

The 'Peace Arsenal' scheme: the campaign for non-munitions
work at the Royal Ordnance Factories, Woolwich after the
First World War.

Daniel John Weinbren

This doctoral thesis is submitted
to the CNAA in partial fulfilment
of the requirements of the degree
of PhD

Thames Polytechnic November 1990

Theses
355
7094
2162
WEI

Contents

	page
Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
List of abbreviations used in the text	5
Chapter 1	7
(a) outline of the thesis	11
(b) outline of the campaign	28
(c) the locomotives	51
Chapter 2	70
(a) the role of national elected politicians	74
(b) the role of the Treasury	86
(c) the role of the Ministry of Munitions	90
(d) the role of private companies	107
Chapter 3	123
(a) the trade unions	128
(b) the Woolwich Labour Party	158
Chapter 4	188
(a) the contribution of business	190
(b) the Christian contribution	204
(c) the military contribution	216
(d) the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign and housing	228
Chapter 5	238
conclusion	
Appendix the number of workers at the Arsenal	245
Footnotes	246
Bibliography	
(a) government records	341
(b) private and local government publications	341
(c) labour and business records	342
(d) tapes and transcripts of taped interviews	342
(e) non-socialist newspapers	342
(f) labour, co-operative and socialist press	343
(g) non-socialist periodicals	343
(h) theses	343
(i) articles	345
(j) books and pamphlets	351

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the result of my own work. None of it was done in collaboration other than that which is specifically acknowledged. I am indebted to the staff of the Public Record Office, the Modern Record Centre, University of Warwick, the Office of Population, Censuses and Surveys, the Royal Arsenal Co-operative Society, Greenwich Chamber of Commerce, the libraries of Ealing College of Higher Education, North London Polytechnic, the University of London, the British Library of Economic and Political Science, Essex University, Lancaster University, Thames Polytechnic, the Fawcett Library, the Greater London Record Office, the Imperial War Museum, Enfield Local History Library and particularly Greenwich Local History Library. I am also grateful to many of my colleagues and the students at the institutions where I was employed whilst completing this work. These were Thames Polytechnic, Ealing College of Higher Education, the Open University, Hackney Adult Education Institute and Middlesex Polytechnic. At Thames Polytechnic the staff of the School of Humanities have been very helpful. I am especially grateful to Fred Lindop and Mick Ryan for their supervision of my work. I am beholden to my friends and relations who have been supportive in a variety of ways. I offer thanks to all of them, especially Rebecca.

Abstract

The 'Peace Arsenal' scheme: the campaign for non-munitions work at the Royal Ordnance Factories, Woolwich after the First World War.

Daniel Weinbren

Following the Armistice many Arsenal workers wanted to retain their well-paid employment. There was a well established community; there was little comparable work in the locality and accommodation was difficult to find elsewhere. In order to secure peacetime production at the Arsenal, the labour movement in Woolwich organised a campaign which drew in traders, councillors, ex-Servicemen and clerics. The effect of this was to aid the integration of the local labour movement into the national constitution which was being reconstructed at the time.

Central aspects of this new constitution were an increase in the integration of representatives of labour and industry in the government, and a new role for the Labour Party. The reconstruction of the constitution involved a degree of economic and legal coercion, and the transmission of government propaganda. These were all orchestrated at national level. The new order also included the accommodation of the working class, which had become more assertive during the war. This meant that social stability could not simply be imposed; the new order had to involve the absorption of tensions and the encouragement of specific strands of working class tradition. The creation of common assumptions could not be done in Whitehall and Westminster alone, it required the active participation of the citizenry; a specific focus and contact with notions generated from within the working class.

That the creation of the new order required these elements is shown through the particular circumstances of the causes, course and consequences of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign. The campaign involved the chief architects of the new order, private armaments companies, the Cabinet and the civil service. It also involved parochial notions derived from the experiences of Arsenal workers.

Abbreviations

AEU	Amalgamated Engineers Union
AFC	Arsenal Football Club
AGC	'All Grades' Committee
ASE	Amalgamated Society of Engineers
ATM	All Together Movement
CME	Chief Mechanical Engineer
COS	Charity Organisation Society
CSOF	Chief Superintendent Ordnance Factories
CWWDC	Civil War Workers Demobilisation Committee
DB	Danger Buildings
DGF	Ministry of Munitions Director General Factories
EC	Executive Committee of the ASE
EEF	Engineering Employers Federation
FBI	Federation of British Industries
GER	Great Eastern Railway
GHTPL	Government Hutments Tenants Protection League
GWR	Great Western Railway
ILP	Independent Labour Party
ISDL	Irish Self Determination League
JTC	Joint Town Committee
LAC	Ministry of Labour Local Advisory Committee
LCC	London County Council
LLP	London Labour Party
LPL	South Side Labour Protection Committee
LNR	London & North Western Railway Co
MFGB	Miners Federation of Great Britain
MIME	Member of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers
MR	Moderate Reform
NER	North Eastern Railways
NFDDSS	National Federation of Demobilised and Disabled Sailors and Soldiers
NFWW	National Federation of Women Workers
NTWF	National Transport Workers Federation
NUGW	National Union of General Workers
NUR	National Union of Railwaymen

OoW	Office of Works
RACS	Royal Arsenal Co-operative Society
RAR	Royal Arsenal Railway
RE	Royal Engineers
RMA	Royal Military Academy
ROF	Royal Ordnance Factories
SDF	Social Democratic Federation
SER	South Eastern & Chatham Railways
SR	Southern Railways
SSC	Shop Stewards Committee
TDL	Woolwich & Plumstead Tenants Defence & Fair Rents League
TUC	Trade Union Congress
UGC	Unemployment Grants Committee
UTUDPC	United Trade Union Discharges Protest Committee
WAC	Woolwich Arsenal Committee
WBC	Woolwich Borough Council
WBG	Woolwich Board of Guardians
WCC	Woolwich Chamber of Commerce
WDC	Woolwich Distress Committee
WEBS	Woolwich Equitable Building Society
WEC	Woolwich Employment Committee
WHTA	Well Hall Garden City Tenants Association
WILP	Woolwich Independent Labour Party
WLP	Woolwich Labour Party
WL&TC	Woolwich Labour and Trades Club
WO	War Office
WU	Workers Union
WUC	Woolwich Unemployment Committee

Chapter I

munition factories are being closed, dismantled and then adapted and refitted for the work of peace. When a full account can be given of the changes which are taking place there will be an interesting story to tell

The Times 19/4/19

Woolwich is always interesting

Haw G From Workhouse to Westminster the
life story of Will Crooks MP London 1917
p307

The post-war settlement did not solely evolve from within a national consensus, nor did it result merely from the impositions of central government or the forces of capital. Rather the stabilisation required the participation of the working class. This will be shown by an analysis of extent to which the Woolwich 'Peace Arsenal' campaign aided the stabilisation of society after the First World War.

There are a considerable number of historians who stress the continuities of the period around the First World War, 'minimal modernisation within the existing liberal framework' in the words of one the most recent contributors (1). Many of those who emphasis the turmoil of the period go on to say that due to the strength of the old order, working-class discontent was contained. They too tend too play down the novelty of the post-war state formation. My analysis derives from the concept that there was a crisis of liberalism in that although the Liberal Party was still of significance until the early 1930s, it went into sharp decline during the First World War, as did the concepts of the laissez-faire liberal state and the civic ideologies and practices which drew upon liberal philosophy.

There are explanations which frame the decline of liberalism and the rise of Labour in terms of occupational shifts and proletarianisation. A number detail the structure and practices of working class organisations (2). Labour tended to recruit from among workers in large-scale industrial production and there are connections between internal plant relations and the social environment (3). Changes in attitude to unemployment has also been linked to location (4). Parkin argues that to vote Labour was 'a symbolic act of defiance' which thus required 'structural support from a wider society' (5). He also argues that 'class is a society, not a community phenomenon' (6). This

smothers local conflict under a blanket notion of environmental factors.

An analysis of transformative politics in mass urban society requires more than a material base in a locality. A broader analysis has been provided by Hall, Schwarz and Durham (7). They draw upon Gramsci's notion of 'passive revolution', a reordering of society from above, without mass participation, in order to stabilise it and forestall a threat from below (8). Gramsci relates the idea of 'passive revolution' to that of 'war of position', political struggles which are not overt military struggles and which occur in those societies where there is 'a proper relation between state and civil society'. He went on; 'the massive structures of modern democracies both as State organisations and as complexes of associations in civil society... constitute the permanent fortifications of the front in the war of position' (9). Hall and Schwarz apply this to the situation in Britain. Hall and Schwarz also employ concepts alien to Gramsci in their theoretical framework; 'corporate bias', 'new liberalism' and 'feminism'. In section (a) the reasons why their model has been selected as an appropriate one for a study of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, is outlined.

Section (b) is an account of the Woolwich 'Peace Arsenal' campaign. Prior to a thematic examination of the key elements of the campaign it is necessary to establish a clear understanding of the chronology of events and the priorities of the campaigners and their opponents. The campaign promised to undermine revolutionary discontent in Woolwich by providing work for those at the Arsenal, work for those who used the items produced there, and work for those reliant on the spending power of Arsenal workers. The campaign offered a vision of a regenerated pre-war-style community, and the opportunity to reduce the amount

spent on payments to the unemployed and on items required by the state. These factors, and the initial success of the campaign, were sufficient for it to secure a central role in the town. It involved the co-operation of members of all classes in respectable activity under the aegis of the artisanate. It thus aided the integration of the latter into the post-war constitution.

The focus in section (c) is specifically upon the campaign to build locomotives at the Arsenal. The workers were familiar with locomotive construction. Locomotives bridged the gap between munitions and non-munitions work, they could aid the national recovery, of which transport was an intrinsic part, and they symbolised a return to the certainties of the mid-nineteenth century, when Woolwich artisans were called 'Labour Aristocrats'. Locomotives were symbols of both study pre-war engineering and a new direction for state activity.

(a)

Mayer argues that there can be 'no comprehensive vision without recourse to organising generalisations and principles' (10). He offers a view of the period after the First World War which emphasises its continuity from the pre-war period. He suggests that there were connected post-First World War political crises across Europe which led to substantial political changes from which, with the exception of Russia, 'the forces of perseverance... the pan-European ancien regime' recovered. Workers were 'too weak and too well integrated into nation and society to resist impressment'. In England 'the governing classes... grafted industrial capitalism into social and cultural structures' and the country 'continued to be a nation of small shopkeepers'. Mayer's 'Marxist history from the top down... with the focus on the upper rather than the lower classes' is too diffuse and begs too many questions about the working class to be of great value to a study of the role of that class in the settlement.

Foster too has considered the success of the ruling class in Britain during the same period. He argues that the quiescence of the working class before the war was because the 'Labour Aristocrats' were bribed with the profits of empire (11). The war, unionisation, full employment and the Russian revolution left this system in disarray (12). After the war there were divisions within the ruling class which, the banking fraternity proposed, could be resolved by greater monopoly production. The 'classic example' that he cites of the growth of monopolies is that of the armaments industry (13). The ruling class also maintained its dominance through appeals to the public via the mass media; at one time the Ministry of Labour was giving out 1,000 articles a week to newspapers. In addition the ruling class selected key figures from the labour movement

to buttress its ideology (14). The leaders of the labour movement adopted the ruling class idea that it was important to win over public opinion and to marginalise extremists (15). Foster notes that there was a link between 'cultural identity on a locality basis' and the 'Labour Aristocracy' and the importance of 'the wartime creation of a locally rooted mass labour movement' (16). He also notes that the bribes were 'distributed locally' and that 'detailed local studies' are required. However it is not these ideas that are developed, but the concept of national 'blanket control through bureaucracy' which is insufficiently subtle for use in an analysis of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign (17).

Middlemas acknowledges the importance of the integration of the labour leaders to the recasting of bourgeois Britain, their new role in the constant brokerage which characterised the period from 1917 (18). He concentrates on the 'arts of public management' and reduces regional disparities to 'the middle class south east' and the 'derelict' remainder. Lloyd George, Middlemas argues, introduced a system in which decision making was a matter of collaboration between 'governing institutions', the government and the leaders of the employers and the unions. The Trades Union Congress became responsible for the maintenance of order in the union ranks. Middlemas does not state how decision makers were selected, how decisions were made or who set the agenda (19). He also pays insufficient attention to the influence of, and the hierarchies within, the civil service. It is widely accepted that the Treasury was an influential promoter of the idea that a balanced budget and a return to the gold standard would be a bulwark against economic catastrophe (20). There is some disagreement as to exactly when the Treasury became influential and how great its ascendancy was and whether its central concern was to build its own

empire or to administer efficiently (21). There is no serious qualification to the argument that it was of importance (22). The Treasury was particularly anxious to reduce the role of the Ministry of Munitions which was responsible for the alternative work at the Arsenal (23). At the Arsenal the Ministry of Munitions was associated with collaboration between unions and management. By contrast Middlemas positions the Ministry of Labour with its sympathetic attitude towards the unions, as central to the fostering of corporate bias and ignores the Treasury (24).

McKibbin argues that 'everything points to Labour's enduring ante-bellum character: continuity of leadership and personal at all levels, effective continuity of policy, and above all, continuity of organisation' (25). He also says 'the industrial disputes of the war, for example, were no worse than those which occurred immediately before it, and arose out of traditional grievances' (26). His central interest is in the Head office and the leadership. He frequently refers to 'the unions' meaning the leaders of the larger trade unions affiliated to the Labour Party. On its own McKibbin's is not an appropriate text for a study of a particular locality because the evidence from Samuel and Jones is that movement within the Labour Party did not radiate from the centre (27). Hinton too mentions the 'residential and community solidarities which played such a vital role in the emergence of labour's early twentieth century identity - arguably at least as important a role as workplace and occupation' (28).

McKibbin also marginalises important changes within the working-class during the war. The economic and social distances between the poorest and the artisan strata were narrowed (29). Wages and security of employment improved for the former, and the latter gained relatively little

except a reduction in working hours (30). Organised labour made substantial gains in terms of union recognition (31). Trade distinctions and apprenticeships were eroded (32). The growth of both the non-manual lower middle class and of work graded as 'semi-skilled', rendered the artisan less distinct. Between 1914 and 1919, the percentage of skilled workers in engineering dropped from 60% to 50% and down to 40% by 1926, whilst the percentage of semi-skilled workers rose from 20% to 30% and to 45% by 1926. Contemporary studies by the Chief of the Imperial General Staff, Henry Wilson; the Labour Party leader, Henderson; Fabian Beatrice Webb; senior civil servant Thomas Jones; and American academic Carter Goodrich, noted changes within the working class. The spate of publications with the titles, What the workers want, Labour in transition The new labour outlook and Fed up and full up bear witness to the discontent as do the reports about the activities of subversives that the Cabinet received (33). Labour politicians used the idea that there was chaos in order to counter it with their vision of sober, orderly socialism (34). Over the last seventy years the notion of post-war instability has been frequently reasserted (35). Engineers and ex-Servicemen were considered to be particularly vociferously truculent (36). Not only were there around 1,400 troops in Woolwich in April 1919 and at least as many engineers, there was also an active organisation especially for veterans who were employed in the Arsenal (37). The most recent account of industrial relations in this period, by Wrigley, accords with Hall and Schwarz's analysis that it was only following a reconstruction that the political settlement came to represent an unequivocal victory for the forces of constitutionalism (38). Wrigley argues that the government did not proceed through pragmatic adjustment, as those who stressed continuity propose, but through the deliberate crushing of direct action (39).

Hall, Durham and Schwarz, within a framework derived from Gramsci, synthesise the studies of specific aspects of the transformation of liberalism made by Hinton, McKibbin, Middlemas and Foster. They conclude that there was a 'recomposition of British society, politics and the state from the 1880s to the 1920s' which they call the 'crisis of liberalism (40). This was the means by which social relations were reconstituted 'reconstruction in the very moment of destruction' as Gramsci puts it. Following Foster and Middlemas, Hall and Schwarz propose that 'the architect of this transformation' was Lloyd George (41). His role, and that of other elected politicians, in regard to the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, is examined in Chapter 2 (a).

Hall and Schwarz also argue that 'internal administrative reform became a key mechanism for transforming the state' and that this was performed by 'state intellectuals informed by Fabian or new liberal ideals' (42). The role of the civil service is considered in 2 (b) and (c). Hall and Schwarz engage in a reappropriation of the Dangerfield thesis that 'the death of Liberal England' occurred 1910-1914 (43). However, their view also owes much to Dangerfield's opponents, who suggest that there was a rise of 'new liberalism'. Clarke and Morgan say that an intellectual elite provided an ideology of reform which was accepted by the Liberal leadership and a large number of working class voters. Before the First World War there was a decline in that which Clarke terms 'community politics', which were capable of uniting economically antagonistic groups around a common political cause. These were replaced by national, class, issues (44). Hall, Durham and Schwarz refer to the 'new liberals' as 'a group of highly gifted professional intellectuals with an ethical evolutionary body of thought which aimed to preserve individual liberty through greater state intervention.

They say that 'liberalism did not 'die' in the years between 1910 and 1914'. Rather there was a 'frenzied reconstruction of constitutional liberalism' which 'remained (for the most part) within the constitutional boundaries'. Schwarz and Durham add that MacDonald's constitutionalism owed much to the new liberals. This appears to follow Morgan's line more than Dangerfield's. Morgan holds that, by 1914, 'the new Liberalism had in large measure supplanted the old, a factor which in itself goes far to demolish the "Dangerfield thesis"' (45).

The importance that Schwarz and Hall grant to the civil service is evident from their description of the route from Victorian laissez faire to the new state where there were universal social rights for all citizens, rule via constitutionalism rather than force, and integrated union leaders and employers.

Challenges for reform from below [1] were first defined in public discourse by new liberal or Fabian social theorists, [2] taken up by progressive state administrators, reconstituted in a bureaucratic mould, installed as state policy [3] and at that point presented back to the people [4]. This was a process that lay at the very core of an administrative type of passive reform and led to the consolidation of statism (46).

In the case of the campaign for alternative work from 1903 the workers urged those who controlled the Arsenal to adapt it in order to ease unemployment (stage 1). Their argument was defined by Woolwich Labour mayor Gilbert Slater, later principle of Ruskin College, in a critique of the private arms trade published in 1905. A government committee under Arthur Henderson examined a refinement on this argument in 1907, the case for a great state production centre in Woolwich (stage 2). Hall refers to the Ministry of Munitions as 'the new powerhouse of state intervention' and Hinton calls those who ran it 'the administrative elite of

new Liberalism' (47). Officials at the Ministry of Munitions argued that the Arsenal could be efficiently used for peacetime production, they became in the words of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners 'commercial travellers on behalf of Woolwich Arsenal' (stage 3) (48). The workers then received a constitutionally safe version of their own ideas from the civil servants in the form of orders for railway locomotives (stage 4).

The role of the private armaments companies in relation to the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign is considered, in 2 (d), in the light of Hall and Schwarz's analysis. Despite the factual errors that Lowe and Dintenfass note, Schwarz describes Politics in Industrial Society as 'formidably well researched' and Hall and Schwarz endorse Middlemas's notion of corporate bias (49). Schwarz says that 'the British economy underwent a profound transformation... with a succession of mergers, takeovers and informal trade and cartel agreements' (50). Hall and Schwarz make the case that in the late nineteenth century 'the most significant in the political realignments [was] the recomposition of the capitalist class', due to 'the expansion of capitalist accumulation' (51). Schwarz adds that 'the state had two key areas of concern: the armaments industry and the railways' and that 'state guaranteed contracts ensured a steady source of super-profits' (52). Foster also notes the importance of the large armaments companies.

Hall and Schwarz also argue that the 'the drive of capital to break down the skills of the those workers strategically placed in the production process had crucial implications in the restructuring of the division of labour' and that the working class was 'remade' (53). During the period from the late nineteenth century until 1914 'different strands of "socialisms" appeared as organic expressions of proletarian experienced though this process was manifestly

uneven and heterogeneous' (54). There were other new forces, including a feminist movement, which broke the liberal system. All of them, Hall and Schwarz say, wished to reconstruct 'the forms and boundaries of the state' (55). Hall and Schwarz also say that 'a central feature of many of the emergent solutions was collectivism'. This was the theory that the state was required not merely to hold the ring within which individual interests competed, but to intervene (56). This was linked to 'a set of new claims upon the state by the unenfranchised masses, a new conception of citizenship' (57). One of these "socialisms" was Fabian socialism, which both had 'much in common' with new liberalism and was also 'reformist, bureaucratic, anti-democratic and illiberal'. It was 'deeply at odds with other socialist currents and with the spirit of self-activism' (58). In chapters 3 and 4 the significant elements of the Woolwich variation on socialism, its union orientation, and business and clerical influences, are explored, not in terms of its doctrinal position - which did not amount to a considerable body of thought - but through an examination of a specific example of its activity, the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign.

The need to focus on the concrete example of the campaign can be gauged by a comparison between Hall and Schwarz's generalisations, and events in Woolwich and Whitehall. The case for alternative work at the Arsenal did not proceed through the civil service as smoothly as implied in Hall and Schwarz's description of how the 'machinery of state began to be transformed' with the formation of particular ministries, and the use of scientific administration by civil servants such as Beveridge, Morant and Llewellyn Smith (who was seconded as Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Munitions, 1915-18). The campaigners recorded the efforts of the management to secure orders, and that, 'every effort is being prosecuted by Ministry officials to

substantially increase the programme of alternative work'. They received 'organised assistance' and thought the Director General, Factories, 'a straight man' who was 'virile and sympathetic'. However they also noted that the progress of the latter was blocked by opposition within Whitehall and that there were frequent disruptive changes within the Ministry of Munitions personnel (59).

Hall and Schwarz say that the 1889 Dock Strike was 'the first major sign of the organised workers' movement disengaging from the Liberal Party', but for Woolwich the closure of the Dockyards by the Liberal government in 1869 was of greater moment (60). Hall and Schwarz also argue that the Representation of the People Act, 1918, 'shaped the conditions which made possible the strategic reassertion of the absolute centrality of Parliament and constitutional politics', by providing for the resources for the emergence after 1926 of a new political language of citizenship (61). However Woolwich was famous for its constitutional politics long before 1926. There was individual membership of the Woolwich Labour Party (WLP) before the war and, on a visit in 1919, militant shop steward Arthur MacManus scathingly noted how people in Woolwich referred to themselves as citizens not as workers. In Woolwich the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (ASE), was, according to local Labour MP Snell, a 'respectable and deferential movement, whose members were as harmless as rabbits' (62). It was also a formative influence in the foundation of the WLP. On the Clyde the engineers were less deferential.

Hall and Schwarz marginalise the importance of faith and locality of those involved in labour politics. In the WLP, and in other local Labour parties, people's perceptions of why they joined was not because of the national programme but rather because of a specific local experience. Snell

stressed the need for 'a sense of vocation', wrote of his own 'confession of faith' when he joined a left-wing party and his later 'call of duty' to politics. He also mentioned the 'moral fervour and idealism' that Grinling, another WLP activist, derived from his early work at Toynbee Hall (63). When the WLP won 25 of the 36 seats on the town council 'it was fun' one contemporary recalls, 'a discourse which sounded like a revivalist sermon... the capitalist system and the Devil might have been interchangeable' (64). The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was developed from the experiences of those within the ASE, the WLP and nonconformity.

The campaigners experience of the state was unusual. Hall and Schwarz note how 'the labour movement, clearly, was an emergent organic social interest with which the state would have to deal'. In the Arsenal the state already dealt with the labour movement (65). A J P Taylor's remark that in 1914 a 'sensible law-abiding Englishman could pass through life and hardly notice the existence of the state' cannot be applied to residents of Woolwich (66). There was little else in Woolwich besides the Arsenal, the Dockyards and the Royal Military Academy. During the first decade of the nineteenth century the population around the Arsenal rose by 73% due to the Napoleonic Wars, then fell back only to rise when weapons were required for one of the 72 Victorian military campaigns (67). There were no major bourgeois employers in the locality until the twentieth century (68). Although Churchill, when Minister of Munitions, claimed that 'workers do not care very much whether they are working for the state or a private employer' there is evidence to the contrary (69). Hall and Schwarz's review of the main features of the arguments misses the particularities of the implementation of the transformation.

Writing about the Woolwich artisans Crossick says 'ideology only moves and survives if it is capable of making sense of the world in which those who share it live'. The values of the Woolwich artisans were not an external imposition but rather 'the drawing out in a changed situation of strands within a working class tradition' (70). It was through local experience of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, rather than through speeches, or the machinations of civil servants, that the transformation was realised.

Hall and Schwarz make no mention of Gramsci's conceptualisation of the way in which society requires the 'active consent' of its citizens. Everybody, Gramsci says, contributes to modifying the social environment in which he develops... Everyone is a legislator in the broadest sense of the concept, he continues to be a legislator, even if he accepts directives from others - if, as he carries them out he makes certain that others are carrying them out too, if having understood their spirit he propagates them (71)

Furthermore Gramsci argues that everybody constructs a belief system which derives from common assumptions and language. He calls this the 'commonsense' of society (72). People's views are created, and their consent gained, both in society and in 'private associations' (73). The post-war reconstruction involved new rules and new rulers, it was a dialectical process because, in order to be successful, the ideology of the settlement had to be in a Gramscian sense, a 'lived relation', that is it had to be rooted in the specific. Joan Smith argues during this period Britain was

still a 'local' society in the sense that each conurbation's industrial and social structure could have a profound influence on the political life of the town. Not until the late 1920/1930s were local differences overwhelmed... workers' beliefs develop in relation to the 'commonsense' of their towns as well

as their own class interests' (74).

Richard Hoggart proposes that the 'the core of working class attitudes' was a sense of the personal, the concrete, the local (75). Hobsbawm and Macintyre note how important within the conditions which gave rise to social movements was a sense of 'community feeling' and 'a variety of locally controlled institutions [which] bound the community together' (76). The cohesion felt within Woolwich was greater than the rest of London, claimed the local Labour newspaper, but it was 'civic pride' not class consciousness of the 'Little Moscow' variety (77).

Gramsci shows little interest in gender politics, but Hall and Schwarz include an analysis of 'popular and public concern over sexual matters' and the ways in which feminism activated 'new sources of contention and antagonism' (78). Hall and Schwarz's addition is of relevance because the status of the skilled men at the Arsenal relied on the subordination of women and this was challenged during the war.

Women were restricted by the military presence in the town and by the lack of jobs. Defence regulations, - the Contagious Diseases Acts which named Woolwich as a 'subjected district' and then, during the war regulation DORA 40D under which women who had VD and then had sex with a man in the forces could be gaoled - made women the object of military suspicion (79). In addition before the war there were few opportunities for paid work for women in Woolwich and many ASE members disapproved of their wives earning money (80). The construction of masculinity was central to the response of skilled men to mid-nineteenth century industrialisation and to new patterns of women's employment (81). Alexander concludes, from her examination of the rhetoric of skilled working men, that in their minds 'their status as father and heads of families was indelibly

associated with their independence through 'honourable' labour and property in 'skill' which identification with a trade gave them... masculine privilege was embedded in popular conceptions of both skilled labour and authority' (82).

Masculinity is linked to the concept of skill by Philips and Taylor who suggest that skill is 'often an ideological category imposed on certain types of work' and the 'sexualisation of skill' was a response to de-skilling of the work process (83). At the Arsenal skills were acquired through apprenticeships where by younger men copied older craftworkers. Thus workers were not dependent upon the employer for their skills but upon fellow workers. This was inexpensive for the state, as it had no need to provide specialised training staff and it could pay apprentices lower wages. Apprenticeships helped to bond the workforce together, a process enhanced by virtue of the fact that at the Arsenal once a man was trained he had little chance of promotion beyond foreman, itself an opportunity open to only a few. Arsenal workers could neither take their 'skills' elsewhere, as many were not recognised as 'skilled' beyond the confines of their own specialised Arsenal work, nor could they establish their own rival munitions works (84). They were tied to the Arsenal and their best hope for improvement was through reliance on their own collective resources. Joyce and Melling both argue that it was the erosion of their industrial skills and the continuation of their political privileges which helps to explain the 'quiescence' of artisans during the late Victorian period (85). The skilled men relied upon one another in matters of safety and they worked together; nobody could make a gun as enormous as 'the Woolwich Infant' on their own. Their activities extended outside the Arsenal into educational and recreational activities, which further bonded the men together and reinforced their

workplace hierarchies. This was the period when the post of shop steward was created in the Arsenal and as Durham and Schwarz say, 'in the formation and development of the shop stewards movement a masculinist model of socialism did perhaps restrict its own popularisation' (86).

From 1914 the skilled men's power base of skilled Arsenal work was threatened by dilution and then unemployment and the growth of 'semi-skilled' work. Segal notes; 'Male unemployment and the restructuring or dismantling of old industries created new crises in traditional patterns of male authority. Such disruption connects up with cultural struggles over the meaning of 'masculinity' (87). The ASE was prepared to admit men who had learned skilled trades during the war, and in 1926 semi- and unskilled men were admitted. Women were only allowed to join seventeen years later. The ASE, along with 32 other unions, was, after meeting the government in 1915, prepared to drop its restrictions on employment practices for the duration of the war. No women's unions were involved in the drawing up of this agreement. Women were paid the same rate as men if they were doing the same work. There were many disputes about the extent to which women were doing the same work as men (88). The strike led by the shop stewards during the war, which involved the most people, a quarter of a million workers, was about the substitution of women for men on non-war work (89).

Hinton stresses the importance of 'class consciousness at the grass roots' and the relationship between struggles over the dilution of skilled labour and consciousness (90). He argues that where craft privileges were intact in 1914 and were then arbitrarily and acutely attacked, there was the highest degree of militancy. Dilution at the Arsenal involved a rise in the number of women workers from almost none to over 23,000 in four years. The control exercised

by the Woolwich craftsmen allowed them 'to maintain a contemptuous superiority towards the less skilled' (91). Jeffreys, the historian of the engineers, suggests that after the war 'the dilutees ran, drifted or were eased out of the industry' (92). This smooths over the restructuring of gender relations and marginalises the lengths to which the ASE went to obtain agreements that employers would expel the new workers. Snell's contemporary account links work and masculinity in a more pertinent fashion. He said that employers used the threat of starvation to bring workers into line and that in order for a worker to gain a job he had 'to crawl on his belly so that his manhood was taken out of him and he became a sycophant' (93).

In Woolwich the skilled men dominated the inter-union 'All Grades' Committee (AGC) which masterminded the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign and which bound together people in Woolwich in a common identity arising from work at the Arsenal. They were central to the course, concerns and emphases of the campaign. It was they who formulated it as being state- and locality-orientated and also distant from London, socialists and direct action. As Hobsbawm says, it was the skilled male workers, 'trapped in their own sectionalism' who carried a 'strong tradition of working class consciousness' based within nineteenth-century industry into the post-war period (94).

Hall and Schwarz argue that 1880-1920 were 'the crucible years' for 'the major political forces of the 1980s' and that 'the neo-liberal resurgence today is testimony to the unfinished trajectory of the crisis' (95). In the 1980s, as during the time of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, there were government sales of state assets and there was an interest in the conversion of the armaments industries (96). In 1985 Labour MP Gordon Brown argued that 'the privatisation of defence work has been a major theme of the

Thatcher administration since 1979. The interests of national security have been subordinated to commercial gain' (97). Both were periods of high unemployment, induced deflation, technological change and government relief schemes. In the 1980s an important group of workers, coalminers, opposed the orthodox commodity economy which justified the destruction of community, jobs and skills on the grounds of 'efficiency'. The Woolwich workers also sought traditional employment within a locally-based community in the face of a government obsessed with inflation.

In his lengthy history of the Arsenal Brigadier Hogg gives the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign only a curt glancing blow and Trebilcock is dismissive of the post-Boer War campaign (98). In 1919 the Daily Telegraph suggested that the hard times experienced in Woolwich were, like the post Boer War depression in the town, 'inevitable' (99). Dr Thom argues that the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners went unheard as there was already an 'adequate supply' of goods from private industry. She also suggests that the principle body in the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, the trade unions' 'All Grades Committee' had no women members. To these minor inaccuracies she adds that 'it was obviously hopeless to switch to producing agricultural machinery, railway wagons and ambulances; the government did not have enough money to finance the turning of swords into ploughshares' (100). Even if the demise of the Arsenal was inevitable, and the fight against closure hopeless, this need not mean that the workers' plans should be ignored as we are not at the end of social evolution ourselves and, as Edward Thompson says, from lost causes we may discover insights (101).

Furthermore whilst,

the causes of Labour's failure to effect a more substantial transformation of British society are many and various. To show that alternatives were discussed and fought for is not to argue that,

given the circumstances of post [World] war [II] Britain, they were realistic. Such alternatives are of interest not because they might have created a different past, but because of their implications for our futures (102).

Hall and Schwarz, with reference to Middlemas, argue that the political stability created in the 1920s, with its rhetoric of collectivism, citizenship, efficiency and constitutionalism, lasted until the 1960s. The dominant feature of the new order were the 'governing institutions' of 'the corporate state' (103). Middlemas defines a 'governing institution' as 'a body which assumes functions devolved on it by government' and he refers to national organisations. To extend his concept to include the Board of Guardians and the Borough Council, bodies which took up and shaped the campaign for alternative work, would highlight that the settlement required resolution at all levels of society, and that the working class made a contribution to it.

(b)

The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign ran for four years from the summer of 1918. It rested upon the idea that orders for alternative work would be placed at the Arsenal if a rational case was presented by a well-established civic community. The seeds of the campaign were planted in the depression following the Boer War.

Although the Arsenal workers produced weapons for use abroad at the behest of the government, and there were soldiers who had fought in many parts of the globe in the town, there was a strong sense of locality in Woolwich. It was physically separated from other areas, being built between marshes and a river, with only 'indifferent' rail facilities (104). Despite the free ferry and the tram service, in 1907 the locals were 'dependent to a degree more than usual on finding employment in the district' (105). There were 5,000 soldiers in Woolwich at the height of the Boer War but the Arsenal was the major employer with 21,000. It employed far more people than most employers in London, which in the main lacked large-scale production (106). The remark that Woolwich, 'although peopled by Cockneys, stands apart from the metropolis... the people seem conscious of the separation' is echoed in many contemporary accounts (107). McKibbin suggests that the town 'had a social homogeneity akin to some of the mining divisions', which distinguished it from the rest of south London (108). The borough was also distinctive in that in 1903 it elected a Labour MP, and a Labour majority onto the town council. By 1906 there were Labour majorities on the council (WBC) and the Board of Guardians (WBG) and both the county councillors were Labour (109). Despite the limitations on the franchise 'the union man, with the prospect of a settled home, [such as a Woolwich artisan]

had the ballot in his hand' (110). Foster has argued that Labour in this period emphasised 'unionisation and union rates' and that these were 'intertwined with expectations of state legislation' (111). Certainly this was the case in Woolwich. One of the first moves of the labour council was to pay union rates, and to lobby the government for the provision of work. When, after the war, the secretary of the central group in the campaign for alternative work 'called on every worker to use his (sic) power at the ballot box', he was drawing on the pre-war success of Labour (112). In contrast to this the rest of the capital was as Tom Mann put it, 'the sphinx of Labour', in which it was difficult to mobilise and organise the migratory and industrially heterogeneous working class. This diversity was satirised in Shaw's Pygmalion (1912). Higgins, whose interest is 'the science of speech' claimed to be able to tell the part of London from which a speaker came, 'within two miles', by their accent.

To the prosperous Woolwich community the dismissals from the Arsenal after the Boer War were a disaster. 4,000 jobs were lost in 1902, another 3,000 before 1906. The workers demanded that the government place its orders for munitions at the Arsenal, rather than with private armaments firms. They also argued that it was efficient to maintain a skilled workforce at the Arsenal, making either munitions or non-munitions (113). This was an argument which built upon contemporary economic assumptions and was designed to maintain the distinctiveness of an elite within the workforce. As Gramsci points out;

to build up an organic and well-articulated skilled labour force in a factory... has never been easy... It would be uneconomic to allow the elements of an organic whole so laboriously built up to be dispersed... this limitation has always been at the origin of the formation of privileged labour aristocracies (114)

The post-Boer War demand for alternative work was taken up by local churches and civic figures (115). The WBC provided some work, encouraged emigration and established a committee on unemployment which organised conferences in 1903 and 1906. These were attended by religious, political and labour representatives (116). There were marches to London, mass public meetings, a petition to the King and meetings with the Secretary of State for War and the PM (117). The Chamber of Commerce, (WCC) the unions, friendly societies, co-operative society and Guardians were united in their interest in securing employment for the town. Through the provisions of the 1905 Unemployed Workmen's Act, a local Distress Committee was established (118). The Woolwich Distress Committee annual reports from 1905-12 all point to the significance of finding work for the Arsenal and call for 'the manufacture of the implements of peace', and no further discharges from the Arsenal.

The campaigners also repeatedly called for a government inquiry (119). In the two decades prior to 1907 there were six government inquiries into the role of the Arsenal so the workers were well used to this means of investigation. The petitions system of wage negotiation also involved the workers directly with central government. One of the committees, chaired by a civil servant, Murray, sat from 1905-07. It concluded that there need be only 10,000 jobs at the Arsenal in peacetime (120). Murray later joined the armaments company, Armstrongs. Whilst this committee was deliberating, the number of employees at the Arsenal was pruned and the people of Woolwich underwent severe hardship (121). In 1906, the Parliamentary Labour Party sent six MPs, including Henderson and Barnes (a former Arsenal engineer), to the Arsenal in 'with a view to making themselves acquainted with the idle machinery'. The Labour Party then pressed Haldane, the Minister at the War Office, to appoint a committee to inquire into the prospects of

alternative production. Local calls for work were bolstered by these parliamentary voices and a committee, chaired by Henderson, was established to consider the possibilities for alternative work.

Despite this co-operation with the national party the WLP remained distinctive because, unlike others on the left, it did not oppose military expenditure (122). In the years before the First World War the left was vociferously opposed to military expenditure and the WLP was isolated, particularly from the ILP (123). Local MPs, Labour and Conservative, often supported votes for armaments orders as this led to local work (124). In 1913 the TUC condemned the manufacture of arms and pledged to 'do everything possible to make war impossible', which implied that Woolwich would be without work (125). This did not lead Woolwich to form a community of interest with other munitions towns. J Tudor Walters, MP for Sheffield, a centre for private arms firms, was on the Henderson Committee. He was adept at gaining orders for Sheffield, as he boasted in August 1907, 'It is up to me to go to the War Office and the Admiralty and get the orders... Sheffield has obtained a higher proportion of them than ever before' (126). He also said that he got a seat on the Henderson Committee in order to look after the interests of Sheffield (127). Will Crooks, the Labour MP for Woolwich, found allies in the Labour MPs for the dockyard towns of Barrow and Chatham, but there was still a degree of rivalry which encouraged the post-war campaigners for alternative work to look closer to home for allies (128).

The evidence that the Henderson committee heard from Arsenal officials and workers and from local dignitaries was that the Arsenal could be efficiently adapted; 31 shops were capable of general work, and 43% of the machinery was idle and maintained by supervisors in a state

of readiness. However, the Chief Superintendent Ordnance Factories (CSOF) argued that it was inappropriate to use the Arsenal for non-munitions work and the Conservative mayor proposed that some of the Arsenal's land to be sold to the private sector (129). Both arguments were aired once again after the war. The Committee recognised that Woolwich was adversely affected 'in a more than ordinary degree' by reductions in orders for arms as, 'apart from the Royal Arsenal there are no other very considerable works in the immediate vicinity, and a rise in the tide of general commercial prosperity leaves Woolwich to a great extent untouched'. The Medical Officer of Health reported in 1907 that:

It is certain that very many persons have suffered in health and many have died as a result of poverty due to loss of work (130).

