From ‘Amicable Understanding’ to ‘Tear him from Limb to Limb!’: Anger & Reason in the English Coal Lockout of 1893

Good afternoon. My name is Quentin Outram and I'm the Secretary of the Society for the Study of Labour History.

This is the text of a presentation by Dr Quentin Outram for the Society for the Study of Labour History. The video was uploaded to YouTube on 21 August 2021.
Part 1
Part 2

My presentation this afternoon is one of what is hoped to be many contributions in an area of increasing interest to labour historians, and that is the area of labour history and the emotions. This presentation treats the emotions involved in the Great English coal lock out of 1893. At the start of this conflict, miners and coal owners were said to enjoy “an amicable understanding”. But before too long miners were threatening to tear a colliery foreman “from limb to limb”. So we see a transformation from relatively calm and peaceful emotions to anger and the threat of violence. My focus here is on the anger, and in particular the relationship between anger and the reason involved in a running a dispute, a dispute of two sides, here workers and capitalists. The two sides have to negotiate, and negotiations usually involve the use of reason. So what is the relationship between the angry emotions that were soon seen in this conflict, and the reason required to bring the conflict to an end and negotiate a return to work?

OK, the presentation is rather long, so I’m going to present it in two halves. This is the first half. I'm going to deliver the presentation by talking to a deck of PowerPoint slides and, I hope, if I can get my head around the technology, that I can ‘share’ these with you, to use the technical term. So please just give me a moment or two while I get this going.

TITLE SLIDE
The slide show opens with what will seem a rather odd picture for a presentation about a coal mining strike. It's a picture of a fresco painted by Tiepolo in 1757. It depicts a scene from Homer's *Iliad*, showing the confrontation between King Agamemnon, who's on the left, and Achilles, who’s on the right. This is the point at which the enraged Achilles draws his sword from its sheath as the idea of killing Agamemnon enters his head, but he is restrained from this by the goddess Athena, the figure on the extreme right, who seizes him by his hair. She's rushed down from Mount Olympus in order to restrain Achilles in his anger, or, as it's often translated, in his wrath. So this scene is often interpreted by translators and commentators as an example of Homer's use of godly intervention to metamorphose and externalize internal mental and emotional conflicts. More recently, however, classicists have come to argue that the Greeks recognised no conflict or split between reason and emotion. The anger felt by Achilles and the restraint exercised by Athena should both be seen as aspects of the same personality. So this neatly captures one of the ideas that I want to pursue in this presentation this afternoon: that to think in terms of a split or division between emotion and reason is not helpful.

SLIDE 2
But before moving on to that, let me give my thanks and my acknowledgments.

This talk was first presented at the Emotions in Conflict conference organized by the Society for the History of Emotions of Australia which wasn't in Australia, but in Canada at the University of Ottawa in October 2019.

I'd like to thank the organizers and the participants in that conference, particularly Mark Cels, Jim Jaffe, Claudia Jarzebowski, and Susan Matt for their comments and amity. The usual disclaimer applies.

SLIDE 3
So let me fill you in a little bit about the lockout.

I call it a lockout because it was precipitated by an attempt by the owners, (which is how the miners' employers were usually referred to), to reduce wages significantly in what were called the Federated Areas. That is to say, the areas organized by the Miners' Federation of Great Britain. These covered a large part of England, but not Scotland, and not South Wales. But not all of England. The major coalfields in the northeast were not affiliated to the Federation at this point, so we're talking Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, and Warwickshire, and so forth.

Although it didn't include every mining district in the country, it was still a very, very big dispute. Indeed it was then the largest industrial dispute ever known in Britain with about 300,000 workers involved. It also lasted a long time, from the 28th of July to 17th of November, 16 long, hungry weeks.

At first it was fairly calm but disturbances broke out from August onwards and in September the conflict was marked by an event called the Featherstone Massacre. This was on September the 7th and it was, an event in which large crowds of miners were confronted by soldiers. Eventually, the Riot Act was read and the soldiers opened fire. One miner was shot dead, another was mortally wounded, and others were injured.

So that's the conflict. The photograph here shows the heavy policing that was involved from time to time in parts of Yorkshire.
It's a photograph taken at Tankersley Colliery. Tankersley is just north of Barnsley in what's now known as South Yorkshire.

If you're wondering where Featherstone is, let me enlighten you.

SLIDE 4
This is a modern map and it shows you Featherstone in relation to the motorway network. Featherstone is in the middle. To the west of Featherstone is the M1 running north and south. To the east is the A1 again running north and south; the junction with the M62 at Ferrybridge is only a few miles away from Featherstone. The closest towns are Pontefract, then the location of an army barracks, and the glass and coal mining centre of Castleford, now just north of the M62. Normanton, another coal mining town and also an important railway centre is to the west and so is Wakefield, the headquarters of the county police forces. So I hope that gives you an idea of, the geographical location of the events which I'll be discussing.

SLIDE 5
I want to focus on two issues. Firstly, why did the conflict turn violent and I'm rather taking it for granted that considering the emotions is, or should be, a major part of that consideration. And if emotions turned violent, what happened to reason in this conflict?

SLIDE 6
But there's one question which you may be asking yourselves already. Why look at *this* conflict? Why not look at, say the 1984-85 miners' strike? Or the Liverpool transport strike of 1911 or any of the

other obvious candidates? Well, the reason I'm looking at this strike in particular is, to be perfectly honest, is partly because I happen to live quite near to Featherstone, and I've been interested in its history for quite some time, but there are some more general, reasons as well. These lie in the quality and multiplicity of the sources available. First of all, we have newspaper accounts. By the 1890s we're in a media world in which even quite small towns have their own weekly, sometimes daily, newspapers. So, for instance, in 1893 there had been running for some time, since 1880 in fact, the *Pontefract and Castleford Express*, which covered and still covers Featherstone, often in some detail.

Because two people were killed, there were inquests and the evidence offered at those inquests, especially that of one of the men killed, James Gibbs, was reported in great detail in the local and regional papers, such as the *Leeds Mercury* and the *Sheffield Independent*.

There was a committee of inquiry established to discover what had gone wrong and why two people had been shot dead by British soldiers on British soil. Evidence was heard in public at this inquiry, and it was published alongside the report of the committee. It was chaired by a chap called Lord Bowen, and so you will hear me referring to something called the Bowen Inquiry.

Prior to the sittings of that Inquiry, the Treasury Solicitor's Department in London had sent up a young man, Francis J. Sims, to gather evidence from witnesses and other interested parties in the area and the records made by this very enterprising and inquisitive civil servant are now preserved in the National Archives.

And lastly, we have an account written by a working-class writer called Sam Wood, and this is really unusual. Sam Wood, as I'll indicate in a moment or so, was an authentic member of the working classes and he was also in a position to see what was going on and to hear accounts of what was going on from friends, neighbours, and relatives.

