 19, 1871.

[68] Jones, "Mr. Gladstone and the Army Bill," ibid., July 29, 1871.

> . . . He has proved to a powerful class of habitual and privileged law-breakers that it was possible to put a stop to the game of plunder. . . .[69]

In 1872 Lloyd Jones expressed himself unfavorably on an issue not without relevance to the mid-twentieth century--the opportunity for public assembly. In that year, A. S. Ayrton, a Liberal M.P. and Commissioner of Works and Buildings, introduced a bill to regulate public parks.[70] Jones opposed the bill, for "it is evident from what has been said in the House that the real desire is to put down the right of public meetings in the Parks. . . ."[71] Jones held that while it was easy to hold meetings in provincial parks, "in London it is next to impossible to procure such places" already. Moreover, public meetings in parks represented almost the only avenue remaining open for the public ventilation of working-class opinions, since small meeting-halls were too small to use, large ones were too expensive, and the press was hostile to the working-class. He contended that the wealthy used parks for their purposes, and that no less should be expected for the poor.[72]

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] Jones, "The People and the Parks," ibid., March 2, 1872. Cf. Jones, "How to Silence Working Men," ibid., March 23, 1872; and 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates CCIX [1872], 1120-1121.

[71] Jones, "The People and the Parks," Bee-Hive, March 2, 1872.

[72] Ibid.

Early in 1874, Jones expressed himself amply and firmly on the new Royal Commission on Trades Unions which the Conservatives under Disraeli decided to set up soon after taking office, as a preliminary to trade union legislation. It will be remembered that the election was held in a climate of trade union resentment against the Liberal union laws of 1871, and of agitation for improved replacements.

Lloyd Jones opposed the formation of the Royal Commission. His stance was representative of most working-class opinion. He pointed out that although two working-class leaders, Alexander Macdonald (chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress) and Thomas Hughes accepted seats on the Commission, its inauguration was a "mistake." For the Royal Commission was really a "snare" for working-men. Jones contended it was a manoeuvre by Disraeli, R. A. Cross, the Home Secretary, and others to evade the obligation of taking action on working-men's questions which would alienate employers. Jones said that many Tory candidates stood committed to favorable legislation, but the inauguration of a Royal Commission would absolve the M.P."s of their pledges; that it would offer the opportunity of having slanders on the working-class movement enter into its report; that it would "indefinitely" postpone legislation;

that it would divide the working-class movement; and that it would silence Parliament on important issues until it completed its task. Therefore Jones argued that working-men should "have nothing to do with the Commission--it is a trap. . . ."[73]

In the event, Jones's hostile attitude toward the commission was justified, for its report was unfavorable to trade union interests. But despite early and unsatisfactory bills based on the report, the next years of 1875 and 1876 brought into Parliament the kind of legislation the working-class had been seeking. This included the repeal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and its replacement by the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act of 1875 which once again legalized peaceful picketing and laid down the rule that an act done in combination was not illegal unless it was illegal to do it singly.

But legislation did not arrive without vigilance and struggle. And the old social missionary sought to keep up the fight for a fairer England for the man who labored for his bread by the sweat of his brow.

---

[73]Jones, "The Royal Commission--the Blunder," ibid., March 28, 1874.

CHAPTER VI

"TODAY THE EARTH IS RED WITH THE BLOOD OF COUNTLESS THOUSANDS OF CHRISTIAN MEN"

Even when it came to foreign affairs, Lloyd Jones could not shed his habit as an old Owenite social missionary and thus interpreter of the world to the working-men of England. Foreign affairs were not without implications for the British working-class, Jones's fraternal spirit was concerned for the peoples of other nations, and he was anxious that British official policy reflect popular instead of privileged class interests.

In July of 1870, the watching British public saw the French take the bait of a diplomatic affront of Bismarck's revision of the Ems Dispatch, and declare war on Prussia. Bismarck's ruse worked, and the British opinion initially viewed the war as a piece of French aggression.[1] The war ran against France. After the

---

[1]Dora Neill Raymond, British Policy and Opinion during the Franco-Prussian War (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Vol. 100; New York: Columbia University, 1921), p. 73.

defeat and capture of Napoleon III at Sedan, Paris overthrew the Second Empire and republicans in the Corps Legislatif organized a provisional Government for National Defense. In Britain the change of regime was received with little sorrow by the general public and with distinct pleasure by the working-classes.[2] The new government was more Parisian than national, and Bismarck wished to negotiated for peace with a more broadly-based regime. So in January of 1871, he concluded an armistice under which Paris capitulated and during which an election, based on universal manhood suffrage, would be held for a national assembly. Of the 630 delegates to the National Assembly, some 400 were conservative monarchists, 30 were Bonapartists, and 200 were republicans of various sorts. Not only was the National Assembly monarchist, but it chose Adolphe Thiers, a well-known politician of royal sympathies, as "Chief of the Executive Power." British public opinion was divided over the wisdom of the choice, since some journals such as the Daily News considered him unprincipled, while the Times saw him as a man of rich experience.[3] The National Assembly chose to move from Bordeaux to Versailles where it could avoid the Parisian crowds but still legislate for the metropolis.

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 155, 166.

[3] Ibid., p. 340.

Paris and the National Assembly had different ideas regarding the kind of government appropriate for the capital and the nation, since Paris wished self-government for the major cities of the country and the assembly stood for centrism. The result of this was the inauguration of the Commune of Paris, which aimed at autonomy, and the siege of Paris by the Versailles government--the second siege in two years. Initially the Commune evoked some sympathy in British public opinion, since it seemed to stand for local self-government.[4] But since radicals, socialists, and communists all became connected with the communal regime, the attitude of the British "respectable" press became predominately hostile.[5]

British working-class and radical opinion had been neutral with a disposition against France until the proclamation of her republic, and evident signs of German territorial aspirations.[6] Then a contrary sentiment developed. Jones's views were a mirror of much working-class opinion. His articles in the Bee-Hive did not begin until 1871; but his views can be seen through the Labour Representation League's public

---

[4] Ibid., p. 387.

[5] Ibid., p. 394.

[6] Collins and Abramsky, Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement, p. 185.

statements in 1870, of which, as secretary, he was a signatory.

In early September of 1870, when the Government of National Defense was less than two months old, the Labour Representation League adopted a resolution urging the British government to recognize the new French regime if its republican status seemed assured, but arguing for restraint if a monarchy seemed likely to be established. It also hoped that the British government would avoid all alliances that might lead the country into war--a position which Jones and many of his friends were to abandon because of the turn of events in Paris.

Less than a month later, the Labour Representation League attracted national attention[7] by sponsoring a large deputation of trade union leaders which called upon Prime Minister Gladstone to request recognition of the Government of National Defense. Gladstone replied that the regime in France would have to be deemed temporary until the elections were held, when the British government expected to abide by the results. Questions and answers followed the formal address, in which Lloyd Jones played the largest part, trying to nail down the Prime Minister to this position, whatever

---

[7]Raymond, British Policy and Opinion, pp. 169-170.

contingency arose. Gladstone was sufficiently nimble to avoid a commitment firmer than the one he had made.[8]

By the end of 1870, the Labour Representation League had reached the point of militancy in intervention. At a meeting just prior to Christmas it urged British intervention (though it did not distinguish diplomatic from military) to free France from the "Prussian despot." And in January of 1871, Jones joined a mixed group of working-class personnel representing trade unionists, co-operators, Marxists, and Positivists which "remonstrated" on the Franco-Prussian war especially in the light of the Prime Minister's refusal to receive them in person.

The Remonstrance heralded a new policy in Britain toward France and Germany. It pointed out that "a great military monarchy of whose dangerous character and power we have had abundant proof" had been created by the war. It urged an end to the British policy of inaction with respect to intervention, and demanded war with Prussia if she refused to make reasonable terms with France.[9]

About the same time Jones editorially lashed out at the Working Men's National Peace Society, a

---

[8]"The French Republic and the War . . . Deputation to Mr. Gladstone," Bee-Hive, October, 1870.

[9]"The War between Prussia and France," ibid., January 7, 1871.

pacifist group with virtually no prominent support apart from W. R. Cremer and Edmund Beales.[10] Echoing earlier nineteenth century radical views, Jones reviewed Anglo-French relations, and suggested that during the wars of the French Revolution, "England did not make war against France in favour of popular freedom, but for the purpose of crushing it by force of arms," which amounted to "an attack on popular liberty in favour of monarchy." During this era, "we did not fight for nations; we fought for kings and aristocrats."

With respect to the possibility of war between England and Prussia over the settlement of the Franco-Prussian conflict, Jones sought to counter the claim of the Working Men's National Peace Society that war would increase taxation and the national debt. His answer to this was that while fighting costs money, a truism that needed no repetition, some values attained by war are "more precious than money."[11]

Lloyd Jones was clear as to why he viewed Prussia as a bugbear in the expressions of the Labour Representation League. He saw in France the hope of republicanism, with all the idealism that the term raised in

---

[10]Collins and Abramsky, Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement, p. 199.

[11]Lloyd Jones, "Working Men's National Peace Society," Bee-Hive, January 21, 1871.

the hearts of nineteenth century radicals, whereas he saw in Prussia the forces of aggressive reaction.

He was friendly if technically noncommittal toward the Commune of Paris in 1871 when it was under attack by the Versailles National Assembly. In England public opinion was divided, as it was within the working-class. Most seemed to support the Commune, but the respected Thomas Dunning of the London bookbinders saw it as an attack on property that must be opposed.[12]

Jones counselled a watch-and-wait attitude before reaching conclusions regarding the nature of the Commune, but urged readers not to pay attention to the calumnies on its government printed in the popular papers, for "if it was of the character our newspapers state it to be, [it] could not have obtained the support and sympathy which have carried it safely so far."[13]

At the same time, he took a dim view of its adversary, the National Assembly. "Young France has no very strong reasons for having confidence in her old men"; and he suggested that the new men in Paris might offer a better alternative. For the National Assembly was "thoroughly reactionary" and had "no

---

[12]Collins and Abramsky, Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement, p. 199.

[13]Jones, "The Revolt in Paris," Bee-Hive, April 1, 1871.

. . . intention" of establishing a republic in France.[14]

About the same time, Jones was appointed one of the two Honorary Secretaries of the Working Men's Auxillary Committee to the Mansion House Relief Fund, which sought to relieve the suffering caused by the war in France. What an evident example of Owenite fraternity and humanity!

The Honorary Secretaries printed a plea for funds to the working-class in March, 1871, which described the need in France and urged that the demands of humanity and Christianity be heeded in joining with other classes in Britain in answering the destitution.[15]

In the same month, Jones wrote a leading editorial describing the carnage of the war: "Today the earth is red with the blood of countless thousands of Christian men, shed in battle by the hands of those who claim to be Christian brethren!"[16] He said that it was then no time to calculate blame in connection with the war, but to mitigate the distress caused by it. And he said that such an evidence of fraternity among men would be

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] "The Mansion House Relief Fund," ibid., March 25, 1871.

[16] Jones, "Distress in France--Duty of English Working Men," ibid., March 4, 1871.

a greater force for future peace than "the hollow friendship of kings, or the parchment provisions of treaties."[17]

Jones believed that England's international position may well have been altered by the outcome of the Franco-Prussian War. In an editorial which asked rhetorical questions rather than laying down dogmatic statements, he hinted that England's influence and power vis a vis other countries had been adversely altered by the Prussian victory. He also implied that Germany might become hungry for international trade, and try to block British access to her foreign markets. If such were to occur, Jones believed that war was in order.[18] In such an assessment, Lloyd Jones was in advance of most Britons in his realism.