During the winter of 1908-09 there was, said the Labour paper, the Pioneer 'almost unparalleled distress from unemployment, the percentage of men out of work reported by the Board of Trade exceeding all past records'. A local employer, H J Furlong, set up a Soup and Bread Society whereby people purchased tickets for food and distributed them as they saw fit (131). Like the Murray Committee, the Henderson Committee rejected the idea of a 'great State manufacturing Department' and suggested instead that the Arsenal survive on a third of the state arms orders (132). Henderson proposed that the Arsenal be maintained as a reserve in case of war; that the Services place more orders at the Arsenal; and that, although it could be used to manufacture non-munitions items, it should not be used for this purpose. After the war an official at the Ministry of Munitions recorded that, 'absolutely nothing came of the labours of this committee' (133). Meanwhile, numbers at the Arsenal continued to fall and emigration continued (224). The cumulative effect of these committees and inquiries was to strengthen the idea that the state was of

central importance; that there was access to its decision-making processes. and that the private firms, at least before the war, had better access than the working class.

By 1910 the WLP had lost control on the council, lost its seats on the LCC and Crooks had lost his seat. The WLP split, the left joined the British Socialist Party leaving the right even more firmly in control (134). The conclusion that those who remained within the ranks of the WLP drew from this was that unity, rather than socialism, was of the greatest importance (135). The Arsenal was reduced to a core of skilled workers whilst there was high unemployment for others in the town.

During the pre-war period there was an active campaign in Woolwich for the extension of the franchise to women (136). Although it was not directly related to work at the Arsenal, it contributed to the restructuring of the community based on work at the Arsenal. The WLP sought to integrate the challenge within its own activities. There was some support for extra-legal action, Labour Councillor Newman claimed in 1907 that conditions in Woolwich were 'quite as bad as a state of slavery' and advocated following the example of civil disobedience as practised by the suffragettes. (137). The Pioneer condemned the government's treatment of suffragettes and the 1913 'Cat and Mouse' Act and published articles by Sylvia Pankhurst up until 1914. Charles Grinling was particularly supportive of the women's suffrage campaign and Crooks, supported the integration of women as voting citizens, as did the Conservative councillor, Ingram, and a financial backer of the Pioneer, Pethick Lawrence (138). Local Labour activists Crooks, Snell and Barefoot were unhappy at some of the suffrage activities and encouraged women to channel their energies into unions and electoral politics; areas over which the men had some control. Women workers

in Woolwich were, compared to the rest of London, exceptionally well unionised and of all the co-operative societies the Royal Arsenal Co-operative Society had one of the highest percentages of women members (139). In addition before and during the war there were women Labour councillors in Woolwich. Within a year of the extension of the franchise, 400 women had attended the first Labour Party women's social and there were 400 members of the Woolwich habitation of the Primrose League, most of them women (140). Grinling suggested that 'Woolwich public men and women for the most part began their experience and training in the life of the voluntary organisations' (141). In Woolwich the pre-war suffrage movement provided a training ground for civic life, the local militants did not set fire to any letterboxes, as occurred in Lewisham, or engage in revolutionary activity. They sold newspapers and held meetings and received qualified support from the WLP (142).

Before the war the Arsenal ASE was more concerned with the administration of benefits than it was in strikes or even pay negotiations. The union took on many friendly society functions, such as offering loans for house purchase, which enhanced its respectability (143). This encouraged caution and bound men to the union organisation (144). Young men were attracted because the union offered a route to better-paid parts of the trade, older men stayed for the benefits. Membership was encouraged in order to discourage non-union members from undercutting the union rate. Such activities showed the union to be respectable and if a member left he forfeited his entitlement to benefits. He had to rejoin and 'occupy a position in all respects as if he had never been a member', for, at the very least a probationary year (145). The bonds of craft solidarity were strengthened by the ties of insurance. Even after the pre-First World War Liberal welfare reforms which placed some of its

concerns in the hands of the state, help in times of unemployment was offered (146). The Unemployed Workmens Act (1905), the Workmens Compensation Act (1906), which explicitly excluded casual labourers, the introduction of state pensions (1908), and the National Insurance Act (1911) encouraged regular contributions and good behaviour as dismissal rendered one ineligible for insurance. The legislation was 'designed to benefit the respectable poor, to incorporate them into society' and, as such, did not undermine the position of the Arsenal ASE (147). There was better provision of benefits than in other unions (148). This emphasised, once again, the need for unity. This was reflected in the remark, made after the war, by the shop steward and WLP activist, Jack Sheppard: 'people who will not organise are not worth looking after... I do not stand to help those who constitute the biggest enemy - the unorganised mob' (149).

The workforce at the Arsenal increased fifteen-fold during the war, from 6,400 in 1914. The core of ASE members at the Arsenal maintained a degree of control during the war because they had considerable influence over both the dilution of labour and over the other major unions, the National Federation of Women Workers (NFWW), the Workers Union (WU) and the South Side Labour Protection League (LPL) (150). These latter three unions grew in membership during the war and tried to emulate the steadier ASE.

The NFWW, with ASE help, recruited 1,474 of the 27,000 women workers at the Arsenal. It owed much of its influence with the government to its ability to discipline dissident members. When members complained about the dangers to health of working with TNT it did not support them (151). Its scheme for patrols to keep women workers away from soldiers was adopted by the Metropolitan Police

(152). When there was a spontaneous march to Westminster of dismissed women workers it tried to marginalise the anger, not harness it (153). The NFWW, and the WU, both promoted the idea that women ought to leave their jobs after the war in order to allow men to work. In 1918 WU was the largest union in the country, with an eighth of its members, 15,000 people, in the Arsenal (154). The Divisional Organiser was Tom Macnamara, (1870-1919) a skilled worker who gave evidence to the Henderson committee and the post-war M^CKinnon Wood committee and was tutored in political thought by a local Liberal who became the first Labour Party councillor, E T Fennell. The WU had an unemployment scheme which encouraged solidarity - in that in order to benefit from a payoff a member had to stay in the union. It also discouraged militancy, in that a strike might have jeopardies funds. In this the WU mimicked the Arsenal ASE (155). The LPL was a general union in the Arsenal which also emulated the ASE. Its motto was 'defence not defiance' and it too prided itself on the benefits that it provided for its members rather than on its militancy (156). A number of its activists, Jackman, a turner who gave evidence to the Henderson committee, Gilder, Langham T H Thompson (the LPL President) and Harris (LPL secretary) were active in the campaign for alternative work (157). Although there was an instance when the ASE returned to work after their claim had been settled and before the labourers had got a rise, often the unions worked together before and during the war (158). The significance of this was that the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign rested on co-operation between all grades of workers and on respectable trade unionism.

In August 1918 a government committee, chaired by M^CKinnon Wood, was established to consider the post-war role of the Arsenal. In response to this, the issue of alternative work was raised in the Pioneer, and taken up by a joint

committee of the WCC and the Woolwich Labour and Trades Council (WL&TC). The Arsenal shop stewards established a sub-committee to campaign for alternative work. This became the 'All Grades' Committee, the central body in the campaign. At the time of the Armistice the workers favoured retention of the Arsenal, for munitions and non-munitions production, the private sector which was not based in Woolwich was largely in favour of a swift return to the pre-war version of the free market, and the government sought stability and was prepared to compromise with some labour demands to get it. A few days after the Armistice, workers dismissed from the Arsenal marched to Westminster to seek redress. The AGC met Addison, the Minister of Reconstruction, and received the assurance of a promise of alternative work, some of which was forthcoming (159). In December there was a General Election and further promises of work from Lloyd George, the PM who was returned to office as leader of a coalition.

The AGC argued that an experienced workforce had been assembled and housed in Woolwich (160). The Arsenal could do work which was beyond the scope of private firms (161). Alternative work could utilise the otherwise idle machinery which was in the Arsenal and that which the government owned and which was sited elsewhere (162). It would also mean that the skilled workforce was not scattered. If armaments production was not linked to making profits then there would be less incentive for armaments firms to promote war. Wartime controls were not a step towards socialism and peacetime state production was conceivable within a liberal framework. As the government had attracted people to Woolwich, and there was considerable damage to the town due to the war, unemployment, and the repair of the infrastructure should be a national responsibility (163). The AGC used evidence from the Board of Trade to contend that private output was being

restricted in order to to keep up prices, 'which is the cause of all labour troubles'. The use of the Arsenal 'to combat this evil is desirous in the Nation's interest'.

In January 1919 there was a mood of optimism amongst the campaigners; 'It was a first-class move when the representatives of the 'All Grades' movement got before Mr Lloyd George and told him straight to his face what they thought about the matter. The moment was opportune. Conversion was the fashion' (164). The enthusiasm was misplaced as during the same month, on the advice of Sir Eric Geddes, a businessman appointed to wartime posts in the Ministry of Munitions and the Admiralty, the War Cabinet decided that national factories could only produce goods for the state and then only if there were no private suppliers in competition (165). This effectively sealed the fate of the national factories (166). Though the Arsenal, Waltham Abbey and Enfield were kept under state control, from February 1919 the national factories began to be sold off. None, despite negotiations, were sold to the labour or co-operative movement. Local authorities were not allowed to purchase them and produce goods commercially (167).

The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was built up during 1919 on constitutional lines. The Arsenal men were neither soldiers, despite the military command of their workplace, nor, despite the wartime control of the Ministry of Munitions, were they civil servants. As workers they had not, in the tradition of Victorian public administration, internalised the spirit of servility, but neither were they prepared to strike for alternative work. Whilst they were prepared to utilise the disruption around them, a bakers strike in Woolwich in the summer of 1919 and more dramatic events elsewhere, they were not prepared to engage in such action (168). The remarks from the AGC secretary, that if

there was not work provided 'it was too much to expect good temper and good order to be maintained', and from the chair that, 'Woolwich was a colony that the government should hesitate to disturb' were more a warning of the difficulties of their policing role than a threat (169). They were indicative of the ethos of the core workers.

The AGC received support from Crooks (returned to the Commons in 1918), the council (WLP run after Spring 1919) and the Board of Guardians which had a Labour majority. Scoble who was on the AGC was a Guardian. Voce, the AGC chair, served on the National Industrial Conference, and Mills, the AGC secretary, was made an Alderman and then elected as an MP in 1920. In March 1919 there were 25,000 men and 2,000 women workers left at the Arsenal. The AGC decided to join forces with the Ministry of Labour Local Advisory Committee (LAC) and the Woolwich Chamber of Commerce (170). 3,000 people attended a public meeting with the local MPs, councillors and representatives of the AGC and the WCC (171). There was less enthusiasm from the ranks of those above the skilled men in the Arsenal hierarchy. The CSOF argued that whilst the Arsenal should be used for armaments work and whilst alternative work 'may be necessary... there is a good deal in the saying that the shoemaker should stick to his last'. The President of the Foremen's Association was also unenthusiastic. He thought that, although Arsenal workers could execute any kind of work 'as may answer to the national requirements... it does not appear as if the time has arrived when the sword may be beaten into a ploughshare' (172). A committee of representatives from the council, WCC and AGC was formed and the Joint Town Committee, (JTC) went to see the PM, the Minister of Supply, and Bonar Law (173). The JTC later met with Auckland Geddes, the chair of the Railway Executive Committee, Walker, and the Minister of Munitions, Lord Inverforth.

The JTC deputation told the PM about local unrest and how they had had difficulty 'in keeping the Arsenal employees away from Downing Street'. The PM said that 'unless Woolwich Arsenal was kept fully occupied it would be a national disaster'. He established a new committee, with civil servants and four members of the AGC, to discuss the prospects for alternative work. The campaigners thought that the M^CKinnon Wood Committee had been reduced to considering 'mere domestic reorganisation' at the Arsenal, while this new committee, set up with Prime Ministerial blessing would be influenced to a far larger degree by the workers (174). This was a relief to them for, although Woolwich West MP, Sir Kingsley Wood, claimed that the M^CKinnon Wood committee would produce a report which would aid the prospects for the Arsenal as he had friends on the committee, the Pioneer was sceptical of his powers (175). The impression that the M^CKinnon Wood Committee left on the Arsenal workers was that of business men 'determined to keep business in their own hands'. Wages were considered to be too high by Lord Marchamley, a member of the M^CKinnon Wood committee and formerly an MP connected with the Treasury (176).

In July 1919 the M^CKinnon Wood Committee reported that it favoured the retention of a state arsenal, ready for expansion in time of war, at Woolwich. It recommended that government orders be placed there, but that the stores be moved. M^CKinnon Wood recognised that there was a potential market for the items that could be produced at the Arsenal; that the Arsenal could be converted back to the production of munitions if an emergency arose and that the Arsenal did not have to pay shareholders a dividend, nor to bear the costs of advertising, interest on loans or insurance (177). The committee concluded that 'labour is most extravagantly used and inefficiently regulated' and that the overheads and initial conversion costs were expensive. The Arsenal

could be efficient in conventional economic terms, if there were large or long production runs (178). Two Labour MPs, William Adamson and Will Thorne, sat on the committee, and produced a minority report favouring alternative production. Adamson went on to serve on the Woolwich Advisory Committee which advised on the implementation of the M^CKinnon Wood proposals. In addition, he helped the Woolwich campaigners by arranging for them to meet Addison, accompanying them on delegations, and, at one time, visiting the PM three times in six weeks on behalf of the AGC (179).

Although the Treasury argued that the Arsenal was inefficiently laid out and badly managed, the Cabinet decided that equipment would be moved to Woolwich and goods for the state produced there (180). Montagu, Barnes, Milner, Roberts and Addison voted for the nationalisation of the mines in Cabinet in August 1919, a potential market for Arsenal products, but soon afterwards there were moves towards a return to gold, and a balanced budget (181). Governmental enquiries stretching over thirty years had drawn attention to some of the inadequacies of the site. The Engineer, 18th July 1919, echoed these when it drew attention to the lay out of the buildings, for 'no-one ever puts new muscles on an old skeleton', and there was another problem, 'to put it baldly, bad management'. The magazine went on, 'One cannot help feeling with regard to Woolwich Arsenal... that the very best thing that could happen to it would be for a devastating fire to consume it, lock, stock and barrel... Woolwich is hampered by many old buildings... Its regeneration is a matter of national importance' (182). As competition with the private sector was disallowed the Arsenal was denied economies based on horizontal and vertical integration. This restriction was rather vaguely worded so that all varieties of alternative work could, if it suited the private sector, be challenged, as the

Ministry of Munitions noted (183). It made finding appropriate alternative work a difficult task (184). Eventually the Arsenal produced items for the Post Office, the Indian Postal Service, Trinity House, the Anatolian railways, the Board of Trade and the Ministry of Food.

By the end of first year of the existence of the AGC, the number employed at the Arsenal had decreased by 50,000. The AGC had little to show for its meetings with the PM, Ministers and civil servants, its rallies and its attempts to raise the issue at a national level. There were three replies to its appeal to 'every national factory, every body of shop stewards' every trades council and every body of organised men in the country' to campaign to preserve the national factories. The AGC held 24 conferences and 75 ordinary meetings within the first 18 months of its existence (185). The AGC campaigned on the assumption that the workers were citizens whose grievances could be redressed within the emergent post war social order.

By September 1919 the idea that unemployment could be diminished by lobbying or that a Labour government would be elected and adapt the existing institutions looked less likely. There were 6,000 registered unemployed in the town. In the face of this the Woolwich United Trades Union Discharges Protest Committee (UTUDPC) was formed by disgruntled shop stewards, including Scoble of the AGC (186). It argued that, in the face of continued dismissals, the AGC had diluted the industrial and social interests of the workers by marginalising the links with workers in other national factories and concentrating on collaboration with representatives of business and civic interests. Although only one of the three skilled men on the AGC had voting rights, (the secretary and chair did not), and although 75% of the alternative work was for semi-skilled and unskilled workers, it was argued that the

AGC was dominated by skilled men (187). The immediate catalysts for the creation of the UTUDPC were that, whilst Jack Mills went to Glasgow for the TUC conference and the other two skilled men on the AGC went to the Midlands to learn about locomotive construction, 1,000 men were laid off. There was also the implementation of recommendations of the Nathan report on the Danger Buildings (DB). Following from the McKinnon Wood Committee, Sir Frederick Nathan had been asked to investigate the safety of the Arsenal. The conclusion was that it was dangerous to store high explosives close to London at the Arsenal and that, despite the excellent safety record and the experience of the workforce, the DB should close. The JTC had largely accepted this proposition. The AGC shop steward in the Danger Buildings refused to sign a petition for the CSOF protesting at the transfer of all the work of the Danger Buildings to Banbury. He supported the argument that the JTC worked for the DB men not by protecting their jobs but by arguing for alternative work. The stores were transferred in September 1919 (188). The UTUDPC argued that the DB workers had had few accidents, and could do civil work such as making materials for housing (189). Whilst the Danger Building were being run down, advertisements appeared inviting tenders for the breaking down of ammunition, which required the sort of special plant already in existence in the Arsenal (190). The AGC had fought to get other work for Woolwich rather than fighting the transfer itself. Although the division was so serious that the UTUDPC and the JTC sent separate delegations to the PM, unity was re-established in time for the inspection of the alternative work by the PM in November 1919 (191).

When the PM inspected the alternative work in November 1919 the AGC presented him with a copy of their 'The Case For Woolwich Arsenal' (192). A copy had been sent in advance

to him and a critique of it prepared by a Ministry of Munitions official (193). This stressed that the government already had a surplus of much of that which the plan proposed could be produced at the Arsenal and that there was a board trying to distribute surplus government property (194). The workers' representatives workers asked for a stoppage on discharges until after Christmas which the PM did not promise. By the end of 1919 there were 1,000 demobilised unemployed soldiers in the borough, a further 1,000 unemployed men who were not in receipt of the donation, around 1,100 women without paid work and about 400 unemployed youths.

Throughout 1920 the Woolwich Guardians, Council, Labour Party and Chamber of Commerce agreed that the opposition to the securing of more work for the town derived from particular private firms and from general government inefficiency. The 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners argued that the 'greatest thing they were up against was private interest' (195). The solution to unemployment was alternative work (196). The Labour mayor continued to preserve the distinction between soldiers, engineers and unskilled labourers and to refer to the unemployed as citizens of the community. He sought the common ground that existed between parties on the subject of unemployment. The WLP's election slogans referred to 'labour' and 'anti-labour' and 'community versus monopoly' and promised jobs rather than socialism (197). One of the slogans ran 'The Labour Party is not politics - it is life. Do you belong?' (198). The WLP's interest in gaining individual members, it was the best supported Constituency Labour Party in the country, led it to stress rational efficiency and to seek broadly acceptable policies (199). Organisation of wards, registration of voters and 'increased political representation' were central (200). The WLP chair declared that the 'main duty of the Labour

Party is to gain representation on all public bodies both local and Parliamentary and when in a majority to carry out administrative duties with efficiency' (201). Widespread concern about future employment prospects was directed, via the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, along the newly opened corridors of power. The WLP secretary Barefoot argued that there 'was an absence of real grip on the part of the government of the problem of organisation' and called for Labour control. His example of the case of private shippers holding up the delivery of materials for a road-building scheme in Woolwich was echoed in the Commons by Crooks (202). The AGC chair Voce also criticised governmental mismanagement. The 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners critique lent support to the Conservative town councillor who said that there was a need for 'every citizen to assist the government in order to get over the difficulty', as if the problems did not lie with the individual Coalition government politicians in office. Such arguments also paved the way for the WCC President to decry the 'unholy muddle' of government activity as if all government activity was inept and all economic activity was better in private hands (203).

The campaigners blamed unemployment in Woolwich upon specific foreign policy decisions. Sanctions against Russia and arms for Poland and the Empire, were a misallocation of much-needed resources (204). One of Woolwich's Labour county councillors, Haden Guest, argued 'we ought not to be fighting Russia: we ought to be helping, sending machinery and things which could be made at Woolwich Arsenal'. He wanted locomotives to be made for Russia and Britain (205). Woolwich, it was argued, could do with the orders for the goods that Russia required, or with the money spent on munitions for Poland. 'The situation would be Gilbertian if it were not tragic' suggested the Pioneer. Barefoot, put his hope in a

demonstration and supernatural forces to get those in power to change their ways, 'my call; he wrote 'is for a great rally... such as will put the fear of God into the hearts of even this government' (206).

In February 1920 a number of ex-Servicemen at the Arsenal were dismissed. They formed their own committee and tried to march to the Commons. They were beaten back on Westminster Bridge by the police. The AGC continued to meet the Minister and to press, with little results, for alternative work. The lack of progress was blamed, in the main, on officialdom and private enterprise, though some Ministry officials were praised.

In January 1919 the Ministry of Munitions became the Ministry of Supply under Lord Inverforth formerly Andrew Weir the private armaments manufacturer. Inverforth was not interested in business efficiency and although supportive of the Ministry in many ways, was anxious to resign his post (207). In April 1920 the closure of the Ministry was announced. The Ministry finally disappeared in 1921. The functions of the Ministry were divided amongst other Ministries (208). This caused some consternation in Woolwich;

it seems that the War Office and the Admiralty are merely the mouthpiece of the Armaments Ring: therefore the workers of Woolwich must see to it that Nationalisation of all production must be enforced and the means to do this is in their own hands. [It is through] Parliamentary election (209).

In June 1920 the War Office took over those parts of the Arsenal in which the alternative work was done and which had been run, since 1915, by the Ministry of Munitions. Bonar Law claimed that this would make no difference to the work, but the relationship between the campaigners and Ministry officials was undermined (210). The abolition of

the Ministries of Shipping, Food Information, National Service, and Reconstruction, had preceded the end of Munitions. As the role of the state was reduced the number of potential state purchasers of Arsenal products diminished. Hinton argues that whilst the ideas of the militant shop stewards movement were countered by Fabian and Labourist arguments, and the rise of managerial prerogative, the most decisive factor was decontrol. 'Decontrol effectively removed from the immediate political agenda all arguments about popular control of economic life' (211). During the war most firms had sub-contracted to the Arsenal but from this time the Arsenal was forced to subcontract to private firms (212).

In July the Pioneer held that the overall situation was not entirely gloomy but by October it reported that the jobs outlook was 'black' and that there might be a test to civilisation if things did not improve (213). There was a violent demonstration about jobs for Woolwich in Whitehall. The Woolwich mayor met the PM mentioned the capacity of Woolwich for alternative work and requested central government funds towards roadbuilding (214). Money for the latter was accepted by the WBC, though other Labour councils were more dubious of the offer to ease unemployment through public works (215). In November 1920 the government made it clear that whilst it was still searching for appropriate orders for the Arsenal, and sub-contracted work could be done, in order to reduce costs numbers at the Arsenal would have to be reduced (216). In December 1920 a Minister suggested that the alternative work was only a temporary measure and that some alternative work would take place at other national factories. Arguing within conventional economic parameters, Jack Mills MP, proposed bringing forward government work scheduled for 1922 and 1923. The council established an Unemployed Committee food parcels were distributed and £3,000 was

donated to the Mayor's Unemployment Fund. In January 1921 orders for guns for battleships went to the private sector, the Arsenal went on short-time, a much hated and, if the cost of overheads was included, uneconomic option. In addition a further 3,000 workers, 20% of the workforce, were laid off (217).

Throughout 1921 the local economic situation did not improve and the campaign made no gains. Short time was introduced at the Arsenal and workers were unemployed one week in six, from January 1921. Work was shared, and wages and union funds depressed during a period when, through the local rates, 5,000 unemployed had to be supported. The Pioneer saw short-time as a plot to 'smash the trade union rates and conditions'. It went on 'every man who realises the true import of the danger that is threatening the organised industrial community must constitute himself a missionary against short time' (218). The ex-Servicemen proposed that the idle machinery be used for an export drive. The skilled men referred the matter to the JTC, which wrote to various Ministers and the TUC. The National Union of General Workers, (which included the LPL and NFWW) joined the WU, in inviting the engineers to join in an 'all-together-movement', so that 'their front was solid against the Cabinet'. The Amalgamated Engineering Union, (which included the ASE), joined as did a number of other unions, and an all-together-movement' deputation met the PM and War Office officials. The single issue unity was not being lost as the focus was on alternative work and the same individuals were involved (219). In November 1921 the government agreed to guarantee fully bills on goods exported to Europe, except, significantly for Woolwich, armaments and products destined for Russia. Barefoot argued that peace with Russia could bring 8,000 jobs to Woolwich and the WLP supported both the local Council of Action and the demonstration in favour of peace (220).

In 1922 the number of workers at the Arsenal dropped to below the pre-war figure and no more orders for non-munitions work were placed there (221). The Pioneer nearly collapsed under enormous debts and the WLP, the unions, the organised unemployed and the WCC formed a new Town Committee. This aimed to gain Services' orders for the Arsenal and to attract private firms to Woolwich. The Combined Shops Stewards' Committee, dissatisfied with the Town Committee, called a conference for MPs and Ministers but the venture failed. The government announced that there would be a minimum of 8,000 Arsenal workers, this figure was later reduced to 6,000. Some MPs suggested that parts of the Arsenal be sold to private firms. A number of private firms tried to use the Arsenal for work which could not be done in their workshops during the lock-out of the AEU. Just as in 1897, during the ASE lockout, the Arsenal was not directly involved in the significant struggle between the union and the EEF. Arsenal workers boycotted the work but the AEU nationally was defeated. In 1922, and again the following year, wages were cut, short time was maintained and more workers were dismissed. Alternative work was not required to subsidise the private sector during the post-war dislocation, nor was it required to fulfil demand as there was a recession, nor was it needed to break strikes or make weapons for use during domestic social unrest. A former Labour mayor of Woolwich argued that,

Leading opinion in Woolwich is now clear. The demand for alternative work is not practical politics at present. War Office and Treasury officials don't like it... Further, now that all private engineering firms are so badly off for demand, this is the wrong time for Government establishments to compete in the open market (222).

An offshoot of the McKinnon Wood Committee, the Stevenson Committee, had been considering the fate of the Arsenal and was the last, tiny, hope for the alternative work

proponents. In 1923 it was disbanded. Woolwich was by then the key factory retained by the state after the war but there was no further alternative production there and the numbers employed had been reduced by a factor of more than ten.

The campaigners approached their activity as if alternative work could be introduced without any major political repercussions; as if it was a goal that responsible men could reasonably attain. This method diffused the potential for other approaches and sanctified the procedures that the campaigners endorsed. The form of the campaign allowed the campaigners to be admitted to the corridors of power in Whitehall and Westminster. Once there they found that, by the criteria that they had accepted, it was legitimate for the doors to be slammed in their faces on the grounds that, as Slater put it, 'this is the wrong time'.

(c)

Hall and Schwarz argue that the recomposition of the state took the form it did because new liberals reconstituted challenges from below in a bureaucratic mould (223). 'The defining feature of a passive transformation' say Hall and Schwarz 'is the success of the dominant groups in maximizing the exclusion of the masses from determining political affairs and the reconstruction of the state' (224). This, they say, favours 'those elements which contribute to restoration and continuity'. An examination of a specific aspect of the campaign for alternative work clarifies how this occurred. The challenge came from Woolwich, the people of Woolwich were excluded, and then the 'organic state intellectuals' who had taken up their challenge were ousted from power and the campaign for locomotive production collapsed (225).

The campaign to secure orders for locomotives for the Arsenal was part of a broader movement for the utilisation of the national factories. Other factories were either shut down or converted with few problems. In America the state factories were closed, and private companies reconverted their factories. In France the *Ministere de l'Armement et des Fabrications de Guerre* became the *Ministere de Reconstruction Industrielle* and the national factories were used for the production of such items as door and windows (226). In Britain for private firms, such as the local saw millers J Watt Torence, packing casemakers of Woolwich, conversion was fairly straightforward (227). In the case of the national factories, the government was unwilling to maintain them in the state sector. Concern was expressed about popular attitudes towards them by Sir Stephenson Kent, 'a businessman [who] naturally favoured the ending of controls' (228). He was the director of six

companies and a prominent shareholder in Vickers (229). He was also the head of the Ministry's labour department and on the Munitions Council. In December 1918 he said that of the current 'dangerous state of affairs' that
the principle trouble was deputations of disgruntled munition workers... The chief grievance of these workers was that no consideration had been given to their claim for turning munitions factories into peace factories.

On another occasion he noted that workers preferred working for the state and 'protest with vigour against being turned out of government employment when a demand exists for which the National Factories... could be well adapted' (230). Thomas Jones, the secretary to the Cabinet, told Lloyd George that popular unrest was being caused by 'rumours [that] the surplus factories and stores of the government are being handed over at ridiculously low prices to the profit makers' (231). The closure of the second largest government-run plant, the Slough Government Motor Transport Depot, led to industrial disturbances including the establishment of workers 'soviets' (232). There was also 'labour trouble' at the National Factory at Richborough, Kent, with its 'wastes of rotting war material' (233). Richborough, which was run by the War Office, was proposed as a suitable site for the repair work, as the GER could not get repairs done privately, but this was not allowed by the government (234). In Coventry and Newcastle former shop stewards in the munitions industry demanded conversion (235). Trade councils, unions and the Scottish TUC took up the issue (236).

In January 1919, at the National Aircraft Factory, Waddon, the shop stewards produced 'A scheme for the better utilisation of National Aircraft Factories, particularly the factory at Waddon'. These workers forged links with the the National Aero Engine Factory shop stewards at Hayes and the shop stewards at the National Aircraft

Factory, Aintree. The workers were told that the government had not yet come to a decision about state aircraft production (237). There was a campaign for peacetime non-munitions work at the Waltham Abbey Gunpowder Factory and the Enfield Royal Small Arms Factory, which were run as one unit (238). The Conservative MP for Enfield argued for alternative work stating that 'I cannot see why it is any more socialistic to make them than it is to make guns and rifles' (239).

There was a joint march and rally of munition workers, addressed by Arsenal shop stewards in London immediately before the 1918 General Election. Although the workers wanted, and received, orders for tractors, dairy appliances, motor vehicles, coins, medals, house building materials there was considerable interest in locomotive construction because locomotives were already repaired and used at the Arsenal and because locomotive production was prestigious and required skilled work. Locomotives could be used to nurture the craft tradition. The manufacture of doors, which also occurred at the Arsenal, had not the same emotive appeal. Firstly the appeal of locomotives will be outlined and then the extent to which they were 'defined in public discourse by new liberals... taken up by progressive state administrators' will be examined (240).

The verities of the Victorian era were embodied in railways. When Lloyd George sought a way in which to disparage the Russian revolution he fixed on the fact that the Russians could not repair locomotives with the doctrines of Karl Marx (241). The construction of steam locomotives was a prestigious skilled, male, task. Whatever alterations the war had brought in terms of the dilution of skilled work, this was a relatively unscathed area. British locomotives in the nineteenth century were hand built for the most part, precision made and

superlative examples of engineering quality. As such they were a metonym for the certainties of mid-Victorian masculine skills. Hamilton Ellis expressed the consensus view about Victorian locomotive engineers when he wrote that 'it is probable that in no other profession of the mechanical arts did a man, who has risen to the top, enjoy such nearly absolute power' (242). Typically a manager of a railway company 'knew little or nothing about technology and was the servant of the board in law and of the engineer in fact' (243).

In 1907 there were 68 steam locomotive engines and over 1,200 wagons in use at the Arsenal. It was with some confidence that, in evidence to the Henderson committee of that year, engineers said that they were able to rebuild a locomotive from its nameplate upwards. Some Arsenal workers had been railway engineers, a group who constituted 16% of all engineers in 1907. Amongst them was one of the workers who gave evidence to the Henderson Committee and who argued that locomotives could be built in the Arsenal. He was supported in this claim by the superintendent of the Royal Carriage Department, the CSOF and the mayor of Woolwich (244). All gave evidence that locomotives could be made at the Arsenal. Similar remarks were made to the M^CKinnon Wood committee. This claim was echoed outside the Arsenal as J A Cole noted, recalling the wartime period in his autobiography, 'the world looked to us [Woolwich] ,for guns and locomotives' (245). When Jack Mills addressed the TUC about productivity he focused upon
the derelict engines at Derby waiting to
be repaired, cargoes waiting for
locomotives, food rotting for lack of
transport power (246).

This familiarity was emphasised by the Pioneer in January 1919

Peace work was no new shibboleth for Woolwich workers... the Henderson Committee and its Report, the products of the labour movement, crystallised the

arguments of those who had been seeking
the welfare of Woolwich

To call for locomotives work was to follow a pre-war track.

The locomotives symbolised the idealised world of the labour aristocracy, which the engineers aimed once more to inhabit. The growth of their union in Woolwich Arsenal coincided with, and was linked to, the development of locomotives. Railways embodied progress for the working classes. Chartism, Fergus O'Connor declared was the first carriage behind the locomotive. John Stuart Mill wrote how railways, 'the more visible fruits of scientific progress... carry the feeling of admiration for modern, and disrespect for ancient times, down even to the most uneducated classes'. In 1851 the ASE, the union for those whom Marx termed the 'superior class of workmen', was formed. Its insignia depicted Peace, Unity and Industry, the latter denoted by a locomotive (247). The union had 175,400 members in 1914 and eight branches at the Arsenal. Over the same period the Royal Arsenal Railway was developed within the Arsenal until by the end of the First World War there was 120 miles of standard gauge track and a considerable amount of narrow gauge as well (248).

Richard Price argues that much nineteenth century radicalism was rooted in an artisanal vision of a golden age of self-governing communities. In the mid-Victorian period workers accepted a large degree of subordination within society but enjoyed a large measure of self-determination in production. This accommodation was a blend of respectability, localism, workplace ritual and deference (249). The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was in part an attempt to reduce workers' insecurity by a return to a Victorian world of locomotives. Rubin portrays the ASE nationally in a similar way. He suggests that Lloyd George's

aim was not simply to restore a pre-war

status quo. It was to mould a new realism in collective bargaining in respect to which trade unions would have no need to be defensive. [However] major unions, especially the engineers [made] a vain attempt to hold the line (250).

During the war technical changes in working practices were introduced for the production of munitions. Some of these alterations had to be maintained as George Barnes recognised 'some aspects of the matter which could not be restored. They could not eliminate knowledge' (251). Some changes could not be adapted to non-weapons production, and this was a further inducement to produce locomotives (252).

Hinton defines three principles of craft tradition as exclusiveness, craft control and local autonomy (253). In the locomotives there was an opportunity to nurture these ideals. As locomotives were expensive they were frequently repaired rather than scrapped. There was a large degree of local autonomy in the way that repairs were undertaken (254). The work was exclusive because locomotives were associated with the a masculine artisan world (255). Certain types of work, Walby argues, 'provide its practitioners with a reinforcement of their masculinity' (256). Rose suggests that, 'the connections between masculinity and working class respectability contributed to a working class divided upon occupational lines' (257). If the Arsenal no longer produced munitions, there was less need for the women dilutees to compete with the men for work. To construct locomotives was not a challenge to the economic and social power structure. As Jack Mills put it, 'I have yet to learn that there is one economic law for wagons and another for munitions' (258). Rather Locomotives could be used to maintain the respectability and exclusivity of the artisans. Ramsay MacDonald told a crowd in Woolwich

when swords will be beaten into pruning-hooks, I want the machines of the

Arsenal to be making the pruning-hooks. When the time comes for the gun carriage to be scrapped, I want the railway carriage to be made in its stead... If in time the machines at Woolwich cease to make things that are necessary whilst men and nations are mad, I want the machines to be turned by the same skilled hands to make things that the nation and men will use when the nation and men become sane (my emphasis) (259).

That a civil servant who aided the campaign for locomotive work was praised as 'virile' is indicative of the perceptions of the campaigners. Hinton argues that 'central to any understanding of the shop stewards' movement is the fact that it was a movement of craft workers who felt their traditionally privileged position within the working class to be under the most severe pressure' (260). The campaign for orders for locomotives exemplifies this.

The case for state locomotive manufacture was taken up during the 1918 election campaign. Lloyd George promised rail nationalisation and also that an order for 500 locomotives would be placed at the Arsenal. He said that there was a need to regenerate rural life through the extension of the rail network, 'and that was where Woolwich Arsenal might be used to an extent that it has never been used before'. He went on to say that 'it would be a very grave national disaster if Woolwich were not used to its fullest capacity for the work for peace' (261). Churchill argued for the state control of transportation and specifically promised rail nationalisation. He said it was government policy even though it was not (262). Making a virtue out of a necessity he claimed, 'We are doing our utmost to develop alternative industrial production as a stop gap pending the transition from war to peace industry' (263). He promised an order for the Arsenal of 1,000 locomotives and 30,000 or 40,000 wagons if private

enterprise was not forthcoming in placing orders. He also promised the Arsenal orders for Local Government Board equipment (264).

The efficient manufacture of locomotives at the Arsenal buttressed the case for the continuation of a Ministry, called either Munitions or Supply, to oversee production. The Ministry of Munitions favoured orders for locomotives being placed at the Arsenal. It received estimates as to the cost of 100 2-6-0 locomotives from Vickers, Beardsmore, SER and Armstrongs. The estimate for Arsenal locomotives was cheaper. The Ministry argued that placing orders would improve the Ministry's negotiating position in regard to the liquidation of its assets and would generally stimulate production and thus there would be national benefits.

Furthermore

in view of the probable great expansion of railways all over Europe, Africa, Asia and South America that it is necessary to organise immediately adequate sources of supply to meet the demands...immediate government action... is necessary to legislate for unemployment and secondly because it will be too late to start...when the buyers are ready to place their orders. America is now ready to cope (265).

As the Pioneer pointed out no locomotives had been made for five years and as 2,000 had been blown up in France orders from the dependencies alone would be sufficient to keep the Arsenal going for five years (266).

Although the Ministry noted that there were no firm purchasers or price, but argued that this point was 'not legitimate' as the necessity of stopping unemployment overrode it and official approval would encourage buyers to place orders. The locomotive trade claimed that there was not an appropriate workforce available but the Ministry countered this by noting that soon former employees would

be out of the Forces and that former Ordnance workers could be employed. There was no suggestion that ordnance workers could not build locomotives. However the Ministry official, formerly of Beardmores, V B Stewart did venture the opinion that

I think the real reason is that the locomotive trade which is an old and extremely conservative one hesitates to employ the class of labour employed in the Ordnance work.

As the Arsenal could only produce items for the state, the nationalisation of the railways was of importance the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign. There had been interest in state control of the railways from 1840 when the railway board of the Board of Trade was established. In 1844 the chair of a committee on railways, Gladstone, suggested that 'state purchase of railways was possible in the future' (267). There was provision for state purchase under the Cheap Trains Act of that year (268). Furthermore railway companies were regarded organisations akin to modern day public utilities. David Eversley writing about the Great Western Railway argues that, 'by 1885 railways were an institution and a public service. Trains might be more or less full but they would run, since the public expected it' (269). From the 1890s the length of the working day on the railways, their charges, their industrial relations and their amalgamations were regulated by the state (270). Lloyd George and Churchill voiced their support for railway nationalisation in The Nation 7th March 1908 (271). The General Manager of the North Eastern Railway Co called for state ownership in an address to the Royal Economic Society in 1908 (272). The Times agreed in 1912, 'the railway system undoubtedly ought to be under the control of the state' (273). The Railway Companies' Association opined that 'the future of the great Corporations will lie more and more in the Government offices' (274). During the war

the Railway Executive Committee, chaired by the President of the Board of Trade, ran the railways and after the war control was extended until August 1921.