These sources often give evidence from participants or witnesses and sometimes the evidence is in what purports to be verbatim speech but it's been edited, of course, so all the Errs and Ums have been taken out, and other faults amended, so it's what I refer to as *pseudo-verbatim* reported speech. It is similar in this sense to the reports in *Hansard* of proceedings in the House of Commons. So, this is the reason that I would probably use to try and convince you that this conflict is a particularly useful one to consider if you're interested in emotions and labour history.

SLIDE 7

Let me just give you a few more details about Sam Wood because as I said, it is really unusual to have any lengthy account of an industrial dispute by a working-class writer. He was a 31-year-old boilermaker at the time of the Lockout. He lived at number 4 Keir Street in Barnsley. The street was built sometime after 1888 and possibly as late as 1904. It is tempting to assume it was named after Keir Hardie but it seems much more likely to have been named after George Keir (1807-1864), a prominent Barnsley attorney.

Kier St still stands and a photograph of the top end of the street is on the slide in front of you.

Sam Wood's coal mining relations included his father, who was a colliery banksman, and a brother, Charles, who was a colliery labourer. His next door neighbours included a chap called Alfred Broadhead, at number 2, who worked in a linen warehouse, and John Swift, at number 6, who was himself a coalminer. The picture shows you the very cramped conditions these three men were living in along with their families. So all this confirms Sam Woods' class position.

OK, so that's Sam Wood and I'll be quoting from him from time to time later in this presentation.

SLIDE 8
What this means is that I do not, unlike many historians of the emotions, have to rely on conduct books. This has been a major problem in the field. How do we know what feelings were regarded as acceptable? What feelings were approved? What emotions must be suppressed? What emotions could be freely expressed? and so on and so forth. Well, for a very, very long time, the shortage of direct evidence has led people to examine, conduct books which were published instruction manuals about how to manage yourself emotionally. A large number of these were produced and the example on your screen is just one of them.

The trouble is we don't know who actually read these conduct books. Were they working class? Probably not, unless they had aspirations for social advancement. So such books may tell us, if they tell us anything at all, about the middle classes. Nor do we know how much attention the people who *did* read them, paid to them. So that you can easily see there are major problems in using conduct books to pursue the history of the emotions, particularly if we are interested in the emotions of the working classes.

SLIDE 9
So I haven't relied on conduct books, thank heavens, nor have I relied on fiction. It's often been assumed that writers of fiction, especially so-called "realist" fiction, as exemplified by the C19th novel, can be taken as good guides to contemporary emotions, how people felt, and how they expressed their feelings.

But this is a dangerous assumption: novelists have all sorts of reasons for depicting emotions as they do, not least to convey excitement and interest to the reader, and not least to confirm the prejudices of their readers about, for instance, the feelings and manners of the working classes.

The view that novels document at least the 'manners' of society is an old one. Charles Knight, the editor of *Half Hours with the Best Authors*, wrote in 1850:

"The novel, especially in that cheap issue which finds its entrance to thousands of households, furnishes the chief material from which the future philosophical historian will learn what were our modes of thought and of living—our vices and our follies—our pretensions and our realities—in the middle of the nineteenth century."

This introduced an extract from *Vanity Fair* which Knight praised as 'the work of an acute observer' and its author as '[a]mongst the most successful of all those who have come after Mr. Dickens.'

Although *Vanity Fair*'s Becky Sharp is said to be penniless, she is not working class and the very extensive cast of other characters contains very few working people. Nor do the events of the novel include a strike. It would be a very difficult source to utilize for this presentation.

SLIDE 10
What about novels then which take strikes as their central theme? There is an example on the slide in front of you.

The Seed She Sowed by Emma Leslie is a novel allegedly about the Great Dock strike of 1889. It's an unknown work by an author of some present obscurity although she published over a hundred novels in her lifetime, which drew to a close in 1909. "Emma Leslie" was a pseudonym. Her real name was Emma Boultwood (1838-1909) and she specialised in children's and historical fiction

written for the Religious Tract Society and the Sunday School Union. She made her living through authorship.

It's by no means clear that Emma Leslie would have experienced the Great Dock Strike herself, or that her friends or relations would have been able to inform her. So here, too, there are problems: we may be reading fiction in the pejorative sense, as well as in the literary sense.

That we do not have to rely on such texts as sources here is therefore a relief.

OK, so enough about methodology.

SLIDE 11
Let me now move on to give you the first section of a narrative of this dispute. Here's a picture that I hope you'll find decorative. It's a scene from *Othello* where Othello is relating his life story to Desdemona. It's purely ornamental here and I use it simply to signal that some narrative is coming up.

SLIDE 12
As I've already indicated, at the very beginning of the dispute, in late July and early August, people were saying, or rather being reported in newspapers as saying, "There's not much temper. All seem to accept the situation calmly and deliberately". This was the answer given by a Yorkshire miner, a check-weighman, who was asked what was the feeling on the subject by a reporter for the *Pontefract and Castleford Express*.

The *Leeds Mercury* remarked that "there is no bitterness of feeling … Seldom has a crisis like the present culminated with so amicable an understanding between the parties. It would seem that it is, to quote the most recent diplomatic phrase, a 'pacific blockade' of the mines that is intended."

The *Barnsley Chronicle* agreed. A reporter for the *Chronicle* wrote "both sides mean fighting, but they begin on friendly terms, and, reciprocating the good feeling which the men have shown" it had been arranged that the men's tools should remain down the pits with the implication that all would be able to return to their old places at the end of the dispute.

Sam Wood noted also that the miners had been allowed to remain in their colliery houses instead of being threatened with eviction as had happened in previous disputes.

The local Featherstone newspaper remarked that the mid-August Featherstone feast was as "brisk and frolicsome" as ever. One miner recently returned with his family from a holiday in Southport cheerfully told the reporter that if the strike did not end soon he would take his family off for another fortnight's holiday, this time to Scarborough.

But underneath this air of light hearted indifference, continued the reporter, was a determined confidence. The men entertain little fear that in the end they will not come off conquerors and there seems a very determined feeling among some that they will not give in whatever may be the results. That was the *Leeds Mercury* for the 29th of July, 1893.

SLIDE 13
But as we've seen, August passed and in early September, a violent disturbance took place at Ackton Hall Colliery in Featherstone. Troops were deployed. James Duggan and James Gibbs, who it was admitted on all sides, took no part in any rioting, any violence, any arson, any destruction of

property, were shot dead or mortally wounded by the troops. At least nine others were wounded by the troops, so this became known as the Featherstone Massacre.

There on the slide is the only contemporary depiction of the scene that I've been able to find. It's to some extent imaginary. No other account that I've seen mentions the holding of miners' trade union banners aloft, for instance. You can see a pair of them to the left of the scene there. The conflagration that is depicted seems rather greater than is described by contemporaries but nevertheless the large numbers of people shown present is certainly accurate. We are, indeed, looking at an incident involving several thousand people. OK so why this transformation from light-hearted indifference to violent confrontation?