The passage of almost two years did not alter Jones's opinion of the National Assembly and its tendencies. In late 1873 he wrote that the "Right [wing] . . . has taken upon itself the initiative," and that the clergy were busily at work promoting this policy. He believed that the church and the throne mutually supported each other to give France "faith and obedience instead of liberty and right." The National

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Jones, "English Opinion and the War," ibid., February 11, 1871.

Assembly was not elected to establish a monarchy under the Comte de Chambord; and if it were installed, the nation would be weak and divided. Further, the monarchy would narrow the voting qualifications so as to produce a minority government, and deprive the country of freedom of the press and of free association. Jones predicted that if the monarchy did succeed in establishing itself, it would end by violent overthrow.[19]

Jones only turned his gaze toward Germany's domestic policies when they affected socialism, the movement which nurtured him in the working-class movement. This was a decade in which Marx was trying to seriously interest British working-class leaders in his views. Jones was unmoved by these efforts. Nor did he seem to keep a close eye on continental socialism, at least if his writings be a guage of his interest.

In 1878 Prince von Bismarck began his campaign against socialism after two men, with whom a connection with socialism was never proved, made attempts on the life of the Emperor William I.[20] He caused an anti-socialist law to be introduced in the Reichstag which prohibited socialist meetings and publications, and

---

[19]Jones, "The Restoration in France," ibid., November 1, 1873.

[20]Marshall Dill, Jr., Germany: A Modern History (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961), pp. 154-55.

allowed a state of siege to be proclaimed to aid in enforcement.

Lloyd Jones sought to interpret German socialism to his readers. He drew on Vorwarts, the "'central organ of the Social Democrats of Germany,'" for an explanation of the socialist program in the Second Reich:

> They express a harmless general truth to the effect that labour is the source of wealth. . . . There is then another general statement that the obligation to work belongs to all. It is further added that the instruments of labour are used by that class to secure the dependence of the workers, and from this arrangement springs misery and want. Work . . . should be regulated in accordance with the principle of co-operation, and its fruits more equitably distributed, with a view to the public good.[21]

Also, Jones used Vorwarts to show that the German socialists desired only to pursue their objects "'by all legal means.'"[22] He defended the German socialists by asking with a straight face what harm the pursuit of such a program could be. Indeed, it might help harmonize the relations between labor and capital in Germany.

Jones believed that the campaign against socialism by the Bismarck government was a greater mistake than its earlier attempt to show that the would-be

---

[21]Jones, "Socialism in Germany," Industrial Review, July 6, 1878.

[22]Ibid.

assassins were socialists. He also condemned the principle of the intervention of the government against socialism. This had never happened in England, he reminded his readers, and it was thus more evil than the British style of opposition to socialism.[23] However, he was not over-optimistic about the prospects for the German socialists. He held that if the government could win the middle and upper-classes to its side, it might for some time block socialism, and thereby "human liberty," causing "the ordinary amount of misery and suffering" to continue.[24]

Spain's diplomatic and dynastic affairs had contributed to the outbreak of war between France and Germany in 1870. Jones took a distinctly economic, and thus Owenite socialist, interest in Spain's affairs in the eighteen-seventies. That country had seen a rift between liberal and conservative elements, dating at least from the Napoleonic era. Another factor that entered the turmoil in 1833 was the Carlists, adherents of the brother of Ferdinand VII, who claimed the crown over Isabella II, his daughter. Isabella II was deposed by liberals in 1868, and succeeded by a foreign but constitutional king, Amadeo, who abdicated in 1873 after a

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Jones, "Anti-Socialism," ibid., October 26, 1878.

reign of two troubled years. A republic was proclaimed amidst Carlist insurrection, which was followed by the restoration of the Bourbons in 1875 in the person of Alphonso XII.

Lloyd Jones viewed the Spanish developments of 1874-1875--the last days of the Republic and the accession of Alphonso XII--from the standpoint of the meaning that these events would have for the British working-class. He remained the old Owenite teacher.

Ever friendly to the establishment of republics, Jones wrote in 1874 that much of the then-current difficulty in Spain would have been obviated if the British government had recognized the 1873 republic.[25] The situation was worsened by covert aid given to the Carlist rebels by British subjects. He feared that the Spanish miasma might draw intervention by Germany or France; and that war might occur in which Britain would be pulled as a participant. It was this that had implications for the working-class.

Jones wrote that although Britain might have a sizeable army, so much of it was committed to policing the empire that the available troops to meet an emergency did not constitute a force required by a first-rate

---

[25]Jones, "The Coming Crisis," Bee-Hive, August 15, 1874.

European power. And obviously more troops would be needed for campaigns on the continent than to resist an invasion of Britain itself.

It was here that working-class interests came into play. The working people "have found out by a very unpleasant and humiliating experience that they have no country to fight for." He explained that whereas the Queen had her crown, the nobility their titles, the clergy their church, the manufacturers their wealth, the working people lacked a concommitant interest. He asserted that the working people might emigrate, if a crisis came, but they would not fight:

> . . . should trouble come, the working classes will not take on themselves the duty of fighting for rich manufacturers, fat farmers, and exalted landholders, for men who have magnified their rights and trampled on their duties.[26]

This, of course, was socialism of the contemporary sort of the eighteen-seventies.

With an abvious reference to possible British intervention in Spain on behalf of Spanish bondholders, Jones condemned past examples of British and French intervention, such as the Don Pacifico affair, and the French invasion of Mexico. But he claimed that a new force was at work which might exert pressure toward

---

[26] Ibid.

Spain in this direction, "the power of money,"[27] and that the working-class could not be too careful in guarding against any efforts toward this end.

Lloyd Jones denied that the British government owed its Spanish bondholders any special protection. They were

> mere money-lenders, vulgar hunters after profit, frequently tricky speculators, who are cunningly fighting for a rise or a fall in the securities they deal in, that they buy in, or sell out, for a profit; and they . . . have no more right to call in the aid of the Government to enforce their claims than they would have to demand British ships and British soldiers to compel the payment of their bills by foreign private traders.[28]

They knowingly underwent a risk in buying the Spanish bonds at a cheap price; and in this, they sought their own advantage, not that of the general public. Thus they had no claim upon the general public for aid in their difficulties. Also, the bondholders sent their coupons to Paris for receipt of interest, so that the payment would not be subject to the British tax if paid in London.

Jones wanted to make sure that the government not only avoided using force to aid the bondholders, but also abstained from remonstrating on their behalf to the Spanish government.[29]

---

[27]Jones, "Spanish Bondholders," ibid., September 5, 1874.

[28]Ibid. [29]Ibid.

The troubles of Spain, he believed, were produced by the competition of its monarchist factions; and the brief republic of the early eighteen-seventies was merely a breathing space in which the factions could lay foundations for the future. Since the Alphonsists did this best, he wrote in 1873, they won the game of manoeuvres and gained the crown for Alphonso XII.

He had little use for the new king; he was a "stupid boy." But Jones seems to have become disillusioned with the Spanish people, some of whom, at least, were "profligate," "ignorant," and "superstitious." He did not believe that the Spanish people had earnestly accepted the republican idea, and in turn doubted that Spain was "fit" for a republic at that time.[30] But Jones had no doubts about the American republic at this time, although he was disappointed with its policy over the Alabama claims against England. Editorially he touched on two topics: the Alabama claims, and the influence of America upon Europe.

Following the termination of the Civil War, the United States government began actions aimed at obtaining financial damages resulting from the depredations of the Alabama and other Confederate cruisers as had benefitted from British assistance during the late

---

[30]Jones, "The New Revolution in Spain," ibid., January 16, 1875.

struggle. A major question involved in the damage claim, as presented by Senator Charles Sumner, was whether indirect charges, based on the assumption that the cruisers had prolonged the war, should be pressed as well as the direct charges.

By terms of the Treaty of Washington of 1871, the British government expressed its regret over the "escape" of the British cruisers from its ports, and agreed to a tribunal of five, which would determine the amount of damages due. The Alabama tribunal awarded the sum of $15,500,000.00 to America, which occasioned an outcry in Britain, but which was accepted.

Lloyd Jones believed that the Alabama issue should never have arisen; and it would not have done so, if the working-class had counted politically when the Civil War was in progress.[31] As it was, the claims amounted to a "punishment for a foul wrong stimulated by aristocratic rivalship, and by . . . disgraceful and dishonourable greed. . . ."[32]

Upon the conclusion of the Washington treaty of 1871, which provided for international arbitration, Jones tended to accept the American claims: "Let the

---

[31]Jones, "Influence of the People on International Policy," ibid., February 10, 1872.

[32]Jones, "The American Claims," ibid., February 3, 1872.

money be paid, and the whole ugly business be got rid of. . . . We have escaped at as small expense, and with as little degredation, as we have any right to expect."[33] But with the passage of time, Jones re-thought his position, and began to have reservations relative to the American indirect claims.[34] He wondered what alternatives Britain might have, if she refused to accept arbitration at that late date. Could she recede from arbitration without facing war? Was there still another alternative?[35]

Jones came up with one. Recognizing that Britain had already made concessions with respect to giving up her claims to American acquiescence to Fenian harassment of Canada in the late eighteen-sixties, he suggested that rather than perhaps get snared in the net of indirect claims, the working-men of Britain could select their own accredited ambassadors "to the American people" and plead the case in the interest of both peoples, on the grounds of justice and humanity. He recognized that it might end in failure, but was worth trying.[36] This was an extraordinary suggestion.

---

[33]Jones, "The Washington Treaty," ibid., June 17, 1871.

[34]Jones, "The American Claims," ibid., February 3, 1872.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Jones, "Shall it be War or Peace," ibid., February 17, 1872.

He was sure of one thing. Since the aid to the Confederate cruisers had been made against the volition of the working-class, the funds raised from the arbitration settlement should not come from taxation of the working-class. They were already paying through national shame and humiliation, and that was sufficient.[37]

Although Jones did not defer his reactions until the final arbitration, the settlement was largely along the lines he was prepared to accept, except in respect to the source of the funds paid to America by the award.

If Jones was prepared to hold reservations relative to the settlement of the Alabama claims, he was nonetheless a warm friend of the United States, as he showed in reflections upon the celebration of the centenary of American independence in 1876.

Lloyd Jones asserted that England now admitted that she was wrong in her struggle with her thirteen colonies, and that American victory in the revolution "had been a blessing on both sides of the Atlantic."[38]

Not least of the American achievements was her implementation of democratic government. America was

---

[37]Jones, "How the American Claims should be Met," ibid., February 24, 1872.

[38]Jones, "The American Centenary in London," ibid., July 15, 1876. The standard work on American influence upon Europe, which Jones reflects in this article, is Halvdan Koht, The American Spirit in Europe: A Survey of Transatlantic Influences (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949).

a nation ruled by a nation, not a class. Further, having successfully and fully tested democracy, "she has given hope to the peoples of all nations" and "thrones have become less secure" as a result.[39]

Second, America served as a haven for the politically oppressed and the economically lowly of Europe. Jones was unable to say what would have happened to Ireland during the famine, had it not been for the United States.

Finally, America had proven that "religion can live and flourish without state support"; and the record showed that all faiths could live and get along well without an Established Church.

Thus America had become "the second home" of the English people; and Jones hoped that the English statesmen would be wise enough to partake of some of the influence coming from across the Atlantic.[40]

Perhaps it was the relative success of the Alabama arbitration that led Jones to advocate international arbitration in general as a proper mode of settlement of international disputes. Jones, writing in 1873 and reflecting nineteenth-century optimism, believed that the earth was evolving from a "fighting world" toward

---

[39]Jones, "The American Centenary in London," Bee-Hive, July 15, 1876.