Of the 1918 General Election campaign the chair of the South Eastern Railways, SER, Managing Committee told his board that 'railway shareholders had nothing to fear' and they 'must always take the remarks of a gentleman who was standing for Parliament with a pinch of salt' (275). However Armitage, in a study of the post-war settlement, argues that the promise was no political chimera but rather that 'a consensus for rail nationalisation existed in 1919' (276). When the Ministry of Transport was established control of electricity was tacked on in the belief that the railways would soon be electrified (277). Eric Geddes, formerly of North Eastern Railway Co, and first Minister of Transport said 'unified control was essential to transportation' and did not rule out nationalisation (278). In the Cabinet Eric Geddes, argued that state production was economical (279). He said that as there were a lot of wagons requiring repairs, the rates proposed by the private sector for such work were high and the actual work was 'not a very difficult thing' wagon building, by and for the state was 'probably the best thing to do' (280). Although the repair of coal wagons kept both mineworkers and Arsenal workers in employment it provoked alarm in the Commons (281).

Even if the railways were not nationalised there was a widespread understanding that railways were a vital aspect both of the war effort and the civilian economy and as such were a legitimate concern of any government. By blurring the distinction between munitions and non-munitions, the Ministry could bridge the gap between that which constituted legitimate work for the state and that which was the province of the private sector. As locomotives

were associated with warfare, this increased their acceptability as items appropriate for the state Arsenal to produce. Following the innovative use of rail during the 1871 Franco-Prussian War the Regulation of the Forces Act was passed, the Railway War Council established (1876) and locomotives became an integral part of internal and external state security plans. The 10th (Railway) Company Royal Engineers were stationed in Woolwich which was a principal supply and ordnance depot for the defence of London. In 1907 the Henderson Committee concluded that railways are an increasingly important feature of modern warfare. That being so the manufacture of railway stores becomes a proper class of work to be undertaken at the Royal Arsenal. We think the War and India Offices should be encouraged to place some portion of their orders for these stores with the Woolwich factories

During the war the High Court made it clear that railway repair work was in law and fact munitions work and the Ministry of Munitions maintained a liaison officer to deal with the railway companies (282).

These arguments carried less weight in the face of the economic recovery of political and economic stability. Recovery was aided by the government which paid £60 million to the railway directors for wear and tear incurred to the railways during the war (283). As private sector grew in confidence and the number of workers at the Arsenal was reduced, so the order for Woolwich locomotives was reduced. It became 100 in April 1919 and then the plan was to build one locomotive by the summer and two a week after that. Twice, and with no discernible effect, the shop stewards visited the Minister of Munitions, Kellaway, in order to secure further orders for locomotives. The JTC visited Bonar Law who promised orders for 2,000 wagons and 100 locomotives. However, it was a private company, Elswick Ordnance, which received a government order for 50

locomotives, whilst a private shell factory was refitted for railway work. Only in June 1919 was finance for the construction of any locomotives in Woolwich found (284). The SER expressed interest in purchasing the locomotives in July 1919 (285).

Some rail companies requested that the Arsenal be used for their repair work and ordered wagons from the Arsenal in 1919 and 1920. 500 wagons were repaired for the GWR in 1919 and 500 sold to the company in 1920. 2,000 wagons were repaired and another 2,000 made for the NER during the same period (286). Also some GER engines were repaired at the Arsenal (287). Repairs to wagons in the Ministry of Munitions pool were also undertaken (288). In July 1919 the Cabinet decided to maintain the pool (289).

Immediately after the war there were few profits in locomotive construction (290). The Times claimed there was a shortage of wagons and that truck builders were without orders not because of shortages of materials but rather because private railway companies did not wish to invest in fixed capital goods in case they were nationalised and thus there was not a demand for wagons (291). The number of steam locomotives being exported fell during the war and did not pick up again during the post war 'boom'. In 1913 the 141,685 tons worth were exported, at a value of £7992,000. The return to the employer was £56.4 per ton. In 1919 only 52,781 tons worth (37% of the pre-war figure) were exported at a value per ton of £105.6. By 1920 the value per ton was £138.6 and in 1921 it was £164.7 (a 16% rise) whilst the weight (which indicates the numbers employed) only grew from 73,694 to 77,458 tons (a 5% rise). Manufacturers could sell fewer locomotives for a greater profit and in a such a situation it was in their interests to halt production at Woolwich (292).

After the initial post-war dislocation was over there was an increase in interest in orders for railway wagons, and not all civil servants were supportive of the case for production in Woolwich. The government had over 2,200 wagons in its possession by June 1919, but there was, said the Ministry of Transport, still a shortage of 200,000 wagons. Woolwich was required to build them as private firms 'cannot possibly overtake the shortage'. Indeed when three became surplus in August 1919 there were swift enquiries as to their future from a private firm (293). However the controller of the Railway Materials Department counted 23 firms which between could produce 1,890 wagons per week. These companies were 'none too well off for work and could give early deliveries. It would appear from this that they should be given a chance of tendering for the order for wagons, it is proposed to place with Woolwich'. The Director General, Purchases, felt that it 'would be a distinct advantage if Railway Companies would relieve the Department of [Surplus] wagons before we start out and build new ones - at Woolwich'.

Interested parties from industry complained to the Ministry of Munitions and they put the case for wagon orders to go to the private sector. The British Commonwealth Union, the FBI and other representatives of trade and industry in total almost fifty of them, held a meeting to discuss and then to repudiate, Geddes' statement of support for state wagon production (294). The chair of the Metropolitan Carriage and Wagon Co, Dudley Docker, claimed the company could undercut the Arsenal prices but this was only after the latter were announced and the company also complained about Woolwich being used as a locomotive construction centre (295). The private companies also said that the production of wagons at the Arsenal was unfair to traders, was injurious to national interests and a repudiation of the promise not to allow the state to compete with the

private sector. A deputation from the private companies was formed and went to Bonar Law (296). The railway wagon builders demanded an inquiry (297). The Minister of Munitions was lobbied by the Railway Carriage and Wagon Builders and Financiers Parliamentary Association (298). In response in July 1919, the Director General, Factories, (DGF) Johnson, argued that Woolwich could 'efficiently economically and promptly' do railway wagon repair work (299). The government requirement for wagons was fulfilled at a lower cost than if the orders had gone to the private sector. This argument was a difficult one to make as the Cabinet had made it clear that Woolwich was not to undermine the prices of the private sector, nor to exceed the boundaries as to what constituted legitimate work for government establishments (300). Johnson also argued that the railway work kept the workforce located in the same area in case they were swiftly required in the event of national emergencies.

During the war some 2-8-0s, designed by J G Robinson, were built at government expense, for about £6,000 each. After the war consideration was given to building more Robinson 2-8-0s at the Arsenal, but as the government had difficulty in disposing of those that it owned, (as well as over 11,000 wagons), the idea was rejected. Instead the Maunsell 2-6-0 Class N design was accepted (301). Eventually in November 1919, just before the visit of the PM, work on the Arsenal locomotives commenced. In December 1919 Given of the Ministry of Munitions stated that 'it is obviously impossible to turn the whole Arsenal over to such work [as locomotives] and it is premature to forecast the extent of the new department. But no time will be lost in pressing on with the work' (302). By the end of 1921 although over £72,000 worth of work on the locomotives had been done at the Arsenal, there were only 13 completed locomotives. 12 other locomotives were complete except for

tenders, 52 boilers were finished, all the wheels were cast and the materials had been supplied. As Robert Campbell a member of the ASE and a Woolwich Municipal Reform councillor said, in January 1921, the Woolwich locomotives were very expensive (303). In addition over £255,300 worth of work for railway companies had been completed.

Once the threat of industrial conflict had subsided and profitmaking appeared to be more assured, there was intense press and private sector hostility to state management of the railways. The specialist The Railway and Travel Monthly compared trade unionists to 'Huns', claimed that the state management of the railways during the war led to chaos and inefficiency and derided the scheme to build locomotives at the Arsenal as 'hare brained'. It pointed to the 'ghastly failures of the Metropolitan Water Board and Government telephones' as evidence of the inefficiency of nationalisation. Telephone parts were another alternative product made at the Arsenal (304). The Evening Standard emphasised the dangers of state production of wagons and locomotives and several times clarified that it was clearly not policy that production should be permanent, and that it was merely temporary (305). It argued that 'it can hardly be expected of a government that it will give Woolwich work to do unless it it can do it at least as economically and as well as any other town' and 'there is no greater need than national economy' (306). The idea that the national factories could do experimental work, was an example of 'complete confusion' by Labour men as the state should not provide work 'for the mere sake of providing employment' (307). In December 1919 the Stock Exchange Gazette thought the government was in danger of altering its policy of non-competition and that such a change to a 'Socialistic experiment' would mean that 'a deadly blow will have been struck at that spirit of private enterprize (sic) which the Prime Minister has just told the

Nation is the key to our commercial stability and progress' (308).

It soon became difficult for the Ministry to prove efficiency in its sales ability. The Ministry tried to sell the Arsenal locomotives to the dominions and colonies, 'an easy market' according to one specialist magazine. However it was in competition with Armstrongs which received favourable terms for establishing a locomotive manufacturing company in India (309). Poland, which had lost 48% of its locomotives, wanted rolling stock and locomotives, as did Finland, but they could only offer sugar and timber in exchange (310). In addition in May 1920 there was a strike in support of the Bolsheviks in the London Docks when the government attempted to aid the Polish struggle against Russia. This hampered the prospects of fulfilling further orders for Poland (311). In April 1919 the government acceded to a request from the the Czechoslovak government for locomotive engines, tenders and spare parts, but these sales were to an impoverished nation and little more by way of orders could be expected (312). By contrast in February 1921 Armstrong Whitworth received orders to repair large numbers of Russian locomotives, twenty a month for several years (313).

1922 was 'the first orderly year which Great Britain had known since the outbreak of war', according to A J P Taylor (314). In May 1922 45 of the 100 Woolwich locomotives were complete, at a cost of £16,000 each. The highest price paid for a commercially constructed locomotive during the period of highest demand and shortage of 1919-20 was £12,000. The price for a commercial locomotive comparable to the Maunsell 2-6-0 was £9,000 (315). The Arsenal workers could not benefit from their experiences over the course of a lengthy production run or draw on previous experience of making Maunsell 2-6-0s. A further £88,000

was required to complete the remaining 55 locomotives (316). By December 1922 another 5 had been completed and the remaining 50 were two thirds complete (317). By this time the atmosphere in Whitehall and Westminster had changed. Lloyd George was no longer PM, the Ministry of Munitions no longer existed. Sir Robert Horne was arguing that alternative work was uneconomic, and Eric Geddes, once the advocate of state railways production, chaired a government committee examining how to save public expenditure. It argued for the cancellation of the last fifty Woolwich locomotives in order to save £900,000 (318).

In 1923 the first two locomotives were sold and in 1924 the Metropolitan Railway took some of the locomotives and Southern Railway (SR) purchased 50 of them and some parts (319). The remainder went to Ireland (320). Despite its high ambitions the Ministry failed to manufacture or promote the locomotives within the appropriate economic criteria. The Daily Mail's accusations, made in 1922, of the 'rusty locos' of Woolwich bleeding the taxpayer and the stories in the Guardian and Daily Express in 1925 of undue governmental pressure upon private companies in order to make the sales, reflected badly on the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign.

The locomotives could only be effective against the post-war economic fluctuations; the possible overpricing by private firms; a revolt by disaffected workers; an invasion of the country and as a means of maintaining a viable, skilled workforce in Woolwich, if they actually worked. The Arsenal management and workforce were accustomed to the very high engineering standards of the armaments trade and the pursuit of excellence, rather than fiscal savings. This, combined with the lack of experience at making locomotives, meant the work went slowly and was expensive. Arsenal tradition has it that the locomotives were made to

such fine specifications that they were too good to be engines. A former worker recalled seeing the locomotives being tested. He said of them 'they made 'em so well that they wouldn't work..they were made so well by the engineers that they were a bit on the tight side, they weren't working so well.. they had to sort of work them in. It wasn't shoddy work it was too good...eventually they were sold to Russia..all painted pink' (321). The official historian of the Arsenal, formerly at the Ministry of Supply, remembered that 'for years long lines of these red-coloured monsters could be seen on railway sidings...a gaunt tribute to the skill of the Royal Arsenal' (322). Others were more critical. The designer of the engines, Maunsell, was the Chief Mechanical Engineer (CME) at SR which purchased 50 locomotives. He claimed that they were poorly made. The CME at Metropolitan thought the workmanship 'decidedly second rate' (323). Orders for Arsenal locomotives were not sufficiently large to enable economies of scale to operate, and the work did not make a profit. Also the cost of the locomotives included within it the cost of the conversion of the gunshops, the cost of buying raw materials and the cost of purchasing privately made boilers. As Slater noted ruefully the locomotives although 'beautifully made' even apart from overhead costs, were more expensive than those made by private industry and so they became 'a deadly weapon against the policy of alternative work' (324).

Marx employed an apt metaphor when he described the ways in which technological and economic innovations reflect and endorse the social structures in which they are developed. Machinery possessed 'as capital through the instrumentality of the capitalists, both consciousness and a will... [it] is utilised as the most powerful weapon in the capitalist arsenal, as the best means of overcoming the revolts against capital' (325). The campaign to build locomotives

appealed to engineering skills, masculinity, national pride and rational, efficient, state production. The Pioneer hailed locomotive orders as 'Revolution at the Arsenal' (326). The railways had long been recognised as vital for wartime. In 1919 they were seen as essential to reconstruction. There was a post-war shortage of locomotives, and building them was appropriate for the Arsenal in terms of the available skills and facilities. To use the Arsenal would keep the skilled men in one location, undermine the threat to the social order that mass unemployment posed. The challenge was taken up by state officials who failed to organise efficient production and marketing. When the Ministry of Munitions closed there were relatively few workers left at the Arsenal and there was nobody left in Whitehall to defend Woolwich against a vicious press campaign and the economic resurgence of the private sector.

Chapter II

**I love the noise of men. That is why I
love Woolwich**

Burke T The outer circle London 1921
pp45-6. Burke was a resident of Eltham.

**One can hardly think of a more
interesting part of London**

WBC Industries of Woolwich London 1949
p1

This chapter is about those who had most influence upon the recomposition of the state and their influence upon the course and shape of the campaign for alternative work at the Arsenal. Hall and Schwarz argue that "'the crisis" and "the transition" were constituted by political forces, and their outcomes were determined in the first instance by political struggle' (1). The influence of national politicians upon the campaign is considered in section (a). The central figure was the 'architect of this transformation', Lloyd George. He told labour audiences both that 'the whole of society is more or less molten... you can stamp upon that molten mass almost anything' and also that 'Woolwich has special claim to consideration because Woolwich has saved the whole of European civilisation'(2). The impact of the Treasury, which Schwarz says commanded 'a frontal assault against high state expenditure, is considered in section (b) (3). The bete noire of the Treasury was the Ministry in charge of alternative work at the Arsenal, the Ministry of Munitions.

At the core of Hall and Schwarz's concept of 'passive reform' were the new liberal administrators. Some civil servants were converted to socialism, or at least central state direction of the economy, by their experience of wartime public administration (4). Many of those at the Ministry of Munitions wanted to maintain or adapt as many of its war-time powers as they could. The use of the Arsenal in peacetime could be used to justify the continuance of the Ministry. The Ministry of Munitions conceived of a scheme whereby 10,000 workers would be employed at the Arsenal, 8,000 of them working on non-military projects and 2,000 on military research and production. It argued that state production allowed for effective price comparisons with the private sector which would act as a brake on price rise in the latter, noted that there were £21 million worth of orders for Indian

railways and proposed that it was efficient to take over an 'entire industry, such as the manufacture of locomotive and railway rolling stock (5). Fraser notes how 'it must have been almost inconceivable to the wartime reformers of 1917 that the whole structure would fall to the ground in brief post-war boom for lack of political support' (6). Certainly the rapidity of decontrol was startling and distressing to some. Sir L C Money, private secretary to the Minister of Munitions and parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Shipping, resigned over the break up of national organisation and the sale of the state's industrial sites (7).

Numerous committees, such as Lord Haldane's Machinery of Government Committee and the Health of Munition Workers Committee, took it as axiomatic that 'resolute central direction' would be maintained after the war (8). One of the committees which assumed that armaments production would be under state control in peacetime was the committee which was charged with proposing suggestions for the future role of the Arsenal. It was headed by a Liberal MP, M^cKinnon Wood, and it was followed by three other committees on the Arsenal, chaired by civil servants, Nathan, Johnson and Stevenson. The impact both of government committees and the Ministry of Munitions is considered in section (c).

Schwarz notes the importance of a 'temporary alliance between the Treasury (preoccupied with national debt) and those sections of manufacturing industry capable of sustaining high profits without the aid of government controls' (9). Private arms firms were determined that they would receive the few orders that were available from the government after the war. Their influence upon state production at the Arsenal is examined in section (d). For the Pioneer the position was clear, to provide alternative

work

encroached upon the sacred confines of private industry which of course would be the last thing that a government composed of capitalists would do (10).

However there were distinctions between different firms. There was no clear route for all private companies to take if they wished to improve their profits. Some wanted a degree of state intervention in the economy to ease the difficulties of reconstruction, some placed a stress upon state controls on the unions, and some opposed competition from the state. There was initially little coherence about their views on the future of the Arsenal.

The obvious divisions amongst decision makers, the existence of a 'newly created space within the British political discourse', had profound effects for the campaign (11). As Cronin observes, 'ordinary people's notions about what is politically possible and what is not and hence their efforts to act collectively - largely depends upon the state's present capacities and commitments' (12). In Woolwich the divisions fostered the argument that even if the Labour Party was in a minority in the Commons, Lloyd George would listen to reason. Such an investment in the lobbying of central personalities, rather than in workers' self-activity, aided the successful implementation of the post-war settlement.

(a)

Significant though the Treasury and the Ministry of Munitions were, within the conventions of the political model which was constructed after the war, decisions were ultimately the responsibility of the Ministers who answerable to the Commons. This was particularly emphasised after 1918. The extension of the franchise from 58% of men to 75% of adults meant that if the social stability was to be maintained, then the notions of the primacy of formal political processes and of the value of electoral politics to ensuring equal citizenship needed to be fostered. Barefoot argued that 'the only way to get alternative work is by a Cabinet decision; and it is only by unity of purpose in Woolwich that the Cabinet will be influenced to make the right decision' (13). Within this model of the political decision-making process governmental committees and the Commons were also accredited with some importance. The campaigners sought to influence, not to weaken, the government by gathering mass support. The adoption of such a policy of 'political action, acting loyally and doing the right thing' involved trying to convince mainstream elected politicians through the appropriate channels, that alternative work at the Arsenal would aid the social and economic stability. The 'workers of Great Britain' were told by the campaigners that, Woolwich Arsenal is your property. You are responsible for it, it is your servants, the so-called Ministers of the Crown who hold the power, it is your representative in Parliament whose business it is to watch and control them (14).

The state needed to be presented not as central to the reproduction and accumulation of capital, or as promoting the interests of those who owned or controlled capital, but as neutral. A further implication of this framework was

that leaders in Parliament grew in stature and the working class were categorised as passive public followers. A campaign constructed upon the notion of the passivity of workers and the dynamism of leaders required a personality to admire. The investment of time and energy in constitutional lobbying required not just faith that a Labour government would aid the campaign, although there were frequent references to Labour voting being the key to a successful campaign, it also required, especially after the 1918 election, a belief that leading politicians in the other parties could be persuaded of the value of the campaign.

Amongst the elected decision makers the Minister who was first among equals, Lloyd George, stood head and shoulders above the rest. In a recent biography of him B B Gilbert called Lloyd George 'the most important and influential British political figure of his time and probably of the twentieth century' (15). After the 1918 election in the Commons 'there were more wealthy profiteers than ever... To a man they were adherents of Lloyd George' (16). Over half those who voted, supported Lloyd George's coalition. It had 478 of the 707 seats and was further bolstered by the absence of 73 Sinn Fein MPs. The Cabinet, not restored to full size after the war until September 1919, was also dominated by the Prime Minister. He had a well established secretariat which did much to bypass both Parliament and the established civil service. In addition he used the Civil Contingencies Fund to bypass Parliamentary scrutiny of expenditure; he darted from one problem to another and so kept an eye on numerous matters; and he conducted foreign policy personally in semi-presidential style (17).

Apart from his official status Lloyd George was important in 1919 because he had a reputation, assiduously cultivated, for supporting radical state intervention and

the integration of the labour movement. He supported the Lib-Lab pact of 1903, the year the liberal Labour candidate for Woolwich was elected, and he tried to form a coalition with Labour in 1914. During the war, in order to counter his unpopularity amongst some engineers, he had a communique signed by Addison and the ASE leaders in May 1917 altered in order to create the impression that he alone had settled the dispute (18). After the war he urged voters not to forget the value of 'state action, state help, state encouragement and state promotion' - a message which might well have gladdened hearts in Woolwich (19). His schemes for a new society specifically mentioned an end to an immediate problem in Woolwich, unemployment:

The old world was one where unemployment, through the vicissitudes of industry, brought despair to multitudes of humble homes... The old world must and will come to an end (20).

In March 1919 he told the Cabinet that he favoured imaginative social reform (21). In July 1919 the PM rejected the idea of the nationalisation of the coal industry (22). He was, however, prepared to entertain such radical proposals as fostering new industries, state investment in...iron and steel and control over electricity generation (23).

This radicalism was communicated through Lloyd George's charismatic persuasiveness. Keynes and Lenin both noted his oratorical abilities, the latter specifically referred to his eloquence in front of labour audiences (24). A recent historian noted how he had 'the voice and magnetic personality to sweep an audience into an emotional frenzy' (25).

Lloyd George used his skills to great effect in Woolwich (26). He 'adopted the principle that implements of peace are to be made at the Arsenal' in January 1919 (27). He promised a visit to the Arsenal, kept the issue on the boil

by postponement, having the prices checked and the orders confirmed and then having equipment moved to Woolwich from the national and foreign factories (28). Geddes said that the Arsenal's estimates for various products were cheaper than the private sector's, which also increased confidence in the town. The Kentish Independent said that the situation would deteriorate if he did not visit soon - 'if the government do not act the workers may'. At this point the PM finally visited the Arsenal (29). He inspected the alternative work when progress upon it was at its zenith with 8,000 people engaged on peaceful production, making wagons, medals, penny blanks and locomotives. There was enough work to last until the following summer. Another 5,000 had work for a year doing motor vehicle and wagon repairs and producing items for the Admiralty and the Post Office. Even then his arrival was stage-managed. Two newspapers reported cheering workers, (the official version was 'a cordial welcome'), and the CSOF delayed 400 dismissals from the Fuse Factory and the PM avoided it on his tour (30). When the PM announced that the munitions stores were destined to move to Banbury with a consequent loss of jobs in Woolwich he grandeloquently cried, 'clear them out.. I hope we shall never want them again. Clear them out and start on railway wagons'. He ostentatiously asked the DGF to make a note of the matter, as if the latter were unaware of the situation, and went on, 'thank God we shall not want guns and shells for the next hundred years'. He spent most of his time at the shop known as Frog Island observing the work being done for railway companies.

Although he unjustly blamed workers, specifically the lack of boilermakers, for hampering work at the Arsenal and proposed piecework payments, Lloyd George's popularity was bolstered and his position strengthened by the visit (31). The boilermakers union provided evidence that there were

boilermakers available in order to refute the PM. In 'The case for Alternative Work' the claim was made of the Fuse Factory that 'its range of usefulness is unlimited', but although its range was not tested the Fuse Factory shop steward, found the PM's visit 'very satisfactory'. The mainstream press reported that the Arsenal was to be 'a great railway centre' (32). The Pioneer scrutinised that which was actually said and reported not that the PM had promised an 'Arsenal for locomotives' as the Evening Standard claimed, but merely a conference of his Ministers (33). In fact the Ministry of Munitions were concerned at the Standard's erroneous reporting of the PM's remarks. The AGC expressed their satisfaction and when they reported to the other shop stewards 'an optimistic air prevailed' (34). This was tempered by the deficit of orders. 'what is the use of millions of parts of telephones? A place like the Fuse Factory needs trillions and trillions to keep it going', argued Voce. The WCC thought that the PM provided 'satisfactory promises' and on the strength of this paid £50 to the AGC to cover their expenses in providing for the PM a document outlining the case for alternative work, called 'a well considered scheme' by the Times (35). The PM received a municipal dinner which was attended by MPs councillors, workers and a WCC representative. Lloyd George also featured in a film of the visit was shown locally for a week. There was a promise of compliance with his outlook - the workers pledged to 'justify their claims by turning the experiment into a commercial proposition' (36).

Although in November 1918 the Pioneer said, 'the spirit of Barnum will not be dead as long as David continues to eat leeks', it went on to note, with 'sinister foreboding', that he was being reticent about the future and this was worrying as normally 'he makes whatever good he does go a thundering long way', (37). However, after the visit the

Pioneer concluded that Lloyd George was 'without doubt sympathetic' (38). When it did criticise Lloyd George it was for stupidity rather than duplicity. It noted 'definite promises and pledges were made by the Premier as to the attitude of the government in regard to Woolwich. These promises and pledges appear to have gone by the board' (39). This was because 'the flinty faced men who look as though they have done well out of the war... are confident that they have found a winner in the true demagogue Lloyd George'. Whilst Lloyd George was once a radical 'those days have passed. The flinty faced men have captured him' (40). The implication was that Lloyd George, the embodiment of the liberal state, was neutral and like the state he personified, could be captured by the boldest forces. Looking back on events in August 1921 the Pioneer compared the politics of Coalition to a series of tricks by performing animals, with 'entertaining wizardry' by Lloyd George. The paper continued, 'the wizard is inclined to dress as a prince of peace. Is this wickedness? No it is platform politics... A man who acts wrongly we call a villain but a man who cannot even carry out what he intends to do wrongly we call in plain English a fool'. To the WLP politics was about getting the performers in the ring to dance to the appropriate tune, it had tried to convince the Lloyd George to represent the workers' but he had protected the interests of capitalists, it was only the Labour politicians who were able to govern (41).

Amongst Lloyd George's colleagues there was a small group, including Fisher, Montagu and Addison, who were identified by R H Tawney and Beatrice and Sidney Webb in 1917, as the basis for a progressive politics of the future. In the event 'these expectations did not survive the first six months of the Lloyd George coalition' (42). Nevertheless Addison was an important figure regarding the 'alternative' work and, as the most recent historian of the coalition has

pointed out, a leading reformer in the administration (43). Addison was on the wartime Cabinet Reconstruction Committee from its formation in 1916, and was appointed first Minister of Reconstruction in August 1917. He favoured spending in order to aid the economy and almost immediately after the Armistice he told his Cabinet colleagues, 'it will be no defence to say that vital proposals were not enacted for want of money. Nobody will believe it' (44).

Addison supported the incorporation of representatives of the working class into decision-making bodies in order to achieve more harmonious industrial relations (45). In May 1917 Addison told the ASE,

we have gone out of our way to take great risks to maintain the authority of trade unions... we must deal with the orthodox trade union which represents the trade collectively... We are entitled to ask your trade union... to keep you members in hand as much as you can... There has been a determined and concerted attempt in different parts of the country to upset the authority of the established unions, we have stood in the breach and helped for all we were worth (46).

A fortnight later Addison was at what he termed 'the most boisterous meeting I ever attended'. It was in Woolwich. The person chairing the meeting, Field Marshall Robertson, was heckled until he left and it was Jack Mills the chair of the shop stewards who 'proved to be a very good man' and quietened the meeting. Addison went on to praise Mills further for giving a 'faithful' interview to the Daily Express in which he stressed the need for 'local autonomy', that is power for the shop stewards of the Arsenal (47). Both the faithful Mills and Addison became Labour MPs. Addison continued to maintain a cordial working relationship with the Arsenal shop stewards. In November 1918 Addison received a delegation from the Woolwich shop stewards. They impressed on him that work needed to

provided in Woolwich as they had homes there. They accepted that even if work were provided some Arsenal workers would lose their jobs. In his diary he noted that, 'they recognised that it was impossible to continue to give employment in Woolwich to the vast numbers who are congregated there now'. In addition he told them that 'in the use of National factories for the provision of public requirements, we should make special use of Woolwich' (48). This appearance of sympathetic ears in both No 10 and additionally in the Cabinet offered considerable hope to the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners. Even if, as Macnamara suggested, Lloyd George 'never understood or sympathised with the aspirations of the skilled workers', there was still Addison (49). Moreover Addison actually implemented some of his supportive schemes. He kept those controls of 'urgent importance such as... construction, locomotive building..' and established a Factories Branch of the Ministry of Munitions shortly before the Armistice, in October 1918, in order to manage those factories which were to be kept under control following the Armistice (50).

There were others in the Cabinet with reconstruction plans. There were specific proposals for the retention of state control of alcohol, transport and milk (51). In addition there were plans for central control of government supplies. It appeared that as the Arsenal could produce churns and locomotives for the state this was much more fertile ground for the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners than concentrating on the munitions which the Arsenal actually made, as these were not required in such vast numbers in peacetime.

In February 1918 Churchill, proposed that the Ministry of Munitions in peacetime co-ordinate supplies to the Services, organising rational distribution and bulk purchases and cutting down on inter-Service competition

(52). The Chancellor set up a committee under Lord Inchcape to consider the contracts of the forces and although Inchcape personally attacked the 'wasteful interference of the government', this committee favoured a Ministry of Supply in its report of March 1918 (53). The notion of a Ministry of Supply received praise from the Haldane Committee on the machinery of government and the Munitions Council Committee on Demobilisation and Reconstruction (54). The report of the latter was circulated to the Cabinet by Churchill and received a favourable response (55). The case for a peacetime Arsenal would have been enhanced if there was a Ministry to support the idea. Austin Chamberlain and Edwin Montagu were supportive of a Ministry of Supply but it met with resistance from those Ministries upon whose territories it encroached (56). Plans were laid for the 'beating of swords into ploughshares by sanctioning the drafting of a bill for the conversion of a demobilised Ministry of Munitions into a Ministry of Supply' (57).

Objections came from the Home Affairs Committee of the Cabinet (58). The Admiralty also objected as did Sir Alfred Mond at the Office of Works and the Air Force (59). In October 1918 the Munitions Council, under Churchill, decided that a decision would have to be made at Cabinet level regarding the use of state property for peacetime work (60). Churchill speculated that national factories might be used in peacetime in order to avoid mass unemployment. He wanted a guidelines on this matter established (61). Controls, Churchill maintained in November 1918 were 'necessary for some time to come' (62). In response Addison and Stephenson Kent, who was in charge of demobilisation, suggested some work in state factories to secure jobs. Initially, in December 1918, the Cabinet decided that commodities required in bulk by the government or public bodies could be produced (63). The debate about

utilisation continued into 1919, linked to fears of unrest (64). In a study of this period Maurice Cowling stresses the extent to which the notion of reconstruction reflected fears about social and industrial disturbances (65).

Minister of Labour Robert Horne, (who 'seems to have the wind up about everybody' according to Lloyd George's private secretary), speculated about his Ministry becoming a Ministry of Munitions of Peace (66). Chamberlain told his Cabinet colleagues:

it is far better to run the risk of manufacturing commodities which would not be required and to resolve them into their elements later, than to have multitudes in receipt of unemployment benefit (67).

There was another way in which fears about unrest aided plans for the continued use of Woolwich Arsenal. Supplies from Woolwich could be used in the event of a rail dispute. During the course of a wage dispute in the London and North Western Railway Company the London General management informed a deputation of workers that if necessary 'the government had promised them men who could be sent from Woolwich to Crewe works' (68). Brigadier General Saville informed the Munitions Council and the Demobilisation Board, and Heads of the Supply and Stores Department that garrisons ought to be established so as 'to render as difficult and to delay as much as possible the offensive use of any warlike material that may fall into the hands of the evil disposed'. He recommended that these garrisons be in 'garrison towns', Woolwich being an obvious choice (69). In November 1919, shortly before his visit to Woolwich Arsenal, the Prime Minister called a Downing Street conference of sixteen Ministers including Inverforth the Minister of Munitions, and a number of high ranking civil servants and army officers attended. It was decided that essential stores and a permanent organisation to deal with national strikes was required and that the Ministry of

Munitions would postpone the sale of appropriate stores which were owned by the state (70). In preparation for a 'Triple Alliance' (of the MFGB, the NUR and the NTWF) strike and also immediately before the decontrol of the mines, tanks and lorries used for the transportation of tanks were taken from Woolwich (71). Although the immediate danger died down, Churchill was still worried about supplies in August 1920 (72).

During the course of 1919 the Cabinet maintained that it intended to nationalise the mines, the building industry and transport. It sanctioned two new ministries, Transport and Health (73). Geddes lauded the state operation of the railways, and Lord Pirrie praised the success of the national shipyards. Even the Treasury resisted a headlong rush into decontrol. Opposition to state activity from private companies effectively blocked the reconstruction of the electricity industry and the transport bill that Eric Geddes desired. The Cabinet did not unanimously want to adopt a policy of deflation or of a 'return to 1914'. In the Cabinet Roberts speculated that if the state manufactured there would be problems as 'if you embarked on trade you had got to be a monopolist. If the government entered into trade, stagnation would remain and unemployment would become greater than it was today'. Furthermore, whilst the government could take over a whole industry and run it as a monopoly, to run only a section of an industry 'would miss the advantages both of a monopoly and a minimum economic cost of production' (74). Alfred Mond thought that a 'timid and halting policy because of financial fears seems to me to be the most dangerous line of action any government could adopt' (75). At the first full Cabinet meeting on the subject of the Ministry of Supply, on 9th December 1919, there was very little discussion as the Cabinet were discussing the problems of Woolwich Arsenal (76).

At a meeting in March 1920, after cursory reference to the supply problem, the bad organisation at the Arsenal was discussed at length. Thus one of the administrative moves which could have aided the Arsenal campaigners was partially blocked because the Cabinet was busy discussing another aspect of the Arsenal (77). Churchill then moved to the War Office and changed his view to that of the service chiefs who did not favour a Ministry of Supply. He cited the view of a committee chaired by the Surveyor general of the Air Ministry. The Cabinet, except for Chamberlain who recorded his formal dissent, ratified the recommendations of this report subject to the approval of the PM, then in Paris (78). This decision about the Ministry of Supply was influenced by civil servants. Similarly the Cabinet came to its decision as to the whether armaments, and other products required by the state, should be manufactured in state run factories, or whether these goods should be ordered from private firms after civil servants had made their opinions known. Most influential amongst these were Treasury officials.

(b)

Before the war the financial constraints imposed by the Treasury determined both the products of, and the number of workers employed at, the Arsenal. Waites argues for the novelty of the importance of the post-war monetary policy in public finance, but the Treasury was influential before the war and, as Wright has shown, had been growing more important over the quarter century prior to the war (79). The idea that the Treasury had more power than the Commons had been expressed as early as 1817 (80). However influential the Treasury was before the war, its powers waned during the war. After the Armistice, during a period of 'unparalleled administrative confusion', it sought to regain control (81). In 1919 it largely succeeded (82). It went on to greater influence. The interwar period was 'the Augustan age of the civil service' and central within it was the Treasury (83).

From the end of the last century civil servants and politicians became 'deeply involved' in the resolution of industrial disputes. An increase in state activity began to be widely perceived, in terms of efficiency, security, prosperity and health, as desirable (84). Yeo calls this 'a scramble for socialism as imperialist as the contemporary scramble for Africa' (85). Joseph Chamberlain expressed the view that

Now Government is the organised expression of the wishes and wants of the people... it is our business to extend its functions (86).

However, Britain's domination of world trade and overseas investment was associated with laissez-faire, and intervention was principally to strengthen that notion. Both Jonathan Zeitlin and Robert Skidelsky note the importance, from at least the 1890s, of the policy of

balancing government expenditure at the lowest possible figure (87). Not only was the Treasury 'deeply committed to the laissez faire state' but any alternative meant conflict 'and that typically meant defeat' for those who opposed the Treasury (88).

One of the means by which the Treasury exerted control was through ensuring that the budgets of other departments were limited. Before the war government accounting was relatively simple. There was however an exception. The accounts of the Royal Ordnance Factories were detailed and annually presented in a Treasury approved format. Furthermore the Treasury exerted influence through the committee system. In 1900 Sir Francis Mowatt, a permanent secretary at the Treasury, was appointed as chair of a committee to investigate the output of the Arsenal (89). Five years later the permanent administrative secretary to the Treasury, Sir G H Murray, chaired the Departmental Committee on Government Factories and Workshops (90). These committees were not interested in alternative work, but in reducing costs. Trebilcock observes that in the period 1890-1914 in most states which were ideologically resistant to any public expenditure besides arms production, 'the mechanism for transferring funds from military to civilian use... was decidedly weak' and 'ploughshares and swords did not enjoy high changeability' (91).

During the war government expenditure rose enormously, inflationary deficit financing was introduced, the national debt was increased and London's pivotal role in finance was overturned (92). The proportion of national income expended by the government rose from 8% in 1914 to 50% in 1918. Successive Public Accounts Committees criticised the financial latitude that the Treasury had accorded high spending war-time Ministries and there was criticism from

the Bradbury Committee on the Organisation and Staffing of Government Offices (93). Lloyd George recognised the power of the Treasury and emphasised that a new tradition would have to be established at the Treasury. 'The men at the top were clever men but they were only the more powerfully obstructive for their cleverness. They were steeped in the Cobden Bright laissez-faire school and that was not suitable these days' (94). He wanted to shake up Whitehall (95). The Select Committee on National Expenditure, set up in July 1917, found that the War Office and the Ministry of Munitions were beyond Treasury control because the latter was understaffed (96).

After the war the Treasury aimed, in the words of the Controller of Finance 'to become the central Department to view expenditure as a whole' (97). Under Warren Fisher, the Permanent Secretary of the Treasury from October 1919 (and also the head of the civil service who advised the PM on appointments), the emphasis was placed upon central control of expenditure and standardisation of accounting methods. The new ethos was one whereby officials, and ultimately Ministers, perceived themselves as custodians of the public purse, with an interest in and responsibility for, efficient expenditure (98). In July 1919 the Treasury warned that overspending was leading Britain down the road to ruin (99). In September 1919 Fisher advised Lloyd George that 'war time departments should, I suggest, be wound up as soon as possible and not continued... The Ministry of Munitions is the most spectacular case for abolition' (100). This did not preclude some public expenditure to increase employment and ease the burden of unemployment. There were a variety of public works schemes carried through by local authorities including provision for civil work in government establishments and road building in Woolwich. The Trade Facilities Act, (1921), and the Unemployment Insurance Act were passed. However,

these were considered temporary measures and detrimental to the economy. The view that government intervention could not aid the economic revival, whilst a return to Gold and a reduction in wages could, became more dominant (101). Cronin suggests that the reassertion of control was not the objective of the Treasury alone, others wanted to limit the power of the new Ministries and Liberal Ministers (102). Indeed it is the consensus view that by 1919-20 the Bank of England and the City as well as the Treasury, favoured a reduction in both public expenditure and state activity, including long term alternative production at the Arsenal (103). Hall and Schwarz do not mention the concept of a 'Treasury view', which included within it the idea that there should be no radical state economic intervention. They do, however, refer to the persistence of opponents of collectivism. 'Neo-liberalism' was created during the period of recomposition which they identify. They define its project as 'systematically to contest and where possible uproot the political conditions in which collectivism flourished... state regulation of the market... was inimical in itself'. They refer to this strand of liberalism being 'submerged' but the idea of trying to reduce the fiscal burden on the state dominated the course of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign (104).

(c)

The Minister of Munitions had enormous powers of expenditure. There was no Treasury control of numbers employed at the Ministry (105). In addition the Ministry was a symbol of collectivism and as such it was a challenge to laissez-faire. Churchill claimed that the Ministry was 'the greatest argument for state socialism that has been produced' (106). Even if it 'retarded rather than hastened' the spread of state socialism, as the Official History of the Ministry of Munitions claimed, it was still a potent reminder of state intervention (107). From the Treasury's increasingly cogent view, if the expansion of the state was to be contained, the Ministry, with its plans for a peacetime Ministry of Supply, had to be discredited and liquidated. However, others were eager to use the Ministry in order to prove that state intervention was beneficial.