SLIDE 14
Well, I'm going to put forth some working assumptions here. I'm going to assume them, rather than try to justify them, because that would take even more time than I'm going to take with you this afternoon. I'm going to assume that violence is preceded by anger. That this is the emotional background to violence and certainly in this particular episode.

I'm aware that some violence may be pursued calmly at times, but this is clearly not one of those episodes.

So where did the anger come from? Again, I'm going to frame a working assumption that anger is induced by bodily or mental distress. For bodily distress I'm thinking of things like pain, I'm thinking of hunger, but also drunkenness. I'm assuming that mental distress may be provoked by insults. So when we are looking at anger we are also looking usually at pain, real or imagined, and we're often looking at provocations and insults too.

SLIDE 15
So, at this point it's helpful to explore a little bit further what anger is. And also, what reason is because we often implicitly contrast emotion with reason. So here we contrast the actions of people who were angry with the actions of people who were behaving under the guidance of reason.

That's a contrast that goes back a long way, though it is perhaps most characteristic, in Britain at least, of the C18th, and I think it's helpful to consider this contrast explicitly rather than implicitly, as is usually the case.

First of all to look at anger.

SLIDE 16
We seem to have lost much sense of nuance when it comes to talking about anger. The vocabulary we have for discussing anger is very extensive, we can talk about irritation, resentment, indignation, anger, wrath, fury, rage. But discussion is increasingly dominated by just plain anger.

We can demonstrate this loss of nuance using Google's count of ngrams. Broadly speaking, ngrams are words. The counts are from a text corpus of British English. They are graphed on the slide in front of you, which gives counts from 1900 to 2000.

You can see that the counts for uses of 'anger' rise fairly steadily from about 1950. 'Fury' is the next one down at the right-hand side of the graph and it shows a massive hike during the 1930s and 1940s and then falls again. Counts for all the other terms, 'Rage' the next one down, 'Wrath', the next down, 'resentment', 'irritation', and 'indignation' are fairly stable, so the consequence is that 'anger' is an increasing proportion of all the anger terms, including 'anger' itself from about 1950. So

if we look at the counts of the ngram, ‘anger’, that's 38% of the sum of the counts of ‘anger’, ‘fury’, ‘rage’, and ‘wrath’ in 1900. It's 26% in 1950, so it goes down to quite low levels in 1950, but it's 47% in 2000.

In case you're a bit dubious about Google and its count of ngrams and so on, well, I think everybody has their doubts. But if you conduct a similar exercise as I've done of counts of words, not ngrams, but just plain words, in the digital British Newspaper Archive which is available over the same period one finds very similar results. ‘Anger’ is more and more the only word which people use to refer to what we might previously have referred to as ‘irritation’, ‘resentment’, ‘indignation’, ‘wrath’, and ‘fury’, or indeed, ‘rage’. So I've said that we seem to be losing a degree of a nuance in talking about these varieties of angry emotion.

So how can we actually distinguish them? I think it's useful here to look at what may seem to be a rather old resource George Crabb’s *English Synonymes*.

SLIDE 17
It was first published in 1816, but it was republished and new editions were produced (--new additions with very little change in them, I have to say--) right up to the First World War, and so it's possible to treat it as a standard book of reference for the whole Victorian and Edwardian period, I think,
despite the fact that it was originated in 1816.

SLIDE 18
If we turn to Crabb’s, *English Synonymes* and look up ‘anger’ we will find a discussion of how it is to be distinguished from similar emotion words like ‘wrath’. So for instance, here Crabb suggests that ‘wrath’ is more vivid than ‘anger’. The source of it is often “unbending pride” in the person expressing it. Also, says Crabb, it's often, experienced as the “sentiment of a superior to an inferior”. But the expression of wrath, thinks Crabb, is really unjustifiable between man and man. It is really for God only. So this suggests some quite major distinctions between these two emotion words.

SLIDE 19
What about anger versus rage versus fury here? Crabb suggests that the three terms show a “progressive force” and he tries to explain this by using a common strategy at the time which he clearly felt was a perfectly reasonable one, which was to infer meaning and nuances of meaning from etymologies, even if the etymologies were really quite distant, for instance from the Latin, rather than recent, perhaps from modern French. So when discussing the English word ‘rage’, he refers back to its origin in the Latin word ‘rabies’, madness. ‘Fury’, he notes comes from ‘feror’, the Latin for ‘to carry away’ as in to be carried away by one’s own emotions. He also refers to the Greek Eumenides, that is to say, the spirits the Romans knew as The Furies, who came, not from Hades, but from the region even lower than Hades, known to the Greeks and Romans as Tartarus.

So Wrath is Olympian--we've seen Crabb suggesting it is for the gods only--but Fury is hellish. So again, he's developing quite significant distinctions between these words, which are often these days used as if they were synonyms.

That Crabb is suggesting this, given that his book was a standard reference work for almost the whole of the 19th century, suggests that skilled readers, at least in the 19th century, were aware of these nuances and when I say skilled readers I am not thinking only of the classically educated middle classes, I'm including many of the working class poets and fiction writers that have come to an increasing prominence in cultural histories of the period in recent years.

SLIDE 20
OK, so here's a depiction from the 17th century of what rage actually means. It's a depiction of the *Rage of Hercules*, which is an episode where, in a fit of madness, Hercules kills his wife and children. So here it's being suggested that rage is incompatible with reason. Hercules is depicted as someone who has lost his reason; he's mad.

SLIDE 21
OK, so Crabb continues to point out some other distinctions which may be useful. He said anger may be so stifled as not to discover itself, to reveal itself, by any outward symptoms. Rage, on the other hand breaks forth into extravagant expressions and violent distortions. Fury takes away the use of the understanding, so here he is suggesting that. rather than the "Rage" of Hercules, we should perhaps be talking about the Fury of Hercules, because Hercules, we know, has lost his reason, his ability to understand, rather than the somewhat weaker term rage. In rage, reason may perhaps be distorted, and the expression of reasons may become extravagant, but Crabb doesn't suggest that in moments of rage one could be said to have lost one's reason altogether. But that is something which we might well want to discuss.

Despite this, it seems fairly clear that to skilled readers at least, and to skilled writers, in the 19th century, anger was regarded as compatible with reason. Fury was not. Rage was regarded as at least distorting reason.

OK, so we see that these emotion terms have important distinctions, at least according to Crabb, and there are good reasons for taking Crabb as a good guide to, as I say, the understanding of educated and skilled readers and writers in almost the whole of the 19th century.

SLIDE 22
So if that is anger and some related words, then what can we say of reason? Reason is often just not discussed in histories of the emotions, and yet we need a model for reason, because what we might mean by reason is by no means clear.

