The ‘Working Class’ and the Liberal Party in 1890

Professor Keith Sinclair’s remarks on the electoral contest of 1890 in his biography of William Pember Reeves have provoked a controversy over the meaning that should be attached to the trade unionists’ intervention in the electoral contest, and more generally over the importance of class conflict in New Zealand’s history. Professor Sinclair seems to have considered the electoral contest of 1890 a class conflict, with the Liberals on the side of Labour and the followers of Atkinson on the side of Capital. He quoted Lord Glasgow’s statement that the electoral contest was ‘really a fight between Labour and Capital’, which he seems to have regarded as an accurate assessment for he used the quotation again in a pamphlet for school children.¹ With the Liberal leaders’ accession to office, he wrote, ‘a new class was in power’.² Dr. Erik Olssen has recently defended Professor Sinclair’s view. ‘Rightly or wrongly’, he writes, ‘many working men and women have seen the social system in terms of class and have acted accordingly. The most obvious evidence is political, for our most important political coalitions have been forged during periods of intense class-consciousness. In 1890 urban-working men voted overwhelmingly for Labour candidates or radical Liberals who were absorbed into the Liberal Party which retained working-class allegiance for some twenty to thirty years.’³ Taking exception to Professor Sinclair’s view, Professor W. H. Oliver has contended that ‘if the word “class” has any useful role’ in explaining the political division between the Liberals and the followers of Atkinson ‘it is in need of some pretty considerable qualification’, for many people who were not working-men — ‘manufacturers, shopkeepers, small farmers . . .’ were prominent on the Liberal side.⁴ There cannot, he believes, be any identification between the followers of Atkinson and ‘Capital’ and of the Liberals and ‘Labour’. Professor Oliver and Dr. Olssen begin by addressing their remarks to the electoral contest of 1890, but they go on to discuss in general terms the role of class in New Zealand’s society. Professor Oliver denies that there was ‘class war’; Dr. Olssen asserts that there was. The debate turns very much upon the incidence of ‘upward social mobility’ and its importance in forestalling the development of class antagonisms.
Professor Oliver argues that the Marxian 'concept of class' — the clash of working class with capitalist class — was invalidated in New Zealand because of 'the short expanse from floor to ceiling' and the 'persistence of social osmosis', which was facilitated in the 1890's 'by fairly easily accessible land'. The reasoning that connects upward 'social mobility' or 'social osmosis' with the invalidity of the Marxian ideas of class-consciousness and class conflict is rather hypothetical, but it is reasonable to suppose that a working-man who had set his sights on becoming a farmer was not likely to identify very strongly with his fellow working-men, considered in general or as a 'class'. Dr. Olssen seems to accept the validity of this reasoning, but he denies its premise: that many working-men wanted to go onto the land. He admits that the working-men 'wanted the great estates broken up' but, citing the editor of the Otago Workman, he suggests that their demand for land reform sprang only from class hatred of the capitalists who monopolized the land. The land policy, he writes, 'was shaped more by class tension than by any desire for a farm.' This stands Professor Oliver's contention on its head: the working-men's demand for land reform now becomes a confirmation of their class-consciousness. The difference of opinion on the significance for land reform comes down to a fairly clear-cut question of fact: 'Did many working men want to go onto the land?'

It is true, as Dr. Olssen asserts, that the trade unionists wished to institute penal taxation against the land monopolists, but they were equally concerned to promote settlement. These goals were quite compatible: the land tax, by ending speculative land holding, was to open the land to settlement. The trade union leaders who stood for parliament in 1890 advocated land settlement as well as land taxation. W. W. Tanner thought a land tax 'was necessary to effect the gradual disintegration of large estates more than for revenue purposes'. F. S. Parker said that 'every man should be able to procure at least one hundred acres on which to settle'. When J. A. Millar and J. W. Kelly spoke of settlement it is clear that they had settlement by working-men without capital in mind. Kelly called upon the Government to grant the new settlers unsecured loans. Millar hoped the Government would provide the new settlers with 'every facility'. One union — the Wellington Wharf Labourers' Union — set itself up as a land settlement organization, successfully applying to the Atkinson Government for a block of land upon which to settle its unemployed members.