The 'revolutionary step' of creating the Ministry in 1915 was due to a wartime shortage of munitions. This was brought on in part by the fact that the Arsenal had been run down prior to the war (108). The new Ministry, headed by Lloyd George, was empowered to commandeer plant and to supervise the invention, testing, management and manufacture of munitions. Munitions included 'every kind of work indirectly essential to the needs of war', the flax crop, the metal and aircraft industries, clothing, bedding, food, drink, chemicals, electrical supplies, transport, hospitals and building and ships' requirements (109). In 1917 the Ministry was responsible for 240 national factories, and over 4,000 controlled establishments including Woolwich Arsenal (110). By the Armistice the Ministry owned 350,000 different types of stores, everything 'from sardines to camels', in countries all over

the world, had an administrative staff of 65,000 and employed between 3 and 5 million workers (111). There is some dispute as to the exact number employed. Tawney and Rubin both suggest that it was around 3,400,000, the Labour Party put the figure at 4,500,000 and Churchill placed it at 'nearly five million' (112). The junior Minister, Worthington Evans, said in the House in April 1918, that it was 'the biggest buying, importing, selling, manufacturing and distributing business in the world'. The Ministry was nominally under the control of a Cabinet committee which met only once, in 1915. The Ordnance Board of the War Office was suspended in December 1915 and in effect the Minister, had individual responsibility for spending (113). There were five senior Ministers and five junior Ministers at the Ministry during its six year lifespan. As the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners noted in 1920 'the absence of any continuity of control and policy has so far been very disadvantageous' (114). There may also have been detrimental effects on the efficiency of the Ministry.

Various Ministers claimed that the Ministry reduced costs, citing examples of savings made in expenditure upon rifles, guns and shells (115). Addison gave evidence to this effect to the 1935 Royal Commission on Private Arms. It was also argued that the Ministry aided the efficiency of many firms by the rationalisation of their accounts. The wartime national factories costing systems alone saved £440 million according to the 1919 Select Committee on National Expenditure (116). There was a revolution in cost accounting. The Ministry argued that this could be 'an immense service in dealing with labour disputes [for] the ascertainment of actual facts relating to work and profits should remove much of the distrust and misapprehension existing between employers and employed' (117).

However, the chair of the Public Accounts Committee found the Ministry accounts to be 'a nightmare', two official reports found evidence of gross inefficiency and there were reports in The Accountant and The Economist of its wastefulness (118). Careful records were kept at Woolwich from before the start of the war but depreciation and upkeep were charged to the account and current and reserve were not kept separate but totalled and debited to current items. Records elsewhere were inaccurate and thus definitive criticism of other establishments were less easily sustained. The high capital cost of the Arsenal, due to the antiquated layout of the workshops, was used as evidence of its inefficiency. Raven, the CSOF from 1915 to 1917, thought Woolwich 'altogether about the worst place that you could have a factory' (119). Sir Reginald Bacon, an Admiral and Managing Director of Coventry Ordnance Works, who sat on the McKinnon Wood Committee claimed that 'it is a case of robbing the Admiralty to pay for the reserve machinery for the Army'. His conclusion was that it was 'practically impossible for a government factory to take up commercial business and that Woolwich failed to keep a check on the prices of Vickers and Armstrongs' (120).

The Times denounced the 'vague megalomania' which perpetuated the 'huge and acquisitive departments', of the government. It published the accusations of waste of an Australian engineer who had worked at the Arsenal (121). 'Now that the Middle Class Union has started, let us have a Muddle Class Union, for the mutual protection of our Controllers and other war time bureaucrats' suggested the Star (122). The Economist held that prosperity required that the nation cease 'to pay people for putting difficulties in the way of private enterprise' (123). Almost every edition of the Economist for 1919 contained complaints against extravagant government spending. The

May edition was explicitly opposed to the Ministry of Munitions and called for the greater Treasury control which occurred that month. G E Raine's The Nationalisation Peril (1920) gave the Ministry as an example of the inefficiency of state enterprise. The Times the Economist and Raine also mentioned the national ship yards at Chepstow, Beachley and Portbury (124). State ownership was considered to be an uneconomic throwback to mercantilism. During the three years of the existence of the national ship yards only two ships were produced (125). Nothing was said about how between 1889 and 1914 the state was the largest employer in shipbuilding, (employing over a quarter of all workers by 1914), with no recognised unions and very little industrial turmoil, when there was much in the private sector (126). The Admiralty argued that if mercantile ship hulls were built in the Royal Dockyards then this would

seriously interfere with the balance of trades in HM Dockyards and entail further discharges of men (127).

The Admiralty would build merchant ships only if the trade unions waived demarcation rules and this the union members voted not to do (128). By early 1919 the yards which were still not completed, had cost £4 million. A little alternative work, the construction of a housing scheme, was done at Chepstow but soon the yards were dormant. The yards were offered to the unions and the shipbuilding magnates after the war but the offers were rejected (129). Eventually after £6 million had been spent on them the yards were sold for £600,000. In the face of such fiscal ineptitude the idea that the Royal Dockyards, part of the Arsenal, could be used for boat building, as the campaigners suggested, was unrealistic. Lloyd George denounced the press campaign as 'a kind of epileptic screaming', but Woolwich, so close to Fleet Street was still vulnerable. Well-publicised scandals, gave the case for the continued use of the state Arsenal bad publicity

through guilt by association. As Inverforth the Ministry of Supply, said of the Arsenal, 'of the Ministry's administration no part is likely to give more trouble or be more open to public criticism' (130).

In addition to being considered wasteful the Ministry was established for a period not exceeding twelve months after the conclusion of the war. Tawney argues that as the 'doctrineless collectivism' of the war was not accompanied by any intellectual conversion... each addition... was brought into existence without the merits or demerits of state intervention being even discussed... it did not last long enough to change social habits (131).

It was sometimes the case that decisions regarding decontrol mirrored wartime regulation and were not taken as the result of pre-determined principle. However, the initial lack of a firm anti-interventionalist ideology also meant that some aspects of the state's role were maintained and that abolition was not always straightforward (132). That which Churchill, in August 1916, called 'war socialism' was followed by the establishment of post-war Ministries of Transport and of Health, state financial arbitration through the Industrial Courts Act and the Housing and Town Planning Act (133). The Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act was also evidence that, that the state could not easily be reduced in size and that support for it was not merely the province of the left (134). One contemporary, J E Wrench, recalled that in 1918 government control was so much part of our lives that we found it difficult to jump back in our minds to the pre-war world... I was convinced that we were about to witness the greatest constructive job of social reform (135).

The Ministry proposed that it be given a peacetime role. A reconstruction committee of the Cabinet was established in

March 1916. The use of munitions factories for civilian purposes and the continued central control of the railways were on the first agenda (136). The committee grew in size and importance and in 1917 a subcommittee, the Civil War Workers Demobilisation Committee, (CWWDC) was set up (137). In early 1918 due to a cancellation of orders from Russia and a shortage of supplies, a number of Ministry of Munitions workers were laid off in a summary and disorganised fashion. Addison, the Minister, accepted the validity of CWWDC proposals of aid to discharged workers and the use of national factories by the government to sustain employment after the war. He advocated that the government requirements be made at the national factories to help ease the problem of unemployment (138). In November 1918 Addison, then Minister of Reconstruction, met a deputation from Woolwich Arsenal and gave a clear impression that matters were progressing in ways which won the approval of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners. He established 260 local demobilisation committees for the three million men in the Services. He also made unemployment insurance non-contributory and promised a Ministry of Supply. On the conversion of factories he cautiously suggested that it might prove to be 'not a matter of days but of months' (139). Addison and Churchill, who took over at the Ministry of Munitions, were authorised by the Cabinet to prepare schemes for using national factories on public peacetime requirements. Sir James Stevenson, a Ministry of Munitions official later to chair a committee on the Arsenal, proposed that 'the quickest way to transform the munitions factories into producing peace articles was to discharge the workers now' (140).

By the end of 1918 80% of Ministry of Munitions contracts had terminated and as millions of workers left its employment its power diminished (141). Further powers were

relinquished when controls on strikes and compulsory arbitration was abandoned. By May 1920 over 3 million munition worker had been released and by June 1920, though it still had £300 million worth of goods, 83% of all its surplus products had been sold (142). The Cabinet decision in early 1919 that state factories could only produce for the state and then only if there were no private competitors for the contracts was contested by the Ministry of Munitions. In addition, according to one official, fifteen million yards of Irish cotton for which the Ministry of Munitions had no use were ordered after the contracts for the north of Ireland linen workers had been cancelled 'through the instrumentality of Sir E Carson' (143). In March 1919 there was correspondence at some length on the subject of official policy regarding government mills making caseboards. These mills could either be converted or sold. Although the Cabinet's refusal to employ workers at the Royal Dockyards in October 1919 has been seen as 'the first clear case of an explicit refusal to sacrifice economy to employment', in fact the question of unemployment was raised in the case of the caseboards but it was overridden because economy was deemed to be of more importance and because of a fear of probable criticism from the private manufacturers (144). No evidence of such criticism survives (145).

There was a market for state produced goods as the announcement in the press of the sale of refurbished ex-Government products led to the gathering of huge crowds (146). The sale of what even the Daily Mail called war bargains was called 'a shameful thing' by a former Ministry official, Sir L C Money. He thought that the government's 'deliberate purpose is to avoid reconstruction... after the greatest war in all history, the greatest bargain sales' (147). However there were constraints on further state production at the Arsenal. The Canadians wanted British

government orders for house building materials, even though such goods could be produced at the Arsenal (148). The Arsenal could also produce boots. The government had promised to purchase Indian Tanned kips up until the end of June 1919. It had by that date acquired about four years supply, 120,000 kips, at the 1914 rate of consumption. These kips were only good for boots and there were huge stocks of both commodities. In the circumstances, although there was an apparent need to increase boot production, and although the trade found that its wartime relationship with the state had been of value, the ability of Woolwich to produce boots was of little value (149).

The Kentish Independent noted 'From peace to war was swift and comparatively easy because it was controlled and directed by the government, but from war to peace is a matter of private enterprise and it looks as though the provision of work for all is going to be a slow business' (150). In fact many private factories were converted or extended for war production and then swiftly reconverted following the Armistice. Some others, such as a brand new national factory in Burton-on-Trent, were built by the state but sold to and converted by private firms. That one became a Branston Pickle factory run by Crosse and Blackwell. Diversification by private firms outside Britain appeared to be straightforward. Krupps, the great German munitions concern, gained control of six large manufacturers during the twelve months immediately after the war. By 1920 they were able to employ more staff so that in the first quarter of 1920 the number of employees rose by 71% to 45,000. The Pioneer asked, 'would it be unpatriotic to suggest that the Arsenal, under a sane Government, could do something similar?' (151). The Cabinet did not conceptualise sanity in such terms. Instead it recognised the ease of conversion and concluded that there was a reduced need for a peacetime Arsenal. A

year later the Pioneer again mentioned the 'transformation of Krupps' and detailed how, at the cast steel works at Essen, locomotive engines and wagons were being repaired and manufactured. 5,000 workers were employed in the construction of 500 locomotives and 2,500 wagons. The firm also converted to making motor vehicles, agricultural machinery and machines for the paper and textile industries (152). Snell, the MP for Woolwich East drew attention to this in his maiden speech but the comparison was not recognised as valid (153).

The campaign for alternative work at the Arsenal was sparked off not by Addison, Churchill or by the machinations of the Treasury but by the establishment of a committee. In early March 1918, the Munitions Council Committee on the Control of Woolwich Arsenal recommended to the Minister of Munitions that a committee of enquiry into the post-war role of the state factories be established (154). Later in March the Council Committee on Demobilisation and Reconstruction put forward the view, to the Ministry, that Woolwich Arsenal should be considered separately, that it stood 'by itself...by reason of its historical pre-eminence among the national arsenals' (155). By the end of March the Ministry had produced a report on the capacity of government owned munitions works. This drew attention to The special case of Woolwich Arsenal and proposed that 'special steps be taken to provide work for Woolwich' (156). In July 1918 a Committee of Enquiry was appointed with a brief to propose solutions for the post war fate of the Arsenal. It was chaired by the Liberal MP Thomas M^CKinnon Wood and comprised of a number of businessmen, civil servants and politicians, including Will Thorne and William Adamson (157). Sir Kingsley Wood, who by the end of the year was the Conservative MP for West Woolwich, suggested that the terms of reference of the M^CKinnon Wood Committee did not permit comparisons to be

made between the private sector and the state munitions industry as the 'influential' Pioneer had argued. The Pioneer found this analysis 'superficial' (158). Sir Kingsley's support for the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was not as fervent as that of Labour MPs. However, in April 1919 he said that he favoured a minimum of 20.000 Arsenal workers and in May 1919 he looked forward 'with pleasure and gratification to co-operating with various organisations [in achieving] a great peace arsenal' (159).

The M^CKinnon Wood committee produced two interim reports shortly after the Armistice (160). The M^CKinnon Wood committee touched upon the subject of civil work but a handwritten footnote to the second interim report made it clear that

we do not feel that it is within our province to put forward detailed suggestions as to the nature of such [non-munitions] work. We are glad however to learn that the question is already enjoying the serious attention of the Ministry (161).

The two Labour MPs who sat on the M^CKinnon Wood committee argued for alternative work for the Arsenal, but did not do attend meetings as assiduously as other committee members. For example, of the fourteen engineering sub-committee meetings Admiral Bacon attended on every occasion, Admiral Peirse thirteen times and Adamson turned up once (162). When the final report was submitted in March 1919 the two Labour MPs produced a series of reservations. The majority favoured an Arsenal with a reduced workforce run on business lines by a Managing Director. Adamson and Thorne felt that the workforce had not been consulted sufficiently with the regard to the proposed reorganisation of the Arsenal. They also felt that the Royal Arsenal

should be used for the production and repair of such things as railway rolling stock, transport requisites and articles and appliances required in connection

with municipal and electrical undertakings (163).

These, previously unrevealed, 'vast proposals' irritated M^CKinnon Wood but he did not pursue the matter (164).

M^CKinnon Wood felt that the case for the Arsenal being retained was 'overwhelming' as research and development were better kept secret at a government establishment and as repair work was 'better undertaken under government control'.

The committee drew attention, once again, to the administrative structure of the Arsenal. This had long been considered a burden. In 1898 the Director General of the Ordnance Factories, William Anderson mentioned the 'confusion and extravagance' and in 1910 an inquiry headed by Gracie mentioned the costly and 'elaborate system'. Although Addison twice described Donaldson as the Director of Woolwich Arsenal' he never had the same status as a Managing Director (165). A Managing Director was never appointed but in 1920 industrial magnate Holberry Mensworth was appointed DGF and thus ended two centuries of military command at the Arsenal. Even he was unable to control production as a commercial Manager might have done. In the face of demand the Arsenal was forbidden to produce certain items (166). According to Philip Noel Baker the M^CKinnon Wood committee 'had greater collective experience of the problem than any other body of men who have ever considered it' and it produced a study 'without equal authority' (167). However, many of the recommendations were not implemented (168). Also the committee never completed work on its original brief in that it did not investigate Waltham Abbey and Enfield as well as Woolwich (169).

The Cabinet decided, after the Peace Treaty was signed, that there was no need for state armaments production, that foreign sales would be discouraged and that there would be

no major war for a decade (170). There was, discounting the USA, no major external power strong enough to pose a military threat and there were social and economic reasons for a running-down of munitions production. The army and war preparation were unpopular. In Woolwich the officers at 'The Shop' (the RMA) withdrew into 'self-conscious isolation'. In Woolwich the most important subject taught was horse riding and there was a proposal to return to wearing traditional red coats. Bond has likened the atmosphere to that after a bad dream to be swiftly forgotten and another military historian, Connell, wrote of how 'a naive pacifism was preached in schools, universities, cathedral pulpits and the Press' during the post war period and how it was taken for granted 'that Regular officers were as bloodthirsty as they were cretinous'. There was a fall in the number of candidates for Woolwich and a reduction in the army vote was electorally and economically sound (171). As M^CKinnon Wood pointed out 'the real reserve for war is in the whole of the manufacturing reserve of the country which has been educated in the supply of armaments' (172). The employers journal, Engineering, used the peace treaties as a cudgel with which to beat the Arsenal.

In peace Woolwich has been a source of trouble... It is the same today. The Government scheme to build locomotives and wagons there is intended to bolster a sick borough... Have we any real faith in the League of Nations? If we have we need not fear to tackle the Woolwich question on bolder lines.. (173).

The Pioneer argued that whilst the objective of a reduction in arms production was of value the 'sudden and indiscriminate sweep regardless of the different importance of the services is the worst possible way (174). In this respect the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign situated itself within this post-war pacific paradigm rather than seeking to construct a new alliance which specifically privileged

workers. In doing this the campaign further bolstered the ideas of legitimacy and consensus.

The McKinnon Wood committee expected that all armaments would be produced in government factories, 'the country will insist on the production of all armaments being confined to Government factories' (175). This assumption was shared by the British Empire delegation to the Washington Conference on naval armaments limitations of 1921-2. Wester Wemyss, the First Sea Lord during the war, advocated a policy of government control of armaments production

the interrelation between foreign and home trade in armaments is one of the most subtle and dangerous feature of the present system of production. The evil is intensified by the existence of international armaments rings...so long as this subterranean conspiracy against peace is allowed to continue the possibility of any serious concerted reduction in armaments will be remote (176).

Lloyd George recalled that at the Versailles Peace Conference 'there was a feeling... that Krupps had had a pernicious influence upon the war spirit in Germany, and had stirred up a great deal for their own ends... There was not one there who would not agree that if you wanted to preserve peace in the world you must eliminate the idea of profit of great and powerful interests in the manufacture of armaments'. Sir Kingsley Wood also suggested that the future of the Arsenal would be decided at the Peace Conference (177). Even if it did not directly affect government policy, that Lloyd George spent so much time in Versailles was of significance for those who were left to domestic considerations.

The League of Nations agreed a Covenant which included the following paragraph:

The members of the League agree that the

manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise on how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented (178).

The League created a Temporary Mixed Commission to prepare details. A sub-committee of this produced a report in 1921. It contained six points about the 'grave objections'. These included the propositions that armament firms fomented wars, bribed officials, disseminated false information and organised trusts and rings (179).

A standing advisory committee was established to advise on the implementation of the McKinnon Wood proposals. This, Standing Advisory Committee on the Royal Ordnance Factories was known as the Woolwich Advisory Committee, (WAC) and was chaired by Benjamin Johnson. It met eight times between July 1919 and March 1920 in order to discuss four interrelated issues; the appointment of a Managing Director, the removal of dangerous explosives from Woolwich, the need for a change in lay-out; and alternative work. It received monthly reports from Woolwich. Adamson used his position on the committee to approach the PM at least three times on the issue of alternative work (180). The committee also passed a resolution favouring Woolwich having the first refusal on government contracts and it wanted 'the expenditure of the sum of several million pounds during the course of the next five years'. The committee wanted a clear Cabinet statement on the fate of Woolwich Arsenal and Adamson threatened resignation. Although there was no recorded response made to this Adamson did not resign.

Another committee, chaired by Sir Frederick Nathan, considered the issue of the safe storage of explosives (181). William Adamson, apparently undaunted by the cool

reception of his proposals by the main body of the McKinnon Wood committee, sat on the WAC. He produced a list of items that could be produced at the Arsenal without competition with British firms. A third committee chaired by Sir James Stevenson, considered the feasibility of moving the manufacturing functions of the Woolwich Arsenal elsewhere to a locality 'less exposed to attack from the air and better situated from a point of view of material and power, or in particular the private trader'. The committee also had to ensure that supplies would be adequate in the event of war and to consider the possibilities of the use of part of the Arsenal's space for private manufacture.

The Cabinet also received advice on the future of the Arsenal from the Geddes Committee, established in 1922 to propose how to make £100 million worth of cuts. Eric Geddes was a businessman who was appointed to be the wartime First Lord of the Admiralty. He was one of a number of businessmen who campaigned for both a publicly owned electricity supply and a Ministry for communications control. In December 1919 he drew attention to the change in the political climate which left public production and control out in the cold. He proposed that unemployed demobilised men be employed to produce railway wagons at Woolwich Arsenal, 'that was probably the best thing to do'. He met a storm of abuse from the private sector because he discovered 'everybody wanted to get rid of control' (182). He did not repeat this political error. In 1922 he had come to the conclusion that about half the cuts should be made from the army and navy and these should include the reduction of the Arsenal to 8,000 workers (183). This view of this committee was accorded more weight than that of the minority, amongst others Bevin, Sidney Webb, J A Hobson and W H Watkins who sat on the government committee on Trusts. They argued that concentrated large firms such as the arms

manufacturer Vickers ought to be nationalised and that fragmented, inefficient industries would benefit from such action. The influence of the numerous committees whose briefs included considerations which affected the future of the Arsenal varied enormously. As the Pioneer suggested in July 1922 the Cabinet based its decisions on the criteria that until a committee produced conclusions which suited the private producers the government would ignore the findings (184).

In 1919 there were widespread calls for central organisation of trade and industry. There were also powerful voices within the private sector calling for a reduced role for the state. In 1915 the British Engineers Association demanded post-war decontrol. However, it also wanted better technical education and a Ministry of Industry (185). Although Sidney Pollard suggests that 'by the middle of 1922 virtually the whole machinery of government control was disbanded', it was also the case that the post-war settlement included a role for state control of industry and transport in the nineteen twenties (186). The corporate economy developed unobtrusively. The Sun Insurance Co was used to cover the state rescue of Armstrong Whitworth and the Bank of England established an internal department, the Securities Management Trust to aid the reconstruction of the steel industry (187). The state was instrumental in the amalgamation of rail, 1921, airways, 1924, and electricity with the formation of the Central Electricity Board in 1926. It was also involved in the running of the British Broadcasting Company, which was incorporated in the same year. The British Dyestuffs Corporation was established by the state in 1918 and eight years later the state had a role in its amalgamation with other companies to form a large company with major arms interests, ICI. After the war Armstrong's received direct government financial aid and in 1924 Vickers received a

government subsidy. In 1927 Armstrong Whitworth and Vickers were merged at the instigation of the government. They became part of the English Steel Corporation in 1929 (188). There was government intervention in the economy, but it was covert. Schwarz, drawing attention to this paradox, argues that 'there was an element of subterfuge' and that 'it was remarkable that a bureaucratic and managed economy could be legitimated in this way. The fact that it could may highlight the peculiar forms of the transition' (189). It also highlights that state production at the Arsenal, under Ministry of Munitions direction, was too overt and that private companies wanted a different form of corporate economy.

(d)

Until the mid-Victorian era armaments supplies for the British army were, said Newbold in 1916, sufficiently 'unimportant as to be allowed to remain a Woolwich and Enfield preserve'. Then in 1856 the companies which provided the shells for the Baltic Fleet charged £100,000 more than the shells would have cost if they had been produced in Woolwich. 'From that day to this', the Pioneer reported in 1922, 'the Royal Arsenal has had to resist the machinations of the powerful Armaments firms' (190).

Newbold argued that for 'for a whole generation' the arms companies had tried with 'unrelenting endeavour to reduce Woolwich Arsenal, to close down Sparkbrook and to injure Enfield and Waltham Abbey' (191). This theme was developed in the wake of the Boer War. Woolwich Labour mayor Gilbert Slater wrote;

local energies were exhausted in vain protests and fruitless efforts to make the public understand that the Arsenal was being crippled not in the interests of the reduction of armaments, or of economy or efficiency, but merely to enhance the prosperity of the private munitions industry, the very existence of which is a potent factor tending to war (192).

When numbers employed at the Arsenal dropped from 26,000 down to 8,000 workers, well below the pre-Boer War figure of 15,000, the WLP placed the blame for the redundancies on 'the work of the Munitioneers'. It urged Woolwich workers to take up the issue of orders going to the private sector with their MP (193). The mayor blamed 'the pressure of private interests'. Munitioneers were 'certain employers' who wanted bigger profits and disliked strong unions. The notion of profit-making itself was not scorned, only the rogue employers who wanted the Arsenal reduced to being a 'minimum establishment'. The Pioneer pointed out it was

the job of directors and managers to make profits, 'Do you blame them?' (194).

The solution to the problem of the private manufacture of armament lay in tighter government control of the diminished and tarnished, munitions trade (195). The Pioneer in September 1919 argued that armaments production should be 'national and free from any inducement to artificial inflation'. The newspaper also referred to the case of H H Mulliner. He was the managing director of Coventry Ordnance Co and in 1909 he convinced the Cabinet that Krupps was building ships in order to enlarge the German navy and that therefore Britain ought to build more Dreadnoughts. This tale has frequently been reproduced as evidence of the promotion of war for private gain. It appears in a number of other contemporary and modern sources as well (196). In 1922 the Labour parliamentary candidate for West Woolwich railed against the hard faced Tories with their fatuous foreign policy and their support of the Armament Ring (197). Moderate Reform Councillor Dawson, said that there was a need for a Britain to have arms in case the League of Nations failed, but that there was no need to pile up armaments upon armaments as this was to produce war as history had shown in recent years, and they were not prepared to do that (198).

The campaign appealed for peace, or in the event of war, efficient warfare. 'Our case against the Armament Ring [is] that while it intrigues and manoeuvres make for a war, they make also for defeat in war' declared the Pioneer. In block capitals it proclaimed that 'Woolwich Arsenal is your property'. It rhetorically asked, 'Shall what Munitions of War that are manufactured be manufactured in National Workshops or by capitalist profit-seeking firms? If you decide 'National Workshops' your answer leads to Peace: if 'Private firms' your answer leads to War'. It was made

clear that 'unbiased and patriotic men and women' could only come to one conclusion, that munitions manufacture by private companies was 'the root of militarism' (199). The Conservatives were linked with 'the arms ring', the Labour Party with public ownership and peace (200).

The employers in the private munitions industry exerted their influence in order to undermine the Arsenal because they wished to counter the power of the unions, gain secure and profitable orders, use their expensive plant and not be compared to a producer outside their cartel (201). The Pioneer complained that 'the Rings and Trusts squeeze us at every turn' (202). The Arsenal was potentially a means by which comparisons might be made and a check, independent of the private companies, might be kept on costs and profit margins. As the Pioneer said of the 'Munitioneers', 'that costs should be ascertained in national workshops and used as a test for purchases from private firms does not meet with their approval' (203).

The private armaments companies perceived that a strengthening of the private sector meant a weakening of the organised workers in the public sector. It was the armaments firms which were central to the employers' offensive against the workers in the lockouts of 1897 and 1922. On both these occasions the Arsenal workers were not directly involved in the disputes but acted as thorns in the side of the employers. Private firms were opposed to the existence of strong unions and felt that the engineers of Woolwich needed to be reduced in status. Just as it was convenient not to have any easy means of making comparisons about the size of profits so the efficiency of the workers in the private sector could not be so easily scrutinised if there was no major state armaments production. In the engineering industry the distinction between the skilled and the general workers was maintained into the 20th

century. The former, the 'Labour Aristocrats' of the ASE received better pay, were in the largest and wealthiest (until the 1897-8 lockout) union, and enjoyed greater respect than the labourer. However new technology was used as a means to undermine the position of the skilled men. As Eric Hobsbawm noted of the distinction between the artisanate and other workers, 'every industrial and technical change tended, on the whole, to increase its unreality' (204). In the 1890s foreign competition, the invention of high speed steel, the use of new production methods in the new branches of engineering, the concentration of industry, specialisation by firms and standardisation of articles produced, reduced the need for versatile workers and machinery and increased the incentive to introduce of new technology. A company which did not innovate was at a disadvantage to one which did and workers in the ASE were 'deskilled' by employers introduction of specialised and accurate machine tools.

The strength of the union was further eroded by the formation in 1896, of the EFEA, an organisation designed to represent the employers, (it went through a number of titles but after 1899 it was the Engineering Employers Federation, EEF, and henceforth it will be referred to as such). The employers were determined to stop trade union interference with their prerogatives about new machinery, overtime, apprentices, and payment by piece or time rates. There was also a concern about the socialist revival. The 48 hour week, instead of 56 hours, had begun to be introduced during the 1890s. Thames Shipbuilding Co introduced it in 1892, the War Office in 1894 followed by the Admiralty, the Post Office and a number of private firms, around the country. In May 1897 the ASE ceased overtime in protest at not getting a reduction in hours. At that time 159 London firms had conceded the 48 week and the union felt that the lockout was designed to 'cripple

the ASE' (205). Around 91,500 workers were locked out from July 1897 until January 1898. EEF President, Lt Colonel Henry C S Dyer of Armstrong's, had been in the Royal Artillery and had worked as a superintendent at the Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield. He 'conducted the struggle like a military campaign' (206).

The EEF demanded that employers be free to choose who they wished to work machines, whilst the union wanted to have some tasks reserved for those designated as 'skilled'. Dyer held that the ASE provoked the dispute on this issue in order to avoid the 'machine question' and to gain public sympathy. Certainly when the workers returned the Terms of Settlement made clear that machines had been an issue, and that the ASE had lost. Mechanisation continued from 1897 at an uneven pace. New machinery was expensive and its introduction was liable to embitter industrial relations. One of the areas where the most rapid mechanisation went on was arms manufacture. It was the 'arms ring' which had spawned the EEF and which most wanted to destroy trade unionism which it perceived as the greatest inhibitor of the development of new production methods (207).

Although the 1897 EEF Terms were not binding upon the Arsenal ASE which had not been involved directly in the dispute and was run by the War Office anyway, the clash of interests was apparent. Arsenal workers formed the WLP in response to the 1897 dispute (208). Prominent in the 1897 ASE campaign was Alfred Sellicks (Chair) and George Barnes (General Secretary). Both had worked at the Arsenal. Sellicks was a founder of Erith branch of the RACS and later a national chair of the ASE (209). The Arsenal workers collected food and money for their fellow workers. Their weekly levies 'were one of the greatest difficulties of the Federation [the EEF] in beating down the men' (210). Dyer promised to turn the Arsenal into a repair

shop, a threat remembered in Woolwich for at least 25 years and recalled again after the Second World War (211). A further reason for wishing to reduce the status of the Arsenal was that if it might act as a model for state production. Barefoot implied that the government was a good employer when he wrote that those who had spent a life time in the Arsenal were 'totally unsuited... for the competitive nature of outside work' (212).

Companies were eager for the security resultant from large arms contracts with the government. British firms, being squeezed in other areas by foreign competitors, turned to arms production. Government contracts removed the risk from mass production and gradually more orders went to private firms. 35% in the 1880s, then after the 1889 Naval Defence Act it became the custom to divide work equally between state and private yards (213). 46% of orders went to private firms in the 1890s, and an average of 59% during the first decade of this century (214). The absolute amount spent on private contracts increased as well. Defence spending had a high profile throughout the 19th century as it was the second largest item of government expenditure, behind only transfer payments of which debt charges were the main constituent. From 1885 it was the largest item on any reckoning and by 1913 it constituted between 35 and 39% of the total government expenditure (215).

The annual average British defence expenditure 1895-98 was £38.8m this rose to 68.4m during the period 1910-13 (216). Between those two periods there was the Boer War when the size of the defence budget grew, to over £250 million. The Arsenal increased output by working seven days a week three shifts a day and by the addition of £500,000 worth of equipment (217). The Boer War motivated private firms to increase their productive capacity for munitions and to

become more deeply committed to armaments production. Between 1897 and 1914, the second largest armaments company, Armstrong's, consistently devoted around 90% of the resources of the company to the production of armaments. In March 1895 75% of the contracts for gun mountings went to Armstrong's at Elswick. Armstrong's profits grew, 15% return in 1898, 20% in 1899 and 1900 as the Boer War boosted output, and then 15% annually between 1902 and 1907, dipping to 10% 1908 - 1910 and then picking up again immediately prior to the war (218). Armstrong's Motor Car Department never returned more than 10% and was generally a heavy loss maker, while a ring of armour plating companies, of which Armstrong's was one, kept the price up to £115 per ton rather than the £40 a ton it might otherwise have been. In 1920 there were 550,000 motor vehicles on the roads of Britain, and 952,000 by 1922 and there were very few orders for gunboats. Before the war, however, as the chair of Armstrong's noted, there was more money to be made building one river boat than 6,000 cars annually (219). By 1900 Vickers, the premier private armourer in the country, had a productive capacity in guns equal to that of Woolwich Arsenal and a strong incentive decrease state arms production (220). Marder has argued that 'Woolwich was crippled beginning with the Boer War' (221). In 1901 the Arsenal received around £3.5million worth of orders, against £11.3 million worth which went to private firms. This division was the pattern for the next few years (222).

Once expensive plant had been laid down it was important to use it. The need to be able to fulfil large, accurate standardised orders and to frequently change the pace of production and the product required expensive equipment. This was a relatively new problem. In his work on the history of the armaments company Imperial Chemical Industries Reader dates the application of industrial

technology to warlike purposes on a large scale from around 1885 (223). In 1902 Vickers which owned sites near Woolwich at Crayford, Erith and Dartford, was 'starving for orders' and 'on our beam ends' (224). By the end of 1903 some 616 of the 1,508 gunmaking machines at Erith were idle and in 1906 Vickers reduced its plant capacity at Erith. In 1907 the Army Council decided to give the Ordnance Factories the pick of the few orders that were issued (225). In 1908, 'a thundering bad year' for the company, skilled workers from Erith and Crayford left to work in the expanding London automobile industry. 30% of the orders went to the private sector that year (226). In such circumstances the private firms became determined to secure the few orders for munitions that were available.

To demand from the laissez-faire government that it place its orders with private companies rather than at that product of the mercantilist era, the Arsenal, was to push at an unlocked door. There was an established idea of Commons control of military expenditure and the government wanted to reduce costs (227). Lord Stuart Rendel noted that 'Army and Navy Ministers have perambulated the country and given... open exhortation and encouragement to the creation of new and distinct sources of private supply' (228). In 1895 Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal War Minister argued for £60,000 worth of orders to go to the Arsenal rather than the private sector because to dismiss men from the Arsenal 'would bring discredit on the government, cause the enemy to exult, and play into the hands of the Independent Labour Party'. At the same time Sir Andrew Nobel and Lord Armstrong 'vehemently accused the Admiralty of giving an undue proportion of orders to the Ordnance Factories to the great detriment of the private trade of this country'. Lord Rendel argued that 'the efficiency of the Navy is not to be made to depend upon the labour requirements of Woolwich Arsenal'. The orders went

to the private sector (229). A trend towards greater use of the private sector was identified by The Economist in 1901 when it said that the 'special point of interest' in the annual contracts was the extent of the trust the Admiralty had for private enterprise (230). When three firms already involved in the armaments trade combined to build Coventry Ordnance Works in 1905, they received War Office support for this entrepreneurial venture. In 1909 Rear Admiral Bacon, (who was, in 1918-19, to sit on the McKinnon Wood Committee), became Managing Director. He had been Director of Naval Ordnance since 1907.

During the war the private armaments companies proved unable to supply sufficient munitions and control of the industry was placed under the Ministry of Munitions. This was run by businessmen and many armaments producers benefited from its grants and organisational abilities. The largest factories in the country were those of armaments firms. In November 1916 1 in 15 metal workers, 140,000 people, were employed by either Vickers or Armstrongs at their main works. The largest single works was the engineering works of Armstrong's at Elswick where 48,000 people worked. At the Woolwich Arsenal at that time there were 68,000 whilst nearby there were a further 5,000 at Vickers in Crayford and 9,500 at Vickers' site in Erith. The war encouraged the rationalisation and standardisation and continuity of demand for supplies for the government. This in turn encouraged the rapid growth, mechanisation and electrification of plant, higher levels of productivity, a wave of mergers and the development of business trusts designed to minimise competition and sustain prices. Arms companies were already large. In 1905 on Payne's list of the largest British firms 10% were defence contractors and almost all the major suppliers of defence contracts were listed. As he noted 'few other companies in the heavy industries could rival the great armament firms in size'

(231). The Excess Profits Duty and the post war inflation encouraged companies to take over unprofitable concerns and invest in bricks and mortar (232). There was a certain irony to this in that the private companies presented the Arsenal as a threat to the survival of the economic system whereas it was the formation of armaments cartels and monopolies, spurred on by state contracts, which led to mergers, take-overs, informal agreements and the accumulation of capital in larger and more closely integrated units. This creation of the momentum for the growth of a large number of corporate organisations undermined the notion of laissez-faire in a more drastic way than the survival of the Arsenal (233).

The arms companies recognised that they could benefit from state activity. There was a two-way flow of people between the private and the state sectors. In 1915 Gilbert Slater claimed that around twenty important figures from the Arsenal were poached within just a few years and that the state sector was being used as a cheap training ground (234). The Danger Buildings Officer, later supervisor in the Royal Laboratories, was the son of Sir Benjamin Browne, the Managing Director of Hawthorne, Leslie and Co, the Newcastle engineering firm (235). Sir William Anderson left the local engineering company, Easton and Anderson, to become Director General, Ordnance Factories. During the 1890s he ran the Arsenal 'almost as a commercial venture', fighting Vickers over the production of major artillery. This belligerence led Vickers to protest to the government at the failure of the Arsenal to observe the rules of laissez-faire. The company won the argument (236). However on another occasion Alfred Nobel advised the War Office on smokeless powders only to have Frederick Abel, a War Office chemist, patent cordite having relied upon Nobel's ideas. Nobel could not take the Crown to court so he took the Director General of Waltham Abbey, who ran his

own cordite plant, to court. After three years of this legal 'obsession', Nobel lost (237). In March 1919 the Pioneer noted that Col Vandaleur of Gun Inspection had been promoted to the Ordnance Committee and was leaving the Arsenal. It commented 'Students of Armament Rings will remember that some of the most brilliant officers of that body are now Directors of the Great Armaments firms' (238).

The Ministry of Munitions gave grants to private companies such as the London Small Arms Company which, during the course of the war, received £70,000 in order to increase production. It produced 2,000 rifles in a week, rather than the 250 rifles a week that it had produced in 1912 (239). Arms firms loaned over 90 directors and managers to the Ministry of Munitions so that it was difficult within the Ministry 'to tell where business control ended and state control began' (240). Sir Percy Girouard Armstrong, a director who took up a War Office appointment in April 1915 advocated that 'national' factories be run by private managers. Addison, the Minister, commented 'I suspect that the one reason for his favouring these factories is that they will not become competitors with the big firms... The only 'national' feature about these factories proposed by Girouard is that the Nation would find the money for them' (241). The Ministry aimed to aid the war effort by efficient organisation so that what were considered adequately run private companies were left outside its direct management. The National Projectile Factories, which employed 20,000 people by November 1917, were under the control of private armaments firms not the government. The radical New Witness of May 1917 commented, 'instead of arming the state with the wealth of the private employers they [the politicians] have persistently armed private employers with the powers of the state' (242). Douglas Cole, who worked for the ASE, thought that 'the capitalist was being robbed by the state of his useful function as

merchant and was becoming a mere supervisor of manufacture (243). Cole also said of the Ministry, 'the whole attitude and tendency of the new ministry was bureaucratic'. He called the bureaucratic collectivism of state administration the 'sordid dream of a businessman with a conscience' (244). Eric Geddes and Allan Smith of the EEF were central to production and labour policies, and employers were key figures in the organisation of engineering capacity through their involvement in District Armaments Committees.