It's often assumed that the best model for reason is actually mathematics, that all reason aspires to the status of maths. That is to say, a system of thought which leads to indubitable truths, for instance, that 1 + 1 is equal to 2.

Well, here in the box is the proof of that proposition that 1 + 1 is equal to 2 as given by Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell in their *Principia Mathematica* just before the First World War.

And you can see that it uses a whole raft of unusual symbols. And indeed, Whitehead and Russell were attempting to show that maths could be reduced to logic, and therefore much of the symbolism there is more familiar as symbolic logic than as mathematics. And it's certainly not a model of reason, which we could suggest was in daily use, even by highly rational and highly intelligent people. It's far too demanding, far, far too demanding. Even Bertrand Russell himself did not use reasoning of this sort when writing about why the world should immediately engage in nuclear disarmament, for instance, or indeed even in more obviously philosophical matters, so that that model of reason is really not helpful.

And yet it's often the model that's implicit in people's discussions of the emotions when they suggest that, perhaps, emotions are leading one astray and that one should be led instead by reason, by a sequence of propositions that could be put down, in principle at least, in mathematical form. Well, that's too demanding.

SLIDE 23
But surely we can use a slightly less demanding model of reason, and suggest that reason is like logic. And we all know these syllogistic examples: “All people are mortal. Socrates was a person. Therefore Socrates was mortal.”

OK, yes, clearly that's a reasonable conclusion to derive from those propositions but these examples are too simple to have any real application to historical episodes of interest. The problems that one is faced with in ordinary everyday life and in the conduct of an industrial dispute, for instance, are very difficult to phrase as syllogisms of this sort. So I would suggest that this is also not a useful model of reason for our purposes.

SLIDE 24
What I would suggest is that we refer to a model of reason which is very recent. It's called ‘Argumentative Theory’ and has been put forward by a couple of people called Hugo Mercier and Dan Sperber. Both of them are French and Dan Sperber, at least, began as an anthropologist, so these are not psychologists. These have a rather broader background. than almost all psychologists that I've read on this kind of topic.

What they're suggesting can be summarized by the quotation in the box underneath the portrait of Dan Sperber.

“Our hypothesis is that the function of reasoning is argumentative. It is to devise and evaluate arguments intended to persuade.” I think this is a very plausible hypothesis in itself. Mercier and Sperber spend quite a lot of time explaining just how useful reason as ‘a way of persuading people and evaluating arguments intended to persuade’ is evolutionarily useful.

So we also have a reason here in argumentative theory about why we do reason, or try to reason, at all. Not only this, but we also have a model of reason which includes the kind of statements, the kind of arguments, that we might use in ordinary, everyday contexts when we're trying to explain, for instance, why wages must go down or why it is impossible that they should go down.

So I think it is a useful model of reason, and it is one that allows us to distinguish reason from emotion in the historical record, because we can recognize some aspects of ordinary language as the language of reason.

SLIDE 25
For instance, when we see the word ‘but’ we may often, not always at all --I'm not saying these words, these phrases, always indicate a statement belonging to the language of reason--but when we do see a statement involving the word ‘but’ we should be on the lookout for an attempt to use reason.

For example. ‘But at these wages we shall starve’. This is presenting a reason why these wages should not be cut, and it's introduced by the word ‘but’. Another a useful indicator is the construction ‘if ... then’, even, I would say in the example ‘If you don't do this, then we will kill you’. So that gives the person addressed a reason to do something, which may be a very powerful reason. It may not be a very nice reason. It may not be a just reason, but it is a reason.

And, of course, another word which should alert us to the possibility that reason is being used, or someone is at least attempting to use reason, is the word ‘because’. ‘Because we're stronger than you, we shall win’. That gives a reason why the speaker is confident that they will ultimately prevail. It is because we are stronger than you, our opponents, are.

SLIDE 26
OK, notice that reason in this view is not necessarily calm. The person saying, ‘But at these wages we shall starve’ could be extremely agitated, extremely angry, or extremely distressed and upset. As I've already indicated, reason is not necessarily pleasant and it's not necessarily just. The fact that we shall win because we're stronger than you, does not suggest that we're going to win because our cause is just and yours is unjust.

So the idea that reason is expressed in language of ‘sweet reasonableness’, as Matthew Arnold said of Jesus, is, I think, not a useful idea, certainly not in the context of industrial relations. So the idea that reason is always sweet, calm, pleasant, just--well, I would forget those ideas.

SLIDE 27
OK, so let me now go back to our main question. Why do we have this transformation from amity to anger, rage, fury (I've not yet indicated what I think we were looking at in Featherstone), and the violence that followed from it.

I suggested, just to remind you, that anger was induced by bodily or mental distress, pain, hunger, drunkenness, or that it was provoked by insults. So this gives us an agenda to look at. We can look first of all at pain, hunger, and drunkenness.

Drunkenness, I can say right away, doesn't take us very far. There are very few accusations indeed, that miners involved in riots or other disturbances during this lockout were drunk. It is quite likely, of course, that some of them were, but the people you'd be expecting to voice those accusations voice them extremely rarely, if at all, so I don't think the supposition that people became angry because they were drunk is going to get us very far.

What about pain? Well, the main pain in evidence in this dispute is the pain of hunger, so I'm going to look directly at that before moving on to looking at the provocation of anger by insults.

SLIDE 28
OK, so what can we say of hunger? Hunger was certainly present and was not denied. This is a picture from the front page of the *Illustrated London News* in 1893. This is from the middle of September, so this is a week or two after the Featherstone Massacre, and it's alleged to be a picture of miners’ children and possibly other workers’ children being fed through charitable enterprise. I have to say I think it's at least partly fanciful. One notices just how well-dressed, how clean and well-dressed, are the children as well as the nurses and dispensers of charity in the picture.

SLIDE 29
But we do have some rather more credible depictions of hunger and attempts to alleviate it. This is a photograph of children waiting at a soup kitchen at Ince, near Wigan, in Lancashire. Again, it's from the *Illustrated London News*. It's a little bit later; we’re at the end of September now, so we're three weeks after the Featherstone Massacre. And it's an appropriate illustration of an agit-prop pamphlet published a couple of years after the Featherstone Massacre in 1895 by a Sheffield anarchist called David Nicoll, He produced a pamphlet called *Bullets for Bread*. It's not clear what David Nicoll’s sources were, he may have had no basis for what he was claiming, but he did claim that ‘crowds are starving’, (and yes, he used the present tense) ‘crowds are famished’, and ‘driven mad with hunger’. So he is certainly linking hunger, bodily distress, with madness or a loss of reason, and an emotional impact.

Otherwise, what I suggest to you could be taken from that photograph is simply the enormous scale of the hunger induced by this very long-running dispute. In which, of course. mothers and others not directly involved were unable to claim any form of Social Security. The strike pay that the Miners' Federation of Great Britain and its affiliates were able to offer was very limited indeed. We know that in Lancashire and Cheshire, for example, the union's funds were exhausted after giving out just over two weeks' strike pay.