[40]Ibid.

a "working world."[41] He implied that wars were rivalries between kings and emperors; and were fights of the common people. He was not prepared to argue that no good at all could be served by war; but he did feel that "the awful murder-work called war is a devilish wickedness." Jones believed that war produced vast human misery and greatly enlarged the public debt. But he was less prepared to condemn the death which war produced, for

> . . . a bayonette thrust is perhaps, on the whole, preferable to disease of the lungs, or a sudden musket ball as a mode of human despatch better than the prolonged pain and anxiety of angina pectoris.

His conclusion was that with the great cost of standing armies, and the vast destruction of war operations themselves, "we cannot afford to go on as we have been."[42] Jones was not dogmatic about what he hoped would replace war. He hoped that perhaps an international court, or an international congress, might serve the purpose, or arbitration as such. He even quoted favorably an alleged suggestion of Tsar Paul I that wars should be settled by personal combat between the sovereigns or ministers involved.[43] But in any event, he

---

[41] Jones, "The Trades Congress," ibid., January 25, 1873. Despite its title, Jones used the article to digress on international arbitration.

[42] Jones, "International Arbitration," ibid., July 19, 1873.

[43] Ibid.

did not believe that it was without advantage to cast around for a feasible replacement for the kind of problem-solving for which war is used.

The same year as the American centenary, Lloyd Jones took editorial cognizance of the gathering storm in the Balkans. In 1875 the Slavic peasants of Hercegovina revolted against their Turkish masters, aided by Serbian volunteers; and the rebellion spread to Bosnia. In 1876 the Bulgars joined the rebellion, and the Sultan sent in the Bashi-Bazouks, who endeavored to restore obedience through a series of massacres which electrified Christian Europe. The questions of the hour included what pressure could be exerted to improve Ottoman government of Christian Balkan subjects, and what action would the Slavs' protector, Russia, take in the crisis. Prime Minister Disraeli tended to be unperturbed by the Turkish outrages, in part because he supported the traditional British policy of supporting Turkey in the face of Russian expansionism, and perhaps Austrian expansion as well. Subsequently, although this is beyond the purview of Jones's writings, war broke out in 1877 between Russia and Turkey, the conclusion of which, the Treaty of San Stefano, was modified through British persuasion at the famous Congress of Berlin in 1878. By the mid-summer of 1876, Jones believed that the threat of war to Britain from

the Near East was abating. But he was bitter relative to the cost and management of past wars. He contended that from the Norman conquest to the restoration of Charles II in 1660, England incurred no national debt through wars (although historically this is erroneous). From that time to his time of writing, Jones believed that wars, which he believed had been entered by the upper-classes, had cost the country about £800,000,000. And these wars had been class wars:

> Our governing classes, instead of doing the fighting themselves, and paying the expense as they went along, like men of courage and honesty, have been doing it by the hands of others, and paying for it out of the pockets of others; and, therefore, to them, as a rule, war has been a profit. . . .[44]

Jones feared Russian designs for expansion, especially in the Balkans and toward the waters of the Aegean.[45] He took exception to the expressions of John Bright to the effect that Britain's apprehensions over Russia's expansionism were ill-founded. He believed that both Russia and Turkey were barbarians, and that Russian rule of Slavic peoples would hardly work to their advantage, if the Russian record in Poland and Siberia was a guide.[46]

---

[44]Jones, "Wars and Rumours of Wars," ibid., June 24, 1876.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Jones, "Mr. Bright's Manchester Speech," ibid., October 7, 1876.

By November, 1876, Jones feared the approach of war. He was indignant at the excesses of the Ottoman irregulars toward the Balkan Christian populations, but hesitated to see the Disraeli government carry Britain into war, perhaps partly because of the tax and class considerations just mentioned. He urged that Parliament be called to ventilate various positions on the Eastern Question, and that the mind of the nation be determined before the government carried the nation into hostilities.[47] Jones did not pursue the subject beyond this point, either in the Industrial Review or the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle.

Like the Slavs, the Irish were a separate national entity, though not a political one, during Lloyd Jones's famous series of editorials; and since it possessed a national consciousness, it can perhaps be dealt with here.

Ireland had aspired to be its own master ever since English influence commenced upon her soil; and she secured a taste of this with her own Parliament's autonomy in 1782; but this was lost in the union of crowns and Parliaments in 1801.

Following the successive efforts at restored autonomy by Daniel O'Connell and Young Ireland, the Protestant attorney Isaac Butt appeared upon the scene

---

[47]Jones, "The Eastern Question and Secret Diplomacy," ibid., November 18, 1876.

in the eighteen-seventies as the founder of the Home Rule League of Ireland.

Patrick Lloyd Jones was raised with a legacy of Irish nationalism, and he wrote in favor of Irish home rule, or internal autonomy, as opposed to outright national separation, as early as 1871. He pointed out that pressure for this was not limited to Isaac Butt and a narrow circle of agitators, but was spreading among all Irish classes and among "thoughtful men in England." He implied that the goal was "reasonable and right," and would, if wisely implemented, improve the condition of the Irish people. He was not of the view that Irish home rule would divide or weaken the Empire; on the contrary, it "might tend" to "consolidate" it, with the elimination of such as issue of alienation as external domination was.[48]

In 1873 Jones was interested in the development of university education in Ireland. As a result of pressure from Professor Henry Fawcett, who, as leader of the radical educationists, had long pushed for the abolition of university religious tests, the Gladstone government reluctantly introduced an Irish University Education Bill. It was to create a national Irish university from Protestant and Catholic colleges in Ireland. To avoid acrimony within the new institution,

---

[48]Jones, "Home Rule," ibid., September 30, 1871.

the bill contained "gagging clauses" which removed modern history, theology, and ethics from the university, but allowed these within the constituent colleges.[49] But not each college was on the same basis, which invited opposition from different quarters. Much of the endowment for the proposed university was taken from the venerable and Protestant Trinity College, Dublin, which was to be opened to all without regard to religion; the two non-Catholic Queen's Colleges in the arrangement were to receive state support; but not the Catholic colleges.[50] Despite early interest by Irish bishops, Cardinal Cullen led the Irish clergy in opposition to the bill, wishing to avoid a national university polluted with heresy; and Irish M.P.'s followed suit.[51] Presbyterians opposed the plan, as did the radical educationists, including their leader Professor Fawcett,[52] and Lloyd Jones.

Jones desired a more secular institution than the one projected by the bill, which was built "on the

---

[49]G. Locker Lampson, A Consideration of the State of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1907), p. 167; Leslie Stephen, Life of Henry Fawcett (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1885), pp. 282-83; John L. Hammond, Gladstone and the Irish Nation (n.p.: Archon Books, 1964), p. 124.

[50]Lampson, Ireland in the Nineteenth Century, p. 167.

[51]Ibid., p. 358.

[52]Ensor, England, 1870-1914, p. 24.

mud and stubble of sectarian prejudice."[53] He predicted that the bill would not pass Parliament;[54] and in the event he was right, for it failed second reading in the Commons by a very close vote.[55] Indeed, this defeat produced an abortive resignation by the Gladstone regime, which resumed its shaky power after Disraeli refused to form a minority government.[56] Six years later, the Conservatives under Disraeli created the Royal University of Ireland, succeeded in 1908 by the National University of Ireland.

Lloyd Jones last took journalistic interest in Ireland in 1875. At that time he believed that conditions had considerably improved there through such things as the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland and better peasant tenure of the land. He thus disapproved of the then-proposed coercion act for Ireland,[57] which subsequently passed the House of Commons by the

---

[53]Jones, "Mr. Gladstone's Irish Difficulty," Bee-Hive, February 15, 1873.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Ensor, England, 1870-1914, pp. 24-25.

[56]Ibid., p. 25; Col. Sir Henry Ponsonby to W. E. Gladstone, Buckingham Palace, March 13, 1873; and W. E. Gladstone to Queen Victoria, Carlton House Terrace, March 18, 1873, in Philip Guedalla, ed., The Queen and Mr. Gladstone, Vol. I: 1845-1879 (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1933), pp. 395-96.

[57]Jones, "Peace Preservation Act (Ireland)," Bee-Hive, March 27, 1875.

one-sided vote of 264 to 69.[58] Jones's view of the issue was that at the moment "outrages are few" and general peace prevailed. He recognized that advocates of the bill believed that it would preserve these peaceful conditions, but he contended that a new coercion bill could be passed rapidly by Parliament if a future occasion warranted.[59]

Despite the tranquility of the period, Jones acknowledged that "hostility to the English government is widely spread throughout Ireland." He believed that the English working-class desired "fair" treatment for Ireland, and that patience, an abstinance from anti-Irish language, and consideration were required in framing national policy toward Britain's sister isle.[60]

---

[58]Great Britain, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, CCXXIII [1875], 292.

[59]Jones, "Peace Preservation Act (Ireland)," Bee-Hive, March 27, 1875.

[60]Ibid.

CHAPTER VII

"FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THOSE WHO SUFFER"

If Robert Owen and his disciples stood for any principle, it was for the improvement and reform of the world. So nothing could have been more natural than for Lloyd Jones to devote his journalistic services to many of the numerous reform projects of the eighteen-seventies, a time when reform was especially in the air.

For the reformer and old Owenite socialist that Lloyd Jones was, it is surprising that in the years included in this study, 1871 to 1878, which were his most important journalistic years for the working-class, he rarely directly touched on socialism; but he approached reform as a liberal, and rejected reforms through organized political socialism. For Jones had decided, not without some pain, to live politically within the framework of the Liberal party. And he himself told us in 1873 that his policy was to seek "the nearest attainable goal,"[1] which was rather more pragmatic a policy than most socialists were willing to accept.

---

[1]Jones, "Mr. Ellis and Myself. The Nine Hours Bill," Bee-Hive, September 13, 1873.

In an article of 1877, Jones used irony to show that much of the popular impression of socialism was phantasy. He believed that the advantaged portion of the public was ignorant of the real cause and nature of socialism. In particular, Jones took occasion to react against the reported intention of Baron Krupp in Germany to discharge from his employment all socialist workers.[2] Jones, in a moving passage, described a socialist and the circumstances which produced him:

> . . . perhaps the Times is right when it informs us that he (the socialist) is simply a poor man . . . lacking in a world of abundance, and upon the whole the product of bad government. . . . If so, what amount of pity can be too much for our social pariahs, who are made what they are by bad government, and then starved out of life by the Krupps of the world, because of what they have been made? Or, on the other hand, how can honest men sufficiently condemn the governors who give us such a state of things as a result of what they call Government? And sow broadcast miserable blind Krupps, who correct men's opinions by taking away their bread, and punish their heterodoxy by the hunger of their wives and children?[3]

In the same vein, Jones describes socialists as men who "do not smother their sense of wrong and smile in their misery for the gratification of those who are satisfied because they have fared well."[4]

At this time, Jones's definition of socialism lacks the precision and content of Owenism, or of such

---

[2]Jones, "Socialism," Industrial Review, June 23, 1877.

[3]Ibid. [4]Ibid.

then-contemporaries as Lassalle or Marx: "Socialism really means the thoughts of working men, more or less crude, more or less correct in essence and form, more or less suited to the requirements of society."[5] This is, on its face, vague and disappointing, and is little helped by Jones's hint that this involved a closer relationship between the production of wealth and its distribution.[6]

Almost certainly socialism continued to mean for Jones what it meant to him in the days of Owenism and Christian Socialism: voluntary collectivist industrial and agricultural bodies. Jones's interest in the co-operative movement was never higher than at this time; and we have seen that this implied agricultural as well as industrial organization.