After the war individual private firms expressed interest in making use of the Arsenal, but this was forbidden by the government. The Phosphor Bronze Co. were told that as the government did not require drop stamping work such work could not be done at the Arsenal. R Hoe and Co enquired with regard to the production of printing machinery at the Arsenal. They were told that the installation costs were prohibitive. The request for heavy machinery to be manufactured for them, made by Smith Brothers and Co., was treated with some uncertainty while the Royal Mint orders were accepted (245). The railowners insisted on state ownership for two years after the Armistice as the wages bill had doubled during the course of the war. Lloyd George wanted to use the Arsenal to provide products for the rail companies and thus ease the transition to the peace time economy.

The government also controlled wages. Immediately after the Second World War Hurwitz suggested that 'the history of government labour regulation during the war is, in substance, that of an attempt to introduce controls approaching industrial conscription' (246). Although this view has been modified by further work, there was an extension of collective bargaining between workers' representatives and the government which had some benefits

for employers. Similar industrial structures were envisaged for the post-war period and private armaments employers recognised that these arrangements might encourage Labour voting amongst workers who wished to secure a Labour politician on the other side of the negotiating table. Wrigley's summary of wartime industrial relations is;

on the one hand the government frequently turned to businessmen for expertise... on the other hand the First World War was a frustrating, if not humiliating time, in regard to their relations with the government (247)

Following the Armistice private arms companies wanted the state to restrain unions, aid reconstruction and not compete with the private armaments industry for orders. Although the usual radical argument was that secret state work ought to be strictly controlled by the government Newbold inverted the argument and suggested that the companies' case for arms orders was aided by the fact that in total war subterfuge had become necessary to ensure vital supplies and that because private firms could 'serve the governments in secret [that] is one reason why no government will consent to the nationalisation of the armaments industry' (248). In addition the post-Armistice Commons was filled with businessmen and opponents of state production. Newspaper proprietors, bankers, and clergymen were well represented in both the arms companies and in support of the theory of the necessity for more armaments (249). The Pioneer suggested that donations to party funds and offers of directorships paved the way for the reduction in numbers at the Arsenal, despite the increase in Army expenditure (250). The private firms encouraged the popularisation of the belief that increased armaments made for increased national security. Their activities have been well documented (251). Vickers had three generals and five admirals on their shareholders list in

1904 and 300 officers held shares then as compared to 44 in 1898. The company also had on the board a number of diplomats, MPs, Ministers, Peers, and civil servants including a man who was to play a significant part in decision making at the Ministry of Munitions regarding the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, Sir Henry Fowler. Immediately after the war the Commons was filled with elderly, politically inexperienced, 'hard faced men who looked as if they had done very well out of the war' (252). Typical of the responses of the House to the problems of reconstruction and state control was the remark of Sir J Walton MP on the day following the Armistice. He told his Honourable colleagues that 'every trade and industry' touched by civil servants had been 'hampered and injured'. After the 1918 election many members were still eager to return to 1914. J A Grant proposed the reduction of public expenditure 'by all possible means' (253). This impressionistic evidence has been bolstered by R H Tawney and more recent historians, B B Gilbert and J Turner, who all note both the preponderance of business men within the Commons in 1919 and the ways in which the House tried to serve the interests of private firms by returning the country to a pre-war state (254). Armaments firms also recruited from the civil service. Both Sir Mark Webster Jenkinson and Sir J A Cooper left the Ministry of Munitions to become directors of Vickers (255).

In outlining the national framework within which the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was situated, and with which it was interlaced, it has been established that the political and industrial decision makers were divided amongst themselves as to how to secure their mutual interests. During the war after the fall of Asquith the government was an uneasy coalition, and its administrative response was ad hoc. An official report commented on how

the Ministry of Munitions and War Office
were concerned with the settlement of

disputes on munitions work; the Admiralty as regards war vessels..the Board of trade as regards coalmining... the Air Ministry with the building of aeroplanes... All this has a tendency to result in a lack of uniformity and an absence of co-ordination (256)

Despite their unifying new organisation, the Federation of British Industries (FBI), businessmen held a variety of opinions as to the benefits of corporate bias and the best approach to the state. The President of the FBI observed, rather ambiguously in October 1918, 'we feel that the idea should be state assistance and not state interference' (257). McKinlay and Zeitlin argue that the EEF was not a unified expression of class interests but was riven by regional specialisation, sector diversity and contractual and familial ties between firms which resulted in a 'potent localism' (258).

The 'minimum' number of workers required at the Arsenal, according to the appropriate Minister, was reduced to 13,000 in 1921 and then to 6,500 in 1922. The lack of permanent alternative work at the Arsenal was in part due to its association with Lloyd George. Whether Lloyd George was one of the progressives, as Kenneth Morgan argues, or whether he was an opportunist, as others suggest, is of less significance than the fact that his abilities allowed his schemes to appear feasible (259). Lloyd George played a part in winning over the campaigners when he granted them their own committee, with AGC representatives upon it, a committee which the Pioneer said was of such importance that the McKinnon Wood committee was reduced in stature. Then in 1922 the Coalition fell from office, and two thirds of Lloyd George's Liberals lost their seats.

There was some support in the Cabinet for alternative work. The Arsenal could provide the expensive fixed capital necessary for the economy such as the locomotives. It was

thought that Army orders could be placed at the Arsenal (260). Two former junior Ministers at the Ministry of Munitions were in charge of organising in the event of civil unrest (261). They argued that Woolwich could be used to provide the tanks necessary for the maintenance of order in the event of a popular uprising. There were also those in the Cabinet who saw the benefits, in terms of efficiency, of state production and others who thought that the provision of work would dampen the potentially revolutionary fire of the skilled engineers of the biggest munitions plant in the country. Against these forces were balanced the Treasury, the power of which Hall and Schwarz, following Middlemas, marginalise. Middlemas refers to the civil service as the repository of 'accumulated knowledge, expertise and hence residual power'. The 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners' view reflected their experience, they applauded some civil servants, but also mentioned the power of the Treasury; the anti-national factory 'tea party' in the Ministry of Munitions, and the bias towards businessmen on the McKinnon Wood committee (262).

Chapter III

**in those days the name of Woolwich went
round the earth, and went from the North
Pole to the South Pole**

J R MacDonald recalling campaigning for
alternative work for Woolwich Arsenal,
Pioneer 08/07/21

The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was framed by the perceptions that the centrality of skilled men in the town would be maintained through respectable, rational, individuals forming a geographically-based community network, headed by local men. These citizens would then ensure the election, to all the appropriate bodies, of people who favoured national state economic intervention for jobs and benefits and thus alternative work would be implemented at the Arsenal. This framework was not foisted upon Woolwich by progressive state intellectuals but developed from within the area.

The conventional view of new liberalism, as espoused by P F Clarke, is of an intellectual elite which provided an ideology of reform which was accepted by the Labour Party leaders, by Churchill, Lloyd George and Addison and by a large number of working class voters. Hall and Schwarz agree that new liberals and Fabians defined the Labour Party (1). However, whereas Fabians and new liberals could coexist in theoretical harmony, when they descended from abstract principle to concrete instance, the manufacture of consensus was more complex. Hall and Schwarz recognise that the passive regeneration required 'the containment of a rank and file activism in the labour movement by 1921' and that there had to be control of that 'organic social interest', the labour movement (2). The relationship between the centre and the periphery was symbiotic and not reducible to a conflict between bureaucratic leadership and a belligerent rank and file. Labour leaders had to win a measure of consensus from the localities (3).

Within certain boundaries, those who constructed the post-war order in Whitehall and Westminster keyed into, were affected by, and to some extent redefined, local events. The main constraints were the acceptance of the implications of the return to the Gold Standard and the

rejection of deficit financing and the absence of an alternative economic strategy besides resistance to attacks on living standards through industrial action. The Labour Party nationally offered support for balancing European budgets and the stabilisation of exchange rates at Gold Standard parities. Between 1918 and 1920 wages rose by 50% and prices by 30% to three times their 1914 level. A return to the Gold Standard at the 1914 level required deflation and the reduction of wages.

The effect of the acceptance of this orthodoxy can be seen in the case of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign in the acceptance by the campaigners of the government's notion of efficiency. In 1921 the Ministry of Labour informed the Woolwich Board of Guardians that, in order to aid 'efficiency', the order of dismissals would be changed, and the ex-Servicemen would lose their privileged status (4). Councillor Harry Hart, an ex-Serviceman, said 'the one qualification in the future must be efficiency, I agree' (5). When Kingsley Wood the Conservative MP for Woolwich West, asked for men to be kept on at the Arsenal as an example to industry he was told by the Secretary of State for War that 'efficiency is now the first consideration', Wood accepted this (6). Beyond the idea of increasing foreign trade and a capital levy to pay the war debt, the campaigners had little notion of how to finance alternative work (7). They relied on a notion of a moral right to work or maintenance and this morality was reflected in one campaigners reference to the inclusion of overhead charges as part of the cost of Arsenal production. He decried this as 'wicked' and did not counterpose alternative economic or moral values (8). Frequently efficiency was perceived not as a negotiable concept but merely an aspect of capitalism which had to be accepted.

The campaign was formed within this imposed economic and political framework. In addition Hall and Schwarz argue that 'the containment of labour... had international conditions of existence - the post-war proletarian upsurge' across Europe as workers' councils, some of them revolutionary, emerged (9). In America shop committees and works councils sprang up in the war years with skilled craftworkers generally at the forefront of the movement (10). In Britain one of the largest and most influential forces in the labour movement was the ASE (11). Hinton says that the ASE shop stewards unlocked the subversive potential within the craft tradition and made a major contribution to the ideology of the British revolutionary movement (12). The swiftness with which this militancy died down was due in large part to unemployment. In Woolwich there was less fluidity. The workers' movement did not take enormous leaps forwards, nor did it die back so dramatically. This stability can be measured through an examination of the campaign for alternative work.

In this chapter, and the following one, the concerns which shaped the campaign and which derived from within the local social network are considered. The support for the constitution and the opposition to the 'direct action' of the left, came not from the speeches of Macdonald but from the campaigners understanding of history, from their experiences. Newer, national ideas of constitutional citizenship and efficiency had to be grafted onto particular local stocks in order to survive. This was possible through a campaign for the continued use of the Arsenal for the production of items for the state. The role of the Arsenal trade unions in this process will be examined in section (a), the WLP in section (b) of this chapter.

By contrast to the militancy of others in regard to alternative work, the Pioneer reported the 'Woolwich men did everything that was possible - but they did not strike. That they would not do' (13). The core of Arsenal workers had longer experience of working for the state than other engineers. Furthermore a number of their union representative were integrated into the emergent corporate structure. Shop stewards were recognised at the Arsenal before the war, and had a large degree of control over dilution during the war. The status of the skilled men was less suddenly and dramatically threatened by general workers than was the case elsewhere. In addition one former Arsenal ASE member, Barnes, was in the War Cabinet, another, Rees, went on from being a shop steward to work at the Ministry of Munitions, and a third, Brownlie, was President of the ASE. The WLP emphasised the importance of maintaining a locally-based cross-class community dominated by working men. It promoted the idea of working within the political state apparatus for the promotion of alternative work. WLP county councillor, Guest, insisted on keeping the division between industrial and political issues and argued that in connection with alternative work campaigners 'had to be loyal, disciplined and ready to take any action requisite **in order to get their just demands into administration and legislation** (my emphasis) (14).

(a)

The relatively harmonious industrial relations of the Arsenal; the commitment of the members of the Arsenal unions to solidarity and the economic challenge to the Armaments ring of state production, together presented the private arms industry with a formidable threat. From the late nineteenth century the private armaments companies, threatened by increased competition, sought to undermine their workers' power in order to rationalise production. Maxim Nordenfeld of Erith gave the police beds so that they could lodge non-unionists in their homes during a strike of 1889. By comparison, in the same year, links between employers and workers a few miles away in the Arsenal were less strained. There were no visible employers, and work was not obviously linked to capital or profit. This was a point stressed by the local conservative newspaper, which supported the claims for higher pay for Arsenal workers. It was indignant at the suggestion, made by a dozen former workers, that work at the Arsenal was arduous because of the pressures exerted by those in control of saddlery and harness making. The newspaper asked, 'where is the motive?'. The state sector, it was held, had no reason for oppressing the workers and so, of course, it did not oppress them. Officials were appointed to promote quality not quantity, whereas the situation was different in the private sector (15). During the 1897-8 national lockout of the ASE the RACS in Woolwich contributed £500, and two van loads of provisions to be distributed among 'the necessitous labourers' who worked for the local private armaments companies. The Erith RACS, which had many engineers amongst its members, gave £100 (16). The Arsenal ASE also hired a steamer to take members up the river to Hyde Park for a demonstration. Industrial relations in the private sector were in a different, harsher, category than those at the Arsenal. Nationally the ASE was set back

considerably in 1897 it spent over £500, 000 and lost the dispute, but in Woolwich the workers had no direct part in the dispute and continued to enjoy a high status.

Confrontation between workers and employers continued in the armaments industry during the period between the Boer War and the First World War. Yarrows of Poplar lodged non-union labour on a barge on the Thames and then moved the company to Scotland, in 1906, in the hope of avoiding further industrial disputes. In 1907 a bridge was constructed to get blacklegs into the Erith Vickers plant without them meeting strikers at the railway station. By comparison the movement of 600 men from the Arsenal Torpedo Shop to Gournock in Scotland in 1910 was neither caused by industrial disputes nor did it lead to more than some relatively mild opposition to judge by the pages of the Torpedo Tatler which was the journal produced by socialists in the Arsenal for those workers most affected (17). From 1909 the Arsenal shop stewards worked with the government's Advisory Committee on Wages. the secretary of this body was an Arsenal worker and the chair the Labour Party secretary.

There was another important distinction between workers in the private sector and those at the Arsenal. In the private sector, workers' expectations were that they would be laid off if the management decided that post-war armaments conversion was not a viable option. The superintendent of Wilkinson Sword Co of Acton worked for the Ministry of Munitions during the First World War. With his knowledge of engineering he thought that there was 'a great deal to do regarding the conversion and employment of the machinery in an extensive part of the factory' (18). The conversion of the factory was a managerial decision about strategy and so was not one in which workers in the private sector were involved. Many private firms felt able to shed staff and alter production with greater ease

than was the case on the state-owned sites because their peacetime role was not disputed. Either they reconverted or they closed. A filling factory at Park Royal, Acton was sold into private hands and thousands of staff were laid off until only 800 women and 200 men remained. There was little concern about this as the war work was seen as only temporary (19). Arnotts brought the site for the scrap value of the huts there and shortly afterwards opened a perfume factory. The curtailment of orders for D Napier & son, a company which worked on aero engines and other government war work, did not lead to closure. Indeed, despite two sympathy strikes, the company managed to make other products and to declare large profits and a 22½% share payment bonus in 1919 (20). Private firms which had adapted their product for the war, either reconverted or went out of business. Arsenal workers wanted to explore an option so far denied to the state sector, conversion.

A further difference between the private sector and the Arsenal was the peculiar strength of the core workers at the Arsenal, particularly the ASE, both in relation to other Arsenal workers and in relation to other engineers. Although the ASE was a centralised national union there was, as the Webbs recorded, a 'fanatical attachment' amongst the engineers to 'an extreme local autonomy'. More recent studies also stress the importance of local autonomy and the significance of regional variations (21). The Arsenal ASE was unified, recognised and distinctive from the private sector branches of the union. The traditional method used by workers to increase wages at the Arsenal was by an appeal to the officer in charge of a particular department. The latter then made a recommendation to his superior officer. Wages tended to be lower than in the private sector, but this was offset by continuity of employment (22). Furthermore conditions and pensions were better at the Arsenal than in the private sector (23). At

the Arsenal there was some consultation of workers, in 1889, the Director General consulted the workers regarding a new pension scheme because there had been a dispute lasting over 20 years on this issue. It was resolved, in favour of the men, after the intervention on their behalf of the Conservative MP for Woolwich, Colonel Hughes (24). The issue of pensions flared up again after the war. Workers at the Arsenal necessarily had a closer relationship with the state and their MP than other members of the ASE.

A wartime innovation was the introduction of new pay schemes instead of the previous system whereby workers had to beseech the appropriate officials to grant them their petition (25). This did not bind the Arsenal workers' pay to that of the private sector but it did modernise the structure. In 1915 Arsenal labourers received a payrise because the local EEF had conceded one in the private sector (26). However, Arsenal workers were outside the EEF collective bargaining procedures. Local union officials did not have to try to impose conformity to national agreements. Indeed, sometimes there were different pay awards within the Arsenal. In November 1918, engineering workers received a 5/- pay increase and piece workers got a rise of 12½%, but Building Work Department employees received no increase in pay.

The 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners relied upon an integrated union structure. Shop stewards of the ASE, union officials who represented the union at shop level, collecting dues and organising the membership, were recognised by the Arsenal management soon after their introduction in the 1890s (27). Workers' representatives negotiated directly with the CSOF. The status of the stewards increased so that, instead of being engaged in low-level union administration, they rose to negotiating piece rates. In

the early part of this century the shop stewards were recognised by the Minister of War, Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman. During the same period the membership of the Arsenal ASE rose. By 1901 there were eight branches and 2,000 ASE members in the Arsenal (28). The influence of the Arsenal engineers was widely noted (29). Douglas Cole, the wartime advisor to the ASE, and Wal Hannington, a contemporary engineering union activist, who met the Arsenal ASE representatives, both remarked on the pre-war strength of the Arsenal shop stewards organisation and the extent of their powers (30). In contrast to Woolwich, many shop stewards in the ASE on other sites were only granted recognition during 1917, following various struggles (31). When W R Watson got his job at the Arsenal in 1914, he did so by approaching the appropriate shop steward, and it was only once the job was settled amongst the men that Watson gave his personal details to the administrators and submitted to a medical examination. When Watson moved jobs within the Arsenal the first question his new workmate asked was 'Do you belong?' (32). Tom Mason, who started work at the Arsenal in 1913 and whose brother was a shop steward recalled that 'when the war come on... the management got scared of the unions, if the unions got and took anything up they gave way every time' (33). By 1915 'there was no beating about the bush with managers, shop managers or foremen; they [shop stewards] went directly to the Supervisor or Chief Supervisor as required' (34). There were 130 stewards, one for each shop, meeting monthly. There was also a steward for every fifty men and an executive of 7 stewards who met directly with the management. The shop stewards had more autonomy than a District Committee elsewhere in the ASE (35).

When the shop stewards suspected the Ministry of Munitions of seeking to remove their negotiating rights (the CSOF started to negotiate through the London District Committee

of the ASE), they forced Christopher Addison, the Minister of Munitions, to concede to them that they had the right to negotiate directly with the CSOF. There was a 'stormy meeting' between Addison and the shop stewards. Mills restored order and, shortly afterwards, Addison invited the shop stewards to the Ministry and promised to recognise them once again as official representatives of the workers on the issues of grievances and wages (36). Mills blamed a 'minor official of Munitions who had referred local matters - which for many years had been dealt with directly by the shop stewards - to the head office of the ASE' (37). Addison said that he had never wanted to change the status quo but that a confusion had arisen due to the fact that Tom Rees was both chair of the shop stewards and also secretary of the London District Committee (38). It was in part because of Addison's bad relations with the ASE, he called them 'a nightmare', that he lost his post at the Ministry (39). Mills later accused the government of having failed the workers, but called Addison 'one of the most brilliant minds at the Ministry of Reconstruction who had insufficient powers and called for the skills which had been used to produce weapons to be used to produce ploughshares' (40). A myth arose about this event, which was to have implications for the 'Peace Arsenal' scheme and which throws some light on the ways in which the shop stewards of Woolwich were viewed. It was supposed that Addison had signed a unique 'Arsenal Charter' and that this proved both the strength of the Arsenal shop stewards and their distance from the struggle of other shop stewards. Employers wanted to break this uniquely strong group, trade unionists felt that upon such strength could be built a broader struggle (41).

In other munitions centres there were internal struggles between the upper echelons of the union and the shop stewards. The national union leadership actively co-

operated with the government which inhibited trade union officials from supporting action which would have interfered with production for the war. Shop stewards often represented the disaffected workers. In Woolwich such divisions did not occur. This was partly because the ASE President, Brownlie, made determined efforts to ensure the smooth implementation of the Munitions of War Act. He returned to Woolwich to intervene in a dispute in 1919. He also sat with Addison and various industrialists on the Council on Priority After the the War (42). Of greater significance was the fact that workshop organisations, with full bargaining rights, had developed within the trade union structure before the war, so there was little scope for independent shop floor organisation by shop stewards.

An important part of the continued validity of the shop stewards was their control of dilution which was introduced in 1915. There was considerable dissatisfaction amongst skilled men in many areas, but not in Woolwich. Managers wanted to save money, speed production and undermine the authority union officials had over the rate for any particular job. 'The whole history of the shop stewards' wrote Sheffield engineer and shop steward J T Murphy, 'was a revolt against the new conditions imposed by the dilution of labour' (43). In Sheffield the imposition was 'sudden, arbitrary and acute' (44). In the Midlands, where 'unionism was only skin deep', there were also hostile reactions to change (45). A straw in the wind indicating this is that, according to one Arsenal worker, the solitary 'firebrand' at the Arsenal was not from Woolwich, but from Coventry (46).

By contrast, in Woolwich, the workers accepted the CSOF Brigadier General C P Martel as 'the final arbiter in all questions arising under the dilution agreement' and the ASE had considerable control over dilution (47). Management

made its decisions in consultation with the workers' representatives. Martel engaged in many a smoothing of labour difficulties and had 'won the respect and esteem of the men' (48). The CSOF frequently met shop representatives who were guided by the shop stewards' executive (49). There was also a separate stewards' Dilution Committee of 24 men, at least one member of which was on the shop stewards' executive committee. The Dilution Committee had office facilities provided by the management and recorded pre-war practices so that they could be restored after the war. Martel recognised that the workers 'were very dependent on the amount of alternative work they received' and in respect of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign he argued that success was due to gaining support in Whitehall;

we (sic) can claim to have made substantial gains and we owe this, I think, to the successive Director Generals of Factories who have interested themselves to such an extent in this matter (50).

The Arsenal shop stewards did not share the vision of Clydeside militant Gallacher, who aimed in 1916 for 'one powerful organisation that will place the workers in complete control of industry' (51). Rather, their vision was focused upon particular issues. The shop stewards held a meeting in protest at the food shortages. There were stoppages at the Arsenal when men were late for work through queueing. This was linked to a demand to curb profiteering. They wanted the RACS to handle food supplies (52). In January 1916 just 200 Arsenal workers of all grades supported a resolution in support of the Clyde Workers' Committee. There was an attempt to establish a London Workers' Committee on the lines of the Clyde Workers' Committee. It enjoyed a moment of success when Tom Rees was summoned under the Defence of the Realm Act

for calling a strike. Once the dispute was peaceably settled the London Workers' Committee faded (53). In 1919, the Arsenal shop stewards turned down an appeal to assist at a 'Hands Off Russia' demonstration with the excuse, 'the activities of the [shop stewards'] committee are confined to industrial conditions' (54). In April 1921, the WLP presented solidarity with other unions in immediate rather than abstract terms. If the locked-out miners lost their struggle the engineers would be next to be attacked. The EEF had 'already given notice of its intentions to seriously reduce wages throughout the engineering trades, and it is more than possible that if the present attack on the miners is successful that wages in Woolwich Arsenal will drop by at least £1 a week by the beginning of June' (55). The Pioneer blamed a particular section of businessmen; 'the wasters have deliberately provoked this struggle, backed by a government of flinty faced men and supported by their own press' (56). To focus on the particular was not unusual within the labour movement. In the case of Woolwich because there was not the same degree of provocation as on Clydeside, the shop stewards movement evolved in a different fashion.

As the demand for munitions dropped after the Armistice, so the influence of the shop stewards waned. In Woolwich on the declaration of the Armistice on 11th November 1918, night shifts ceased immediately and the Arsenal, symbolically, closed for the rest of the day. The Arsenal opened the next day to face 'the greatest problem of its existence' (57). Workers were advised to find other jobs. The Arsenal provided railway warrants for men dismissed from the Arsenal and travelling home (58). Women did not get a rail warrant until March 1919. The Australian Munition Workers Association, the South African Mechanics Club and the Canadian and Overseas Workers Association all demanded repatriation. The number of hours worked in a

week was reduced by six to 48, it was further reduced to 47 in January 1919, and an overtime ban was introduced. Similar measures were taken in other munitions factories (59). 'The speed with which women had appeared in these industries was surpassed by the speed with which they vanished from them' as Hyman put it (60). Barnbow Filling Factory in Yorkshire dismissed 1,000 women within a week of the Armistice, and the remaining 7,000 with the next month.

An order of dismissals from work at the Arsenal was established, with the most recent arrivals, at the top of the list. Even when the order was altered the core of workers remained most secure. The last to go were to be pre-war employees, the organised workers, second highest were the disabled, followed by the other ex-Servicemen, and the wartime employees. Those whose jobs were least secure were the few people taken on since the Armistice (61). The hierarchy established by the government regarding dismissals from the Arsenal was challenged. In February 1920 a WU steward argued that 'not one war-hand should remain while ex-Servicemen are dismissed' (62). In January 1921 the council decided that ex-Servicemen ought to be treated in the same way as civilian war workers and that 'no single women should be discharged to make room for an ex-Serviceman' (63). In July 1921, the order of dismissals was altered so that the 995 workers who had been taken on since short-time commenced were laid off first, followed by war entrants, fit ex-Servicemen and disabled ex-Servicemen. Most secure of all were those pre-war men aged over 60 (64). The Pioneer suggested that this order was being undermined by the use of suspensions. If no work was available men were suspended. Once they had been suspended for two months they ceased to be on the books at all (65). Whilst it was being reduced in numbers and status the workforce was divided amongst itself. The secure workers suffered least in these battles.

In 1919 Solidarity, the weekly journal of the workshop committees of London, acknowledged that the engineers were no longer at the forefront of the struggle and Gallacher wrote in the Worker that the engineers were in the 'slough of despond' while the dockers, miners and railworkers were in the ascendancy (66). By contrast, the Arsenal engineers were carving themselves a new niche. The 6,000 skilled men maintained control of the leadership of the labour movement in the face of 28,000 women workers and about 36,000 other men at the Arsenal. The AGC secretary Fred Thomas told non-union labour and ex-Servicemen that for them 'salvation lay in the united ranks of industrial trade unionism and not outside' (67). In 1920 after they had put aside the claims of other workers Lloyd George and Bonar Law both reiterated the claim that alternative work would be provided in Woolwich (68). Jack Mills noted with pride the degree of integration and strength of the 'most powerful' stewards in the country, the Arsenal stewards. They were, he said, 'able to go past the managers of any factory and demand to be called into consultation not only with the superintendent of the various departments but with the Ministry of Munitions itself' (69). It was the maintaining of such confidence in the face of the slump that marked out Woolwich. By 1921, a quarter of the members of the Amalgamated Engineers Union (the AEU, a union made up principally of the ASE) were unemployed. There were over a million registered unemployed people in the country. In Woolwich the ASE still physically dominated the town centre. A visitor to the town commented; 'the essence of Woolwich is Beresford Square...[when] the Arsenal gates open upon it, it becomes the property of the ASE (70).

In 1922 there were two million unemployed, and a quarter of a million on systematic short-time. The status and funds of the AEU were seriously depleted, and interest in its members was so low on the agenda that Sir Allan Smith of

the EEF had too remind the PM that 'the greatest tendency towards unrest...is to be found in the case of the skilled man' (71). The AEU suffered a serious defeat in a lock-out, which did not affect the Arsenal, where the union blacked work which was being denied their locked out fellow trade unionists. Engineers' wages were cut and the AEU was reduced to 330,000 members, (25% of its wartime strength) 90,000 of whom were without work. A number of its militant members were involved in organising the unemployed (72). The older strongholds were reduced as heavy industry suffered recession whilst the AEU was also driven off the shop floors of the newer industrial areas, such as the Midlands (73). In Woolwich, as one former Arsenal worker recalled, 'we was going out in droves...and down the labour exchange there was a queue right the way round there about four deep every day' (74). The newspapers reported bankruptcy, marital desertion and suicide as a result of mass local unemployment (75). Despite these crises, shop steward-led collective action in order to ensure national government intervention remained central to political activity in Woolwich.

In the 1920s the authority of the Arsenal shop stewards was not threatened by workers at other nearby sites as the sites were smaller and the workers less well organised. Before, during and after the war the Arsenal remained a large-scale employer (76). The only comparable sites in terms of the size of the workforce were those of arms companies. In 1916 Woolwich had the largest munitions works in the country, 1 in 30 of the total metal working labour force were employed there, and even when it was reduced in size it dwarfed the other sites. The largest other government works were in Gretna, which had 1,133 employees in February 1920 and Enfield and Waltham, which together had 2,978. None of the rest had over 1,000 workers (77). In 1922 there were 7,000 at the Arsenal and

in 1923 Enfield was reduced to 790 workers (78). Other companies in the area did not rival it in terms of numbers employed until the 1930s. Siemens was established in Charlton in 1863. By 1909 it employed 1,300 workers, 3,300 by 1913 and a further 750 by 1921, including 400 women. By 1926 there were over 6,300 workers there, many of them engineers. Collier's Motorcycles was established in 1899 and employed 3,000 workers by 1922. The Kings Norton Metal Co employed 100 people in 1914, 7,000 at its peak and then it closed in 1922. Two tennis ball manufacturers employed women as did James, the shirtmakers which had a staff of 400 at the height of the 1921 season. Western Electric in North Woolwich had 1,000 workers in 1909, (400 of them women) 2,100 workers in 1922 (79). Just outside the borough were Johnson and Phillips and the Albert Dock, which was extended in 1921, but neither of these were of enormous significance during the period immediately after the war. In 1921 8,000 (17%) of the 48,000 males over 12 who lived and worked in Woolwich were metal workers, 7% were soldiers and 10% worked in transport. By 1932 Woolwich was 'the centre of the cable trade' and Siemens engineers challenged the supremacy of the Arsenal AEU, but at the time of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign the Arsenal was still central and, as the Town Guide said in 1925, 'Woolwich is devoted to Mars and Vulcan' (80).

Another potential threat to the dominance of the Arsenal was from white-collar workers. Eltham, 40% of the acreage of the borough of Woolwich, was fast becoming a dormitory town for clerks (81). The population of Eltham rose by 110% in the decade 1911-21. A further 11,000 people arrived in the decade from 1919 raising the population to 39,000 (82). Although in 1921 the commercial, professional, financial and insurance workers, together with the clerks and civil servants, constituted a fifth of the working men

of Woolwich, these workers did not constitute a coherent, organised, block in the way that the Arsenal workers did.

Neither was the engineers' position in Woolwich undermined by women workers. Over the Thames women left munitions for the clothing trade but in Woolwich in 1921 only 28% of women over the age of 12 had paid work. 18% of these were indoor servants, 15% were low grade white blouse workers and 9% were low grade workers (sewing machinists, tailors' pressers and dress and blouse makers) in the clothing trade. Teachers accounted for 9%, commercial canvassers, 9% and there was very little else for women who sought work in Woolwich. In 1921, the proportion of women in paid employment in south London was smaller than before the war. The largest employment category for women in Woolwich was personal service. A decade later, in 1931, it was still the largest category, accounting for 32% of those women working. Fewer men from Woolwich had been killed in the war than was the case elsewhere. They constituted almost half the population of Woolwich, there were only 3% more women, which was not the case nationally (16% more women) or in London as a whole where there were 10% more women (83). The lack of work and the percentage of men helps to explain why although across England and Wales as a whole 22% of 20-24 year old women were married in 1921, in Woolwich the figure was 32%.

A further potential rival to the Arsenal engineers were the general unions. In 1909, H S Jevons noted how

the skilled man earning, say from 35/- to 40/- a week,... in an engineering shop finds his friends chiefly amongst men earning the same income.... There is much difficulty in the passage of sons of an unskilled or partly skilled class to work of a higher wage and status than their father (84).

The distinctiveness of the ASE and the RACS was necessarily

eroded by the success of co-operation and trade unionism. Nationally there was greater centralisation in the union movement with the formation of the TUC General Council in 1920 and with a shift in the locus of power within unions away from shop stewards and towards national collective bargaining. Union membership was more common. In 1890 there were a million trade unionists in Britain. There were over 8 million in 1920 (85). Co-operative membership over the same period rose from 962,00 to 4,505,000 (86). The superiority of the artisan elite, in terms of their material possession, was diminished by the affluence of all munitions workers during the war years. As a government report of 1918 noted;

one of the most striking features in commerce has been the high purchasing power of the community... during the war... in munition areas, owing to the high rates of wages, combined with the increased population, the demand for goods has increased (87).

More generally, the levelling in working class earnings between 1915 and 1920 involved a relative fall in the earnings of many artisans, particularly those in engineering. The Board of Trade Committee on Industry and Trade carried out a Survey of Industrial Relations in 1926 and found that skilled artisans in engineering whose wages had been 'considerably higher' than those of the unskilled in 1914 'are now no higher and in some case are even lower, than those of various groups of unskilled' (88). In 1918 there were a number of workers representatives who were recognised by the Arsenal management. There were also 35 unions at the Arsenal, only 8 of which had more than one branch (89).

The core of workers continued to hold sway over the others in part because many of the new workers were women and many women felt that they ought to resign from the Arsenal after the war. Women workers were pressured by the press and the

government which encouraged them to leave. Lloyd George, who as Chancellor introduced the Treasury Agreement, specifically wanted women to do the work that skilled men had done for the duration of the war. After his experiences of female staff at the Arsenal Lloyd George 'determined never again to put his finger into any pie connected with women's war work' (90). He washed his hands of the Woolwich women and his government passed the Restoration of Pre-War Practices Act. The women received a month's pay and the promise of state benefit if they were made redundant. However maintenance payments were made in inconvenient locations, and stopped to women who refused to engage in domestic service (91). There was little training provided for women (92). In addition there was the persistent promotion of the idea that women ought to 'renew the homes of England, to sew and to mend, to cook and to clean and rear babies' (93). Women munition workers were taunted as thriftless and extravagant (94).

There were a number of women's meetings and marches during early 1919 which were organised to draw attention to the demand for the peacetime utilisation of the national factories (95). Flora Baker an Arsenal shop steward, demanded that national factories be converted for production and training for women and Jack Mills argued that women had a right to work under the government so that a fair rate of pay could be forced as a pattern to private employers' (96).

Locally women were encouraged to leave the Arsenal and enter domestic service. In January 1919 the Woolwich Gazette reported that there were 25,00 unemployed women in London and that 'Women slackers will not take jobs while the 25/- a week lasts' (97). Some women felt sad about leaving the Arsenal, but also that it was their duty (98). Others were resigned to their fate. A journalist described

the women boarding the trams for the last time in Beresford Square, 'no longer the gay rollicking crowd of a few weeks ago, many sat still with eyes closed, and scarcely spoke' (99). Many of did not want to return to domestic labour as it was badly paid, £26 per annum against between 45/- and £6 a week for Arsenal war work (100). Also it was socially isolating and there were fewer fringe benefits, such as creches, compared to the Arsenal (101). All women were supposed to get a fortnight's notice and the Ministry of Munitions was prepared to subsidise wages in the private sector during the winding up period of munitions work (102). The promotion of the notion that women ought to return to their pre-war roles may not have stopped the 'march of the Woolwich women who rise like lions out of slumber in unconquerable number' as Woman Worker put it, if the national gender divisions had not been mirrored by men at local level (103). The ideas were transmitted locally by the Woolwich Unemployed Committee and the Dockyards Committee. The former, backed by the Workers Union and many Labour councillors, called for 'one man, one job', while the latter asked the PM to sack 250 laundresses so that men could do their work (104). Men's status was threatened when unemployment forced a reconsideration of their role within both the private and the public spheres. In the campaign for alternative work they sought, at the cost of exacerbating gender divisions, to regain their former status.

Once the women had been dismissed, they were a spent force compared to their potential whilst employed. The dominance of the remaining men was relatively easy to maintain in the face of mass redundancies of Arsenal workers. Lillian Barker the superintendent of the women workers at the Arsenal shook 30,000 hands in a week as workers left and had to wear her arm in a sling for a fortnight (105). In the wake of this in December 1918 Matt Horsburgh of the WLP

told the PM 'the greatest problem was of course the women's question and of providing them with work (106). Jack Mills made it plain why this was a concern. He said that whilst the women workers had earned their jobs, they should not displace the pre-war men (107). Some employers did not want former munition workers (108).

By June 1919, across the nation 90% of all women workers and 48% of men had been laid off (109). The NFWW journal, Woman Worker, noted how Woolwich had been through some difficult times but that 'our shop stewards have never lost heart' and that dances were being held 'to keep the members together' (110). Within a year of the Armistice, the number of women workers at the Arsenal had been reduced to 1,500. There were 17,500 men still at the Arsenal, and the influence of the women was slight. 90% of skilled men who left voluntarily after the war found other work within a year, whilst 3,500 women remained unemployed. Unmarried women were excluded from drawing upon the benefits of the Lady Superintendent's Benevolent Fund, which was restricted to the wives of servicemen (111). Although it was argued that women could rely on husbands or parents, widows were not given preferential treatment, despite a plea on their behalf in the press (112).

The NFWW was more concerned about the lowering of wages experienced by many women who entered post-war work and their long hours, rather than conversion or other issues. It also subsumed women into the wider category of workers. Woman Worker presented eight questions for candidates in the 1918 General Election. The questions were about war pensions, food prices, work, housing, the Poor Laws, the need for a Ministry of Health, indirect taxation and adult suffrage. With the exception of the last-mentioned issue, the other policies were not specifically related to women workers, but to workers in general (113). Many of its

members had moved home to do munitions work, and experienced problems attempting to make payments for rent and other fixed charges after their pay was reduced due to their swift redundancy. This was a major problem in Woolwich, where hostel rents were high (114).

Florence Lunnon a shop steward of the WU said that what was done with the Arsenal was a problem for men and that for women unemployment was the problem (115). This view was shared in the NFWW. However, despite its other concerns, the NFWW 'asked to be set productive work', and it mentioned 'the shadows of houses that have flitted before us for so long are not likely to materialise' (116). It pointed out that private enterprise was uncertain of the market, that export was difficult and prices were high. While the prudent private manufacturer was waiting, the government could intervene and use the labour employed during the war to make houses. There were shortages which the public sector could have alleviated. The blockade of Russia, which reduced the size of the market, and the attacks on the property of the Irish, which reduced the food supply were also mentioned by the NFWW (117). A government inquiry into the problem of women's employment was established. The Hills' committee suggested that national factories be used to remedy the main deficiency of women workers, their lack of training (118). In other areas of the country the NFWW favoured the idea of conversion, and worked with more mainstream bodies. Rotherham Chamber of Commerce joined the NFWW in proposing that the National Projectile Factory, Rotherham be turned over to the manufacture of clothing, bicycles and motors (119). In Woolwich women, says Thom, 'were not by and large asking for Arsenal work, they were asking for work or maintenance' (120).

The reiteration of the idea that leaders knew best helped to consolidate the stability of the key Woolwich workers. Councillor Hart referred to the 'gross stupidity of the workers at the recent by-election' when they did not follow the leaders advice and vote Labour (121). The Pioneer noted how 'trade unionists are ever critical of their officials and leaders, who seldom get the credit for their foresight and acumen in looking after the interests of their fellows'. It then went on to explain how Corrigan and Harris had secured unemployment benefit for an extra day for those who were on short-time when 'Beanfeast Day' (an annual paid holiday at the Arsenal) occurred (122). During the 1921 miners' lock out, the WLP proposed 'let us close up our ranks, trust the GHQ to control our movements with skill and effectiveness and do all that is necessary to resist the onslaught (123).