SLIDE 30
Sam Wood in his account of the dispute, *The Battle of '93* wrote "Every day," and this was directly observed (remember: one of his next door neighbours was a Yorkshire coal miner) "Every day, many were brought face-to-face with starvation. Men saw that they were to be starved into submission, whereupon a spirit of hostility at once rose up in their midst."

So once again Wood is drawing a link between the bodily distress and 'a spirit of hostility'. We could say a link between distress and emotion and, indeed, angry emotion.

The reporter for the *Manchester Guardian* also wrote: "The van of the attack on Ackton Hall Colliery," this is referring to the Featherstone Massacre, "was composed of women who urged on the men with a kind of feminine savagery made more eager by hunger, and a brooding over their supposed wrongs." So again, a link is being made between hunger and "an eager savagery", an emotional consequence.

The other thing that emerges from these newspaper reports is that one of the distresses of hunger was not simply the deep pain, and exhaustion, and anxiety induced by it, not only the grief of having to watch your children go through this ordeal, but was also the humiliation of having to beg, of having to pawn one's belongings as the weeks went by, of having to accept charity. This lockout was of people who had been used to making their own way in the world, who were used to making what was, in good times, a relatively good living, and we're certainly not normal inmates of the workhouse or habitual seekers after charity. So the humiliation of begging and taking charity was mixed up with the bodily injuries involved in the hunger.

END OF PART I.

PART II.

TITLE SLIDE REPEAT

SLIDE 32
Welcome back to Part II of this Presentation.

OK, so that's hunger. What about insults and provocations? Well, of course, one of the main insults thrown in this dispute was "scab", "blackleg" and so on because not everybody, came out on strike--the strike wasn't entirely solid.

This is a very remarkable photograph. This doesn't come from the coal lockout at all. It's not even from England. This is from somewhere in the United States it's not entirely clear where. It may be from New York, it may be from Atlanta, but it's probably from one of a number of mass transit and tramways strikes in 1915 and 1916. You can see these two girls are on roller skates. I'm not entirely sure of the functions of the roller skates in this context, so let's pass on to the other obvious feature of the photograph, which is that they're wearing sashes. "Don't be a Scab", say the sashes. 'Scab' is a grave insult.

Was it, or an equivalent, used in the Coal Lockout? Well, certainly, strike-breakers and blacklegs were the focus of much anger.

SLIDE 33
Here's a report, from very early in the strike, from the *Leeds Mercury*. It's a report from Dewsbury, a coal and woollens town a few miles to the south of Leeds, just a few days into the lockout, at the beginning of August, and it reports that a crowd of 2,000 to 3,000 men and lads "besides many women" had gathered around the pits and launched a "furious attack" on working miners. So we see one of these emotion words again: a "furious attack with sticks and stones and pieces of coal on the working miners".

In the second week of August, tense scenes were witnessed at the Whinney Moor Pit near Wakefield. The colliery company had not wanted to reduce wages and had not locked out their miners. But the miners then decided to give notice of a strike so as to be "on an equal footing" with the other miners who had come out. But the company made difficulties, with the result that the notice was tendered late and miners carried on working until the 10th of August, working out their notices so that they would not be in breach of contract when they eventually went off work.

When they did leave work on that day, they found a large crowd of miners waiting for them. Each had a stone in his hand. The Whinney Moor miners were surrounded and 'interviewed' as others cried "Baa baa", like sheep bleating meaning 'blacksheep' or 'blacklegs', Despite this the Whinney Moor miners were allowed to go on their way and no violence occurred.

The following week, however, in the Eastmoor district of Wakefield, only five or six miles west of Featherstone, a series of disturbances arising out of relations between the mass of the miners and five men, Cornelius Hole and James Pounder, who were non-unionists, and Edward Parkinson, and his two sons, Sam and George Parkinson, who had been expelled from the local branch of the Yorkshire Miners' Association --that's the affiliate of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain-- a few months before. All five men were employed by the company on maintenance work while the lockout continued, so they were working whilst others were locked out.

On 14th of August, so a little more than a fortnight into the lockout, at about 9:00 p.m. the homes of the five men were attacked by crowd of several hundred men, women, and children. All the windows at the front of the Holes's house were smashed. There were eight children in the house at the time. Mrs Hole, interviewed by the press, stated that "they have threatened to kill him", meaning her husband, "tonight". Mrs Pounder retailed a similar story. "They yelled and hooted so loud they could be heard three miles away". So too did the Parkinsons. Sam Parkinson told the reporter that "at the time of the attack the youngster was in bed and the wife had to go upstairs and fetch her down. Then we had to crouch behind the door while half-bricks were hurled at it." The district was said to be in a state of "great ferment" with much indignation --another of those anger words—evinced against Cornelius Hole, who at first continued to work despite the threats against him.

So one can see here what locked out miners would have called provocations by strikebreakers or blacklegs, leading to angry responses from locked out miners. And we can also see that the strikebreakers, in turn, were angered by the attacks upon them, or the threats of attacks upon them.

Why should blacklegging be seen in such an angry light? After all, as some of you may have been aware the recent strikes by my own union, the University and College Union, have seen a lot of what a 19th century miner would have called scabbing. While strikes have been on many members of our

profession have continued to go to work, to teach, to lecture, to research and administrate, and these people have not suffered the violence or threats of violence that the Holes or the Parkinsons did. So anger is not an inevitable response to scabbing.

SLIDE 34
What I would suggest is that in these communities, at this time, blacklegging was seen as a betrayal. And betrayal, of course has a very terrible history in Western culture, as I hope the scene in front of you will remind you. This is a scene from a fresco cycle, completed about 1305 by Giotto. Known as the *Arrest of Christ*, it's also known as I'm sure you can imagine as the *Kiss of Judas*.

And to fling the accusation of Judas, at somebody, certainly in these communities, was a very heavy insult, indeed.

So I think part of the reason for the seriousness with which these insults were proffered and taken up, is the idea of blacklegging as a betrayal, and the valuation of betrayal as deeply evil, a valuation going all the way back to the New Testament.

SLIDE 35
Here is another relevant depiction. This is a painting of a scene from Dante's description of the crossing to the Fifth Circle of Hell, the last station of Upper Hell. It is the abode of the wrathfull and the sullen.

Dante writes:
And I ... | made out a swarm of spirits in that bog | savage with anger, naked slime-besmirched. | They thumped at one another in that slime |with hands and feet, and they butted, and they bit | as if each would tear the other limb from limb.

So one sees the association of anger and violence which I have taken for granted here.