However, Jones was a voluntarist as to his methods of advancing the cause of socialism. This was shown when he wrote with some pride that "the co-operative movement did not drive tradesmen into bankruptcy, but rather acted to restrain new tradesmen from entering the field, so that the progress of co-operation could be made with "as little injury to the ordinary tradesman as possible."[7]

---

[5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

[7] Jones, Co-operation: Its Position, Its Policy, and Its Prospects, p. 12.

He did, however, hope to utilize government in the cause of socialism. "Law is necessary to regulate the actions of men living together, not only for the purpose of resisting . . . wrong, but of defining and enforcing what is right."[8] Given Jones's assumptions regarding the definition of economic and social goods, his meaning is clear. We can see here the idea that the government should propagandize the public as to the true order of society, as well as implementing these goals.

This was but a confirmation of his Christian Socialist position on the role of government. Socialism insisted:

> . . . on the right and duty of those who govern . . . to interfere with all institutions and parties that abridge the general welfare; not by forcing on men prematurely new institutions and modes of life, but by preparing men's minds . . . for such changes as new developments in society might render necessary.[9]

In the light of his life-long commitment to his own type of socialism, it is interesting to notice how little cognizance Jones took of the new and more comprehensive systems of socialism, and of socialist leaders such as Henry M. Hyndman and William Morris, who were

---

[8]Jones, "A People's Party: its Necessity and its Functions. No. VII. Political Power: What it is, What it may be used for, and How to use it," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, September 13, 1884.

[9]"Gazette of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations," Christian Socialist, April 19, 1851.

actively appearing in the early eighteen-eighties when he was advocating the formation of a working-class "People's Party" in a series of articles in 1884. For although he complained that "the elections are settled by bodies of men who, though liberal in regard to questions now passing away, are not liberal in connection with the social and industrial questions now coming to the front"[10] his political program essentially accepted the capitalist system, aiming at the correction of specific abuses[11] and carrying the implication that the worker should share more abundantly in the system.[12] The nearest that Jones got to socialism was a suggestion that the government readjust the relationship between agricultural tenant and landlord, apparently along lines that had been followed in Ireland in favor of guaranteed tenure, rights of purchase, etc.:

> Then there is the condition of the law in connection with property tenures and property rights. Here several sets of interests demand attention. By what right [does] the landlord

---

[10]Jones, "A People's Party: its Necessity and its Functions. No. VII. Political Power: What it is, What it may be used for, and How to use it," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, September 13, 1884.

[11]Jones, "A People's Party: its Necessity and its Functions. No. VIII. Political Power: What it is, What it may be used for, and How to use it," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, September 20, 1884.

[12]Jones, "A People's Party: its Necessity and its Functions. No. I. The Situation," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, August 2, 1884.

> hold his land? To what extent the tenant or cultivator should be independent of his landlord?[13]

It was natural for an old socialist teacher and a man who earned his living by words to have a lively interest in education; and for more than a decade prior to 1870, pressure in England was building up in favor of a national education system. Reformers opposed to the employment of children in factories and workshops were becoming persuaded that the best new factory act for children would be a compulsory education act, which would remove children from undesirable occupations. They were led into this position because the Workshops Regulation Act of 1867, which forbade the employment of children by pottery, paper staining, fustian-cutting, lucifer matchmaking, percussion cap, and cartridge firms, was not enforced by national inspectors but by local authorities, which meant that it was not enforced at all, in large measure because localities opposed the employment of inspectors whose salaries would have to be paid by the rates.[14] Also, the wars of the period --the Federal defeat of the Confederacy and the Prussian

---

[13]Jones, "A People's Party: its Necessity and its Functions. No. VIII. Political Power: What it is, What it may be used for, and How to use it," Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, September 20, 1884.

[14]W. H. G. Armytage, Four Hundred Years of English Education (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), pp. 137-38.

victory over Austria--seemed to suggest that educated soldiers were at an advantage over uneducated ones. And the extension of the British franchise in 1867 argued forceable for something better in national education.

The Liberal Elementary Education Act of 1870 amounted to a religious and a financial compromise that satisfied few of the interested parties. Wrangles over the operation of the new system soon arose. Nonconformists were indignant over the inclusion of Anglican schools in the plan. The Anglicans hastened to set up new schools in the hope of forestalling the opening of the state or board schools. Roman Catholics were displeased with the non-sectarian religious provision of the state schools. The secularists were unhappy about the presence of Church schools in the system. A major result of these conflicts in interests was, often, bitterly disputed school board elections fought by rival religious factions.

Lloyd Jones was in the camp of the secular educationists, and shared their disappointment with the Education Act of 1870. Jones not only wished to remove the divisive influence (as he saw it) of religion from the schools, but to broaden the scope of public education: " . . . we have only one true policy in England in regard to education. Instruction must be <u>free</u>,

compulsory, and unsectarian."[15] Jones held that in the struggle for a national as opposed to a sectarian program of education, people were being denied the kind of education that they needed, and "the great sufferers in this struggle are the working men of the country,"[16] for ignorance was one of their worst enemies. He urged working-class leaders to interest themselves in this problem.[17]

As Jones saw it in 1871, the Education Act of 1870 was "a most miserable failure."[18] In 1872 he described the system of education produced by the act as "a congeries of discordant bodies differing in their interest and prejudices, and continually producing by fermentation dissention and strife."[19]

He had a variety of objections to the religious provisions of the Education Act. He believed that a national program of education should seek to promote "unity of thought, feeling, and effort on the part of the people,"[20] whereas the church-operated schools

---

[15]Jones, "The Education Fight," Bee-Hive, October 30, 1875.

[16]Ibid. [17]Ibid.

[18]Jones, "The Education Puzzle, Bee-Hive, December 2, 1871.

[19]Jones, "The Education Act," Bee-Hive, March 16, 1872.

[20]Jones, "The Marquis of Ripon--Catholic Education," Bee-Hive, October 28, 1876.

encouraged denominational proselytism and would enkindle "those sectarian hatreds and strifes, which, through the increasing intelligence of the last half-century, had been gradually dying out amongst us."[21] Thus the act would produce division, not unity.

In addition, Jones implied broadly (although he was never explicit) that sectarian schools tended to be limited or partial in their presentation of academic subjects. In literature, for instance, he said sectarian efforts to make Shakespeare a Catholic or a Protestant "would be a sorry sight."[22] Jones saw a fullness and unity in learning which could be jeopardized by sectarian academic emphasis:

> The Protestant life and thought of the recent day has most undisputedly come out of the old Catholic life of the times of the Henrys and Edwards: and it is this consciousness of unity in the very essence of life and thought in England that should lead us to aim, in education, at the development of unity in thought and feeling rather than building separate sectarian institutions. . . .[23]

Jones complained that religion distracted the school boards and their constituents from their proper functions. He described the boards as "cabals of

---

[21] Jones, "The Education Puzzle," Bee-Hive, December 2, 1871.

[22] Jones, "The Marquis of Ripon--Catholic Education," Bee-Hive, October 28, 1876.

[23] Ibid.

sectarian controversy" which carried on their business "in the lowest spirit of parish contention." He predicted that as the school boards became more numerous, so their quarrels would increase at the cost of "unity of purpose, and charity of spirit in the . . . carrying out of a sound system of national education."[24]

Also, Jones was unfavorably impressed by efforts of denominations to build new schools since the passage of the Education Act. These were not built by the churches for the sake of learning, but to

> grasp more than their rivals, to gain more than others of anything that might be allowed to drop from the coffers of the State, and to carry on a work of proselytism, prompted as much by a jealousy of rivals as by a sincere desire for the promotion of knowledge and virtue.[25]

Indeed, Jones believed that one casualty of sectarian competition within the fabric of public education was religion itself. These disputes tended to "strip religion of its highest and best attributes" to the loss of its "humanizing essence," namely "the spirit of brotherly love."[26]

Jones raised two objections to the use of the Bible in the curriculum of the schools. First, he said

---

[24]Jones, "The Education Act," Bee-Hive, March 16, 1872.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Jones, "Another Form of the Education Puzzle," Bee-Hive, December 6, 1873.

he did not object to the educational use of the Bible as a book "as much as" from the "unseemly and most un-Christian rivalries and rows" that were produced by its use by different sects in schools.[27]

We are reminded of Jones's second criticism to the inclusion of the Bible in the school curriculum when we recall that Jones was writing of the age of Darwin and of Biblical criticism. With considerable insight, he suggested that the use of the Bible would naturally raise questions as to its truth as an historical record, and as to its fitness as a moral monitor.[28] Moreover, on purely pragmatic grounds, Jones wondered whether disputes over religion in education, which impeded the development of the English educational system, might not raise in "the boldest and most daring of the public" a question as to the Bible's practicality as a medium of education.[29]

Within the framework of liberalism and capitalism, Jones championed a number of reforms in the eighteen-seventies. One of these was workmen's compensation. This had not been an issue prior to 1837, for the common law

---

[27]Jones, "The Education Act," Bee-Hive, March 16, 1872.

[28]Jones, "Another Form of the Education Puzzle," Bee-Hive, December 6, 1873.

[29]Ibid.

of England provided for the employer's liability for damages, in the case of negligence, to victims of an accident, whether in his employ or not. But beginning in 1837, the common law was modified by court decisions so as to exempt the employer for liability for his employee. It thus worked out that strangers could claim damages, but not employees.[30]

The miners and the railway "servants" in particular began to press for corrective legislation,[31] and Lloyd Jones supplied his editorial support. Jones condemned the procrastination of Parliament to act in this regard as "a monstrous injustice." He claimed that the statistics for fatal mine accidents for the period since mine inspection was commenced showed that "many of the lives lost now might be saved if the responsibilities of the owners were increased."[32]

He pointed out that the problem was made more acute by increase of the use of mechanical devices where workers were employed, and by the replacement of the owner's direct supervision of work by other employees.[33]

---

[30]Webbs, Trade Unionism, p. 364.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Jones, "Compensation to Workmen," Industrial Review, April 20, 1878.

[33]Ibid.

Jones noted that the workmen's compensation bill of 1878 did not meet the requirements of the railway workers, but he urged them to mend the bill, rather than to oppose it, arguing on the grounds of strategy:

> Surely every working man must know that the power of the party of labour, more than that of any other party, requires harmony of thought, and unity of action for its preservation and increase, and that without these its efforts must be futile when strongly opposed.[34]

In 1880, labor won a partial victory, but this act required claimants to prove negligence on the employer's part;[35] and courts subsequently allowed employers to induce their men to "contract out" of the application of the act, although the act itself was silent on such a procedure.[36] Still, a dramatic decrease in the number of accidents was recorded in the years following passage of the act.[37] Final victory was won by the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1896.[38]

A reform movement whose leadership requested Jones's journalistic support was Samuel Plimsoll's crusade against unsafe merchant ships.[39] Plimsoll was

---

[34]Jones, "Mr. Evans and Mr. MacDonald, M.P.," Industrial Review, October 19, 1878.

[35]Cole, British Working-Class Movement, p. 230.

[36]Webbs, Trade Unionism, p. 366.

[37]Ibid., p. 365, n. 2.

[38]Ibid., p. 366, n. 1.

[39]George Howell to Lloyd Jones, n.p., March 17 [1874], Plimsoll & Seamen's Fund Committee Letter Book

a radical Member of Parliament from Derby who in 1871 approached the Trades Union Congress for assistance in his campaign on behalf of seamen who sailed on unsafe vessels. He sought corrective and regulative legislation; and to this end in 1873 published the book Our Seamen, a heavily-documented indictment of the unsafe practices of the British merchant marine which intentionally gave opportunity for libel suits. The unions strongly gave support to Plimsoll, organizing the "Plimsoll and Seamen's Fund Committee" as a focus of activity. Jones's good friend George Howell served as secretary of the committee. In 1873 a temporary act was passed, under which over 400 ships were detained from voyages for unseaworthy conditions; and in 1876 the Merchant Shipping Act was passed in the teeth of Conservative and shipping opposition.[40]

Jones drew the attention of his readers to the various abuses against which Plimsoll and the movement protested. In the merchant shipping trade, there was a category of vessel so palpably unsafe as to be known as "coffins."[41] The ships were sometimes overloaded

---

[being Letter Book IX of George Howell], p. 356, George Howell Collection, Bishopgate Institute, London.