This evidence, admittedly, gives little indication of the extent of the desire for land among the working-men, and none at all of the number of working-men who were able to go onto the land. Dr. Olssen suggests that an enquiry into how many of the 'applications for small farms carved out of great estates' . . . were drawn from the working-class' would cast light on these points. Without making any such enquiry, however, he concludes
that the number of 'aspiring farmers' among the working-men was minimal.

A survey of the sort that Dr. Olssen suggests was made in 1893 apparently at the request of J. G. Ward, who gave its results. The survey gives the occupations of 223 of the land selectors who settled on the special settlements between 1890 and 1893. (The total number of selectors who settled on the special settlements in this period was 1021). The settlers who figured in the survey were not 'specially selected' but were 'taken from the general records promiscuously'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled working-men</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled working-men</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' sons</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushmen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm labourers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey was not done as thoroughly as one could wish, but it provides persuasive evidence that 'upward social mobility' was a reality in New Zealand. As may be seen from the table, well over half of the settlers were working-men. Labourers and skilled working-men made up fiftysix per cent and another ten per cent were country working-men: bushmen, shepherds, and farm labourers. It seems reasonable to conclude that many working-men, especially among those who did not have a skill, wanted to go, and did go, on to the land. The working-men who were ambitious to become farmers looked to the Liberal party not to wage war on the capitalists but to help them become small-scale capitalists themselves.

Going on to the land was not the only means of 'upward social mobility'. The schools and universities, as Professor Oliver has pointed out, provided possible openings into the middle classes for the children of working-men. Dr. Olssen, however, maintains that few if any of the working-men hoped that their children would rise through academic attainment. The working-men, he believes, were not interested in education for the professions. 'When they [the 'union leaders'] spoke of education,' he writes, 'it invariably transpired that they wanted technical institutes to equip the sons of working-class families with a tradesman's skill.' This does not seem to be correct. The section of the Dunedin Workers' Political Committee's platform of 1893 devoted to 'Education Reform' called, among other things, for 'free and secular education from primary school to university'.

‘compulsory education to sixteen’, and an increase in the number of ‘junior scholarships’. It did not mention technical education. A master tinsmith told the parliamentary Sweating Commission in 1890, ‘When I started it was a very difficult thing to get good boys as apprentices, because people would say, “I do not care about my boy becoming a mechanic; my boy is going to be a lawyer”’. (W. Hoban, the Liberal candidate for Kaiapoi in 1890, who was a lawyer, announced proudly that he was the son of a working-man). It is clear that many working-men looked to the schools and universities to provide entrées for their children into the middle class.

Perhaps the most obvious route into the middle classes for the skilled working-man was to acquire a little capital and set himself up as a master. One of the first leaders of the Dunedin Bakers’ Union went on to become a master. A coachmaker remarked upon the proliferation of coachmaking shops in the main centres set up by journeymen. It may not have been common for journeymen to become masters but it was far from unknown.

The debate between Professor Oliver and Dr. Olssen on the question of social mobility is unlikely to be conclusively settled because there is probably no way of knowing precisely how many working-men were able to rise out of their ‘class’. But the weight of evidence lies on Professor Oliver’s side. There was, of course, no automatic promotion. Most working-men were undoubtedly destined to remain working-men throughout their lives. But it does not follow that the mechanisms of ‘social osmosis’ did not help to promote the social peace and integration for which New Zealand was remarkable. An American sociologist — W. E. Moore — has pointed out that the ‘integrative and stabilizing effect’ of the belief in the possibility of upward mobility springs as much from ‘ideals’ as from ‘fact’. The ‘statistics’ of upward mobility are less significant in a community than whether or not ‘it is possible’, because ‘it is not socially customary to think statistically’. ‘The absence of official barriers,’ he writes, ‘and the emphasis upon rising in the social and economic world, gave a stake in the future which may be illusory, but is real in its effects if it is thought to be real’. This ‘hope for better things’, he concludes, ‘decreases the chances of developing class consciousness’.