But there are lower circles of Hell. And it is the lowest, ninth, circle of Hell, that Dante describes, not as the abode of strike-breakers or black leggers, of course, but as the abode of traitors. One can see a strike-breaker as a traitor to their own community, somebody who is involved in a treasonable act, and we see here that Dante regarded people perpetrating such evils as deserving not just Hell, but the very lowest circles of Hell.

SLIDE 36
The reason for this has been suggested, I think, most plausibly by an American poet and translator of Dante, John Ciardi who wrote "The treacheries of these souls were denials of love (which is God) [God is Love] and of all human warmth. … As they denied God's love, so are they furthest removed from the light and warmth of His Sun. As they denied all human ties, so are they bound only by the unyielding ice". "Ice" because this is what is found in the lowest circles of Hell, not the hottest fire as you might expect, but a scene of ice and cold.

SLIDE 37
Let me return now to a narrative, a narrative of provocation. I've been talking about provocation by strike-breakers and those who opposed them but there were also provocations by colliery managers, not by scabs or strikebreakers.

I'm sure many of you will recognize the scene on the slide in front of you. If you don't, I shan't tell you. At least one miner at Featherstone seemed familiar with the gesture.

SLIDE 38
Let me return to a narrative focused on the Featherstone Massacre. If we go back to a couple of days before the massacre, to Tuesday 5th of September, surface workers were still at work at Ackton Hall Colliery in Featherstone. They were loading smudge into railway trucks and some of it was being sold. A marching gang of men, women and lads armed with sticks and cudgels told the surface workers: “If you don't give over we’ll knock your bloody ribs in.” And the men stopped working and ran off.

SLIDE 39
So ‘smudge’. What is it? It's dust, coal dust. It's coal which is of an even smaller size than slack. And slack is often coal which found a difficult sale. Nobody wanted it because it doesn't give out much heat; and it's extremely difficult to light. It’s main use, in fact, was in damping down a fire at night. Damping it down carefully could keep the fire going throughout the night without consuming a great deal of coal, without, therefore, being very costly.

That was really its only use. So here we have an advertisement from Abraham Madge, coal merchants, of Camberwell in London in 1891. He's advertising for sale various sorts of domestic coal, usually distinguished by provenance --Wallsend in the north east, Silkstone from Yorkshire, and size, large, nuts, and cobbles. Below those grades were the cheapest grades, slack and smudge, and he attempts to persuade potential buyers that “Cheap Coals are the Dearest. No heat. All Dust and Waste”. So buy my more expensive coals.

So that's what smudge is.

SLIDE 40
During the lockout, coal was so scarce that slack and smudge could find a market. If you look at the *Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer* for the end of August, I893, so after the lockout had been going for almost a month, you'll see here an advert for screened house coal; that is to say, house coal that survived passage across a screen, a large sieve, because it was in large lumps; unscreened coal, that is to say, coal in all sorts of sizes; and slack and smudge. So we can see that during the lockout smudge became saleable.

This is the background to, the arguments that took place before the Massacre at Ackton Hall Colliery in Featherstone.

SLIDE 41
On Wednesday, 6th of September, Ackton Hall miners met with the manager, a chap called AJ Holiday, and they said the loading of coal for sale was generating “a very strong feeling among the miners” and it would be “difficult to restrain further violent proceedings”. One gets the impression this is all said in a very calm way, but it's relating statements about feelings, and it's suggesting that those feelings could lead to violence. This is actually rational argument: it's giving Holiday a reason to stop loading the coal for sale. And indeed Holiday seems to be persuaded and at the end of the interview, promises to stop loading the smudge for sale.

SLIDE 42
Later on that day, however, surface workers at the colliery, are surrounded by a crowd armed with sticks, “men and boys and women and all,” who insist they cease work. They used “very strong language” to the surface foreman, William Jaques: if he went near the smudge again, they would “tear him from limb to limb”.

So this is a threat which I've used in the subtitle of the paper as a whole. The threat was actually carried out; Jaques and his wife were assaulted in their homes in Featherstone later that night, although they were not, of course, literally torn “from limb to limb”.

SLIDE 43
Now we come to Thursday, the day of the massacre itself. Earlier in the day, a group of women enter the yard and insist that all work should stop, not just the loading of smudge, but all work, and they were joined by a group of youths armed with sticks and stones.

This is England, so there are no firearms.

The group told Holiday he had broken their agreement. They pointed towards 2 wagons of smudge which were ticketed to Bradford. Holiday responds: The tickets are old ones. I've kept my promise. Again here is rational argument: here is a consideration that might persuade you to change your mind. The tickets are old. The tickets are not new but old, so it remains true that I have kept my promise.

The crowd didn't believe him. They overturn the coal wagons. Windows are broken and Holiday goes to fetch the police. He has to go to Wakefield to fetch the police because there's only one Police Sergeant resident in Featherstone itself, so he goes to police headquarters in Wakefield. There he finds that there are no police to be had, only soldiers. A fateful discovery, indeed.

So let me just pause for a moment here, and take an interlude to think about the relationship between lies, and humiliation, and anger. The crowd thought that Holiday was lying. The crowd thought that Holiday, despite his promise, was loading smudge for sale in Bradford. When one is lied to (and one knows this) then one may feel humiliated. You do not lie to somebody you respect. It is a mark of respect that you tell the truth to them. So to be lied to, if one knows this, is to be humiliated.

SLIDE 44
We can see this perhaps more easily in a fictional example (I know I said I wasn't going to look at fiction, but hey, this is Dickens.) This is a scene taken from *Our Mutual Friend* and it shows Mr and Mrs Lammle. They've each married the other under the impression that the other is rich. They have just discovered that each is, in fact, poor. Both are humiliated by the other’s deception. She's angry, says Dickens. He is livid. (Another emotion word for an angry emotion.) So we see here that lies can easily lead to feelings of humiliation; humiliation, we can see, can lead to anger. Dickens certainly thought so. I'll suggest that he's not alone a little bit later.

SLIDE 45
So let's go back to the narrative. Eventually, soldiers arrive at Ackton Hall. To be specific, they are 28 infantry men under the command of Captain Digby Barker. They arrive at about 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon and enter the colliery yard. They are jeered and hooted by the crowds who have remained there. Barker finds there is no JP present and he feels without a JP, the person who has to read the Riot Act, if the Riot Act is to be read, without a JP present he can do nothing.

So all he can do is to protect his men from the antagonism of the crowd. Remember that sticks and stones are readily to be found, and so he with his 28 men hides in the colliery engine house. He doesn't stand in the open air. He actually hides. This again suggests some humiliation here. This is a theme I haven't developed here, but I think it's worthy of development. It's the feelings of the soldiers themselves.

Barker and his men stay there for some hours. By 6:30 Holiday has returned to the colliery. He's asked to remove the soldiers and he refuses this. He says “I have no power to remove them”.

A crowd of thousands gathers. Holiday is again asked to remove the soldiers and again he does not. Shortly after this, another crowd arrives, it's thought from a neighbouring colliery village, called Snydale, led by a miner called Amos White. And this crowd appears to be somewhat more aggressive than the previous crowds who've been present in the colliery yard from time to time throughout the week.