[40]Cole, British Working-Class Movement, pp. 221-22; Webbs, Trade Unionism, p. 370, n. 1.

[41]Jones, "Commissioners' Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, July 11, 1874.

(in reaction against which the "Plimsoll line" came to be painted to ships' hulls), dangerously deck-loaded, or insured beyond their value.[42] In addition, ships were sent to sea in an undermanned condition.[43]

All this amounted to "murder as a legitimate item on the profit side of the account in our import, export, and shipping trades."[44] Jones was bitter that thousands of ships and tens of thousands of lives had been lost as a result of these abuses, "and yet no strong protest had been made from any influential quarter against such a crime."[45] He condemned the honest ship-owners who merely minded their own business, despite knowledge of the evil; and underwriters who, though victims of the sinking of over-insured coffin ships, feared ruin through loss of business if they protested.[46] Parliament came under Jones's wrath for being less willing to proceed against the murderous operators of the coffin ships than against the cutlers

---

[42]Jones, "Are our Seamen to be Protected," Bee-Hive, June 7, 1873.

[43]Jones, "Commissioners' Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, July 11, 1874.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Jones, "Are our Seamen to be Protected," Bee-Hive, June 7, 1873.

[46]Ibid.

of Sheffield.[47] He also lashed out against the Royal Commission on unseaworthy ships, whose membership lacked a single merchant seamen and whose equivocation appeared intended to put a "wet blanket on Mr. Plimsoll."[48] But Jones saved his strongest criticism for the Board of Trade, in whose province the Plimsoll issue lay. It refused to seek information about the maritime abuses, he charged,[49] and, indeed, gave "blind, official acquiescence" to them.[50] He was particularly indignant when the assistant secretary of the Board of Trade addressed the 1874 meeting of the United Kingdom Chambers of Commerce and asserted that the loss of life in the merchant marine was more due to the unseaworthiness of the seamen than to the condition of the ships.[51]

Jones drew upon current statistics, during the years of the movement, to add to Plimsoll's indictment. In 1873, he cited the just-published Wreck Register and Chart of the British Isles to show that 40 British ships

---

[47]Jones, "Commissioners' Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, July 11, 1874.

[48]Jones, "Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, November 8, 1873.

[49]Jones, "Commissioners' Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, July 11, 1874.

[50]Jones, "Are our Seamen to be Protected," Bee-Hive, June 7, 1873.

[51]Jones, "Unseaworthy Ships and the Board of Trade," Bee-Hive, October 3, 1874.

had gone down in 1872 for unseaworthiness.[52] And in 1874, following passage of the temporary merchant shipping bill, he showed that during nine months' operation of the new law, no less than 256 vessels had been condemned as not fit for sea.[53]

Jones held that Plimsoll's support would have to come primarily from the working-class. He praised the miners for their early generous contributions; and urged others to follow suit. He bitterly wrote that the middle and upper-classes would see the Plimsoll campaign as an attack on business enterprise, and would contend that ship-owners were a "most respectable body of men" whose ships were normally in good repair; and that besides, the sailors could take care of themselves.[54] By 1875, the greater part of the battle had been successfully fought, and Jones acknowledged that the workingmen had raised "the principal part" of the funds needed to meet Plimsoll's expenses, especially those required to resist the attacks of the shipping interests;[55] and he praised them for their "magnificent help."[56]

---

[52]Jones, "Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, November 8, 1873.

[53]Jones, "Commissioners' Report on Unseaworthy Ships," Bee-Hive, July 11, 1874.

[54]Jones, "Are our Seamen to be Protected," Bee-Hive, June 7, 1873.

[55]Jones, "The Value of Agitation," Bee-Hive, March 20, 1875.

[56]Jones, "Our New Moneyed Aristocracy," Bee-Hive, April 17, 1875.

Another reform question which attracted the support of Lloyd Jones was the extension of the Factory Acts. The British trade union movement in the eighteen-seventies was divided on the question of government regulation of economic activities, with the most prominent leaders joining the middle-class Liberals in subscribing to the creed of laissez faire.[57] Some unionists and their friends, however, were interested in attaining the passage of new bills which would limit the number of hours of factory labor per week, and shorten the working quota for women and children.[58] While statutes moving in this direction were attained in 1875 and 1878, opposition to restricting female labor arose from the feminist movement. Women's trade unions, led by Mrs. Emma Ann Paterson, feared that special restrictive legislation would jeopardize women's opportunities for employment.[59] Mrs. Paterson not only organized the first enduring British women's trade union, but also established the Women's Protective and Provident League.[60]

Jones was a stout believer in factory legislation, both on practical and theoretical grounds. On the

---

[57]Webbs, Trade Unionism, p. 374.

[58]Cole, British Working-Class Movement. pp. 220-21.

[59]Ibid., p. 221; Webbs, Trade Unionism, p. 336, n.1.

[60]Webbs, Trade Unionism, pp. 336-37.

practical level, he denied that these acts were impediments to foreign sales of British goods; and he pointed to the impressive increase of Britain's overseas markets during the period of legislation for factory operatives.[61] Moreover, he held that the acts served to promote the health and comfort of the workers, and that health among the working-class should be a "prime concern" to the government.[62] Jones wished to go further than any of the acts of the period and limit the day's labor to eight hours, which he asserted that working-men generally believed would be the best arrangement in terms of their health.[63] And Jones sought to show that the last hour's work, where long hours were observed, was least productive.[64]

While Jones doubted that a conflict existed between human and economic values on this question--since he felt that a shorter working day could be as productive --he clearly gave the priority to human values in any conflict which might arise. Thus he believed that Britain could beat the foreigner in overseas markets by a fair day's work. But if foreign inventions or tariffs were to change the situation, he felt that the British example of shorter hours was easily preferable to competition

---

[61]Jones, "Professor Fawcett's Labour Doctrines," Bee-Hive, August 30, 1873.

[62]Ibid. [63]Ibid. [64]Ibid.

which demanded excessive daily labor at the cost of the health of the people.[65]

Jones also took issue with the theory of laissez faire, whose proponents "regard factory legislation as a undue and dangerous interference with private rights; and education, vaccination, and other prohibitory laws as dangerous encroachments on individual liberty."[66] Jones even discovered a new organization of employers in 1876 whose advocacy of laissez faire extended to opposition to the Truck Act,[67] which had ended the abuses connected with payment of employees in commodities, by requiring that they be paid in current coin of the realm.

He distinguished between a citizen's rightful scope of liberty, and its excessive expansion, which he called anarchy. To him it was an absurd proposition that each man should be free to regulate his own affairs without any outside interference whatsoever, and to deny that society in general had any parallel right. He contended that "collective action" or public regulation was essential for any society.

---

[65]Jones, "Opposition to the Factory Acts Amendment Bill," Bee-Hive, May 16, 1874.

[66]Jones, "A New Association," Bee-Hive, December 9, 1876.

[67]Jones, "The New Society," Bee-Hive, December 16, 1876.

He condemned alarmists who claimed that the factory acts, education acts, and similar laws suggested a desire to put all "social life" under the control of the government, or that this would lead there, or that this would sap the people of their initiative, conscience, or sense of responsibility. Jones argued that such an outcome was inconsistent with the political system of Great Britain; and that besides, the masses of the people had tested the effects of government regulation in their own lives, and found it beneficial.

Jones held that the improvement of the condition of the masses of the people would require collective government action, which, under the law, would improve in its operation through experimentation. Such action would help eradicate evil and promote good; and in the future would foster "the highest idea of human life and progress." Through such, men could foster justice and come to attain their true or proper relationships one with another.[68]

There was one blind spot in the application of the Factory Acts to which Jones pointed with indignation. This was in the colonies, and in India in particular. Here the old unregulated system of labor operated with all its abuses. Jones named specific British

---

[68]Jones, "A New Association," Bee-Hive, December 9, 1876.

business firms which were not "troubling themselves with moral distinctions as to what might or might not be fairly regarded as murder, whilst trampling down the poor and the weak, in the hideous dance of death . . . for the sake of money gain."[69]

Jones drew attention to the experience of Britain, where the "souls and bodies of tens of thousands were ruined" prior to the Factory Acts, which did not, he reminded his readers, harm the owners, whose trade greatly increased under the years of regulation.

Lloyd Jones urged action from two sectors. From the working-class, he called upon the Trades Union Congress and its Parliamentary Committee to act. Also, he asked, "what are the Christian Missionaries in India doing?" Why did they not condemn the "Anti-Christian" operation of the factories? He urged the missionary societies to send out special tracts and special missionaries "to convert the professing Christians who have established and who profit by this inhuman factory system."[70]

Jones was also critical of the Royal Commission on the Factory and Workshop Acts which in 1875 was seeking to ascertain just how the existing acts were operating.

---

[69]Jones, "Peace with Honour," Industrial Review, October 12, 1878.

[70]Ibid.

Jones had no specific objections to the function of this Royal Commission, but rather to its composition. It was made up of men drawn entirely from the upper-classes: it possessed neither employers nor workers. He wrote that "no men understand the intricate conditions of work so well as those who are constantly engaged in performing it, or in regulating its performance."[71] Such men also would be better able to "bring out important points in their right bearing"; and working men could keep their concerns in view. Lloyd Jones speculated as to the cause for the absence of workingmen from such commissions: "we suspect it is because such work is well paid . . . , there being Baronets and Honourables, and others of their class, always ready for such fees."[72]

Lloyd Jones recognized that he was walking on thin ice when he moved from an attack upon unregulated British business firms in India to the ladies who championed women's rights at home. In particular, he took exception to some of the stands of the Women's Protective and Provident League. This organization has a substantial history, and later became the Women's Trade Union

---

[71]Jones, "Royal Commission on the Factory and Workshop Act," Bee-Hive, June 19, 1875.

[72]Ibid.

League.[73] The league contended that while in the past female workers required the protection of Factory Acts, this was no longer needed in 1876; and it believed such legislation to be restrictive and intermeddling.[74]

Jones contended that the league was seeking to protect female workers from the Factory Acts while the workers themselves sought no such protection. Further, Jones held that the women subject to the acts found them "an unmixed blessing, daily felt as such."[75] Moreover, Jones sought to show that the fears of the league were unwarranted. The female factory workers were not being pressed out of employment by the men; indeed, their numbers were increasing in proportion to men. Nor were their wages impaired; and certainly they were better than the old days prior to the Factory Acts. Nay more, their hours were decreased while their pay was increased. Jones warned that if the league sought to increase number of laboring hours for women, they would cheapen the value of labor.[76]

---

[73]Webbs, Trade Unionism, pp. 336-37, n. 1.

[74]Jones, "Women's Protective and Provident League," Bee-Hive, December 2, 1876.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Ibid.; cf. Jones, "Women's Protective and Provident League," Bee-Hive, December 16, 1876. This Jones's rejoinder to a reply to his original article by Mrs. Emma Paterson, the real pioneer of women's trade unionism in Britain and the guiding spirit in the Women's Protective

Jones refused to answer in detail various charges made by feminists to the effect that working-men were unfair to female workers. He replied generally to the accusation, saying that ladies preferred to avoid the work of the founders and machine-makers, and the heaviness of the job prevented their entering dock-work or the building trade; but that in many trades, women were to be found alongside men; and that, indeed, it was more just to accuse working-men of over-working their wives and daughters than to charge them with preventing their employment in the trades. He held that such charges alienated a working-class support which could make the difference between success and failure to the feminist movement.