The position of the core Arsenal workers was also maintained through the fact that the Arsenal was one site, run by one management. Around the Arsenal there were only tiny, barely unionised, factories. Shop stewards did not have to link different sites as they did in Glasgow. Shop stewards in Sheffield had to contend with five firms, which employed 60% of arms workers, and there were fewer than 11,000 workers at the main Vickers site when there were 68,000 workers at the Arsenal.

Barrow was like Woolwich in that it was a single-industry town reliant upon the armament manufacturers, Vickers. From 1889 when the Naval Construction and Armaments Co gained its first considerable Admiralty contract, 'Barrow's fortunes followed the course dictated by international naval rivalries', the economy was reduced to reliance on shipbuilding, the largest concentration of workers was in engineering and machine making and it was 'a predominantly working class town with a large proportion of skilled and

semi-skilled workers (124). However, unlike Woolwich the politics of Barrow, like Crewe, a railway company town, and St Helens, where the Pilkington family established a benevolent despotism, were significantly influenced by personal employer paternalism. In a study of the 'structural supports' required for the development and maintenance of paternalism in another employment sector Filby argued that the greater the dependence on one or two employers or industry the greater is likely to be the degree of control over the workforce exercised by the management (125). In Woolwich the military bureaucracy of the Arsenal management operated in a different manner to Vickers.

An important difference was that Barrow was relative to Woolwich a newcomer to industry. The three decades before the First World War were the period when Barrow was 'a new, dynamic community, almost a 'Wild West frontier town of the industrial revolution'. During the war the numbers employed at Vickers during the war more than doubled from 16,000 to 31,000, most of those workers lived in Barrow. After the war many of the surplus workers returned to their home towns but, even so, by February 1920, there were almost 4,000 registered unemployed in the town. At the end of 1920, when the steel works went on an involuntary 'long holiday', the emigration rate rose and the population fell to 76,561. Like the WLP the Barrow Labour Party had close links with the co-operative movement, and Barrow Co-operative Society, like the RACS, originated amongst a handful of men employed in engineering and built houses for rent. The Barrow Pioneer (established in 1905) was published by the co-operative society (126). There was, compared to the events on Clydeside, a comparatively stable environment and industrial quiescent in Barrow and Woolwich.

The effect of the novelty of industrial processes on Barrow was mirrored on other munitions sites. An important aspect of the sense of continuity enjoyed in Woolwich was that the Woolwich Arsenal had occupied the same site central since Tudor times. E P Thompson, Hobsbawm and Branca all note that the change urbanisation and modernisation affected people's mentalities, and that it was some time, perhaps three generations, has to elapse before people adjust to the modern industrial experience (127). The significance of the continuity of munitions production at the Arsenal can be gauged by contrasting it with the position in Glasgow. On the Clyde many of the workers were new to heavy industrial processes. Giddens argues that the working class is 'more likely to achieve a high degree of revolutionary class consciousness in the initial phase of the industrialisation process'. The process of capitalist development 'incorporates' the working class and its political organisations into bourgeois culture, thus stabilising capitalist social relations (128). Contrary to Marx's identification of revolutionary consciousness and praxis with the maturity of capitalist development, revolutionary consciousness in fact 'tends above all to characterise the point of impact of post-feudalism and capitalist-industrialism' (129). The working class of Woolwich had had longer to become deradicalised than the newly deracinated workers on the Clyde. Tom Nairn stresses that the existence of revolutionary praxis only during the earliest stages of modern capitalism; 'the great English working class, this titanic social force which seemed to be unchained by the rapid development of English capitalism in the first half of the century...after the 1840s it quickly turned into an apparently docile class' (130). Monds links the Clydeside shop stewards-led revolt to a tradition of revolutionary anti-capitalist activity and opposition to central government (131). Bourgeois political ideology, the extension of the franchise and the rise of social

democratic politics, left the working class in Britain unable to carry 'in itself the power to be a class for itself'.

When the Arsenal workforce expanded from 10,866 in 1914 to 74,467 three years later many of the workers were new to the industrial experience. The woman in charge of the women in the workforce found the experience 'overwhelming' and the Arsenal 'like a town within a town', an image also used by the Christian Science Monitor of 1919 which called Woolwich 'a vast city of Arms' (132). Even to the core of workers there in 1914 the expansion was rapid and enormous. When Lloyd George wanted to give a single example of the 'unprecedented and revolutionary extent' of the scope the work of the government during the war, he selected Woolwich (133). The population of Woolwich went up by 15.7% in the years 1911-21, and this does not measure the full extent of the growth, as many workers, and their families, left very soon after the Armistice. Woolwich had the greatest increase in population of all the London boroughs, in this period, both in absolute terms, 19,000 more people, and in terms of the rate of increase (135). In 1922 the local paper reported 'tens of thousands have left Woolwich since the war' (136). The growth was spectacular, but it was not as dramatic for the locality as the influx of munitions workers was to Gretna where there were 10-15,000 workers where there had been 4,500 in 1914. In Woolwich growth had occurred before. The population of the town leapt by 22% between 1891 and 1901 due to production for the Boer War. There were whole new areas where these people lived, such as the Well Hall estate, which was, to an extent removed from the core of workers in Plumstead. It was from their established base that the stable population of Arsenal workers could make connections between work at the Arsenal and accommodation.

Despite the growth in the size of the Arsenal there were very few permanent migrants in the town. In 1921 over 93% of the population of the town came from England and Wales, predominantly from London. This was in contrast to the East End of London where there were many Jewish immigrants, or Govan where there were a large number of Highlanders and Irish (137). In 1921 around 4% of the Woolwich population were born in Scotland. These included a number of radicals; William Ross a Glaswegian foreman from a Chartist home; James Cowie, who, on behalf of the workers, gave evidence to the Henderson Committee; John Wilson, the radical preacher; the Labour councillor James Turnbull; socialist publisher Robert Banner; and the trade union leader J T Brownlie. There were also Welsh activists Haden Guest, the Labour county councillor; Tom Rees of the shop stewards and 'Tubby' Hall of the Pioneer.

Around 2% of the population of Woolwich were Catholics of Irish extraction during the first two decades of this century. The first priest to be appointed in the area since the Reformation arrived in 1890 and proclaimed that 'our programme will be a progressive programme' (138). Many were voteless soldiers but there were also organised republicans and the local priest announced that he was pleased to have the 'backbone of the Trades Union Movement of Woolwich behind him (139). One local labour activist recalled the great fervour of the pre-war struggle for Home Rule for Ireland (140). The United Irish Leagues Of GB recommended Irish nationalists to vote for Labour candidates Cameron and Crooks in Woolwich (141). Irish Nationalists took a dim view of the work carried out at the Arsenal. After the war, the Woolwich Irish Self-Determination League (ISDL) was founded and demonstrated in support of the Irish railworkers who were locked out for refusing to handle munitions intended for the destruction of their own countrymen. The WLP held a Town Meeting to

inaugurate a publicity campaign about the death of Terence McSwiney, late Lord Mayor of Cork. The Labour council permitted meetings of the ISDL in the Town Hall (142). The ISDL President, Woolwich Labour councillor R P Purcell, told the Woolwich 'Hands off Ireland' League that the aim of the ISDL was to shatter 'the tottering Coalshevik government' (143). Radicalism among the Irish workers might have been linked to a nationalist opposition to the colonial ruler but, in Woolwich, there was also divisions exacerbated by nationalism. 'Phil', writing on behalf of the ISDL, recommended 'that the English workers support the Irish struggle for self determination and repatriate 'that gang of Welsh-Canadian-Jew-Scot-Irish political twisters [a reference to the Cabinet] to their own countries' (144).

Although Celtic immigrants may well have radicalised the local labour movement they had to adapt to the terms established by the workers who were already at the Arsenal. The Pioneer emphasised the importance of long service at the Arsenal by frequently reporting instances of men who had lengthy service records at the Arsenal. Two examples of this give a flavour of the genre. The newspaper cited how five brothers all worked at the Arsenal. They followed their father who commenced work there over a hundred years previously (145). Robert Byford, a founder of the Woolwich Radical Club, later a ward secretary in the WLP, an ASE branch Treasurer and active in the RACS and Oddfellows, worked at the Arsenal, though not continuously, between 1866 and 1912. Two of his sons worked there (146). There was a great sense of continuity, particularly amongst the skilled men whose jobs were most secure, and who had a stake in the locality. They were able to maintain their grip on work at the Arsenal throughout the war, aware that, at the end of it, at least 80% of the workforce was going to return to commercial work (147). There were divisions between settlers and natives but the old hands, who had

witnessed the effects of the wartime boom of 1899-1901 and the aftermath, kept their heads and kept control.

Another reason that the core workers at the Arsenal were able to maintain their position was because the government established a degree of competition between the different state sites which did little to harmonise workers' unity and tended to promote the status quo. National factories were graded into four categories, with Woolwich in Category 'A', along with a score of other sites designated for retention. Category 'B' contained about 85 factories suitable for conversion. Repairs and production work was carried out at these sites, sometimes with equipment from the lower category sites. There were 25 'C' factories, of value in breaking down ammunition. The other factories were returned to their pre-war owners. Despite the fact that work of a 'profitable character' was carried out in national factories, this was to cease at the end of the 'transition period' (148). In March 1919 the Evening Standard listed 17 national factories which were for sale, including the National Aero Engine Factory, Hayes (149). Plans announced by the Straker Motor Co to convert the Ponders End Shell Works, which employed 6,00 workers during the war and was managed by H S Bickerton Brindley, who sat on the McKinnon Wood committee, but these were not realised and the site was closed in March 1919 (150). It was made clear that there were only a limited number of orders for workers in the state sector. There was some competition for orders for metal making between Enfield and Woolwich, won by the latter which had the more appropriate plant (151). In 1920, whilst the national factory at Lancaster received orders for railway repair work and some reconditioning of machinery, and there was work for Woolwich, Waltham Abbey received no orders (152). The campaigners continued to try to make such links, for 'the great factor of public opinion must be roused' as Barefoot

put it when publicising a meeting in London on the preservation of the national factories, but they had little to offer workers elsewhere (153). Councillor Harry Hart visited Plymouth, with its thousands of unemployed, and compared the situation to that in Woolwich. He believed that the solution to the problem was that 'it is the rank and file that must fight... to give them all they deserve, that is a clean turnout at the coming General Election' (154). As there were three Coalition MPs in Plymouth, building a network with such a limited agenda was difficult.

There were other towns where the Armistice spelt unemployment for skilled men. These workers often had greater similarities with Woolwich workers than differences from them and a similarity was that they also tended to be bound by economic orthodoxy in their perceptions, and unable to form close ties with each other. The closure of Pembroke Dock, in order to save £60,000, meant that the town was faced with bankruptcy. The pre-war core of Admiralty workers had numbered 2,500. They were reduced to 1,400 by 1925. At least 300 shop keepers depended upon the dockyard trade. Weekly wages amounted to £195,000 and salaries to £250,000, much of which was tied up in property. Two thirds of the workers had mortgages. There was a resolution of protest at the closure passed by the county council, a petition and meetings in the town but the issue, as in Woolwich, was fought as one which concerned the locality (155). In January 1919 Robert Horne, the Minister of Labour, told Portsmouth LAC that any fear of a forthcoming lack of work in the government establishments was 'entirely baseless' (156). This was untrue and the discharges from Portsmouth led to protests and the demand by the local MP that all the naval orders be given to Portsmouth, which meant that Chatham, Pembroke, Devonport

and Haulbowline would have to be converted for mercantile shipping (157).

There were protests at the closure of the national factories but these were not very concerted. Frank Rose the Labour MP for Aberdeen, called the Ministry of Munitions a bureaucratic monstrosity but also claimed that the government gave the 'armaments ring' £50 million in 1920 in order to maintain private plant. He argued for reform in the Royal Dockyards but failed to produce a coherent scheme (158). Another Labour MP, Young, and Coalition Labour MP Clynes both called for national factories to be used in the interests of the state, and to reduce unemployment, but nothing concrete was proposed and, when the Minister of Munitions, Kellaway, stated in the Commons that in peacetime 'it is a fallacy to suppose that the government can hope to compete, in ordinary terms, with private firms', there was no argument put forward to compete with this (159). Geddes suggested that trade unionists or co-operative societies should purchase factories and plans were drawn up, but the estimated costs of the national factories were high and the unions were unwilling to become owners (160). A conference of delegates representing nearly five million trade unionists and 3,500,000 co-operative members considered the matter and it was decided that the government was trying to sell them 'a white elephant' and that the yards should be used for building national ships and running a national shipping line' (161). It was not until March 1922 that a deputation of civic chiefs of industrial centres affected by the withdrawal of orders for battleships asked the PM to provide alternative work (162). By this point it was too late for an effective campaign.

The Woolwich workers maintained successful local links. The mayor of Woolwich and the NFWW lent support to the

Association for the Removal of Restrictions at Deptford Cattle Market and the Pioneer promoted a meeting about the subject (163). The reversion of Deptford Cattle Market from being a War Office store to its former role would have provided work and cheap food in Deptford. The possibility existed that Woolwich would then be used for the War Office stores no longer in Deptford (164). The political culture in Deptford, which, like Woolwich, had a Conservative MP in the late nineteenth century who fought on the platform of being a friend of Labour, was similar to that in Woolwich (165). In addition there were fraternal links. In October 1920 the Pioneer was 'delighted' because the Dartford Labour Party launched the Kentish Leader (166). The reopening of the Cattle Market was a concrete, local issue which fitted into the liberal framework within which the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners worked.

National labour leaders were able to build a body of support in Woolwich for the new order because important aspects of their case keyed into local concerns. The core workers at the Arsenal were paid differently to other munitions workers, which probably led to few disputes on the site, they were more firmly integrated into the corporate structure of the Arsenal, through the recognition of their shop stewards, which aided industrial harmony at the Arsenal, there was a high degree of mutual respect between union representatives and the CSOF. Both in 1897 and 1922 the Arsenal was not directly involved in the acrimonious engineering disputes. As Bush says 'at Woolwich Arsenal the powerful shop stewards' committee remained obstinately non-revolutionary, due to continuing craft exclusiveness and a tradition of management union consultation' (167). The Arsenal workers did not attempt to create a vast new workers' network, but strove to unite, as citizens, on specific issues, such as rationing or the use of the nearby cattle market. The cautious development

had the effect of aiding unity around the core workers. It also had the effect of undermining potential links with workers in similarly affected parts of the country. A broad-based unity might not have been easy to maintain. Shop stewards elsewhere in the country were more ambitious and of them only Sheffield's shop stewards movement was truly representative of all grades and occupations and even there shop floor unity was fragile and short-lived (168). Thom argues that the precarious unity of organised labour at the Arsenal was 'irreparably broken by 1920 after the debacle of Ramsay MacDonald's election and the Labour Council's apparent similarity to its Municipal Reform predecessors' (169). The election was in 1921 and there is no evidence that unity elsewhere was any more firmly secured. The unity was based upon the core workers because the other workers were less secure in their employment, many being either women or unskilled, and were often new to Woolwich. There was one site and one management, the state, which had owned the site for centuries. Elsewhere there were many sites and newer, private employers. Despite the influx of new workers and the threat of dilution, the core of skilled workers maintained their authority within the town after the war because there were no other comparable work sites in the locality, those who kept their jobs there remained well organised and materially better off than unemployed workers or those at other sites. The success of this formula allowed the men to mould the local labour movement in their image, and to exert control over the Woolwich Labour Party. Through the WLP their ideas were taken onto the Board of Guardians and the council chamber.

(b)

Schwarz and Durham propose that when the Labour Representation Committee was formed in 1900 it agreed to extend the struggles of the labour movement into Parliament but that there was no consensus on the forms and conditions of that extension. MacDonald and Snowden then fashioned a form of 'Labour Socialism' which, by 1921, was all but secured (170). Their use of the term 'Labour Socialism' comes from Macintyre. His definition is that it was concerned not with the working class, in the accepted sense of the term, but with the productive community, "every grade and section of producers by hand or brain", including entrepreneurs... progressive in its movement beyond the confines of ameliorative reformism yet conservative in its determination to damp down class struggle in all its forms (171).

Snowden claimed in 1922 that 'the Labour Party is the very opposite of a class party [as its object was] justice for all men and women who live by honest and useful work' (172). MacDonald said 'Socialism marks the growth of society, not the uprising of a class' (173). MacDonald also argued that community was of greater importance than class. Disputes did not just have two sides, labour and capital, there was also the 'side of the general community; and the general community has no business to allow capital and labour, fighting their battles themselves, to elbow them out of consideration'. To Schwarz and Durham the crucial development of the period 1910-24 was 'the emergence of Labour as a fundamentally constitutionalist force' and MacDonald's formulation about the nature of community was 'critical in determining the attitude of Labour Party politicians towards the state' (174).

Schwarz and Durham argue that MacDonald was 'profoundly influenced' by new liberals' (175). He was so influential

that 'the grip of social democracy on the minds of the working class was much greater than the syndicalist leaders had bargained for. Schwarz and Durham add that 'the confrontation inside the Labour Party, however, cannot be reduced to straightforward conflict between a bureaucratic leadership and a belligerent and activist rank and file' as the leadership won a measure of consensus for constitutionalism (176). In Woolwich it was because the attitudes were locally grown, rather than because of MacDonald, that social democratic ideas took root. Macdonald, clearly, was not persuasive. He failed to be elected as MP for the safe Labour seat of East Woolwich in 1921. Schwarz and Durham say that when the Labour Party was opened to individual membership, after the war, this aided the process by which new liberal and Fabian definitions were channelled into the Labour Party. They go on,

the containment of rank and file activism in the labour movement by 1921 [and] the rapid constitutionalization of the Labour Party... contributed to the 'passive' regeneration of the state (177).

They also say that 'key' working class conflicts were primarily defensive, and localised or sectional. They had three major foci: resistance to the dismantling of the staple industries, resistance to unemployment and resistance to the disciplinary and coercive core of the state system of welfare (178).

This recognises the importance of the experience of concrete struggles. The WLP had individual membership before the war. It was the local party which promoted constitutionalism and contained activism in its localised resistance to unemployment. Macintyre says, that the fundamental weakness of Labour Socialism lay not in its reformism but in the aimlessness of its reformism. If the task of the Labour Party, as interpreted by MacDonald, was to repair the ship of state for future voyages, it manifestly lacked any blueprint which

might instruct the efforts of the repairers (179).

Despite its limited success, it was from the struggle for alternative work that constitutionalism and community were buttressed, and this occurred because the campaign provided the specific 'blueprints', drawn up with reference to the radical traditions and experiences which are outlined in this section.

In the nineteenth century in Woolwich working class radicals were organised as Chartists, or were in the Reform League, or were 'Advanced Liberals' (a separate organisation under the liberal umbrella). Some men were in all three, which ensured that continuity was both political and organisational. Although the working class radical liberalism was not 'a sign of independent labour or socialist consciousness', it was 'important in creating the framework' for this (180). Crossick calls it

the radicalism of men who had come to terms with the basis of the society in which they now lived and aimed now at reforming it. The movement was dominated by skilled artisans... the radicalism was circumscribed by a broad social acquiescence... was not concerned with class power... did not grow from class conflict (181)

The Reform Act (1884), the Redistribution Act (1885), the Local Government Act (1889) and the abolition of plural voting for the Guardians (who were in control of local benefits provision), in 1894 gave skilled Arsenal workers both voting rights and, at least by implication, reciprocal duties towards the state. The Woolwich branch of the Reform League had, against the grain of the national body, stressed that it would be through continued respectable behaviour that some working men would be granted the franchise. The spirit of this idea of advance through respectable behaviour was maintained by the WLP. Crossick emphasises the devotion in Woolwich to a traditional

radical analysis, that saw privilege and political inequality as the roots of social ills. He also notes the extent to which the high degree of political integration within a wider structure of formal politics, derived from the way in which national political issues and movements took shape within Woolwich (182). These elements were reiterated in the WLP's links with the unions, in its concern for respectability and its advocacy of gradual advance and working for a high turnout at elections. The WLP's ethos was of parochial cross-class communication, like the politics of those of the previous generation, 'less a challenge to values, far more an assertion of them - in a specifically working class context' (183).

Woolwich was not unique in this respect. David Howell stresses how 'many spokesmen for the Independent Labour Party abandoned the Liberal Party as an instrument but did not abandon many of their Radical Liberal principles' (184). Crossick says that, 'Liberalism drew working class radicalism into the formal politics of the area', it was the WLP which kept it there (185). The WLP became the only Labour Party in London to absorb both socialists and Lib-Labs (186). George Bishop was a Progressive on Plumstead Vestry before becoming a Progressive and Labour Alderman on the first Woolwich Borough Council. Will Crooks received considerable Liberal support and worked closely with the Progressives on the London County Council. Both Fennell, a former Liberal and James Turnbull, a central figure in Plumstead Progressive Association became Labour councillors. John Wilson was a Progressive on the London School Board for the decade 1891-1901 before committing himself to Labour. The social reformer G P Gooch was a major shareholder in the Pioneer. In an article written in 1906 he explained how he wanted a 'new Progressive party, with its Liberal and Labour wings' (187). Mainstream Liberals were viewed with suspicion by Arsenal workers

because the Liberals were associated with a non-aggressive foreign policy and the closure of the Dockyards in 1869 and because the party was dominated by the middle class (188). Although, as Crossick notes, 'Liberalism never took the firm hold with Woolwich labour aristocrats that it did elsewhere', there were elements of the 'essentially accommodationist liberal-radicalism' which were of significance within Woolwich Labour Party (189).

The WLP was built as a party for working men who wanted to have a greater part in local affairs. Following from the Arsenal union tradition of a reliance upon legislative and administrative procedures as the principal means of solving social problems, a primacy was given to formal political processes and the marshalling of the popular vote as a means of gaining Labour hegemony. The WLP developed from the Labour Representation Association, the object of which was 'to secure the representation of labour on all elected bodies'. Theoretical discussion, or even the co-operative commonwealth were not priorities. Crossick says of the Victorian period to 'a vigorously independent working class politics; a clarification of the involvement with liberalism [were] neither satisfying nor necessary' (190). This lack of theoretical clarity sometimes faded into opposition to politics in general. Militant shop steward W Watson recalled that when he worked at the Arsenal

Everybody was talking, and the conversation of my companions was illuminating. The knowledge of football, cricket and racing was extensive, their fund of lewd stories seemed inexhaustible, but they spoke little about the significance of the European conflagration (191).

Helen Bentwich secured a post as an overlooker at the Arsenal, through her brothers influence, 'apparently it's the way things are done here', and noticed how war 'was

seldom mentioned in the Arsenal. Mostly the talk was of money' (192).

In the late nineteenth century, high on the list of radical priorities were the selection of a candidate who was supportive of the claims of working men. From 1870 there were close links between the Arsenal unions and Advanced Liberals and then the WLP and the WL&TC (193). Barefoot was secretary of the WL&TC and then of the WLP. One of the triumphs of the labour movement had been to get Plumstead Vestry to pay union rates and to reintroduce union rates for work done for the borough when the WLP gained power.

The Advanced Liberals privileged the registration of the electorate (194). The WLP maintained this emphasis on encouraging individuals to vote for change. Individual Labour Party membership was pioneered in Woolwich. Street collectors, equivalent to shop stewards, were employed by the WLP and paid on a commission basis. Most constituency Labour Parties did not adopt individual membership until 1925, though one of the earliest parties to do so was in another town dominated by the munitions industry, Barrow. There too there was an effective ward organisation and the regular collection of small sums from members (195). In 1919 the WLP secretary from 1903 to 1941 and its leader on the council, Barefoot, argued that 'the gospel of labour must go forth to the workers of London, and this could only be done by a mass canvass' (196). When Fenner Brockway (the editor of Labour Leader 1911-16 and the ILP secretary 1922-6) reported on the 1921 Woolwich East Parliamentary by-election he drew attention to the startlingly efficient organisational workings of Barefoot and the WLP in 1921 (197). Herbert Morrison the secretary of the London Labour Party also noted, approvingly, the WLP's emphasis on building the party. After the 1921 Parliamentary by-

election he concluded that, 'canvassing on the doorstep is of much greater consequence than holding forth at the street corner' (198). The London Labour Party was an affiliate body, a principle affiliate in terms of financial support was the RACS, and there were close ideological links with the WLP (199). Both the WLP and the London Labour Party favoured house-to-house canvassing, indeed Morrison's model Labour Party member was not a fiery socialist but one with a 'mind like a card index' (200).

The encouragement of personal involvement established the WLP firmly within the locality because there was face-to-face contact when the collectors called for the penny a week. Whereas the President of the WU, Jack Beard, referred in 1919, to his members as passive receptacles upon whom ideas could be imprinted, the people of Woolwich were viewed by the WLP as potentially active citizens (201). When the Pioneer pointed out that the people who financed the Coalition 'are also calling the tune, and well the Arsenal workers know it', it was drawing attention to the fact that Arsenal workers were not dupes (202). This also meant that they could be blamed for the consequences of their actions. The Pioneer took the electorate to task

Think of it you hard headed free and independent electors who turned down Alternative Work on March 2 [1921, a Parliamentary by-election]. The amazing decision of the Cabinet is obviously a complete capitulation to their bosses - the private contractors ... We sold our birthright of stalwart championship in the House of Commons on March 2 for a mess of potage ... **And there has been a change in atmosphere in regard to Woolwich in high places ever since Black Wednesday** (emphasis in original) (203).

The WLP asked people to 'assist us to make the world a brighter place for all to live in. First join the Party yourself and then become a missionary to bring others into our ranks (204). This focus upon the individual

responsibility of electors had the effect of privileging the process of elections and marginalising the wider economic and social environment. The failure to secure alternative work was blamed on the victims, the electorate of Woolwich, as well as the private armaments companies, for the solution was seen to lie in the hands of the individual, not a matter for collective, direct action. Harry Snell argued that 'you in Woolwich can't complain about the state of things that exists'. The reason for this statement was that the WLP candidate had recently lost a Parliamentary by-election after having 'asked for a mandate from you to tell the government that the Arsenal was to be kept going on work of a civil kind. You sent a message back to the government that you wanted nothing of the sort and you were satisfied with what you'd got. Therefore it is not the government that is to blame, it is you that is to blame' (205).

In the key election text of the Pioneer in 1918 27% of the article was devoted to the liberal issue of Free Trade, and to a central issue in the 1903 by-election of Crooks, cheap white bread. A further 27% was taken up with a call for women to vote Labour. The campaigning for the extension of the franchise had received much support in the town. That only 30% of Woolwich soldiers would be able to vote, the record of the government and the need for the Labour Party to promote parliamentary political activity rather than promoting the value of industrial action, were also mentioned. A 'Parliament in which Labour is not fully represented spells chaos and possible revolution within the next twelve months' (206). This article reflected the constitutional, liberal concerns of the dominant strain of Labourism in the town. The Pioneer when calling for funds in order to fight the LCC elections of 1922 asked rhetorically 'Have you realised why the Coalition at Westminster so largely representative of the British

Federation of Industries [surely the FBI?] is refusing work to the Arsenal?' (207). All questions could be solved by reference to Parliament.

The promotion of this idea of individual responsibility was tied to an idea of citizenship. Barefoot promoted the idea of the constitutionalist might of the local citizens, rather than the value of united working class action. He announced that,

every shopkeeper, every ratepayer, is affected by the principle of direct labour and **the sooner Woolwich is united on this principle the better it will be for Woolwich.** And when we are united, when the government cannot turn round and say that on a recent occasion [the 1921 by-election] you turned down the principle of alternative work and direct labour then we can see what we can do to secure more work for Woolwich Arsenal [my emphasis]

Councillor James Newman (Labour) made a similar point in response to a jibe by a Municipal Reform councillor that there was no evidence that the influence of the private sector was responsible for the running down of the Arsenal.

Directly the war came to an end these workshops which had been so successful, and which had been fitted with the latest machinery, were shut. And who shut them? Parliament. And who was mainly represented in Parliament? Private enterprise.

The inference was that the transformation of social and economic structure could be accomplished through voting for the appropriate person to represent the locality in the Commons (208). This was aided by greater individual membership.

Critics on the left have seen individual membership as a means of diluting the fervour of the activists and increasing the authority of the leadership over the otherwise ungovernable mass. John Foster argues that the

introduction of individual membership increased the scope for interference by those outside the labour movement and Thomas Bell, a contemporary Communist, suggested that it was introduced specifically so that middle-class members could counter working-class militancy (209). In Woolwich the effect was to encourage individual involvement in the construction of a community, not a class, consciousness. The WLP considered itself to be answerable to the people of the borough, not just the labour movement. The WLP inquired as to whom the Woolwich Unemployed Committee, a CPGB-dominated organisation, was accountable and it did this from the high ground of its own encouragement of participation. The effect of the WLP's efforts was that the turnout for elections - a great deal of WLP work involved checking the electoral register, - was almost always the highest in London throughout the interwar period. The Pioneer campaigned for readers to register to vote, carrying, for a number of weeks prior to the closure of registration, advertisements with slogans such as 'be certain that your weapon is ready with which to... strike the mighty blow!' (ie vote Labour) (210). In the year following the Armistice, the WLP was active in campaigns for elections to the Commons, the county council, the borough council, and the Board of Guardians. It conducted two registrations, and compiled two registers of the 68,000 voters in the borough. It also reconstructed the ward organisation, conducted a rents campaign, held public meetings, aided strikers and by May 1919 had doubled its membership. In 1921 the Daily Herald 'push' prize of £50 was awarded to the WLP on account of the fact that it was in the constituency of East Woolwich that the paper gained most new readers - 849 of them (211). The WLP raised money through printing on the Pioneer press and through approaches to local clubs (212). In 1919 the average turnout for the LCC elections was 16%, as compared to 1913 when 52% of the smaller electorate had voted. The highest

percentage turnout for any borough was East Woolwich with 40.9%, over five times higher than the lowest turnout, 7.8% in North Islington. Between the wars Woolwich consistently had the highest turnout in London. In focussing upon the demand for legally constituted reforms made through the state apparatus, the WLP revealed its radical-liberal heritage and its interest in the involvement of citizens in electoral politics.

The corollary of the emphasis on electoral politics was the disinclination to engage in direct action. Snell argued that demonstrations did not get results, hard work and organisation did. He emphasised that even if he was not elected to the Commons he wanted to increase the membership of the WLP and the sales of the Pioneer (213). He also stressed that if 'the working class wanted a thing they could get it by political action, acting loyally and using wisdom in doing the right thing'. Haden Guest, one of the two county council members for Woolwich, replied to the criticism that the Labour Party was ill-prepared for power by saying that, in fact, the party had got a 'large number of men and women able to carry out the administrative and other duties' (214). He wanted the demands of the movement 'translated into administration and legislation' (215).

A further aspect of the notion of radical community which was developed in Woolwich through the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign derived from an idea of citizenship. Hall and Schwarz argue that from 1889 there was pressure from the organised workers' movement for the expansion of democratic participation and that this challenge carried within it 'a new conception of citizenship. Furthermore 'the pressures for the expansion of democratic participation were not confined to the male working class (216). According to Crossick from the late nineteenth century in Woolwich
the class hostility that was perpetuated
by artisan radicals in Kentish London

was not that between employer and employee, but between the industrious, productive classes as a whole, and the lazy and privileged... landowners and aristocracy (217)

The barriers to progress of the Arsenal workers, according to this nineteenth-century radical position, were not class privilege, or bankers with ultimatums concerning government spending or newspaper proprietors, rather they were corruption, privilege and unfair rules. Each section of society had its own proper functions and these could be made to run with greater efficiency. When Bernard Shaw mocked the 'Ideal of Citizenship' in a lecture in 1909 he might have been describing the view of the WLP.

We will explain our good intentions and our sound economic basis to the whole world: the whole world will then join us at a subscription of a penny a week; then, the whole of society belonging to our society, we shall become society, and we shall proceed to take the government of the country into our hands and inaugurate the millennium (218) .

The notion of citizenship was developed by the WLP which offered 'straight talk to sensible citizens' as opposed to Communist 'blackguardism' (219). Snell, addressing women at a WLP meeting proposed that 'in the minds of the best women' the vote was never an end in itself. Women he contended, demanded the vote because it was 'a badge of citizenship... it had placed upon them the opportunity of entrance into the full heritage of citizenship'. The Labour Party, the Pioneer claimed, was 'the party of the people against these class parties' (220). Within Labour's ranks were

doctors, parsons, barristers,
historians, novelists, experts on
education and economics... all the
workers. And the workers, as John
Stuart Mill said, are not a class, but
the nation (221).

The reference to J S Mill recalled how in nineteenth century Woolwich working class radicals had sought the

support of the middle class (222). The Pioneer noted that 12% of the population owned 88% of the wealth but added that this minority did not include 'scientists, the inventors, the great engineers, the workers by hand or brain' (223). Fred Thomas, the AGC secretary, proposed in 1920 that

the question of class should in no way sway the minds of the workers of today. There should be no class, each member of the community being a factor essential to the whole... I do not believe that the present system of a strike is a successful means where by we can secure the objects for which we strike... there is no better method of dealing with direct industrial problems than the shop stewards movement. Shop stewards should have extended powers (224).

Citizenship was not handed down to the workers of Woolwich by the central government, it had a local component which emphasised the importance of working men's organisations. It also stressed public order and respectability.

Throughout the 1922 local election campaign the Pioneer never used the words 'socialism' or 'working class' but rather characterised the battle as between 'labour' and 'anti-labour' (225). The Pioneer urged the electorate to vote Labour by reference to 'the civic spirit' of the Party which would run the borough 'wholly and solely on the interests of the citizen' (226). In reference to the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign the Pioneer employed the language of citizenship; 'We men and women of Woolwich appeal to our fellow citizens, the electors of Britain. We do not appeal for pity or charity... We appeal for a hearing' (227).

The ASE, the RACS and later the WLP, were institutions which expressed the artisans' faith in the ability of working men to make their own world by the removal of the obstacles in the path which led to just rewards. In 1921 Jack Mills wrote a pamphlet denouncing the right-wing landowner, the Duke of Northumberland and the WLP denounced

various groups established by the Duke in radical terms, 'real constitutional government is not their concern, but government by persons who are privileged, economically and socially to exploit their fellows' (228). The WLP wanted Sir Kingsley Wood to be given a 'fair hearing' and it made sure that the former Tory mayor of Woolwich was 'graciously treated' (229). Probably the nearest that Barefoot got to a public display of intolerance of a fellow citizen was when he shook his fist at a MR councillor, Dawson, or when he agreed with another MR councillor, Campbell, that Communists were 'scum of other countries' (230). Sir Kingsley Wood in a speech which epitomised the new civic links, the Eltham Chamber of Commerce annual dinner, praised Barefoot and Labour mayor Richard Purcell and then said, 'people should not lose the old spirit and love of this spot in the new civic patriotism (231).

The concept of a civic community was further bolstered by the use of history to show that social regeneration proceeded in a gradual and organic fashion, to demonstrate the need for local Labour representation and leadership and to point out the ground that had been gained and was vulnerable to counterattack. Political recklessness could lead to the exclusion of Labour from the two-party constitutionalism which was being constructed and the destruction of all that had been won. Schwarz and Durham argue that 'the crucial factor in the strategic analysis of the constitutionalists was the perpetual anxiety that a political backlash would occur' (232). This critique sounded more convincing if it was aided by local historical examples. The WLP constructed a positivist account of a past when there had been a community in Woolwich and where workers, although they might be denied justice in the short term, would eventually benefit from general and inevitable progress. WLP council candidate Reverend Matthews wrote that 'the citizen whose time is limited... might well make

his reading historical' (233). The men of Plumstead had, according to the Pioneer, 'presented a solid front to Bluff King Hal when he sought to restrict their rights...The 'characteristic sturdy independence' and the 'grit and determination of Plumstead men' safeguarded Plumstead Common in 1876 when the enclosure of common land by businessmen was successfully resisted (234). Will Crooks, the first Labour MP in the town, was credited with persuading Haldane, the Minister of War, to establish the Henderson committee (235). Shortly after he lost the seat in January 1910 'feed and speed' was introduced at the Arsenal. Layoffs were suspended during MacDonald's by-election campaign in 1921. The day after Labour lost the seat plans were announced to reduce the number at the Arsenal to 14,300, a figure lower than that of 1914, by the end of the month. As MacDonald said, reiterating the importance of Parliament '6,000 of you are being discharged. That is the result of the election' (236).

Within this notion of a civic community, locality was stressed above class. This had its origins in the late nineteenth century. Sutton, expressly working within the framework provided by Hall and Schwarz, argues that from 'the 1870s liberal discussions of citizenship revolved around the belief that it could neutralise class consciousness and play a crucial role in integrating the working class into the state' (237). In the 1870s the local MP, William Gladstone, became unpopular with the local working class because he spoke only eight times in the borough during the twelve years that he represented Greenwich. The Advanced Liberals paid close attention to local affairs, indicative of a sense of involvement and influence in the locality (238). As the Arsenal was central to the locality local MPs all tried to link their names to the well being of Arsenal workers. The Conservative MP for Woolwich until the turn of the century

was Edwin Hughes. He made a point of eliciting working class support and he had close ties with the RACS. As he explained, 'on matters tending to improve the social condition of the people I have voted independently of party, and for that reason I consider myself a true representative of LABOUR' (239). His focus, on the Arsenal workers, adds weight to Hinton's summary of the position that; 'working class politics at the end of the last century were the politics of the labour aristocracy' (240). The Woolwich seat was divided in two in 1918 with Crooks taking the East seat uncontested and Sir Howard Kingsley Wood becoming the MP for Woolwich West from 1918 until 1943. The latter frequently raised the issue of pay for Arsenal workers in the Commons, and had a record of arguing for the fair treatment of Arsenal workers in regard to their pensions and when there were layoffs (241). He was 'staunchly in favour of the claims of labour', arranged for Arsenal workers to meet the Financial Secretary to the Treasury and, in his capacity as a solicitor, represented tenants evicted from the Arsenal's housing estate (242). He said that 'the Unionist of today was not the hidebound Tory of prewar days', that 'he would always support any effort to get alternative work to supplement the necessary war work'. He called himself 'a social reformer, not a socialist' (243).

Labour MPs also emphasised their ties to the locality. The first thing which the Pioneer reported about Harry Snell, when he became the prospective Parliamentary candidate for Woolwich East, was that he was 'one who is really a Woolwich man' (244). His maiden speech in the Commons was about the Arsenal. Jack Mills, elected as MP for Dartford in 1920, spent the morning prior to his introduction to the House in the Arsenal and intended to make his first speech about the Arsenal (245). The Pioneer could not claim that MacDonald had any ties to Woolwich, especially as he was

promised to Aberavon at the following General Election. It did claim that his opponents were 'a gang of carpetbaggers from the Tory headquarters' (246). MacDonald stressed that 'Woolwich interests will remain my interests, Woolwich concerns will remain my concerns'. The Coalition made its only electoral gain in the lifespan of the government because MacDonald's brand of constitutionalism could not be imported wholesale. Unlike his opponent he lacked any empathy with the working class. The victorious Coalition candidate, Captain Gee VC, like Crooks, was born in the workhouse. Of the 51 official Labour MPs before the war MacDonald was the only one whose parents were not of the industrial working classes and one of only three who did not begin his working life as an industrial labourer. He divided workers and blamed victims when he tactlessly said that the trade unions stood in the path of ex-Servicemen and forced their dismissal from the Arsenal (247). Ross McKibbin blames the lack of union support for MacDonald's failure (248).