After his remarks on the question of upward social mobility, Dr. Olssen goes on to contend that industrial relations were generally marked by ‘class conflict’, which he believes was ‘transposed into politics’. That there were industrial conflicts is of course incontestable, the most notable being the Maritime Strike of 1890. The question at issue here is whether antagonism between employers and employees was sufficiently general for one to be justified in speaking of class conflict.

Dr. Olssen takes his evidence from the weekly paper the Otago Workman and the minute books of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners in Dunedin. I have not read the minute books of this union, nor, I must confess, the minute books of any other union. But the evidence Dr. Olssen advances does not altogether bear out his point. He notes that the carpenters and joiners ‘began to see themselves as members of some-
thing they called the “working classes”’. But the term ‘working classes’ did not have the connotations of class solidarity and class hostility that Dr. Olssen gives it. It was in quite general use simply as a collective term for manual labourers. It may be that carpenters and joiners used ‘working classes’ in a manner that implied hostility towards the middle classes. One cannot know whether this was so because Dr. Olssen does not illustrate their usage. The test as to whether the carpenters and joiners were committed to the doctrine of class conflict must surely lie in their relationship with their employers. Dr. Olssen does not go into this. He mentions that they contributed to a strike fund but he does not say whether they went on strike. In an allied trade, the building trade, the relations between the leading masters and the journeymen were evidently cordial. The Dunedin Master Builders’ Association declared in 1890 that it was ‘in earnest sympathy with the movement made by the working-men to rectify many of the wrongs which had sprung up in the building trade’. In a number of other trades, also, the relations between the journeymen and the masters were scarcely marked by the ‘class conflict’ that Dr. Olssen finds. Craft unions in Wellington and Auckland passed resolutions thanking the masters for their ‘friendly spirit’, ‘fair and gentlemanly spirit’, ‘friendly . . . accord’, and ‘kindly feeling’. A joint conference of the Master Tailors’ Association and the Tailors’ Union in Wellington to discuss their common grievances against the clothing factories ‘passed off most satisfactorily’. These resolutions were not ritualistic formulas veiling the reality of class conflict. Industrial relations in the crafts were remarkably harmonious. David Pinkerton, the President of the Dunedin Trades Council, announced proudly in 1893 that in the first four years’ existence of the new Trades Council, to which Dr. Olssen’s Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners was affiliated, there had not been a single strike in any of the trades whose unions were affiliated to it. The majority of the working-men in the main centres were skilled men, most of whom worked under masters in small craft shops. The intimate relationship between the master and the journeymen militated against the development of class antagonism.

Dr. Olssen shows that the editor of the Otago Workman believed that there was a struggle between labour and capital in 1890. He assumes that the outlook of this editor was typical of that of the working-men. Certainly, many working-men perceived their relationship with their employers in general terms as a conflict between labour and capital. But this perception seems to have been largely confined to the unionists whose unions were affiliated to the Maritime Council. These unionists were, in April 1890, the wharf labourers, seamen, firemen, trimmers, cooks, stewards, carters, and grain carriers. (The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants joined the Maritime Council later in the year). The Maritime Council unionists bulked large in the unionist movement — according to the Lyttelton Times they comprised 9,000 of the 21,300 unionists in the country in April 1890 — but there are few grounds for assuming that their outlook was representa-
tive of that of the working-men in general, and good grounds for thinking it was not.

Dr. Olssen takes as his subject 'The "Working Class" in New Zealand', and he begins by setting forth a clear and objective definition of class, which he attributes to 'American sociologists'. In their work, he writes, 'Social classes are no longer defined in terms of one variable but by income, source of income, education, occupation and residential area'. Given this definition, he quite properly notes, 'social classes have existed and still exist in New Zealand'. But it soon becomes clear that Dr. Olssen's working class is more the working class of the socialist than the sociologist. 'Income, source of income, education, occupation and residential area' figure less prominently in his enquiry than 'class-consciousness' (pp. 45, 52, 55, 60), 'class conflict' (pp. 45, 50), 'class tension' (p. 59), 'solidarity among all working men' (p. 55), and the 'new religion' of 'brotherhood, co-operation and socialism' (p. 57). His appeal to the authority of the American sociologists is rather beside the point. The existence of a working class in New Zealand, taking the modest definition of 'class' that he cites, is not in question. What is questionable is his ascription to the working-men of intense class-consciousness and general hostility towards the middle classes.