He asserted that the class which primarily excluded women from employment was not the working-class but the middle-class. He claimed that most feminists were drawn from this class, but strangely directed their efforts toward working-class employment difficulties. With respect to middle-class occupations, Jones favored opening the ministry, law, and medicine to women.[77] He

---

and Provident League. Among other things, Mrs. Paterson sought to drive a wedge between trade unionists and the cause of factory legislation by alleging that the leading advocates of factory legislation in the past had been opposed to unionism.

[77]Jones, "Women's Protective and Provident League," Bee-Hive, December 2, 1876.

especially regretted an episode in Bristol in 1873 during which male physicians on the staff of a hospital struck until a new female doctor left the staff. Jones believed that women were naturally the guardians of the health of the family, that many women would prefer to consult physicians to their own sex, and that in any event, the choice should be left to the patient.[78]

Jones's difference with the feminists entered the high-risk category when he addressed himself to female suffrage. Jones refused to look at the "constitutional" aspect of the question that female claimants possessed citizenship, full age, and other qualifications expected of males. He dismissed this argument by observing that women had never exercised such a right in history.[79]

He found various grounds for opposing female parliamentary suffrage. The most revealing one was that since the municipal suffrage had been opened to women (female householders had possessed it since 1869),[80] they had failed to show "a fair appreciation of the

---

[78]Jones, "Dr. Mary Walker," Bee-Hive, November 15, 1873.

[79]Jones, "Women's Suffrage," Bee-Hive, January 18, 1873.

[80]G. D. H. Cole and Raymond Postgate, The British Common People, 1746-1946 (London: Methuen, 1961), p. 535.

various political questions of the hour" and had, "for the most part, voted Tory."[81]

He had the courage to write that women

> are the slaves of authority and prejudice, . . . who in all conflicts of opinion, as a rule, are to be found on the side of those who oppress free thought, and who stand in the way of that safe national progress resulting from a wise and courageous State policy.[82]

Moreover, he held that the addition of a large body of female voters could affect the political balance of the country. Women might possess higher political understanding than men, he admitted, but "they have never exhibited such aptitude." Nor did women of any class enter "heartily into the activities of political life." Then with impressive daring, he continued:

> . . . it may be for this reason, certainly for some reason, they are unfitted, by habit as well as by an intelligent understanding of the questions of the day, to undertake the efficient discharge of such public duties.[83]

A safer ground was occupied by Jones on the question of the sale of adulterated food. This was an old reform issue with Jones, going far back into his career in co-operation.[84] Clearly Jones believed that the

---

[81] Jones, "Women's Suffrage," Bee-Hive, January 18, 1873.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] E. g., Jones, "The Coffee Dealers and the Poor Man," Christian Socialist, April 21, 1851.

co-operative retail store was one sound means of providing wholesome commodities to working-class families, and of countering the retail sale of inferior products by groceries.[85]

He held that despite legislation against the sale of adulterated products, the practice continued almost unabated. He gathered impressive and unappetizing evidence both by his own efforts and from surveys by Parliament and the medical journal Lancet to drive home the reality of the problem.[86] Impure "tea" seems especially to have been sold to the poor, at the price of the real thing. In one case which reached official notice, the "tea" was composed of used tea leaves from China; dirt "which, as being Chinese dirt, may be regarded as absolute in its perfection"; iron filings; and gum.[87] An another case, in which the Food Analyst of the City of London was involved, 40,000 pounds of spurious tea, advertised as the "'finest new season tea dust,'" was found to be composed of "various sorts of

---

[85] "Gazette of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations," Christian Socialist, April 19, 1851. This recounts the proceedings of the fifth "conversazione" of the society, at which Lloyd Jones lectured on "Working Men's Associations and Co-operative Stores, considered as a means for improving the condition of the people.

[86] Jones, "Death in the Pot," Bee-Hive, July 8, 1871.

[87] Ibid.

dirt."[88] In still another incident, merchants were found to be selling "butter" which consisted of 80 percent grease.[89]

The sale of adulterated products to the poor involved two evils. One involved simple cheating: the people were sold inferior products at prices which would have purchased the real things. Second, the content of the spurious products constituted a menace to health.[90] This had a very practical application, Jones believed. He calculated in 1871 that the weekly wages of the typical urban working-man was 20 shillings, which meant that each farthing counted in the purchase of food, clothing, and other necessities. He believed that through the cheapening of products through adulteration and by fraud in weights and measures, the poor lost 20 percent in value from purchased food and medicine.[91]

Jones's articles do show that prosecution of dishonest grocers and others at the local level was occurring. But he thought that nevertheless the law was very inadequate at the upper levels of government both in

---

[88]Jones, "Adulterated Tea," Bee-Hive, November 25, 1876.

[89]Ibid.

[90]Jones, "Death in the Pot," Bee-Hive, July 8, 1871.

[91]Ibid.

enforcement and in content. He acknowledged that there seemed to be no legal provision for the prosecution of persons who only imported adulterated products into the realm, such as tea; and he urged that laws be framed to correct this.[92] But he believed that at the higher levels of government, officials such as the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Home Secretary, and the President of the Board of Trade, were unwilling to face the problem, either with stiffer enforcement or by new laws, out of a solicitude for the interests of British business.[93]

Jones's concern for the problems of the working-class extended beyond the confines of the kitchen to the larger question of working-class housing. Although it was hardly necessary at the time, he drew attention to the fact that "multitudes of our people live in dirty dens wholly unfit for human habitations" in the back streets and lands of the cities of Britain.[94]

Jones pointed that many evils beyond simple physical discomfort resulted, because humans who dwelt in such circumstances became "angry, maddened, demoralized

---

[92]Jones, "Adulterated Tea," Bee-Hive, November 25, 1876.

[93]Jones, "Death in the Pot," Bee-Hive, July 8, 1871.

[94]Jones, "Working Men's Houses," Bee-Hive, June 10, 1871.

--social pariahs whose existence is an anxiety and affliction" to those who care about the public welfare.[95] Hence they had rightly come to be called the "'dangerous classes.'"[96] Moreover, the slum conditions resulted in a higher death-rate for the inhabitants than for the realm at large, which he showed meant in Liverpool that 5,000 working people died needlessly each year, based on a slum death-rate of 10 per thousand* above the national average.[97]

Lloyd Jones had no patience with the solutions to this problem advanced by Lord Derby, whom Jones acknowledged to be sincerely interested in the problem, but whom he also condemned as being too detached and impartial to accomplish results. Derby offered the solutions of gradualism: working-class housing would improve with the passage of time, by the influence of philanthropists, and by the discovery by the capitalist

---

[95] Ibid. [96] Ibid. [97] Ibid.

*These figures show that Jones estimated that the working-class numbered 500,000 in Liverpool in 1871. The census of 1871 showed it to have 493,000 inhabitants, exclusive of environs, which came to be included in the census of 1891, at which time there was a difference of 112,000 between the city proper and its environs. Mitchell and Deane, Abstract of British Historical Statistics, pp. 24, 26. If Jones's reference was to Liverpool proper, clearly his figures are inflated (though this does not vitiate his principle); if to the metropolitan area, he appears to have been reasonably accurate, since the working-class comprised such a large proportion of the population.

that decent working-class housing is in his own advantage.[98]

It was Jones's view that great national problems required great legislative programs to revamp national conditions; but he was not specific as to what legislative provisions he sought. But he did not think that such action was at all likely, since British statesmen were "practical" and would never take up so profound a move unless the situation was so desperate that they were forced into it.[99]

For Jones, miserable living quarters constituted one facet of a still larger problem that interested him for years, and which he often was able to introduce into articles which were ostensibly dedicated to other subjects. This was pauperism. Jones felt outraged by the fact that there were one million paupers in a country so wealthy as Britain. He was equally indignant that whenever the question was raised in Parliament, or investigated by Parliament, only details of the problem --symptoms--and not the root causes were dealt with.

Jones wanted a most searching investigation undertaken to discover whether the presence of so many paupers was ineradicable, or whether, on the other hand, by a new arrangement of capital, labor, and management, "the

---

[98] Ibid. [99] Ibid.

able-bodied paupers may be enabled not only to support themselves, but to contribute also to the support of the aged and infirm."[100] Aside from the human values connected with seeking to improve the living conditions of paupers, Jones felt that the financial side of the existing program might evoke support for his plan, since the per capita cost of the care of paupers was rising in the third quarter of the nineteenth-century, as was the relative number of paupers in London.

Jones saw this matter as one of the great national questions; and idealist and reformer that he was, he urged action of a fundamental nature: "Nothing but a dogged determinism to accomplish difficult things gives man his triumph over the opposing moral, intellectual, and material forces of the world."[101]

The question of prison labor was akin to the pauper problem, since Jones believed that both for prisoners and for paupers in workhouses, productive labor was preferable to idleness.[102] His attention was drawn to this question in the eighteen-seventies by the deleterious competition of prison mat-making with free

---

[100]Jones, "Mr. Smith's Motion--Pauperism," Bee-Hive, May 13, 1871.

[101]Ibid.

[102]Jones, "Prison Labour," Bee-Hive, March 25, 1871.

labor mat-making.[103] Mat-making was for years the principal prison commercial occupation.[104] While Lloyd Jones believed that the inmates of workhouses and prisons should be profitably employed, he held that in no case whatever should their products compete in the market with free labor, since obviously the cost-advantage in production would lie with the former.[105] Indeed, if the competition of prison-made mats spread, or was extended in principle to other occupations, the result would be to drive wage-earners on the poor rates.[106]

What forms of labor met Jones's criterion of productivity but not at the expense of free labor? He suggested that inmates be put to making all the clothing requirements of prisoners, paupers, police, and soldiers. Also, they could be put to the cultivation of food, the clearing of waste land for production, or "in doing other work by which the resources of the country might be developed."[107]

With particular reference to prisons, Jones suggested that these institutions turn from mat-making in favor of vocational rehabilitation. His ideas reflect

---

[103] Ibid.

[104] Jones, "Prisons Bill," Bee-Hive, July 1, 1876.

[105] Jones, "Prison Labour," Bee-Hive, March 25, 1871.

[106] Ibid. [107] Ibid.

both sympathy and realism. Prisons should teach men trades by which they could earn their livings when freed, and teach such a diversity of crafts as to place no stigma on any of them as being tainted by an association with ex-prisoners. The trades should be large enough both to accommodate prison-trained operatives without adversely affecting the labor market, and to provide them with some hope of anonymity from their past and thus get a new start. Finally, the prison training programs should include vocations which could, within the prisons, supply items needed by prisons, workhouses, and other public institutions.[108]

An entirely different reform question which interested Jones was the Church of England. He looked at this venerable institution from a position which differed little from his old Owenite viewpoint of secularism and humanist morality. He had little use for the national church, and favored its disestablishment and disendowment, not only in print[109] but in public, as at a London working-men's meeting on the subject in 1871, when he spoke in company with George Howell, George Potter, Henry Broadhurst, and Robert Applegarth.[110]

---

[108]Jones, "Prisons Bill," Bee-Hive, July 1, 1876.

[109]Jones, "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1871.

[110]"The Disestablishment Movement. Working Men's Conference," Bee-Hive, November 11, 1871.