Again, Holiday is asked to remove the soldiers but the soldiers stay put. As I say, this crowd seems to be more aggressive and several shout “Kill him,” meaning Holiday, “Kill the bugger while you have him!”.

It's one of the great things about some of the sources available for this incident that we do indeed find “bugger” written down in full and we don't have to cope with the rather prissy B, dash, dash, dash, dash, dash that appears in the Report of the Committee of Inquiry, for instance.

So this is where we've ended up in this dispute. Remember, we started with “amicable understandings”. And now we've got to a point where several miners are a shouting in reference to a colliery manager “Kill him, kill the bugger while you have him.”

SLIDE 46
Around about 7:00 o'clock the colliery yard was set alight. Captain Barker was approached in the Engine House by 6 men, 6 miners, and they say to him “Leave or we shall burn you out”.

Again, this is rational speech. It is giving Captain Barker a reason why he should do something. It is attempting to persuade him to leave. Barker eventually says ‘I'll go if the crowd goes’, so he attempts to negotiate. He attempts to bargain with the 6 men who've approached him in the Engine House and the 6 men accept the deal. Barker goes with his men to the railway station which is adjacent to the colliery yard. (They had arrived by train and would expect to leave by train). But the crowds don't keep their side of the bargain; the crowds remain. So, again, one can imagine that Barker will have been feeling more than a bit humiliated.

Finally, about 8:00 o'clock, Bernard Hartley, JP, arrives from Pontefract. Pontefract is only a couple of miles away from Featherstone but it takes him until 8:00 o'clock to arrive, by which time –remember this is September and that British Summer Time was not introduced until 1916-- darkness has fallen. The troops are marched back from the station to the colliery yard, and the crowd told to disperse. It does not, and so at about 20 to 9 Bernard Hartley reads the Riot Act. The crowd stays put.

About 9:15 Hartley orders the troops to fire. Firstly, in as limited a fashion as possible: only two soldiers fire. But then, after this has no effect, a second time, by eight soldiers. In this volley Duggan is mortally wounded and Gibbs is killed. The crowd still remains.

SLIDE 47
OK, let's reflect on this narrative for a few moments. It's been a narrative of insults and provocations, and it would appear from the request made repeatedly by the miners, that the presence of police and soldiers was regarded, in and of itself, as provocative.

The police presence was heavy by the standards of the day, although nothing like as heavy as we saw during the 1984-85 Miners’ strike. It is evidenced by photographs like this one, which is of Glasshoughton Colliery. It's dated “September 1893” and is probably after, rather than before, the

Featherstone Massacre. Glasshoughton is just south of Castleford so it's a couple of miles north of Featherstone, that is to say, within an easy walking distance of Featherstone. Looking at this photo I would suggest that the police could rather easily be taken as an army of occupation and this is emphasised by the fact that they are clearly on the side of the owners, not the miners, despite the fact that it is the owners' actions in attempting to force down wages which has brought the threat of disorder to the area. I think this is part of the key to understanding these events.

SLIDE 48
When people saw police and soldiers *en masse*, occupying towns and villages, some at least seem to have regarded it as a an "irritation to a free people".

Here's a picture from an early film about Bloody Sunday in St Petersburg, the events that began the 1905 Revolution in Russia. I think it was events akin to this that were in people's minds when they saw police and soldiers massing in the context of disputes such as the Coal Lockout of 1893.

1905 is obviously after 1893 but Russia had been a byword in Britain for tyranny for a long time before 1905. And one of the ways in which that tyranny was expressed, experienced, and recognised was by the use of police and soldiers in a repressive, tyrannical fashion. So there was a sensitivity to the deployment of police in numbers and troops in whatever numbers. When police and troops came to scenes of unrest it made people, at least some people, ask 'Are they not citizens of a free country? Are we not a free people in England? Or are we under the yoke of tyranny, such as is the case in Russia?' So I think this is what's going on here and this is why there was such a repeated request of Holiday and then finally of Captain Barker himself to remove his troops.

SLIDE 49
That perception was shared by the local left-wing press. The *Yorkshire Factory Times* wrote "The military have gone from Dewsbury. It was a mistake for them to be there at all, as it was [and all this next is in capital letters] **an insult of the deepest character**."

SLIDE 50
Similarly, it wrote in another report: "The mounted police were hanging around the Co-op Hall while the miners' meeting was going on. The presence of a mounted police force was **an insult to the peaceable inhabitants**." It suggested that the peaceable inhabitants of Featherstone and the other colliery areas of Yorkshire and Lancashire were not a free people, but that they were the slaves of a tyranny.

SLIDE 51
So let me return briefly to the narrative. What happens afterwards? Well, what happened afterwards was, in some ways, not much.

SLIDE 52
After the drama of the massacre, the activities of the marching bands were checked by the shock of the shootings but the lockout continued, and hunger deepened.

Eventually, but only in mid-November, a conference was convened by the Prime Minister William Gladstone and chaired by the Foreign Secretary, the Earl of Rosebery.

Here's a picture of the Conference. It was an event of a single day and a Rosebery is there shown standing to read out the Terms of Settlement to the assembled miners' representatives on the left and the coal owners' representatives on the right.

SLIDE 53
Sam Wood wrote:
“Towards the end of this eventful day [17 November] men and women gathered in groups about the villages and towns, talking and waiting for the news. Presently there was a great stir on every hand: the telegraph had flashed its welcome message throughout the country, ‘Peace with honour; the men to restart work at once at the old rate of wages!’
“There was boundless enthusiasm in every colliery district. The victory of Waterloo was nothing to this, and the thousands who had suffered so long and so severely were almost beside themselves with joy.”

So, I've been talking almost all the time about anger, but we can see at the end of the dispute different emotions entirely, and I'll return to those briefly in a moment.

SLIDE 54
But, you might well be saying, what about the women who have been mentioned in many of the reports that I’ve put in front of you?

You may have been surprised to notice that the crowds were reported to be composed not only of men, or even men and boys, or even men and youths, but men, women and children.

SLIDE 55
So what about the women? Did they feel things the same way as the men did, or did they feel things differently?

Women in the lockout appear almost entirely as miners’ wives. Women had been banned from working underground in coal mines since 1842. A few still worked on the surface, but mainly in Lancashire. In Yorkshire, around Featherstone, there would have been none at all.

Women were present in action, as I've indicated at many points in this presentation, but women are rarely given voices in reported speech by the newspapers of the time. No woman, not one, was called as a witness to the Bowen Inquiry Commission.

Nevertheless, women appear to have been united with men in feeling, though women expressed their feelings somewhat differently. Women were allowed, for instance, to shed tears. Men, by this point were not. ‘Big boys don't cry’.