MacDonald had not got a record of support for the war, indeed a meeting of his in July 1918 in Woolwich was disrupted by an anti-pacifist crowd. This was in stark contrast to Gee who spent 29 years in the ranks of the army. Gee reminded voters that the Arsenal workers had passed a resolution during the war stating that MacDonald, due to his pacifism, had foregone the right to speak for Labour. Gee argued that the German air raids, (Woolwich Arsenal had been a target), were the responsibility of pacifists. The Woolwich Herald suggested there was discontent in Labour's ranks because a major, Haden Guest, had not been selected as a candidate and Snell reported that the WLP was 'half -sullen' about the candidate (249). The Woolwich Herald called the contest one of 'pacifism vs patriotism'. Crooks had been the MP who had led the singing of the National Anthem in the Commons when the war

broke out and on Gee's victory the Woolwich Herald reported that 'a patriot succeeds a patriot'. Gee had the Reverend C P Edwards MC 'the fighting parson' on his side and the demagogic Independent MP Horatio Bottomley intervened against MacDonald. He paid for trams to pass through the town advertising that MacDonald was a traitor and ran a campaign in his journal John Bull. Gee, copied the WLP and established his own newspaper, the North Kent Argus (250). Maurice Cowling attributes Gee's victory to Bottomley and similarly Chris Cook blames pacifism (251). Snell blamed both (252). Gee promised 'to do his bit for the Arsenal workers' in regard to pensions and firmly stated, 'I certainly do not want to see the Arsenal closed. If we had taken Mr Ramsay MacDonald's advice it would have been shut down long ago' (253). Within a month of his election Gee had occasion to meet with Lloyd George. He made sure that he 'put in a word for Woolwich Arsenal and its workers' (254). Both parties recognised the centrality of the Arsenal to the campaign, Gee was better placed to exploit it. As soon as the WLP had a more appropriate candidate, Snell, it recovered the seat. The Communists in Woolwich rejected MacDonald and the Commons and looked to a working class dictatorship as 'the sole salvation'; the WLP's accepted the Commons but MacDonald only grudgingly because he did not accord with its conceptualisation of a local civic community (255).

The notion of a strong local community was reinforced in a number of other areas. The applicability of the concept provided a broad base from which the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign could be launched and then maintained. When the Pioneer argued that a local wood ought to be saved from development it focused upon cross-class links. It listed a number of famous people who supported the view of the paper and then added rather patronisingly that 'all the great mass of the toiling population have felt instinctively that

these great heights [Shooters Hill and Castle Wood] must be saved' (256). The rational leaders articulated the instincts of the people in this as in other fields. The campaign to save Castle Wood on Shooters Hill was supported by the secretary of the shop stewards, Voce; the WL&TC chair, Jackman; the WCC President, Eley; high-ranking local Army officers; elected representatives of both parties on the local and the county councils; the MPs; and the chair of the Polytechnic governors, and funder of the Pioneer, Grinling (257).

The campaign for alternative work was developed within, and bolstered, a particular view of the state as the political expression of the community. The WLP posited the state as a free-floating device, above class politics, which could be seized, or at least influenced in the legislature, so that appropriate solutions could be imposed. It was the state which had introduced 'one of the greatest changes' at the Arsenal, according to a man who worked there from 1877 until 1922. It introduced the eight-hour day in 1894, three years before the large-scale dispute in the engineering industry over the issue (258). MacDonald argued for the conversion of the Arsenal into a specifically 'national civil workshop' and the Pioneer argued that the national organisation of industry is the alternative to anarchy and red chaos' (my emphasis) (259). Snell proposed, as he had done for over twenty years that just as there was a standing army so there ought to be a 'standing Arsenal'. He also thought that the Arsenal should be used for 'the production of things that the community does need', and stressed that unemployment should be dealt with nationally, not on a local basis (260).

The WLP gained control of the offices of the local state, the council and the Board of Guardians, in the 1919 elections and the campaign for alternative work became part

of a broader campaign for the government to take responsibility for unemployment. The WLP's time in office was characterised by cautious, constitutional, action on behalf of the those who were perceived to be part of the community. The WLP when running the council reduced the rates and emphasised in its election material that to vote Labour was to 'tell the Coalition that you stand for real economy' (261). The chair of the finance committee was proud that 'we not only preach economy, we practice it... we promised true economy in administration and I challenge anyone to show that we have broken that promise (262). A Fabian publication of 1929 subtitled 'the case for municipal housekeeping' focused upon Woolwich because from it one might deduce 'the perfect arsenal of facts which prove that its Labour councillors can mind their own business' (263).

As Christopher Nottingham notes, during this period 'much care was taken over the dispersal of state functions' so as to allow Ministers to evade responsibility when it suited them (264). Specifically the cost of unemployment benefit was raised by the council and the benefit distributed by the Guardians. If adequate provision was to be made for the unemployed there was a heavy rates burden in the area where the unemployed resided. The more unemployed people there were, the less that could be raised and the greater the calls upon the council's services. The number of people eligible to claim the council's free milk rose as unemployment rose. 20,000 households paid rates in Woolwich, at least 75% of which were working class houses. By September 1921 there were around 10,000 unemployed in the town, about 50% of whom paid rent. Most of the 11,000 on short time at the Arsenal paid rent. Rent payers also paid rates and, under the Rent Acts, every rates increase above that which prevailed in 1914 could be added to the rent. If 60% of the unemployed - a low estimate - could

draw £2 a week for their families the total required from the rates would be £12,000 a week. A penny (1d) rate raised £3,900 in Woolwich, £3,000 in Poplar and £31,000 in Westminster. For Woolwich to have raised £31,000 an 8d (3½p) rate would have had to be levied (265). In order to raise £12,000 a week the occupier of a house rated at £12 (the working class average in Woolwich) would have to find an additional £7 16s (£1.80) a year (266).

In response to this inequality the WLP lobbied for the equalisation of the rates across London, but stressed that the relief of the overburdened ratepayer 'must await the coming of a Labour government' (267). The WLP argued that as the Arsenal had provided arms for the nation and as it was the government which had induced people to move to Woolwich during the war and as the Arsenal workforce were paid from the national coffers, the burden of unemployment ought to be taken off the ratepayers. Specific remedies were proposed: the government to reimburse the Woolwich Borough Council for the cost of the benefits that it had paid, public works, a house building programme, trade with Russia, credits for central Europe, and the use of the Arsenal 'for the production of useful articles' (268). The WLP also called a town meeting and demanded a 'special grant to relieve Woolwich', from the Ministry of Health on account of the fact that unemployment in the town was distinctive (269). In addition the Woolwich Borough Council provided a charity, the Mayor's Fund, for the unemployed and sent Barefoot, along with a number of the London mayors, to lobby Lloyd George when he was in Gairloch, Scotland (270). Following the publicity resultant from the Gairloch confrontation the Minister with responsibility for local government, Sir Alfred Mond, met WBC representatives and promised further house-building. The War Office agree to meet a deputation from the Joint Town Committee (271). Representatives from the council, the Chamber of Commerce,

the unions (the ASE, WU and NUGW) and from the Ministry of Labour Local Employment Committee, went to the War Office. Led by Voce the delegation pressed for an end to the discharges and government aid for the borough as the town was 'almost wholly dependent on the national factories for work'. The Service orders ought to go to the Arsenal, because the Arsenal could not diversify and because the M^CKinnon Wood committee had concluded in favour of a national arsenal in Woolwich. The War Office countered the delegation by stating that the question was one for the Cabinet, not the War Office. Sir Kingsley Wood said that the Cabinet should decide the on the matter and Barefoot said, 'it was a Cabinet decision that 300 men should be discharged weekly and therefore a Cabinet decision would be required to stop the discharges'(272). Those who campaigned for alternative work, and on the related issues of work and local government finance, abided by the constitutional conventions as well as employing a notion of community.

The role of the Guardians in Woolwich was not to provide a platform for an attack on the government, rather the Guardians were to provide voluntary, constitutional solutions, which involved a degree of collective self-help. They were to help 'towards making the lives of many thousands of those who have fallen upon hard times a little brighter' (273). The WBG held a 'whip round' and provided a 'meat tea' unemployed men and their children (274). The WLP looked to another part of the community network for support. Coupons which could be exchanged at the RACS were also provided by the WBG and the RACS itself provided food at wholesale prices to the council's Unemployed Committee (275).

Protests at the level of benefit were levelled at the WLP and the problems of unemployment fell upon it rather than

central government. In September 1921 The WBG was locked in its offices overnight with a group of people who demanded that the Guardians make further payments to the unemployed. The WLP called this 'disgusting treatment... by those not resident within the area covered by the Woolwich Board' (276). The protestors were deemed to be physically be from outside of the community and thus of less account. This was not an isolated incident. There was a similar event in Erith Council Chamber in October 1919 (277). In 1921 WLP organiser Charles New was pelted with onions because, in his capacity as a Guardian, he gave evidence which led to the conviction of a man found guilty of obtaining relief whilst his wife had a job (278). In February 1922 Barefoot and New were locked in with protestors at the Town Hall, the Woolwich Guardians were locked in their offices, a meeting of Erith Guardians was invaded by 500 people and an attempt was made to rush the gate of the Lewisham Guardians' office (279). The Times reported that 'processions of the unemployed to Boards of Guardians are now a daily occurrence in London' (280).

There were five London Boards with Labour majorities in 1919 but Poplar and Woolwich were the only London boroughs where there had been a Labour administration had held power before the war (281). Both had their own newspapers; the Pioneer urged readers to buy the Herald (282). Poplar was characterised by casual dock labour and the rag trade. The Labour council in Poplar made the same complaints about the unfairness of the rating system as the WLP made; but won its case through an intransigently unconstitutional campaign (283). George Lansbury, a Poplar councillor and Guardian, said that it was their duty to provide 'decent treatment for the poor outside the workhouse and hang the rates!' (284). In 1921 Poplar Borough Council resolved, without prior consultation with the London Labour Party or other Labour Councils, only to raise a rate for itself and

the Guardians, and not to raise a rate for London-wide matters such as the police, water and asylums. Following legal proceedings against them, in September 1921, 29 Poplar councillors were fined and gaoled for their activities on a specific charge of contempt of court. Schwarz and Durham argue in respect of the 'key class conflicts in the 1920s' that 'many of the fiercest struggles were concentrated within and against the apparatuses of the local state', and that, as in the case of Poplarism, 'on specific issues the constitutional/non-constitutional distinction was simply inoperative' (285). In Woolwich the prognosis that to achieve either work or maintenance constitutional action was required was reinforced by the WLP's analysis and activities. It was against the background of the WLP's response to Poplarism that the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was developed.

The WLP did not condemn the Poplar councillors outright but neither did it support them through either the Guardians or the Council (286). The WLP called the imprisonment of the Poplar councillors a

mere incident which does not affect the problem of unemployment in the slightest degree beyond calling attention to its urgency (287)

Councillor Newman told his fellow members of Woolwich council that the time was rapidly approaching when Woolwich might have to follow Poplar's example but he hoped the necessity would not arise (288). Councillor Harry Gilder (Labour) was the representative of the Joint Shop Stewards of the NUGW and the WU and represented the lowest-paid workers. He explained to the Communist-backed Woolwich Unemployed Committee that even 'supposing that you do get the Guardians to do what you want you will find that the Government will still be top dog and refuse to allow the Guardians to pay out the money. They may go to prison and you will still be out of work' (289). When the Poplar

councillors were released there were still the precepts to pay and there was still no rate equalisation but the Minister hurried through legislation, the Local Authorities (Financial Provisions) Act of 1921. This allowed the council to borrow money, dependent on Ministerial consent, and it spread the cost of pauperism, proportionate to the rateable value of the area, over all London. The equalisation required the collation of the accounts of the appropriate Poor Law Unions.

In 1921 control of the Guardians reverted to Municipal Reform (MR). In June 1922 the Woolwich MR Guardians declined to take advantage of the Finance Act which would have allowed them to save £40,000 from the rates. The Labour-controlled council refused to pay the Guardians the money which the WBG could have saved (290). The Guardians then took the council to court (291). The WBC were prepared to go to court to ensure that the rates did not rise to 10d (4½p) in the pound but were unwilling to go to court for the same reasons as the Poplar councillors.

In January 1922 the Minister of Health, Mond, imposed new scales of relief which the Poplar Guardians refused to implement. They avoided further legislative battles by using their own definition of 'cases of emergency' and thus effectively ignored the intentions of the Minister. Four Labour representatives from the Guardians, four from the WLP General Committee and four from the official Woolwich Unemployment Committee met to consider the Poplar scale of relief of £2 per week for a married couple compared to Mond's level of £1.5s (£1.25). There were similarly proportioned increases for other claimants. If these more generous allowances were paid in Woolwich it would have added over £2,600 a week to the cost of unemployment benefit in Woolwich and added £2.12s (£2.60) to the annual bill for a person paying £12 a year in rates. The WLP

resolved that the WBG would not pay the same rates as the Poplar Board to the unemployed (292). The meeting decided that the local authority would 'go as far as possible' on the issue but would 'centre agitation on the National administration' rather than agree to pay the money (293). 'Surely the work of the Guardians in relieving the destitute under present conditions was more of a national than a local question' said Councillor Newman. He added that at present the government paid 85% of the cost of poor relief and that it 'ought to be more like 98%' (294).

The WLP, when in office, paid union rates, as did Poplar council (295). In 1924 both Woolwich council and Poplar council were, after a lengthy legal battles, surcharged for this by the District Auditor (296). In 1925 Woolwich council paid £5,000 towards the Poplar Councillors Defence Fund and the struggle continued until 1927 when, after an emergency conference in Woolwich between trade unionists and councillors, the WBC were again surcharged for paying illegally high wages. Shortly afterwards new legislation clarified the issue (297). On this union-related matter the WBC was defiant of the government. That the WLP was prepared to defend trade unions and low rates in the courts reflects the ties between local radical-liberalism and the unions. The continual co-operation was unique in London, and it lasted until the Communists gained control of the WL&TC (298). In 1921 the WL&TC fell under Communist control and in 1922 the WL&TC, though still affiliated to the WLP, supported non-Labour Party candidates in the LCC elections, and the WLP drew apart from it (299).

The WLP wanted an increase in state employment in Woolwich but if orders for the Arsenal were not forthcoming it was prepared to implement government relief work schemes. Lansbury thought relief schemes institutionalised casual labour and that the municipal work should be done by a

regular workforce, not by the unemployed (300). Woolwich council was more willing to acquiesce with public works, seeing them as a temporary expedient before the imposition of a socialist solution by a national Labour government. 73,000 jobs had been promised in Minister of Labour Dr Thomas Macnamara's Public Works programme of 1921 (301). The 'thoroughly scientific' WBC approach was to provide full-time work for 20 men and part-time work for 160 painting public toilets and street signs, breaking up stones and performing a number of similar tasks. With the aid of some LCC money a sewers scheme was initiated which provided work for another 80 men, and road widening, using government funds, provided a little more work (302). The WBC had a grant for £30,000 worth of road works and wanted to repair the sewers but the materials were not available. A total of £152,000 worth of work was found in the first 21 months of the post-war Labour administration, all but £4,000-worth of it from outside the borough (303). In addition to the idea of alternative work at the Arsenal the council proposed schemes to 'absorb on half-time practically all the unemployed men in the borough' (304). Woolwich was prepared to accept the Coalitions' political agenda and to discipline the struggles of the unemployed, Poplar tried to harness them (305).

The Woolwich Local Advisory Committee (LAC) was also used as a platform from which to launch appeals for a centrally-financed, constitutional, solution to unemployment. The LAC was established by the Ministry of Labour to be the local body to deal with unemployment. There were similar bodies all over the country, they were an example of how the wartime expansion of the state created theoretical possibilities for political solutions to social and economic grievances, it also put in place institutions whose *raison d'être* was to devise and implement such solutions (306).

Each LAC had wide discretionary powers and individual applicants had no right of appeal. In general LACs were composed of people sympathetic to the Coalition government and as the Minister in charge of them put it in 1923, 'could in the main be trusted to see that the unemployed did not get more benefit than was strictly necessary' (307). The unemployed had to prove to the LAC that they were 'genuinely seeking work', even if work did not exist. Many skilled men were unwilling to use the employment exchanges, seeing them as an attempt to weaken the union control of the hire of labour. However in Woolwich the LAC chaired by Will Crooks, became a vehicle for the promotion of the views of the Arsenal's skilled men. In June 1918 it passed a resolution, forwarded to the Ministry of Munitions, which called for a minimum of 20,000 post-war jobs to be maintained at the Arsenal. It also urged strongly that, if necessary, non-ordnance work be introduced at the Arsenal. The Woolwich LAC presented the Ministry of Munitions with what the latter described as 'a most valuable document', about the conversion of the Arsenal. In evidence to the McKinnon Wood Committee, the Woolwich LAC suggested a number of items which the Arsenal could have produced after the war, and stressed the reliance of the towns people upon the Arsenal for employment. The LAC deputation consisted of two local employers; one, Edwin Thomas, a past president of the WCC, the other, W C Pitter was chair of the Gauge Manufacturers Association. There was also a skilled Arsenal worker, Voce, and Macnamara of the WU. The Woolwich LAC chair, Crooks, and vice chair, Edwin Thomas, also appealed in the press for work for ex-Servicemen (308). Despite the work of the Woolwich LAC, many still viewed the LACs with distrust, particularly after the 1919 local government dispute when exchanges were used to supply blackleg labour the LACs were viewed as creatures of the government (309).

The context in which the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign was developed can be seen from the WLP manifesto, produced in September 1921. The WLP called upon 'every citizen' to back its five-point plan, it held meetings to publicise the plan, it distributed copies of the plan house-to-house and the plan was reproduced in the Pioneer. The manifesto blamed capitalism, though not capitalists, for unemployment. It did not call for the overthrow of capitalism but for the government, having brought people to the town, to provide work in the form of orders for the Arsenal, or to finance maintenance for the unemployed of Woolwich. It demanded that Parliament be recalled to consider the issue of unemployment

not in any party spirit but with a common determination, [for] Parliament is the proper authority and the government the active agent for tackling a serious national emergency (310).

The manifesto was locally specific, constitutional and it called upon citizens to unite to persuade the government to alter its plans.

The campaigners' acceptance of the need for efficient national solutions reflected the lack of a local economic strategy of greater complexity than seeking government aid with road building and swimming pool and house construction. Alternative work faded from the agenda to be replaced by 'foreshores waiting to be reclaimed, roads waiting to be made' (311). The WLP submitted schemes for the unemployed to the value of £1 million, £600,000 worth of which was arranged. Thorne and Adamson contributed suggestions as to that which might be produced at the Arsenal for the McKinnon Wood committee, but they made no economic contributions beyond echoing the list of items which the Arsenal had or could produce which the Henderson committee had compiled in 1907. Beyond the idea of a

capital levy to pay for the war debt, the Labour Party had little notion of how such schemes were to be financed.

Lloyd George resisted restraint and cutbacks in reconstruction until there were signs of recovery and a rise in unemployment. He allowed 1919, 'the year of indulgence and generosity' as the Webbs put it to pass. When 'the prospects for better days had dwindled... the zeal for new things glowed dim' the Treasury pressed harder for deflation and decontrol (312). Lloyd George was cautious about Woolwich, as late as Spring 1920 he stated that the government was sticking to its pledge to provide alternative work (313). After all the 'most serious strike of the war', according to Basil Thomson, the head of the Criminal Investigation Department, was the one that involved Woolwich workers being unable to produce munitions (314). By the early 1920s the danger from Woolwich, if it had existed, was deemed to have passed.

The WLP, and the unions, promoted alternative work as the solution to unemployment because such work was in keeping with the traditions of state work in the town; it would be organised and financed nationally; it required efficient administration, rather than a overturning of the social and economic order and it benefited the locality as a whole, particularly the men at the Arsenal. In addition that which Hall and Schwarz call the 'sometimes frenzied reconstruction of liberalism' required a specific paradigmatic dimension (315). The campaign was a means by which generalised radical notions of individual responsibility, local community and a neutral state could be focused and grafted onto the newer, and at first also nebulous, concepts of efficiency and constitutional citizenship in an age of mass electoral politics.

Chapter IV

the story of munitions is not so much
one of shot and shell...it is rather one
of the men and women behind the scenes

Addison, Minister of Munitions Addison C
Politics from within Volume I 1924 p63

The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, initiated within the labour movement, derived not only from the local radical political tradition. It was also shaped by the experiences of the working-class in running the Arsenal Football Club, the RACS and the Pioneer, and from the local businesses which thrived on the prosperity due to full employment at the Arsenal. The contribution of business methods is considered in section (a). Section (b) is about the contribution of the Churches, particularly nonconformity. A number of local clerics and Christian organisations had links with the skilled men and contributed to the campaign for alternative work. The notions of individual responsibility, community self-help, and national solutions, determined the shape of not only the WLP but also another organisation which contributed to the Peace Arsenal' campaign, the Woolwich and District branch of the National Federation of Disabled and Demobilised Soldiers and Sailors (NFDDSS). It's role is examined in section (c). The important and close ties between the campaign for alternative work at the Arsenal and tenants on the estates built for Arsenal workers are examined in section (d).

(a)

The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign made use of the well-established links between trade unionists and the local social elite. Geoffrey Crossick notes that in mid, and late, nineteenth century Woolwich as there was no strong employing class there was little incentive for economic class conflict. The professional and military men who were resident in Woolwich were closely involved, with the workers, in social relationship based around community affairs. The local elite were active participants in the defence of Plumstead Common when there were protests over its enclosure in 1876. Furthermore 'the apparent identity of interest in towns of government employment between the workers and social elite over economic matters is a wider manifestation of this'. As higher wages led to increased purchasing power 'we find the local social elite actually petitioning and using its influence to obtain higher wages for a large number of the workers'. There was 'little immediate economic hostility between the social leaders and the workers'. For the upper stratum of the working class the mid-Victorian economic and social structures 'helped create a situation where in addition to being not antagonistic to the social leaders of the area they outwardly shared... their values' (1).

The constitutionalism which was being constructed after the war relied upon there being two national parties, one of 'business' and one of 'labour' and that both recognise the validity of the other one. Schwarz argues that the process by which the constitutional arrangements of the mid-Victorian period were rebuilt on the new foundations of universal suffrage, 'was exceedingly precarious for the dominant classes'. Both Baldwin and MacDonald aimed for two-party constitutionalism built around Labour and Conservative (2).

The installation of such a notion at the level at which people lived their lives was aided by social contacts. In Woolwich the chair of the Board of Guardians and a MR mayor, Henry Smith Syer JP, was an active Freemason and Friendly Society member. He also spent 20 years as an engineer working in the Royal Carriage Department of the Arsenal. He could rub shoulders with fellow Freemason and Friendly society activist Arthur Beechey, a turner in the Royal Carriage Department who worked for the ASE for 30 years and was one of the first Presidents of the ASE Institute in Plumstead (3). James Boyle, an ASE activist and half-back for Arsenal was also a Freemason with Syer. A sense of the continuation of the social ties between the local elite and members of the working class can be gauged from the fact that MR councillor and Guardian, Leon Charles Chasteauneuf, E Dixon JP (the WCC President) joined Labour Party activists, Tynemouth (the mayor in 1919), Radford and Charles Langham, (who worked in the Royal Laboratories from 1889 was a Labour councillor and on the AGC) in the Freemasons. The last five men named were also members of the Independent Order of Oddfellows. Chasteauneuf was branch Treasurer and district trustee for 35 years. For balance, whilst the Masons Thanksgiving Service was held in the church, St Johns, where the chair of the Conservative Association, Dawson was warden, the Oddfellows annual service was held in the labour-orientated Baptist Tabernacle (4).

During the run-up to the National Insurance Act 1911 Sir Kingsley Wood was part of a formidable campaign to ensure the status of the largest insurance companies and to undermine the Friendly Societies. Yeo calls him 'an active antagonist of labour's forms on behalf of private property'. Wood maintained this interest, he wrote a book about insurance and was Private Secretary to Addison, the Minister of Health 1919-21 and then Parliamentary Secretary

to the Minister 1924-9 (5). Wood also thought it politic to maintain his membership of both the Oddfellows and the Freemasons. He was also a circuit steward for the Wesleyans (6).

In 1900 Edwin Fennell, a local leather dealer, son of a Chartist and a former Secretary of the Liberals, stood for Labour on a ticket of trade union rates for council employees, and beat mayor and MP Edwin Hughes in a council by-election in 1900. Fennell helped to run the business side of the Woolwich Labour Journal (the forerunner of the Pioneer). He also helped secure a place for Barefoot on the council and was acknowledged as the mentor of Thomas Macnamara (1870-1919). Macnamara gave evidence to the Henderson committee, became General Secretary of the Woolwich WU but he worked for Fennell before entering the Arsenal. Another personal link which broadened the view of the Woolwich labour movement was forged when a retired Army officer, Conservative G R Hunter, who chaired the council's Finance Committee was offered the opportunity to be an Alderman by the victorious WLP in 1903. Although unpopular with the town's paupers he was a very effective accountant. Arthur Bryceson (1863-1944) was a lawyer articled to Edwin Hughes, the Conservative MP for Woolwich. As an agent he helped to organise the Moderate Reform victory on the first Woolwich Borough Council in 1900, then became the Town Clerk and, as the Pioneer put it, 'a propagandist for Labour principles' (7). He was Honorary Secretary to the Conference on the Discharges convened by the council in 1906 and involved in the running of a large number of charities. His efficiency in campaigning for municipalisation and in controlling his staff were praised by the Pioneer. As 'a businessman serving the municipality' he provided a personal link between the Town Hall and the labour movement and a model of administrative precision (8).

The labour movement's understanding of business was also enhanced by the involvement, in the mid-, and late, nineteenth century, of the Arsenal workers in their own business ventures. The RACS developed out of a workers co-operative movement which had existed in Woolwich since 1760 (9). The movement died back after the closure of the Dockyards in 1869. This allowed the RACs, formed in 1868 by a handful of Arsenal engineers with a capital of just over £7, a space in which to operate. The first secretary, Alexander McLeod, originally worked in the Arsenal repair shop. Other members of the full-time committee also worked there as did William Barefoot (10). By the time that McLeod retired in 1902 there were 17,000 members and seven stores. The RACS was the 20th largest co-operative in the country and the largest in London (11). The second largest society in the capital was in Stratford and it was less than two thirds of the size. So dominant was the RACs that the quiet of the streets where many of the Arsenal engineers lived was explained by the fact that 'not even a tallyman goes round, for they find no room in co-operative Plumstead' (12). Edwin Hughes, was solicitor to the RACS and later Sir Kingsley Wood was supportive of the RACS. The first civilian director of the Arsenal, Sir William Anderson (1834-98) was keenly interested in the co-operative movement. Prior to his appointment at the Arsenal in 1889, he was instrumental in the foundation of a co-operative shop in Erith, which was where he ran the engineering firm Easton and Anderson (13).

The RACS was an important base from which core workers of the Arsenal could develop their business acumen, and their links with the community outside the Arsenal. During the Boer War when earnings were high and regular rents rose by as much as 50%. The RACS purchased Borstall estate and commenced building 1,052 houses in 1900 (14). The RACS was interested in peaceful economic change, it twice tried to

establish a local co-operative dockyard, in 1869 and again after the First World War. In 1926 it purchased 15 acres of the Dockyards and used the site for garment production and food processing (15). Also the RACS was financially supportive of trade unionists, Progressive and then Labour electoral candidates (16). It was affiliated to the national Labour Party and the London Labour Party. It supported charities, and a great deal of local educational work, 2½% of the trading surplus was earmarked for education and in 1920 this came to £250,000 (17). In addition it ran its own dairy, engineering works and funeral directors and saw its work in terms of aiding working class collective self-help (18). The RACS stressed the need for working class advancement not through class conflict but through social harmony.

The effects of such a strong co-operative movement were considered by Shaw in Major Barbara, 1905. In the play an enormous arms factory dominates a Middlesex hillside and features a 'huge cannon of the obsolete Woolwich infant pattern' pointing towards the town. There are 'various applications of co-operation' which encouraged local loyalty and distanced workers from class practices in which they might otherwise have been involved (19). Through many RACS activities ran a thread which stressed the neutrality of the state, collective peaceful self-realisation and, to cite the name of the RACS journal, Comradeship. When there were food shortages during the war RACS established its own rationing system and Arsenal workers demanded of the government that food distribution be done through the RACS. After the war the Labour-dominated Woolwich Board of Guardians distributed food coupons which could be exchanged at the RACS. The RACS was used to alleviate discrete social problems through constitutional activity. It was a means by which artisans could become involved in the recomposition of politico-legal structures. In 1921 it had

80,000 members and 92,000 members in 1922. They were in 51 branches and 39 women's and men's co-operative guilds (20). The success of the RACS perpetuated the idea of community self-help, and specifically, it converted part of the Arsenal. In addition it promoted the notion of national solutions, in that it had closer ties to the Labour Party than any other co-operative society in the country.

The Arsenal workers also had direct understanding of the structure of private firms through their involvement with the Arsenal Football Club (AFC). From the late nineteenth century football was very popular amongst the working class of Woolwich (21). There was Royal Ordnance FC, which existed for a year 1893-4, Erith FC, formed in 1885 at the local engineering works of Easton and Anderson, Erith Wednesday, Erith Rovers, the Grasshoppers and the Maxim Nordenfellt works team. Blundell Mission FC, formed during the Boer War and later called Charlton Athletic, was the only one of these teams to rival the principal team formed inside the Arsenal, in 1884, which came to be called Arsenal FC. Recruitment to the team was through the Arsenal and there was also support from the garrison (22).

Although the founder thought that limited liability would cause the club 'to degenerate into a proprietary or capitalist club', in the face of pressing financial incentives the team turned professional in 1893. Players received payment from local working men, who bathed in the reflected glory of a team victory (23). Over 1,500 of the 4,000 £1 shares were held by 860 shareholders. 'A great number of gentlemen were £1 or £2 shareholders', and many of the shareholders were Arsenal engineers (24). The game was like work at the Arsenal in that relied upon male bonding and stamina. Teamwork was required for both and an absence through illness led to loss of pay and adversely

affected the pay of others. For both a collective response was required to improve pay or conditions. The team was tied to the fate of the Arsenal. During a depression it played a benefit match for the unemployed and during the Boer War it suffered low attendances (25). A local paper in 1913 argued that it was 'one of the most steady factors in the social reform of the masses' and industrialists and the Home Office agreed (26). There were protests when AFC left the area just before the war (27). The team was the result of collective local action in which the artisans were central. William Dawson, who was a director of the club, was prominent in the WCC and was Conservative leader on the council. The Pioneer reported that the Labour councillors 'who knew him well regard him as being in many respects very much a Labour man... essentially a Manchester Tory Democrat'. It was said that he voted for Crooks in 1903 (28). Barefoot was another director. Both of these men were active in the campaign for a 'Peace Arsenal'.

Another business venture in which local skilled men held shares was the Pioneer. It bridged the gap between business and labour. This newspaper was supported by its shareholders. These included the wealthy, Joseph Fels, the millionaire American Henry Georgite, Frederick Pethick Lawrence, a Liberal who had other newspaper interests and May Tennant, the middle-class Treasurer of the Women's Trade Union League. However, almost 42% of the shareholders were engineers or machinists (29). The Pioneer claimed the credit for sparking off both the post-Boer war campaign for work and the campaign after the First World War (30). It sought to unite local readers within a Labour Party framework and in this it was probably more successful than most other labour newspapers (31). One example of the way in which it both informed and corralled its readership occurred in 1920. The Pioneer explained the

effects of the imminent housing legislation and placed this information under a headline which suggested that readers be passive spectators of the central political activity rather than participants, 'Tenants - Watch Parliament!' (32). The Pioneer criticised 'lumbering' local firms and those workers 'living in a fool's paradise of temporarily inflated wages because neither had cooperated with 'organised labour'. It saw its role as to adapt to new conditions, get officials and workers to 'move with the times' and to encourage 'loyalty'. 'Loafers and all parasites will have to be cleared out of the Arsenal' it warned (33). In fact it was the EEF president, not Arsenal officials, who vowed to reduce the Arsenal to a repair shop (34).

The Pioneer supported the campaign by local traders to turn Woolwich into a local shopping centre. It vigorously promoted the inaugural 'Shopping Week' in the summer of 1921; it was the subject of a frontpage headline in April (35). The event taught traders about the 'necessity for unity amongst themselves... The welfare of the borough and not of the individual trader must be the object in view, for the fate of the various traders is bound up with the larger issue' (36). The Pioneer was in competition with the Kentish Mercury, which was 'devoted to the maintenance of the true Protestant Faith [and] the elevation of the working classes'. There was also the largest circulation local paper, the Kentish Independent, 'the Conservative and Unionist' Woolwich Herald, the Woolwich and Plumstead Gazette, and a newspaper notorious for its anti-union bias, the Eltham Times (37). The Pioneer did not have the circulation of these other newspapers, circulation was a problem for much of the labour press (38). It might have been helped if there had been a London wide Labour newspaper with localised editions, as the Pioneer proposed, adding 'there is a nucleus for such an organised effort at

Woolwich' (39). However the eventual launch of the London Labour Party Citizen which did just this, came too late for the Pioneer.

In 1922 the Pioneer ceased publication on a weekly basis and asked for donations to make good its financial losses. The enormous debts were not paid until 1936. A free Pioneer was published in May 1922. It carried a large number of advertisements. The edition which followed after was distributed during 'Woolwich Shopping Week' and, once more, 15,000 free copies were distributed. Other issues appeared, full of advertisements. At the height of its success the Pioneer carried an advertisement for a tavern which boasted that the WU held weekly meetings on the premises and offered 'accommodation for working men at dinner time'. This was local businesses adapting to the strength of labour. In the absence of links with other Labour Parties, the WLP formed alliances with the local business community and by August 1922 the WLP found itself reduced to carrying a full page advertisement for the shop owned by Councillor Cuff (40). The last issue of the Pioneer to be sold carried an editorial on the engineers lock-out, then in progress, and also the information that Sir Charles Higham MP was to address the WCC on the subject of 'more business for Woolwich traders'. The final appeal was articulated in the political language of mid-nineteenth century certainty. As if those who were correct would necessarily be victorious. 'Let Labour, united in determination and moral fervour, bring victory from seeming defeat. Labour knows not defeat. As Will Crooks so often told us, a temporary setback is but a victory deferred' (41).

In the welfare of the workers was 'bound up the prosperity of those who depend upon their spending power', but that did not render the local traders quiescent and ready to fall in line behind the skilled men (42). Whilst the

engineers were developing the RACS, other traders were moulding their own organisations. Chambers of Commerce, representing the common interests of merchants and manufacturers in a particular locality, had first appeared in the eighteenth century. One was established in London in 1881 and in 1889 the Woolwich and District Traders Association, later WCC, was founded. By 1902 it had 144 members paying 10/6d (52½p) a year each, about as much as an engineer could earn in a one to two days.

The WCC President was Sidney H Cuff whose own drapery emporium 'romped ahead' during the Boer War (43). Commentators who visited the town during both the Boer War and the First World War noted how the presence of troops and war work improved trade (44). During the post-Boer War depression the Conservative mayor William J Squires argued, in his evidence to the Henderson Committee of 1907, that the discharges ought to be stopped and that the government orders ought to go to Woolwich not to private firms. Squires was active in the WCC, and he was a Guardian, and a JP. The Pioneer said of Squires that his Conservatism, 'to many London County Councillors, was indistinguishable from ordinary Progressivism' (45). Squires proposed that the Chamber of Commerce, the borough council and other public bodies 'ought to be up and doing' on the issue of the discharges. The idea that part of the Arsenal could be released and the land used by private firms was suggested to the Henderson committee by George Bishop, the Woolwich Equitable Building Society secretary from 1880. The WCC also promoted the idea of alternative, private, use of the riverside location within the campaign for work for Woolwich. In 1908 the WCC argued, in a letter to War Minister Haldane, that to reduce the numbers at the Arsenal to 8,000 would intensify local distress, be uneconomic, in that the overheads would not be reduced, and would undermine national security. It recommended a workforce as

large as that which had been employed before the Boer War, be employed 'in the National Service' (46).

During the First World War local shop-keepers had close contact with the Arsenal workers not only because they 'minded pipes and baccy' for them, but also because they knew that, as the Medical Officer of Health reported in 1915 that there was an 'abundance of money and food' in the town which benefited the traders, because of the Arsenal (47). However, in 1917, with thoughts of the post-Boer War depression in mind the WCC established a committee to consider the postwar fate of the Arsenal. The committee called for 20,000 Arsenal jobs, the same figure that the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners later demanded. In 1918 the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign commenced, and initially Sir Kingsley Wood accused the campaigners of wishing to 'cause disturbance in the Arsenal' (48). When Sir Kingsley addressed the Woolwich Chamber of Commerce on 'Trade After the War' he made only one specific reference to Woolwich Arsenal, and that was to say that the reduction in the numbers there before the war was not due to competition between private firms and the state but because of the disarmament lobby. The Pioneer argued that if the traders of Woolwich had 'a real grasp of the situation they would be getting busy in defence of their own interests' (49). The traders chose to focus their concerns in the way that the Pioneer suggested. In 1918 the 260-strong WCC sent representatives to give evidence to the McKinnon Wood Committee. It wanted the site used, preferably commercially, but it accepted that there could be state production at the Arsenal. In Spring 1919 E G Dixon, the 'most popular, efficient and hard working President' of the WCC took up his office and membership grew to 288 (50).

Among the WCC's Honorary Vice-Presidents were Conservatives Wood and Syers (the mayor) and Labour Party members Crooks,

Haden Guest and Snell. Later Herbert Morrison joined them (51). In December 1919 Dixon suggested that the WCC donate £50 to the AGC and the WCC unanimously agreed to this (52). The Pioneer noted the 'energy, ability and enthusiasm' of the President of the WCC. The Kentish Independent claimed that the interests of the Labour dominated council and the conservative WCC were 'as near as possible identical' (53). When management was criticised it was made clear that this did not refer to local employers. In 1906 Crooks said that there were too many officials at the Arsenal, 'private firms would not keep that number for 20 minutes' (54). Harry Hart echoed this in 1921 'I am convinced that alternative work will be a failure unless a clean sweep is made of the management in government establishments' (55). In July 1921 MR Councillor Campbell said that whilst the former MR leader had taken 'a prominent part in the movement for alternative work at the Arsenal' Campbell himself thought that the Arsenal should not get preferential treatment and ought to compete, in the open market against private firms, as far as it was able given that it was 'overstocked with officialdom' (56). The Kentish Independent focused on the workers. It suggested that

if Woolwich is tided successfully over the dangerous period that is before us, history will place on record that that result was largely due to the wise handling of the Executive of the 'all grades' movement of a problem that literally bristles with difficulties from whatever point of view it may be regarded.

The paper encouraged readers 'to co-operate in this movement of vital importance to the Borough'(57). On another occasion it called the AGC executive 'skilful and tactful'. Dixon called for the conversion of the Arsenal, and Government aid for Woolwich. The call was echoed at the WCC AGM (58). The WCC was part of a broad alliance which campaigned for alternative work along with the AGC

and LAC. These three bodies then formed the Joint Town Committee which lasted until 1922 when the Town Committee was reconstituted without the WCC. In 1921 the Pioneer provided a fulsome obituary for the late President of the WCC and for one of his predecessors who died within a few days of each other (59). The new President, Eley, blamed 'the war and the waste entailed' for the 1921 depression. His solution was honest hard work and increase in production. He also thought that it was the duty of the WCC

to impress upon the government the necessity of utilising the enormous workshops, machinery and river front of the Arsenal for the production and manufacture of goods needed in peacetime, as well as for munitions of war, so that our citizens may be fully employed and secured from the evil effects of short time and uncertain wages which are the causes of deep seated unrest (60).

The Pioneer noted in November 1920 that
The work that the Chamber accomplished especially in conjunction with other organisations on behalf of the commercial and industrial interests of the borough whilst Mr Dixon was at its head was of an extremely valuable character, though perhaps the general public is not in a position to regard it from its true perspective (61).