Jones conceded that there was some good in the church. Among its clergy were "large numbers" of "high-minded," "enlightened," and "liberal" men.[111] And thirty years previous, the Anglican priests who were active in Christian Socialism were "brave, honest, earnest men."[112] And Jones had a good opinion of at least one member of the episcopal bench. This was Dr. Frazer, Bishop of Manchester, who took the side of the farm laborers in the agricultural lock-out of 1874.[113] In addition, Jones displayed sympathy for the "large numbers of poor parsons whose miserable incomes have to be made up by charity.[114] Finally Jones grudgingly admitted that the church was "moderately tolerant" which he made sure to explain was due to the lack of public support of the church.[115]

---

[111]Jones, "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1871.

[112]Jones, "The Clergy and Trade Unionism. Letter 6. Mr. Hansard's Letter--A Digression," Industrial Review, September 1, 1877. Jones's assessment of these men was not entirely based on memory. He remained in contact with an old band of Christian Socialists until the end of his life through the regular meetings of the F.D.M. Club. Cf. J. M. L. [udlow], "The Late Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, June 5, 1886.

[113]Jones, "The Bishop of Manchester and the Lock-Out of Farm Labourers," Bee-Hive, April 11, 1874; J. M. L. [udlow], "The Late Mr. Lloyd Jones," Co-operative News, June 5, 1886.

[114]Jones, "More Bishops," Industrial Review, August 10, 1878.

[115]Jones, "The Established Church," Bee-Hive, July 25, 1874.

Indeed, there was "much to be said in favor of such an institution" when the mass of the public supported it, and when there was public agreement as to its doctrine and government.[116]

Jones's objections to the current condition of the Church far outweighed its advantages and these led him to his advocacy of disestablishment and disendowment. As Jones assessed the situation, "practically nine-tenths of our people live altogether outside the Church's influence."[117] With its base of popular support reduced to only a section of the people, the Anglican Church's real position in the nation was as a "competing rival sect."[118] Nay more. "It is a sect made up of a number of sects."[119] He refused to enter into a discussion of the relative merits of the Low Church and High Church positions, confining himself to the views that "there is much that is absolutely offensive on both sides;[120] and that the diversity of doctrine within its membership militated against its national character--a test

---

[116] Ibid.

[117] Jones, "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1871.

[118] Jones, "More Bishops," Industrial Review, August 10, 1878.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Jones, "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1871.

he probably would not have wished to have used with respect to the working-class movement. He thought that the various factions of the Church held together only because they had a vested interest in its wealth. None of them wished to leave it before its disestablishment for fear of losing their share in the division of its properties.[121]

The Church's wealth interested Jones as well. He saw it as national property of which the church was the public steward. If misused, it could be withdrawn from the church through disendowment, and put to better use.[122] And to Jones's mind, the Church did misuse its wealth. Within the clerical ranks, there were serious financial inequities. While there were bishops and "rich rectors" with superfluity,[123] there were too many "miserably poor ministers" whose compensation did not even provide them with "ordinary comfort" despite their heavy duties.[124] Jones was correct that there was much disparity in remuneration among the clergy in the

---

[121]Jones, "More Bishops," Industrial Review, August 10, 1878.

[122]"The Disestablishment Movement. Working Men's Conference," Bee-Hive, November 11, 1871.

[123]Jones, "More Bishops," Industrial Review, August 10, 1878.

[124]Jones, "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1871.

nineteenth-century Anglican Church. Yet the round of Whig-initiated reforms of the Church in the earlier part of the century had produced considerable equality in episcopal stipends (reducing the richest for the benefit of the lowest-paid); and had suppressed sinecure rectories, nonresident prebends, and resident canonries above the number of four in each cathedral, the money-saving going to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners who used it to augment the poorer clerical livings.[125] In addition, Jones complained that ecclesiastical endowments for charitable and educational purposes had been either diverted into an unintended form, or had been taken by the trustees for their own purposes.

Jones took particular issue with the church over its education policy. He claimed that it included the goal of proselytism; and that in agricultural districts, church-operated schools sought to inculcate a class-oriented "submissive servitude" in the pupils, rather than to develop them into fit young men and women.[126]

---

[125]Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church, Vol. V, part 1 of An Ecclesiastical History of England, ed. by J. C. Dickinson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 137; Moorman, History of the Church in England, p. 348; Olive J. Brose, Church and Parliament: the Reshaping of the Church of England, 1828-1860 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), pp. 123, 134, chap. vii.

[126]Jones, "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church," Bee-Hive, May 20, 1871.

The personnel of the Church also gave Jones cause to complain. Almost certainly a fundamental reason for Jones's quarrel with the Church was the presence of what he called the "old-fashioned bigotry and Toryism" of a "numerous crowd" of the clergy.[127] Moreover, he claimed that many clerics were unprincipled--so much so that they would lead the worship of Satan if it meant security to their salaries.[128] For Jones, this sentiment was no mere rhetoric; for years later it was repeated when he claimed that the chief lesson to be found in the lives of the clergy was not comforting the afflicted nor helping orphans and widows; but in "looking carefully after the main chance" with "energy and perseverance."[129]

The social irresponsibility of the clergy, as he saw it, vexed Jones considerably. He excoriated the clergy for cowardice in failing, thirty years earlier, to respond to the initiative taken by the Christian Socialists. When a group of clergy expressed a desire to understand or to support trade unionism in the eighteen-seventies, he condemned its "timid and hesitating" approach

---

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Jones, "More Bishops," Industrial Review, August 10, 1878.

to what he considered a vital moral issue affecting millions of working-class Britons.[130]

Jones was particularly outraged at manifestations of social irresponsibility in the upper echelons of the church. He bitterly condemned Dr. Charles Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, for the latter's speaking out against union "agitators" in the agricultural districts. He pointed out that this represented an effort by poor men to obtain wages which would supply adequate physical nourishment; that the bishop was aware of the truth of the matter; and that the bishop's opposition to such a goal was hardly made persuasive in the light of his own income of £5,000 a year.[131]

And his indignation knew no limits when the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, a venerable organization founded in the seventeenth century,[132] published a pamphlet in 1874 entitled Strikes and their Cost.[133] It was written by W. H. S. Aubrey, editor of Capital and Labour, the organ of the British manufacturers;[134] and

---

[130]Jones, "The Clergy and Trade Unionism. Letter 1. Mr. Hansard's Letter--A Digression," Industrial Review, September 1, 1877.

[131]Jones, "Bishop of Gloucester on Agricultural Agitators," Bee-Hive, August 10, 1872.

[132]Moorman, History of the Church in England, p. 267.

[133]Jones, "Christian Knowledge Society and Trade Unions," Bee-Hive, October 17, 1874.

[134]Ibid.; Jones, "A Hint to the Promoters of Christian Knowledge," Bee-Hive, October 24, 1874.

its sentiments reflected its source. Jones's outrage lasted through three successive articles, and it was directed more against the church than against Aubrey.

Jones's wrath had both practical and theoretical grounds. He objected that the publication of a church body would contain factual untruths harmful to the working-class. As an instance of this, he cited Aubrey's assertion that the chief beneficiaries of union dues were the union leaders. And the pamphlet's calculations on the cost of strikes were similarly misleading. Such things, said Jones, were particularly unfit in a publication by a church organization which was in official opposition to bearing false witness. Jones said that such features of the pamphlet not only were not "Christian knowledge"; they were not "honest truth."[135] Jones warned that if the SPCK continued to publish such tracts, working-class readers would lump the lies and the religion together.[136]

He believed that the "viciously-intentioned . . . dishonest libel" of a pamphlet[137] was a plot by the SPCK, which he accused of cynically doubting that it would

---

[135]Jones, "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," Bee-Hive, October 10, 1874.

[136]Ibid.

[137]Jones, "Christian Knowledge Society and Trade Unions," Bee-Hive, October 17, 1874.

have much impact upon the working-class. It was, he felt, really aimed at the industrial class, whose financial support it was intended to attract. Jones hoped that the SPCK would turn its attention to this group, and begin a series of tracts to improve its morals by exposing its misdeeds, such as a manufacturing fraud whose details Jones quoted from the Pall Mall Gazette.[138]

Jones's role through many decades was agitation, both in print and on the platform. There was more than one meaning behind Jones's reaction to the Bishop of Gloucester's deprecatory description of agricultural union activists as "agitators." Reform requires initiative, or if you will, agitation. Jones by no means regarded it as a term of derision.

"There is nothing well-to-do people cry out against more than agitation."[139] Reaction against agitation was likely to come not only from those affected, but from the press, to whom the agitator or reformer was a demagogue.[140] Agitation on questions of reform "is the most losing and worrying game any man in his senses ever undertook to play," Jones could write with understanding. And yet, to the credit of mankind, there was

---

[138]Jones, "A Hint to the Promoters of Christian Knowledge," Bee-Hive, October 24, 1874.

[139]Jones, "The Value of Agitation," Bee-Hive, March 20, 1875.

[140]Ibid.

a "large number of men who agitate on special questions as a personal duty they dare not forego. Indeed,

> a long list might be given of the names of those who for the benefit of their fellow-creatures gave all they had to give, even their lives. Their time, their thought, their substance, were freely given; whilst in return they took cheerfully all the interested and the bigoted had to give. . . .[141]

Few men in nineteenth-century Britain were more fitted, through experience and association, to speak on this theme than Lloyd Jones.

---

[141] Jones, "Are our Seamen to be Protected," Bee-Hive, June 7, 1873.

CONCLUSIONS

Patrick Lloyd Jones was an extraordinary man. By his wits and talents alone, he rose from an immigrant fustian-cutter in Manchester to a figure of prominence in many of the nineteenth century British working-class movements, and a friend of most of the major trade union leaders.

He is particularly interesting because of the breadth of his newspaper articles in the eighteen-seventies, when he was the working-class's leading journalist. Here a rare thing can be done: the world view of a working-class leader in this period can be sampled.

The greatest influence upon his life was Robert Owen, whose movement embraced reform within capitalism, a fostering of trade unionism, and, most fundamental of all, co-operation. To these goals Jones devoted his life. Doubtless in part his personality was attuned to the Owenite gospel of world regeneration. For he had a combative but compassionate spirit.

Jones rose high in Owenite circles, gaining the esteem of Robert Owen and becoming a "social missionary"

for the better part of a decade. He could never forget his role as a missionary and as a co-operative teacher; in whatever subsequent capacity, he continued to work for the "New Moral World."

The thread of Owenism continued directly in the co-operative movement, which Jones re-entered through the door of Christian Socialism, into whose inner councils he was admitted. In his subsequent journalism, Jones sought to stress the wholeness of co-operation as a system and as a pattern of life, not a mere guarantee of good quality and a cash saving.

But the majority of Jones's articles in the eighteen-seventies dealt with trade unionism. Jones was a unionist before he became an Owenite; and besides, Owenism found unionism compatible with its principles of assisting the working-man. Jones believed that trade unionism vastly improved the status of the worker, although co-operation offered an even better future vision.

In his journalism, Jones sought to interpret unionism to a hostile outside world, and interpret national events to the working-class with the implications they carried for the working man.

Not least of Jones's national interests was politics, in which he rose to be secretary of the Labour Representation League and a member of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress. In his many articles

on politics, Jones challenged the class system as it adversely affected the working-man in the constitutional system and in the Liberal party in which he hoped that labor would find a home and influence. As an old Owenite teacher, Jones wrote his political articles to advise and interpret, and to show the working man how best to attain his rights as a man.

In a sense, Lloyd Jones's whole life was dedicated to reform; certainly in a particular sense it was devoted to many reforms. For five decades he remained a social missionary pointing the way to the New Moral World.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

Cowen, Joseph, Collection. Newcastle Central Library, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Holyoake, George Jacob, Papers. The library, The Co-operative Union Ltd., Manchester.