Professor Oliver and Dr. Olssen have rightly seen the Liberal party as a test case for their different views on New Zealand's society in the 1890s. Professor Oliver denies that there was a general conflict between labour and capital and refuses to see the Liberal party as the instrument of an aggressive and class-conscious working class. Dr. Olssen, asserting that 'class conflict . . . dominated politics' (p. 45), takes the urban wing of the Liberal party to provide the 'most obvious' evidence of the working-men's 'intense class-consciousness'. He presents this evidence thus: 'In 1890 urban-working men voted overwhelmingly for Labour candidates or radical Liberals who were absorbed into the Liberal party which retained working-class allegiance for some twenty to thirty years'. I cannot see the force of this reasoning. It does not seem to follow that the working-men were intensely class-conscious simply because the bulk of them voted for the Liberal-Labour candidate in 1890. It is questionable whether working-men saw these candidates as their champions in a war against Capital.

Professor Oliver has suggested several considerations that may have induced working-men to prefer Liberal to Atkinsonian candidates that had nothing to do with 'intense class-consciousness'. The most important were land reform and temperance reform. The temperance agitation was no more a manifestation of working-class-consciousness than the agitation for land reform. P. F. McKimmey has shown that drink, like land monopoly, figured in its enemies' minds as a road block in the way of the working-man's rise in society. Temperance reformers ascribed the miseries of working-men not to the oppression of Capital but first and foremost to drunkenness — the result, they believed, of moral irresponsibility. The Trades Councils in Auckland, Wellington and Dunedin allied
with the temperance forces in 1893 to press temperance reform upon the Liberal party.

Dr. Olssen takes the working-men's demands for labour reforms to be evidence of class conflict in politics. Labour reform had no such implication. Certainly, the Liberal-Labour candidates were pledged to support the labour bills of 1890, and many but not all supported the eight hours bill. But the call for labour reforms was not a call for class conflict. William McLean, a Liberal-Labour candidate for Wellington, said that he would not 'go in for class legislation'. W. B. Perceval, one of the Liberal-Labour candidates for Christchurch, assured the electors that the labour bills would not prejudicially affect the interest of any class of the community. The two parties were not seriously divided on labour reform. Most of the Atkinsonian candidates in the urban electorates supported the Atkinsonian labour bills of 1890. The Atkinsonian electoral committee in Dunedin, the Electoral League, went further by including the eight hours bill in its platform. The five Atkinsonian labour bills were introduced into the House by T. W. Hislop, the Minister of Education, and they had the support of the Atkinson Government. Hislop's labour legislation anticipated much of Reeves's. Dr. Olssen notes that the editor of the Otago Workman demanded in 1890 'an end to sweating, extension of the eight hours system, passage of a Workman's Lien Act and an Employer's Liability Act, the abolition of the truck system and votes for seamen' (p. 59). In all of this, except for the extension of the eight hours system, Sir Harry Atkinson was in accord with him. In 1893, it is true, the parties were seriously divided on Reeves's Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. But it would hardly be fair to many of the Atkinsonians to suggest that the Liberals were interested in labour reforms; that only the Liberals sought to advance the interests of 'the working class'.