But this was a relatively recent development. If one goes to newspaper reports of Nelson's funeral in 1805 one can see statements indicating that the sailors who attended that funeral shed tears quite freely, and we're not criticized for doing so. So the male reserve in the expression of distress was relatively new, and yet it is clearly observed by this point, in 1893.

SLIDE 56
The *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent* reported on the 1st of August that:
“…the miners have been splendidly supported by their wives. Labour leaders declare that women are the best trades unionists, and it is undoubtedly a fact that the remarkable unity and determination that exists in the ranks of the Miners’ Federation is largely due to female influence.”

So this suggests that there was indeed a unity in feeling between women and men.

SLIDE 57

Here is a letter published in the *Wigan Observer and District Advertiser* for the 27th of October, so quite late on in the dispute. The writer has not given her name and there is always a question, in any case, about whether published letters to the press are genuine, but bearing that in mind, for what it's worth, let's look at it.

It's from a purported miner's wife, and she writes, "I see … that the masters are blaming the miners' wives for the miners not returning to work". And she goes on to say, well, they're quite right, actually, you know.

And she goes on to state that "the masters are answerable for the piercing cry of hungry children, and the rash acts of those [men] who have done wrong [by blacklegging] under the pressure of privation, misery and wretchedness."

So there seems to be little division between men and women in this dispute.

SLIDE 58
The rejoicings that Sam Wood described at the end of the dispute in November, were reported in an interesting way for this question. An instance is given by the *Yorkshire Evening Post* in its issue for the day after the end of the dispute had become known. It's difficult to read the text on the screen, so I'll read it for you.

"The end of the strike has been signalized by rejoicings in all the affected districts. Some of the reports showing the joy of the women and children are indeed pathetic. [That is, excite pity in the observer.] The news of the settlement was received at Castleford with wild excitement. Men, women, and children danced for joy at Alfreton. The men threw their caps in the air and cheered until they were hoarse. In some places the church bells were rung during the evening, and in most places of worship in Derbyshire thanksgiving services will be held to-day. When it became known in Bolton and the surrounding districts that the strike had been settled there was general rejoicing. The miners and their wives manifested their satisfaction by dancing and singing in the streets whilst the same spirit of hilarity characterised the gatherings of the soup kitchens.

"Describing the reception of the news at Barnsley a correspondent says:-- It was the women that were the first to recover themselves. The silence was broken by the exclamation, which broke from a wan, tidy-looking woman with the inevitable shawl pinned over her head 'Eh, but that's blessed news!' And then might be heard on all sides, expressions of joy. Hands were shaken, tears rolled down the *women's* faces, and it was altogether a scene which is to be impressed on one's memory as long as he or she lives."

So we see here that the expression of emotion is different. Tears roll down the women's faces, but by implication not the men's. And women are put with children in some descriptions I've read out to you:
"Some of the reports showing the joy of the women *and children* are indeed pathetic", but not the reports of the joy shown by the men.

So there is a difference in the way in which women and men react, or, if you like, are allowed to react, to joyful news. But in the course of the lockout itself, we see little division emotionally between men and women.

SLIDE 59

Let me summarize, let me try and draw some of the morals of the story. That's why I've given you a picture of Aesop to look at here, he being the man whose fables always drew a moral at the end.

SLIDE 60
First of all, why did the conflict turn violent? Well, I've suggested it was because people, both women and men, became angry. Why did they become angry? Partly because of the bodily distress, the hunger. Although it has to be said that the hunger was widespread but the violence was sporadic and scattered: there was violence at Featherstone and at some other collieries but other collieries were entirely peaceful, so the hunger is not a sufficient explanation.

In Featherstone, at Ackton Hall colliery, we saw managerial lies, or what were thought to be lies, and I suggested that such lies will have been experienced as humiliating, and we know, or we think we know, that humiliation can lead to anger.

We also saw that the presence of police and soldiers was regarded as provocative by the miners, provocative of anger. But also again, there's an element of humiliation in this, as there was in the hunger as well, people were forced to beg; people were forced to accept charity.

Both these things would have occasioned feelings of humiliation. The psychologist Thomas J. Scheff has suggested that humiliations are provocative of anger. Indeed, he argues that the reason why people become angry from time to time is largely because they have been humiliated or they have felt humiliated.

We've seen that the actions of strikebreakers may have been seen as betrayals, as treason, not as reasonable actions to take in the circumstances, possibly excusable by the youth of one's family or other personal circumstances, but as a denial of love and productive again of anger and hatred.

So it seems possible to give. explanations of why the conflict turned violent, and those explanations are multifaceted, as indeed we would expect them to be, I think.

SLIDE 61
This is Thomas Scheff's main book. It's called 'Bloody Revenge: Emotions Nationalism and War' and is very ambitious; indeed, he attempts to explain the outbreak of World War One in terms of the emotions and specifically the emotions of humiliation and anger.

SLIDE 62
What about reason? What happened to reason? Well, I think we can see here that reason remained. We see anger and violence in close conjunction with requests, negotiations, threats, and indeed, violence. We see repeated requests to remove the soldiers, and the negotiations, or attempted negotiations, with Holiday to bring about this end. We see a parley with Captain Barker, where he is given a reason, not very pleasant reason, but a reason, to remove his soldiers. We see threats to surface workers which give them reasons to stop working. We see threats and violence specifically to William Jaques and his wife.

So we see requests, negotiations, parleys, and threats, all of these using reason, in an emotionally highly charged situation. We see, I think, that reason and emotion are compatible. And we remember that after all, the lockout was settled by negotiation by a bunch of men sitting around a table in the Foreign Office, chaired by the tactful and diplomatic Foreign Secretary, Lord Rosebery.

SLIDE 63

Women and men, I suggested, were united with men in feeling here. But we've also seen that outside observers saw women as comparable to children in certain circumstances. And we've seen that women have been perhaps more ready to express emotions, in particular ways, whether they be by tears or by dancing in the streets.

SLIDE 64
So finally some conclusions.

SLIDE 65
I would argue that anger is not always incompatible with the use of reason and the pursuit of peaceful negotiation. I will put it no stronger than this. After all, this is just a case study. There can be restraint in angry human affairs, I would suggest.

SLIDE 66
To bring this up right up to date, let me just refer you to my favourite Labour MP, Jess Phillips. She is pictured here telling the Prime Minister --this is back in a 2019, so it's Theresa May— that she will not sit and listen to the Prime Minister crow about employment going up when where I live, employment is falling and hunger is rising. She said she is "enraged with the PM's complete and utter lack of bravery on Brexit".

That's a report from *The Guardian*. I'd suggest that, going back to that rather more nuanced understanding of anger that was perhaps a bit more prevalent in the 19th century than now, that Jess Phillips is angry, but not in fact, enraged. She's angry, but she's rational.

So I think this presentation has a resonance in the events of the present day.

Thank you.