Howell, George, Collection. The library, Bishopsgate Institute, London.

Kingsley, Charles, Papers. Manuscripts division, The British Museum, London.

Public Documents

Great Britain. Certified copy of Entry of Birth of William Cairns Jones, October 1, 1846, no. 238, Cavendish Square sub-district, Marylebone registration district, at General Register Office, Somerset House, London.

Great Britain. Certified copy of Entry of Death for Mary Jones, May 31, 1886, no. 243, Kennington Second sub-district, Lambeth registration district, at General Register Office, Somerset House, London.

Great Britain. Certified copy of Entry of Death for Lloyd Jones, September 18, 1877, no. 99, Kennington Second sub-district, Lambeth registration district, at General Register Office, Somerset House, London. (This was the eldest son of Patrick Lloyd Jones.)

Great Britain. 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, CCIX.

Great Britain. "Report from the Select Committee on Investments for the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes." House of Commons Sessional Papers, 1850, XIX.

Great Britain. "Return of Charges made to Candidates at the General Election of 1885, in England and Wales, by the Returning Officers, specifying in each case the Number of Members Returned, and, in cases of Contests, the Number of Candidates; also the Total Expenses of each Candidate (both exclusive and inclusive of Returning Officer's Charges) delivered to the Returning Officers pursuant to 'the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act, 1883,' and the Number of Votes Polled for each candidate." House of Commons Sessional Papers, 1886, LII.

Newspapers

Bee-Hive Newspaper (London), 1870-1876.
The greatest bulk of this dissertation's research material comes from hundreds of newspaper articles by Lloyd Jones in the Bee-Hive and Industrial Review newspapers. To a lesser degree, this is true of the Co-operative News.

Christian Socialist (London), 1850-1851.
The best source for Jones's views on Christian Socialism.

Co-operative News (Manchester), 1873-1878, 1886.
Essential but less valuable on co-operation than the Bee-Hive and certain pamphlets.

Industrial Review (London), 1877-1878.
This is a continuation of the Bee-Hive under a new name and format.

Leeds Weekly Express, 1886.

Newcastle Weekly Chronicle, 1884-1886.

Northern Star (Leeds), 1839.

Reasoner (London), 1851.

Spectator (London), 1886.

The Times (London), 1873-1874.

Writings by Lloyd Jones

Jones, Lloyd. A Letter from Lloyd Jones to George Jacob Holyoake. n.d., n.p.

_____. A Reply to Mr. R. Carlile's Objections to the Five Fundamental Facts as laid down by Mr. Owen. Manchester: A. Heywood, 1837.

_____. Co-operation in Danger. An Appeal to the British Public. London: Simkin Marshall, 1880.

_____. Co-operation: Its Position, its Policy, and its Prospects. London: Central Co-operative.

_____. "Die jüngste Landarbeiterbewegung in England," Landwirthschaftliche Jahrbücher: Zeitschrift fur Küniglich Preussischen Landes-Oekonomie-Kultegiums. Edited by H. von Nathusius and H. Thiel. Vol. IV. Berlin: Wiegandt, Kempel, & Pareh, 1875.

_____. Inaugural Address delivered at the seventeenth annual Co-operative Congress, held at Oldham, May 25, 26, & 27, 1885. Manchester: Central Co-operative board, n.d.

_____. The Freaks of Faith: an Account of Some of the many Messiahs who have deluded Mankind. Manchester: A. Heywood, 1840.

_____. The Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen. Edited with a sketch of the author by William Cairns Jones. 3rd ed. London: Swan Sonneschein, 1900.

_____. "The Struggle for Reform, 1832," To-day, the monthly Magazine of scientific Socialism, II. New Series, 1884, 233-46.

_____. Trade Unions. Two Lectures. London: George Potter, 1877.

_____, and Alexander, Harvey. Christianity versus Socialism: Report of a Discussion between the Rev. Alexander Harvey, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, social missionary, in the Relief Church, Calton, Glasgow, on December 24, 1839, on the vast

Superiority of Christianity over the Religion of the New Moral World. Revised by the Speakers. Glasgow: Robert Miller, 1840.

_____, and Barker, J. The Influence of Christianity. Report of a Public Discussion which took Place at Oldham, on the Evenings of Tuesday and Wednesday, February 19th and 20th, 1839, between the Rev. J. Barker of the Methodist New Connexion, Mossley, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, of Manchester, Social Missionary, on the Influence of Christianity. Manchester: Cave and Sever, 1839.

_____, and Bowes, J. Report of the Discussion on Marriage, as advocated by Robert Owen, between L. Jones and J. Bowes, in the Queen's Theatre, Christian-Street, Liverpool, on Wednesday, May 27, 1840. Liverpool: James Stewart, 1840.

_____, and Dalton, T. Socialism Examined. Report of a Public Discussion which took Place at Huddersfield on the Evenings of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, December 13, 14, and 15, 1837, between the Rev. T. Dalton, and of the Methodist New Connexion, Huddersfield, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, of Manchester, upon the Five Fundamental Facts, and the Twenty Laws of Human Nature, as found in the Book of the New Moral World, written by R. Owen, Esq. Manchester: Cave and Sever, 1838.

_____, and Ludlow, John Malcolm. The Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867. London: A. Strahan, 1867.

_____, and Troup, George. Report of the Discussion betwixt Mr. Troup, Editor of the Montrose Review, on the Part of the Philalethean Society, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, of Glasgow, on the Part of the Socialists, in the Watt Institution Hall, Dundee, on the Evenings of Tuesday and Wednesday, 17th and 18th September, 1839, on the Propositions, I. That Socialism is Atheistical; and II. That Atheism is Incredible and Absurd. Dundee: James Chalmers and Alexander Reid, 1839.

Books

Amulee, William Warrender Mackenzie. Industrial Arbitration in Great Britain. London: Oxford, 1929.

Armytage, W. H. G. Four Hundred Years of English Education. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

Beer, Max. A History of British Socialism. 2 vols. London: Bell, 1921.

Bowley, Marian. Nassau Senior and Classical Economics. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937.

Braunthal, Julius. History of the International, 1864-1914. Translated by Henry Collins and Kenneth Mitchell. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1966.

Briggs, Asa. Victorian People: a Reassessment of Persons and Themes, 1851-67. New York: Harper and Row, 1955.

Chadwick, Owen. The Victorian Church. Vol. V, pt. 1 of An Ecclesiastical History of England. Edited by J. C. Dickinson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962ff.

Clapham, Sir John H. Economic History of Modern Britain, Vol. II: Free Trade and Steel, 1850-1886. Cambridge: University Press, 1929.

Cole, George Douglas Howard. A Century of Co-operation. Manchester: Co-operative Union, n.d.

_____. A History of Socialist Thought, Vol. I: The Forerunners, 1789-1850. London: Macmillan, 1953.

_____. A Short History of the British Working-Class Movement, 1789-1947. Rev. ed. London: Allen and Unwin, 1948.

_____. British Working-Class Politics, 1832-1914. London: George Routledge, 1946.

_____. Chartist Portraits. Introduction by Asa Briggs. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.

_____. The Life of Robert Owen. Introduction by Margaret Cole. London: Frank Cass, 1965.

_____, and Postgate, Raymond. The British People, 1746-1946. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961.

Collins, Henry, and Abramsky, Chimen. Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement: Years of the First International. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.

Dill, Marshall. Germany: A Modern History. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.

Ensor, Robert C. K. England 1870-1914. Vol. XIV of the Oxford History of England. Edited by G. N. Clark. 15 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936-1965.

Gammage, R. G. History of the Chartist Movement. Newcastle: Browne and Browne, 1894.

Gill, Conrad, and Briggs, Asa. History of Birmingham, Vol. II: Borough and City, 1865-1938. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Gillespie, Frances Elma. Labour and Politics in England, 1850-1867. Durham: Duke University Press, 1927.

Grampp, William D. The Manchester School of Economics. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960.

Guedalla, Philip, ed. The Queen and Mr. Gladstone. 2 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1933.

Hammond, John L. Gladstone and the Irish Nation. N.p.: Archon Books, 1964.

Hanham, H. J. Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone. N.p.: Longmans, 1959.

Harrison, Royden. Before the Socialists: Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861-1881. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Hasbach, Wilhelm. A History of the English Agricultural Worker. Translated by Ruth Kenyon. Westminster: R. S. King, 1908.

Holyoake, George Jacob. Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life. 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1892.

Institute for Marxist-Leninism. Karl Marx-Friedrich Engels: Werke. 34 vols. and index. Berlin: Deitz, 1961-1966. Vol. XXXII.

Koht, Halvdan. The American Spirit in Europe: a Survey of Transatlantic Influences. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949.

Lampson, G. Locker. A Consideration of the State of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1907.

McCabe, Joseph. Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake. 2 vols. London: Watts, 1908.

Mitchell, B. M., and Deane, Phyllis. Abstract of British Historical Statistics. Cambridge: University Press, 1962.

Moorman, John R. H. A History of the Church in England. 2nd ed. New York: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1967.

Owen, Robert. A New View of Society and Other Writings. Edited with an introduction by G. D. H. Cole. London: Dent, 1963.

Pelling, Henry. A History of British Trade Unionism. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.

Podmore, Frank. Robert Owen: a Biography. New York: Appleton, 1924.

Raven, Charles. Christian Socialism, 1848-1854. London: Macmillan, 1920.

Raymond, Dora Neill. British Policy and Opinion during the Franco-Prussian War. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. Vol. 100. New York: Columbia University. 1921.

Stephen, Leslie. Life of Henry Fawcett. London: Smith Elder and Co., 1885.

Testimonial Committee. Lloyd Jones. Notice of his Life. ?Oldham: Seventeenth Co-operative Congress, 1885.

The Times (London). Tercentenary Handlist of English and Welsh Newspapers, Magazines, and Reviews. London: The Times, 1920.

Webb, Sidney, and Webb, Beatrice. The History of Trade Unionism, 1660-1920. Rev. ed. London: Sidney and Beatrice Webb, 1920.

Wood, Anthony. Nineteenth Century Britain, 1815-1914. London: Longmans, 1960.

Woodward, E. L. The Age of Reform, 1815-1870. Vol. XIII of The Oxford History of England. Edited by G. N. Clark. 15 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936-1965.

Articles

Allen, V. L. "The Origins of Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration." International Review of Social History, IX (1964), 237-54.

Collins, Henry. "The English Branches of the First International." Essays in Labour History. Edited by Asa Briggs and John Saville. London: Macmillan, 1960.

Gossman, Norbert J. "Republicanism in Nineteenth Century England." International Review of Social History, VII (1962), 47-60.

Harrison, Royden. "British Labour and the Confederacy: a Note on the Southern Sympathies of some British Working-Class Journalists and Leaders during the American Civil War." International Review of Social History, II (1957), 78-105.

Holyoake, George Jacob. "Lloyd Jones." Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 22 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1917, Vol. X.

Howell, George. "History of the International Association." Nineteenth Century (July, 1878), 19-39.

Jones, William Cairns. "Sketch of the Author." in Lloyd Jones, The Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen. Edited, with a sketch of the author by William Cairns Jones. 3rd ed. London: Swan Sonneschein, 1900.

Ludlow, John Malcolm. "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years." II, Economic Review (January, 1894), 24-42.

McCready, H. W. "The British General Election of 1874: Frederic Harrison and the Liberal-Labour Dilemma." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XX (1954), 166-75.

Maehl, William Henry. "Gladstone, the Liberals, and the Election of 1874." Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research, XXXVI (1963), 53-69.

Seligman, Edwin R. A. "Owen and the Christian Socialists." Essays in Economics. New York: Macmillan, 1925.