Professor Oliver has made the point that the Liberal party was not a 'class party'. It cannot be considered a class party either in membership or in ideology. Professor Sinclair himself notes that the Electors' Association, which supported Reeves in 1887, 'included many manufacturers, shop-keepers, small farmers . . . agricultural labourers . . . [and] lawyers'. Dr. Olssen distinguishes between the 'labour' or working-man candidates (of whom there were eight in 1890) and the middle-class 'radical Liberal' candidates. It is clear that neither he nor Professor Sinclair wishes to assert that all or even most of the leading adherents of the urban Liberal parties were working-men. When Dr. Olssen maintains that 'class conflict . . . dominated politics' it is not quite clear what he means. But the impression he leaves is that the middle-class Liberals betrayed their class to take up the aggressively class-conscious demands and rhetoric of the working-man. That this is what he has in mind seems to be confirmed when, on his next page, he speaks of 'the rhetoric of class', and remarks that 'working-men and women voted as if the rhetoric was true' (p. 46). An examination of the views and 'rhetoric' of the Liberal-Labour candidates in 1890 will give quite a different impression.
When Dr. Olssen writes of 'radical Liberal' candidates he presumably refers to the twenty-four middleclass Liberal candidates who received trade union endorsements. Not all of these candidates were, as Dr. Olssen believes, 'absorbed into the Liberal Party'. George Fisher and Henry Fish went over to the Opposition in 1871. They can be presumably dismissed at the outset as traitors to the working class. Of the other twenty-two candidates, two — Michael Gannon and William Hutchison — give some credence to Dr. Olssen's contention. They did use the rhetoric of class, although they did not accept the Marxian idea of the inevitability of class conflict. (Hutchison hoped labour reform would make society 'comfortable and safe' for 'the capitalists'). But the other middleclass Liberal-Labour candidates were scarcely the aggressive champions of the working class that Dr. Olssen would have them. They eschewed the rhetoric of class, if by 'the rhetoric of class' one means language that posits a conflict between a working class and a capitalist class. Several, among them William Pember Reeves, spoke critically of strikes or strikers, while others denied that they were standing in the interest of any particular class, or even sought to dissociate themselves from labour. The labour question did not figure very prominently in their speeches. They concentrated on land and taxation reforms, which were not class issues. One of the middle-class committeemen of the Nelson Trades and Labour Political Association, in making public the Association's programme, said that 'it would, he was sure, be adopted by more than working-men, for many within a strata of society which these considered was above that of working men would be very glad to see the property tax done away with, and a land and income tax in its place'.

Dr. Olssen's contention would have been more convincing if he had confined his remarks to the 'Labour', or working-man, candidates. William Earnshaw, R. Winter, and Francis Flowerday did indeed use the rhetoric of class. In the cases of Earnshaw and Winter this usage was not surprising, for they were connected with one of the militant unions affiliated to the Maritime Council: the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. (Earnshaw was elected the national President of the A.S.R.S. in 1893; Winter served on its Executive in 1890). Earnshaw was returned for the Peninsula, but the working-men of Nelson and Wellington did not 'vote as if the rhetoric of class was true'. Flowerday at Nelson received only seven per cent of the vote; Winter at Wellington received only five per cent.

There is an element of truth in Dr. Olssen's contention. That it is only an element is confirmed by the utterances of the other working-man candidates, none of whom used the rhetoric of class. David Pinkerton deliberately refrained from speaking of classes: he said that 'as he understood it there was only one class . . . humanity'. W. W. Tanner used 'class' in its neutral and merely descriptive sense. He had no intention, he said, of 'doing injustice to any class or causing friction in the body politic'. J. W. Kelly denounced strikes as 'a barbarous method of settling disputes'. T. Buick opposed the eight hours bill in 1892 declaring,
'It is much better that these things should come about by general custom than by legislation'. F. S. Parker proposed that there should be half-yearly meetings of 'employers and employees to cement their connection' and promote 'the general interest'. The ideal of these unionists was an ideal of social peace and integration, not of class conflict. The tally of candidates who were committed to the doctrine of class conflict does not tell in favour of Dr. Olssen's contention that 'class conflict . . . dominated politics'.

Dr. Olssen maintains that 'the overwhelming majority' of the working-men voted for the Liberal-Labour candidates in 1890. This is probably true for the main centres. But in the country town electorates many working-men voted for the Atkinsonian candidates or Liberal candidates who did not have trade union endorsements against the Liberal-Labour candidates. In Kaiapoi, Gisborne, Napier, Nelson and Timaru the Liberal-Labour candidates failed to receive majorities, although the great majority — ranging from fiftynine per cent in Nelson to eightytwo per cent in Kaiapoi — of those eligible to vote in these towns were working-men. The 'conservative' working-men did not pass unnoticed at the time. The Liberal candidate for Napier in 1893 mentioned the problem of the 'Tory working-man'. That the Liberals were more dependent on the votes of the working-men than the Atkinsonians is incontestable. But it does not follow that the Liberal party was a class party, or that in voting Liberal working-men were manifesting 'intense class-consciousness'.
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