Although in June 1920 the WCC urged the government to enforce 'the most stringent economy possible in every department of state' it was anxious to maintain that it was not a rival of the council, even though the latter was Labour Party dominated (62). The WCC worked closely with the council on the Joint Town Committee and in close co-operation with the members of the AGC, with the ex-Servicemen's organisation, the NFDDSS, on other schemes besides the campaign for alternative production at the Arsenal. These included a successful campaign for the extended use of a hostel for women; formulating demands

together for further road building schemes in the area and the extension of out of work donation to allow ex-Servicemen to be trained (63). In 1924 a joint deputation from the council and the WCC went to Southern Railways in order to persuade it to improve the town by roofing over part of its trackway and both bodies expressed satisfaction when in the 1920s part of the Dockyards was taken over by Swan Mill Paper Co (64). The recognition of the symbiotic relationship between local businesses and the labour movement strengthened the concept of a civic community, fighting together in order to persuade central government to change.

(b)

The thread which runs through many reports on the impact of Christianity upon Woolwich in the period from the mid-nineteenth century up until the end of the First World War is that whilst there was a degree of hostility towards the Church, it was the widespread indifference which was more marked. Nevertheless the relationship between Arsenal workers and the traders of Woolwich found an echo in the relationship between many of the institutions and leaders of Christianity and the Arsenal workers. To some extent Church and chapel were employed in an immediate, temporal manner in order to bolster the respectability of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign, while, on the other hand, clerics took up labour issues in order to counter the apathetic reception that their message received. However, in addition, nonconformity did effect the campaign in that it framed the perceptions of the leading campaigners.

According to the religious census of 1851 the Woolwich area had the second lowest church attendance in the country (65). This lack of enthusiasm continued throughout the rest of the century and in 1902 Booth wrote that the skilled engineers of the area, 'thank Cobden and Bright and everybody but God for their prosperity' (66). C F G Masterman in a study of religious life in the area written at the turn of the century noted that the clergy of south London were not very sympathetic to labour (67).

Attendance at church and chapel was only for a small minority, less than a quarter of all adults, and a further breakdown reveals that on the day in 1902 that all of London was surveyed only 5.4% of adults in Plumstead attended a place of Christian worship (68). In 1902 one churchgoer at the Arsenal reckoned that of the 100 men who worked with him, 8% of the workers attended church on a weekly basis and 12% were members of a chapel (69).

Charles Booth thought these figures 'unusually high' and the same year Rochester Diocesan Society thought that the figures were more likely to be 2% and 3% (70). In his recent study Hugh McLeod concluded that working class areas, particularly those which had a lively neighbourhood-centred working class culture such as Woolwich, had rejected the church. There was a fortnight-long Church of England 'Crusade' to Woolwich by the Chaplain-General to the Forces in 1917. Bishops, canons, parish, clergy and laywomen arrived in the town and met with 'prejudice and suspicion' from the Arsenal workers, according to the Church Times (71). There was a little overt hostility, rather the Church was damned with faint praise. In 1902 the Rochester Diocesan Society found that 'amidst the indifference there is little or no ill-will'; in 1917 in reference to the 'Crusade' the Woolwich and Plumstead News referred to 'mild friendliness' and the Pioneer said that there was 'no hatred of the Church by the people' (72).

When the church offered individualistic solutions to sin, or condemned lack of self-discipline rather than lack of sympathy it was received with suspicion. Sometimes there was open conflict with the labour movement. The RACS purchased a farm but it made a loss in its first year and the RACS decided not to pay the tithe-rent, which was that part of the annual produce of agriculture devoted to the support of a local vicar, McAllister. The Reverend McAllister declined to meet the RACS but instead went to law. A broker seized two wagons from the farm and held an auction to raise the money owed to the vicar. Four months later a similar auction took place and once more McAllister was condemned by the RACS (73). Others in the Church felt more ambivalence towards labour. The Bishop of Woolwich said that after having seen Walworth's slum housing he 'sympathised with the labour programme from beginning to end' (74). The Bishop also addressed a meeting on

Blackheath with Labour politicians (75). However, he did call trade unions 'truly selfish organisations' and added that 'trade unionism was responsible for the appalling conditions in which workers were living in parts of South London and other cities' (76). Reverend A M Pickering, the rector and rural dean to Woolwich, mediated, rather than taking a partisan position, during the 1911 Dock Strike (77). Others found the Church stifled their radicalism. Snell met Grinling when the latter was a radical curate in Nottingham. Through this connection Grinling, on being appointed as secretary of the Woolwich Charity Organisation Society, (COS) invited Snell to join him in his work. Grinling and Snell tried to make the Woolwich COS 'a centre for social endeavour' but this was considered 'woefully unorthodox' and both were forced to resign (78).

Some of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners wanted to draw upon local Christianity and local entrepreneurs in order to further the integration of the skilled men. Jack Mills' remarks are indicative of this. In June 1919 Mills and Miss Elliott (NFWW), both of the AGC, attended a Ruridecanal Conference on 'Industrial Problems'. Mills took the opportunity to state that religious movements, though he did not include individual Christians, had failed the workers and that 'had it not been for a determined fight put up locally we should have been in a bad position in Woolwich today. R A M Walters, an MR councillor was a member of the conference in 1920 and in 1921 the Ruridecanal Conference noted the 'apathy and hostility on the part of large sections of labour towards the church'. However, institutions and value systems although here portrayed as external to the interests of Woolwich men, had a greater influence than Mills allowed (79).

In general the focus of loyalty in Woolwich was the local labour community; it provided a keen sense of communal

morality and solidarity and the success of other ethics were circumscribed. Vicars could gain social approval through activity for the collective good, in a material sense, and few of them engaged in such work. An exception was J W Horsley an Oxford graduate, freemason, former prison chaplain and a member of the Christian Social Union (a group of radical Christians, founded in 1889). He became vicar of Holy Trinity a church just outside the main gates of the Arsenal and the congregation was mostly Arsenal officials and employees. Part of the parish was an area of poor housing, St Saviours, known locally as 'the dusthole' and described by a police magistrate as 'the worst plague spot in London'. Horsley became active in campaigning for better housing and sanitation for the local working class. He served on the Board of Health from 1893 until 1894. He supported the Woolwich and Plumstead Tenants Defence and Fair Rents League which did 'a grand job in searching out all insanitary defects and forwarding them to me' (80). The tenants' league successfully campaigned for the creation, under the 1891 Public Health Act, of a Board of Health in Plumstead which would be responsible for local sanitation. Horsley recalled that he got 'not a word or act of sympathy' from any member of the clergy bar one, but he did gain the support of the energetic local Medical Officer of Health. His work aided the integration of the local working class into the new, elected, structures of local state. Arsenal workers were presented with a respectable solution to their problems, an appeal via the vicar for an elected body (81). When the church acted on behalf of local workers it was well received but there was a degree of wariness as Horsley recognised (82). The United Trades Labour Friendly and Temperance Societies of Plumstead Charlton and District called him 'a terror to slum owners, rack renters, and other exploiters of the poorest and most defenceless of our class.' It went on to endorse sentiments expressed in

Horsley's last sermon, that 'to preach temperance, sobriety and chastity to dwellers in insanitary dens, without attempting to ameliorate their condition, is a canting absurdity'.

The chair of the London branch of the Christian Social Union, was Charles Ernest Escreet, (1852-1919), the Rector of Woolwich 1892-1909 and the rural dean 1905-6. He was chair of the Woolwich Board of Guardians and took an interest in the local hospital and the Polytechnic (83). It is likely that in his capacity as chair of the Charity Organisation Society he secured Grinling as secretary. He was a member of the left-wing Guild of St Matthew and chaired a committee for the wives and children of striking miners on which Snell was secretary and Canon Horsley a member. In December 1906 Escreet explained in a letter in the Times that in three years 7,500 workers had been laid off from the Arsenal, that there were 12,000 fewer workers than 11 years ago and that 'Woolwich is suffering from acute depression which is unparalleled during the last twenty years'. The council had arranged for 70-100 men to emigrate to Canada in the Spring. Escreet appealed for funds. The joint Treasurers of the fund were Squires, a Conservative and Slater, the Labour mayor (84). In January 1907 Escreet repeated his appeal for funds for emigration for Arsenal workers. Donors included the Bishop of Woolwich, a canon and Armstrong's Lt Col Gironard (85). In April 1907 Reverend W F Bailey of St Margarets, Plumstead appealed to congregants to help one another for the 'Plumstead distress is very acute' and there was a need for all the clergy to meet with each other (86).

The Church of England, in Woolwich, was not actively opposed to the labour movement but there was a gulf between the two which led Booth to report that amongst Arsenal workers, 'it is bad form even to nod at a parson in the

street' (87). This gap can be highlighted by reference to the exception. The 'most remarkable feature' of St James' Church, Plumstead according to Booth, was the fact that the congregation, 'artisan or lower middle class', managed the finances of the church. 'They are trusted, and they are loyal' (88). Chasteauneuf (Conservative) was a sidesman at St James and Keeble (an Arsenal foreman, RACS committee member, councillor and Guardian) attended there (89). When the church made an effort to involve the labour movement, on its own terms, then it met with a greater degree of acceptance.

St Lukes Church, Eltham was erected in 1902 for use by the Boer War munition workers who lived on the surrounding Corbett estate which was built 1900. The parish grew as more house were constructed. The population tripled in the first year of the First World War to 15,000 people. The church grew in size and staff and the local Conservative S H Cuff donated the alter rails to the church. In 1919 the vicar of St Luke's wrote in the Pioneer that 'there is a strong feeling among Clergy that the ownership of such places as the Dusthole at Woolwich [the slum area] by Baronets [he was referring to Sir Spencer Maryon Wilson] is incongruous... anti-social and anti-Christian'. He went on to say that many clerics thought that 'if landlords own this type of property they should try and live in it themselves' (90). St Luke's hosted a League of Nations Sunday which was preceded by a procession where the banners of the GHTPL (tenants) and the ASE the WL&TC, the WU, the Pioneer Circle and the band of the LPL were to the fore. The event was arranged by the secretary of the Well Hall Tenants Association (91).

The idea that the church was used as vehicle for social advance was suggested in the Church Times report of 1917; many working men, it said, 'look upon the Church so much as

a 'business' that they naturally think that we are out for our own profit and advantage' (92). In practice the chapel was probably a more fruitful route for advance. Contacts founded in a common interest in Christian observance helped the career of George Bishop (1847-1914), the Arsenal wheelwright who went on to become the secretary of the Woolwich Equitable Building Society (WEBS) for 35 years and on its executive for 26 years. Bishop chaired Plumstead Vestry, became a Labour councillor, an Alderman and a JP.

According to the Pioneer

he has never forgotten his early prentice and Arsenal days. This is the key to his public work. In his inmost heart he is not a businessman but a staunch trade unionist (93).

He met the son of the WEBS director Joseph Wates at the Rectory Place Chapel. Bishop, the treasurer of the Free Church Council, chaired the meeting at which Crooks was adopted for Woolwich, threw his support behind Crooks, and later became a Progressive and Labour town councillor and an Alderman. Thomas Mason who started work at the Arsenal in 1913 mentioned that, 'if you was a church goer, the right church, our assistant manager he was a Methodist, and if you were on that side, you got a job'. Mason and the assistant manager attended the same church, St John the Baptist, Plumstead. Mason had other links with the Arsenal, which also might have helped; his father, both his grandparents, his uncle and his two brothers worked there. He went on, 'I know someone who because they was churchgoers or knew the boss... they come in and got a foreman's job... He was useless... He used to make pianos! [This was in the carpentry shop at the Arsenal]. I remember one of my pals saying to him 'I didn't get me job by going to church' (94). This latter remarked echoes that of the Congregationalist who told Booth that in the Arsenal a religious man was despised for setting himself up as superior to others (95).

It was with the nonconformists that the labour movement had the closest ties. The Reverend Frederick Pickering was an itinerant Primitive Methodist preacher who wrote articles in Primitive Methodist Leader supportive of the labour movement whilst he was in Woolwich between 1905 and 1909. The first nonconformist on the Eltham Vestry was an Arsenal machinist William Marks. Unitarian the Reverend L Jenkin Jones was on Plumstead Vestry and a Progressive before he followed Fennell onto the council as the second Labour councillor, and then became one of the first Labour mayors in the country, a county councillor and a Guardian.

The following year Crooks, a Congregationalist, became MP for Woolwich (96). One of his advocates was the local Guardian, the pastor of Woolwich Tabernacle and President of the Baptist Union, John Wilson (1854-1939). He was not the only Baptist pastor who was supportive of the WLP; the Reverend Francis Matthews was a Guardian, and he stood for the LCC in West Woolwich for Labour. Wilson was very influential. Crooks said 'I was returned by Woolwich Tabernacle... the 'only man who represents Woolwich is John Wilson' (97). Wilson's 2,500 seat Baptist Tabernacle, was enormously popular with artisans, 'such as save and buy their own homes in Plumstead, and live comfortably... men with a trade, not labourers; men who earn good wages and spend them on their homes and wives and children'. Wilson attributed his success to his sympathy with workers, 'His spare time and surplus energies he gives to public work. [He] takes a keen interest in all local affairs... an ardent Progressive'. One of his Church of England neighbours suggested that the success of 'the Tab' with the local working class lay in Wilson, 'being more of their class and can say things which somehow we cannot' (98). At the opening, in 1896, the Commander of the Royal Artillery attended, but the Tabernacle was a working-class institution, 'largely erected through the efforts of

workers in the Arsenal'. Wilson's words and acts were 'a common theme of discussion in the Arsenal' (99). All the deacons were working men (100). The 'Tab' was used as a refuge for the unemployed and 'many times Arsenal workmen, fighting for their rights, have made it a meeting ground' (101). Wilson was said to have written more letters to help men find work than any other man in Woolwich and he was successful because he had the favour of managers of works (102). Barefoot attended Wilson's Bible Classes, where Wilson inspired him to 'make economics his business in life' (103). He also chaired the Tabernacle Brotherhood. Mabel Crout, the assistant secretary of the WLP and later mayor, also attended the 'Tab' (104). Haden Guest was sympathetic and William Adamson MP was closely associated with both the Brotherhood Movement and the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign (105).

Alfred Hall was another Baptist prominent in the Woolwich labour movement. He was the son of a Baptist Minister and was sacked from the Arsenal when he took leave to organise the election of Fennell in 1900. He was appointed to work full-time for the labour movement. He joined Fennell on the council in 1903. Yeo has argued that working class organisations, specifically branches of the ILP, because they lacked money and sometimes felt obliged to employ sacked activists, turned to wealthy patrons, which meant a client relationship, or to 'business modes' which meant that they suffered 'displacing effects' from their original goals (106). This can partly be applied to the WLP. It was formally established after the election of Crooks, in 1903, who, being an unpaid MP, received payments from it until 1911, when MPs were paid by the state. In November of the same year the WLP won power on the council and it had to find its election expenses. Hall's first post was as advertisement canvasser and circulation manager for the Labour Journal. The centrality of raising money meant that

the WLP looked to nonconformist Frederick Pethick Lawrence for funds (he owned £1,000 worth of Pioneer shares), and to Grinling, who owned £500 worth. This did not lead to the WLP being displaced from its goal of securing the election of working men.

Support for the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign also came from the Reverend W E 'Comrade' Lee of Plumstead who called for the abolition of capitalism and encouraged labour speakers at his meetings. At one Haden Guest took the opportunity to promote alternative work. Specifically he noted that the government offered £150 to builders as an inducement to build homes and suggested that the items required for reconstruction be produced at national factories (107). Another of Lee's meetings was advertised as being about 'unemployment and the way out'. It was suggested that 'capitalism has no plan. Jesus has one. Come and hear what it is' (108). The Comrades were also addressed by the Presbyterian, the Reverend John Cairns MA, the Honorary chaplain to the Territorial Force and acting chaplain to the forces in Woolwich. He lived in the town between 1904 and 1924 and he was on two advisory committees of the War Office.

Possibly the frequent portrayal of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign in religious terms can be attributed to the influence of non-conformity. The men who visited Lloyd George on order to convince him of the merits of alternative work at the Arsenal were 'missionaries' who went with a scheme for 'conversion' which would lead to 'salvation'. The 'peace work was not a new shibboleth for Woolwich workers', the law that said that the Arsenal could only be used for war was not as unalterable as that of the 'Medes and Persians' and the Arsenal was not to receive any further orders for alternative work because the electorate had, in the election of Gee, deserted 'the path of virtue'

(109). People the Pioneer reported, were driven to desperation because 'there is no opportunity of effecting Cain's curse and earning their bread by the sweat of their brow' (110). The employment of such language was not uncommon amongst nonconformists or former Christians on the left. J T Brownlie, the Arsenal engineer who went on to become President of the AEU, was noted for his oratorical style (111). He was a nonconformist and listening to him at a meeting has compared to being at 'a great religious revival' (112). Snell said that, 'we glory in the religious impulse behind our work' and stressed the 'sound moral basis' of the Labour Party. The effect was to emphasis non-class links and the place of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign within a traditional morality. Communists, on the other hand, were not only a 'sinister force' intent on 'smashing the Labour Party' but also 'carping critics whose eternal theme is that no good can come out of Nazareth' (113). Through a job at the Arsenal a workers gained the opportunity to build social relationships, engage in collective activity and be assigned status. Un- and underemployment led to a loss of participation, income and status. Mills expressed this in rather nonconformist terms, 'enforced idleness meant moral degradation' and made people into 'mere degenerates' (114).

There were social links between the leaders of organised labour, traders and the church in the management of local educational and charitable bodies. Involved in the Woolwich Invalid Childrens Aid Association were the RACS, trade unions, the Pioneer staff, and local businesses (115). In 1890 Woolwich Polytechnic Young Men's Christian Institute, the inspiration of Arsenal fitter Frank Didden opened (116). The Board of Governors included Edwin Hughes, William Anderson, Charles Grinling, Charles Escreet and Councillor Fred Chambers, the first Labour chair of the Finance Committee, and a Guardian. There were a

sufficiently large number of ties, of sufficient strength, between workers and clerics that even if those mentioned were atypical the sense of local community upon which the campaign was built was enriched.

(c)

Service personnel, including the Territorials, were a significant part of the population of Woolwich. In 1902 Booth described the principal aspect of Woolwich as being that it was a garrison town, 'dominated by the barracks and the military'. Every Sunday there was a church parade 'held partly in the interests of recruiting' and the 5,000 soldiers spent freely in the town on drink and prostitution (117). Following the retirement of Colonel Hughes in 1902 Lord Charles Beresford, a naval officer who was 'the nation's idol', according to the Kentish Independent and whose platform was that he 'had the utmost contempt for politicians; he always put his country before his party', was returned, unopposed, as MP for Woolwich (118). He refused to meet a delegation from the Trades Council who wished to discuss the discharges from the Arsenal. After four months he retired from the House. The Conservative candidate who stood against Crooks in 1903, and beat him in 1910, was Major W A Adam and the Coalition candidate in 1921 was Captain Gee VC. When the Duke of Connaught visited Woolwich in order to unveil a memorial to the British who died in the Boer War, the Labour mayor, 'pro-Boer' Slater, explained why so many of his colleagues were absent. This was taken as an affront to the Army and has been given as one reason why he lost his seat on the local council that November.

A sufficient number of former Service personnel had settled in the town to form an active branch of the National Association of Ex-Naval and Military Men (119). There was also considerable support for the voluntary military institution which ostensibly existed in order to guard against the invasion of Britain, the Volunteer Force. This, after 1908, was the basis of the Territorial Army.

Initiated nationally in 1859 and founded in Woolwich in 1860 the Force was at first a middle-class activity. In order to join an individual had to be able to afford the time, the expense of a uniform and had to have the inclination to carry arms (120). In his study of the Volunteers Cunningham concludes that in general the Volunteers embodied; 'many of the canonised values of Victorian Britain. Patriotism, self-help, local initiative, discipline order, health giving recreation and class mixing in an approved manner' (121).

There may have been a fear of an invasion in a nearby part of Kent, or a professional interest, if not actually an inside knowledge, of the relative merits of the armouries of the potential enemies but in Woolwich a central reason for joining the Volunteers was that it presented an opportunity to the urban working class to forge links with the local elite of regular officers from the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich (122). The 10th Kent Artillery (formed 1868) was made up of artisans from the Arsenal shot and shell factory and the 14th Kent was so closely associated with the Royal Dockyards that shortly after it closed in 1869 the corps was disbanded (123). Until it was forbidden from the practice, a few years after its formation, the Woolwich Volunteers elected its officers. Even then a list of officers nominated following a ballot was sent to the Lord Lieutenant of Kent, the person who appointed the officers subject to Royal approval. The list was rejected as it consisted 'of an indiscriminate amalgamation of the names of some of the superior officers of the departments and the mechanics without due regard to their classification'. Eventually a commission was given to a head foreman of one of the Laboratories, but Woolwich was clearly an exception as when a similar case arose in Chatham a commission was withheld from the keeper of the garrison canteen (124). The force continued to attract

Arsenal workers and the throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The Pioneer remarked that the Volunteers were 'a chance to retain your job [at the Arsenal] and, in some cases, where the wife was a daily woman to a superior person, a little promotion might come your way'(125). In general, as Beckett suggests the Force enhanced respect for authority. He calls it 'a cohesive factor in that it tended to draw the differing classes which composed its strength together' and cites how members were thought to be more loyal and patriotic than other civilians. Some nonconformists disapproved of the Volunteers on the grounds that the Force drew youth away from teetotal pledges towards the influence of military ardour (126). This was not the case amongst the prominent Labour temperance campaigners in Woolwich, such as Crooks, whilst a local Marxist who worked in the War Office, George Moore Bell, argued positively for the Territorials (127).

In March 1906 Labour Leader carried a article 'Down with weapons', and the April ILP conference denounced military training. The ILP also opposed the creation of the Territorial Army in 1907, with only one Labour MP voting with the government, Crooks (128). In 1908 the Woolwich volunteers became part of the 2nd London Brigade RFA (TF) of the Territorial Army, under direct War Office control. From 1912 its HQ was in the house of the turn of the century local Conservative MP, Edwin Hughes. The other local regiment was the 2nd, later 9th, Kent Artillery which during the war became the 65th (8th London) and was commanded by Lt Col E H Eley. He worked both privately as a surveyor and did surveying on behalf of the Woolwich Home Owners' Association. After the war he became a president of the Woolwich Chamber of Commerce (129). The WLP continued to support the Volunteers and the Pioneer, carried obituaries of local Volunteers (130). In 1921 Eley proposed that a war memorial to the 65th (8th London) be

constructed on Plumstead Common and Barefoot aided the processing of the application through the council (131). The labour movement did not recoil with liberal horror from the military because members were involved in a community activity, the Volunteers, because the solution that it sought to unemployment was a standing army equipped by a standing state arsenal in Woolwich.

During the war the government promised to restore pre-war practices which had been undermined by dilution and to provide work for former Service personnel. Those soldiers who had worked at the Arsenal expected to be able to return to their jobs after the war, and those who had been invalided out of the Forces and had started work at the Arsenal did not expect to be sacked. The ex-Servicemen were sufficiently well organised to present a threat to social order if their demands were ignored. In October 1918 the Civil Demobilisation and Resettlement Department was established. At its head was Sir Stephenson Kent. When he refused to meet dissatisfied ex-Servicemen, they invaded his office and pinned him to his desk (132). In the light of this and other, more violent incidents involving mutinous and recently demobbed Servicemen, such as the burning down of Luton Town Hall and the occupation of the barracks on Horseguards Parade, the ex-Servicemen of Woolwich were treated with some respect, or at least with caution.

The government provided some training exclusively for ex-Servicemen and disabled ex-Servicemen and subsidised particular work if the employee was a former Serviceman. The Woolwich LAC demanded that the Arsenal be used for training veterans (133). Mills also agitated on this issue, and the Minister responded that the issue was 'again under consideration' but little came of this plan for this alternative use of the Arsenal (134). There was some

training in state factories, Birtley Government Instrument Factory was used for this purpose, and in September 1920 the Minister of Labour promised that any man who completed his training and still found no work would be retrained again on full allowances. However, the factory was closed in July 1921, the men without work discharged and unemployment benefit for disabled ex-Servicemen was reduced from £1 to 15/- (75p) a week (135). The government also encouraged the employment of ex-Servicemen by means of a quota system. If 5% or more of the workforce were disabled ex-Servicemen the firm's name was entered on the Kings National Register. Local firms advertised if their names were on the Register (136). 8% of governmental staff had to be disabled ex-Servicemen (137). In Woolwich the Arsenal was well over quota and there was a promise made in 1919, (and revoked the following February), firstly that no ex-Servicemen would be discharged from the Arsenal and then that the ex-Servicemen would be among the last to be dismissed (138). This meant that the cost of production at the Arsenal was greater than it could have been. The CSOF announced that 'we are employing disabled soldiers in every way we can' but then complained to the Ministry that this burden, which did not apply to private firms, was 'manifestly unfair'. It was expensive to employ men 'for work which can be done at a much lower rate by young girls'.

In June 1919, in a speech which must have sounded ominous to the ex-Servicemen, the Minister of Munitions, Churchill, said that all men of pensionable age were being replaced at the Arsenal and that the order in which discharges were taking place was based 'entirely on efficiency' (139). This was reiterated in 1921 when the Financial Secretary to the War Office told a deputation from the Joint Town Committee that the previous order of dismissals had been inefficient and that henceforth people would be dismissed

or employed depending on the requirements of the Arsenal at that time, not upon the status of the individual. 'Every effort is to be made to employ the most efficient men and to provide the maximum amount of employment by the further recruitment of skilled men' (140). In February 1922 the Ordnance Department at the Arsenal took on a few extra workers and it was reiterated that it was government policy was to give preferential treatment 'other things being equal' to ex-Servicemen (141).

The government also offered free passage to the Empire for ex-Servicemen and their dependants, on the proviso that they had the approval of the appropriate foreign government or a job awaiting them. Government loans for farm land, stock and implements were available (142). In October 1921 the PM promised a £300,000 to help ex-Servicemen to emigrate (143). There was considerable publicity about the opportunities for emigration and the local Distress Committee assisted the passages of 15,000 local men, many of them with records of twenty years service at the Arsenal, in addition to their being ex-Servicemen (144). In February 1922 eight hundred unemployed former skilled Arsenal workers who between them owed £4,000 in back rent formed the Eltham Migration Committee and asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies for assistance with their passages to the Empire (145).

There were other specific aids for ex-Servicemen in Woolwich which marked them out from others campaigning for secure employment in the town. There was a Disabled Ex-Servicemen's sub-committee of the Woolwich council's Woolwich Employment Committee (WEC). Woolwich tennis raquet manufacturer A & G Gardiner arranged, via this sub-committee, to take on disabled ex-Servicemen. The sub-committee also toured local employers seeking appropriate occupations for the disabled. The WEC gave loans to ex-

Servicemen to enable to start their own businesses. In addition it pressed the CSOF to allow ex-Servicemen suspended from the Arsenal to be able to claim benefits without prejudicing their chances of re-entry into the Arsenal (146).

There were a number of organisations specifically for ex-Servicemen. In Woolwich there was a small number of members of the Comrades of the Great War. This body was founded and funded by big business, it had War Office sanction and senior officers and Unionist MPs on its self appointed executive (147). As the Chief of Scotland Yard's Criminal Investigation Department, Basil Thomson said, 'it never gave cause for anxiety' (148). It existed partly to stop ex-Servicemen forming political links with munition workers and the Woolwich branch had no links with the 'All Grades' committee. The Communist Party made appeals to discontented ex-Servicemen, but without any noticeable success (149). The ex-Servicemen's organisation which was sympathetic to the Labour Party was the National Union of ex-Servicemen, known at the time as NUX. It had a branch in Woolwich from December 1919. At the time of its creation there were 19,208 workers at the Arsenal and 3,500 unemployed in the town of whom 1,000 were ex-Servicemen (150). It was committed to stopping the discharges through constitutional means including the promotion of alternative work. The NUX Men's Labour Club had a procession in December 1920 in order to ask a factory to work a three shift system rather than employ men on overtime. It received support from the Woolwich Labour Institute, and a number of Labour activists and councillors including Harry Gilder, C H Langham and Jack Sheppard (151).

Larger than either the Comrades or the NUX was the Woolwich and District National Federation of Demobilised and Disabled Soldiers and Sailors, (NFDDSS). Within six months

of the Armistice it had got 20 branches within a 6 miles radius of Woolwich, including a separate branch on the Well Hall estate and within a year it had 4,000 members and representatives on the local War Pensions Committee, the LAC and the AGC (152). The nearby Dartford and Crayford NFDDSS had 1,700 members by that point (153). The Woolwich NFDDSS proclaimed itself to be 'non-political' (154). As the Sidcup & District NFDDSS secretary declared, 'there is no Bolshevist or Red Flag element in the Federation or its branches' (155). The organisation was narrow in its outlook. The secretary of the Tottenham branch of the NSSF (a local equivalent of the NFDDSS) told Acton NSSF that munition 'flappers' should not receive 25/- out-of-work-dole whilst soldiers wives only received 12/6d separation allowance each (156). The Woolwich NFDDSS looked to the government which had conscripted many of its members for help with unemployment. It sought special treatment for its members, in October 1919 it told the Ministry of Munitions that ex-Servicemen ought to be offered housing as a priority (157). The chair of the Woolwich branch, W G Kiddell, called the organisation 'strictly constitutional' and he said that it had 'no use for direct action' (158). A typical action was that of April 1921 when the NFDDSS appealed to the King for the retention of 1,900 ex-Servicemen at the Arsenal. This was followed by a delay in the layoff of the ex-Servicemen (159). The Woolwich NFDDSS's General Secretary, Thomas Crutcher, told the Conservatives that he had no use for politics and he praised the efforts of Sir Kingsley Wood to gain pensions for NFDDSS members (160). Sir Kingsley Wood promised to aid the organisation in an inquiry into pay and dismissals from the Arsenal (161). In September 1919 the NFDDSS held a joint memorial service with the Conservatives (162).

The Woolwich NFDDSS asked the other parties to withdraw and allow four of its candidates to stand unopposed in the 1919

borough elections. The MRs did not stand against the NFDDSS in 4 wards in Woolwich but the WLP refused such an arrangement, despite the fact that ward Labour parties in Battersea withdrew candidates in order to allow the NFDDSS to stand unopposed (163). The WLP suggested that Crutcher stand for Labour but he declined, stood for the NFDDSS, and lost. The generosity of the Conservative Party in not standing in seats it was unlikely to win might have been related to the fact that during the war the local Conservative party 'fell to pieces', according to the Conservative Woolwich Herald. The party had not got an agent in 1919 (164). The NFDDSS stood in four safe Labour seats and came bottom of the poll in three of them. In the other the candidate came in just ahead of one of the Tories, and a long way behind the successful Labour councillors (165). The co-operation between the NFDDSS and the unions was limited. In September 1919 during the rail strike the Woolwich NFDDSS organised a civil guard of 1,000 men. 'It is to be distinctly understood that no circumstances whatsoever will be grounds for strikebreaking' the NFDDSS said, adding that it wanted to maintain law and order and to protect property (166). A Labour municipal candidate in Stepney and a member of the NFDDSS accused Woolwich NFDDSS of scabbing during the rail dispute, despite the NFDDSS policy of neutrality. His resolution to expel Woolwich was defeated 74 to 3 and he resigned (167).

The higher status of ex-Servicemen at the Arsenal was effectively removed in early 1920. At this time there were 388,000 ex-Servicemen in receipt of the donation and 39,000 of them were disabled. In February 1920 some ex-Servicemen at the Arsenal were threatened with the sack. There was a huge demonstration in Beresford Square with speeches from councillors and ex-Servicemen's representatives. The demand was for alternative work.

This demand was of central importance to men in Woolwich whether they were traders, skilled artisans or ex-Servicemen. The opposition it was frequently reiterated, was not the government nor an individual manager but as one councillor who addressed the crowd on this particular occasion put it, 'they were up against the representatives of vested interests'. Another speaker, an ex-Serviceman, stressed how the fight had to be taken to the floor of the House and how 'Seven million men trained in arms could beat the politicians' (168).

A deputation of seventy discharged, disgruntled, disabled ex-Servicemen went to see the PM who refused to meet them. The response of the men was to say that they would camp in Downing Street if necessary, but they then decided to see Kellaway at the Ministry of Munitions. They told him that the disabled were unemployable in capitalist firms and the government had a duty to provide work, not making munitions but 'productive work for the nation'. Kellaway sympathised but blamed the more general crisis. he said that he had 'a duty to the public purse' Councillor Hart compared Kellaway with the Minister who had been responsible for the reduction of the size of the Arsenal workforce after the Boer War, Haldane. Whilst the deputation were seeing the Minister a large group of like minded protestors were trying to march on Downing Street. Some reports put the number at 5,000 (169). The demonstrators were joined en route by ex-Service personnel from other areas of London. Councillors and representatives of local traders swelled the ranks. They got as far as Westminster Bridge where the police, using what the Pioneer labelled 'Prussian' tactics, dispersed the crowd. There were 500 injured people. Thomas Mason an ex-Serviceman at the Arsenal who went on the march described how the police set about them with batons and went on 'You should have seen some of our fellows, head

wounds, bandages around 'em' (170). In April 1920 at the annual conference of the Socialist Party the battle of Westminster Bridge was cited as an example of the fierceness of the class war and as evidence of how the 'governing class would stick at nothing to uphold its dominance (171). The Pioneer explained that the 'battle of Westminster Bridge brought prominently to the fore the question of alternative work not alone in Woolwich but in the country generally' (172). As an outcome of the 'battle' the government established a new committee comprising of civil servants from the Ministry of Munitions and the representatives of ex-Servicemen who were employed at the Arsenal including a highly articulate Woolwich councillor, Hart. In addition discharges were postponed for a fortnight (173). This committee met Martel (the CSOF) the next day and he suggested that the responsibility for the discharges lay with Given at the Ministry (174). Once the anger and fear which had been responsible for the establishment of the committee had dissipated, departmental officials offered almost nothing to the ex-Servicemen, not even the promised training schemes for the disabled (175).

Ex-servicemen rallied a week later in Beresford Square and their representatives met General Martel. They handed a petition on behalf of the disabled men, to Princess May, asking her to pass it on to her father, the King. Jack Jones, the Silvertown MP, publicised the cause of the ex-Servicemen at the Arsenal in the Commons (176). At this time ex-Servicemen from the First World War, not previous campaigns, were second behind only pre-war employees in the order of dismissals (177). On behalf of the King Sir Robert Horne replied to the petition saying that ex-Servicemen received 'special consideration' at the employment exchange, that work had been provided 'to the fullest extent that has been found practicable' and that if

uneconomical work was provided then that threw people out of work elsewhere (178). Within days of the petition dismissals were again proposed, 120 able-bodied men and 116 disabled were to be laid off over a four week period. The ex-Servicemen's committee were furious, as the PM had promised consultations would occur prior to any decisions being made (179). The policy of discrimination in favour of those who had fought in the First World War continued in name for some time. By June 1920 there were 195,000 registered unemployed ex-Servicemen and 24,600 of them were disabled (180). A month later there were 143,000 ex-Servicemen in receipt of the donation, this cost about £168,000 per week. In 1922 however the Woolwich Workers' Unemployment Organisation was established and its five point programme included the demand for no discrimination between the unemployed (181).

Although distanced from the core Arsenal workers by their experiences of the war; their privileged treatment at the hands of the state, and their particular demands, the Woolwich NFDDSS did contribute to the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign. The NFDDSS had a representative on the AGC and when ex-Servicemen at the Arsenal were given work in the dangerous Arsenal TNT factory the shop stewards and the NFDDSS worked together to protest against this treatment (182). The NFDDSS had its own, recognised, steward at the Arsenal and, working in close co-operation with the other stewards, the organisation claimed responsibility for appealing on behalf of hundreds of dismissed ex-Servicemen and winning their jobs back for them. In August 1919 of the 176 dismissals from the Arsenal of ex-Servicemen, all but 34 had been re-instated (183). Ex-Servicemen were a potentially disruptive force. In Woolwich their organisations were harnessed to the campaign for alternative work. Through such activity they were brought into the new civic order.

(d)

One of the demands of 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners was to produce house building materials at the Arsenal. This linked the campaign to housing, an issue of great local and national pertinence. Many Arsenal workers were tied to their work because if they were laid off they faced eviction from the accommodation especially built for Arsenal workers and, at a time of a national housing shortage, there were few other places to go. Others had no wish to leave their homes, as most tenants had controlled rents, and owners would have had to find buyers for a property in an area without prospects of work. In September 1919 a small house on the Well Hall was for sale for £350, 18 months later a similar house cost £210 (184). If the Arsenal was used to make items used in house construction, the dilemmas of a housing shortage and unemployment could be resolved. In addition the campaigns over housing were linked to the campaign for alternative work because they reinforced the values which were central to the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign. There was private housing and a well-organised tenants association for the artisans which aimed to encourage a sense of local community, and inferior housing for the less successfully organised new arrivals at the Arsenal. The government made promises, and then influenced by the Treasury and the Commons, reneged on them and tried to offload its responsibilities onto the Woolwich council.

In the late nineteenth century as there was well-paid, regular work and little competition from a commercial and professional strata artisans were able to purchase their own houses. The Arsenal and Dockyards 'produced a home loving and thrifty class of mechanic and artisan, responsible for Woolwich having more owner-occupiers than any other locality in the UK in proportion to the

population'. From the late nineteenth century at least a quarter and possibly as much as a third of owner-occupiers in Woolwich were working-class (186). In the WEBS there was an adequate institutional means by which money could be channelled to property in Woolwich. Based on a nonconformist firm founded in the 1840s the WEBS grew to own assets of £1.6 million by 1920 (187). In 1925 it had assets of £2 million and the first person not from Woolwich was appointed to the board (188). In 1900 George Barnes noted that the constituency 'needed a milk and watery man unidentified with socialism... there are a lot of houseowners in Woolwich. The poor chaps... believe in the the rights of property' (189). Booth recorded the demand for small houses, the 'broad wave of prosperity that springs from employment at the Arsenal' and that the money went into housing; 'the aquisition of property is the dominant idea in Woolwich and the sole object of life seemingly to buy a house'. It was 'one of the few districts in London where the workman has made the sides and crests of the steep hills his own' (190).

The influx of munitions workers during the war led to a tremendous pressure on accommodation. Sales rose and eight estate agents reported that they had not got a single vacant house between them (191). The council had built a few houses in the past but there had been difficulties in producing accommodation for workers which could also be let an economical rent (192). In 1901 Woolwich had the lowest density of occupation per house anywhere in London and in 1911 there were 1,300 unoccupied houses in the borough. The council did not wish to be saddled with empty properties once the population declined after the war (193). It lobbied for a national solution, house building by the Local Government Board (194).

The government intervened in two ways. It controlled rents and it built accommodation. Before the war rent legislation was 'a modern Frankenstein' as Labour Leader put it, because 'a rent strike at once involves a thousand laws that safeguard property' (195). The 1914 Court Emergency Powers Act meant that landlords needed a court order before they could seize goods in lieu of rent and the 1915 Rent Restrictions Act stabilised rents for those in controlled accommodation. This legislation was passed after much agitation, some of it in Woolwich. The Fabians suggested that this local interest was in part because
landlordism was easier to attack than
capitalism where the only large industry
is government work (196)

There was also the background of the campaigns of Horsley for improvements in house sanitation and for tenants' rights and a WL&TC demonstration which was part of a campaign in 1900 which called for municipal housing and fair rents (197). In 1915 the campaigning was framed in terms of patriotic activity to end profiteering. The War Rents League continued to campaign after the 1915 Act, the outline of its work being summarised by its mainstay, Dan Rider, as 'no evictions during house shortages, no rents for slums no increase in rents without repairs' (198). The 1915 legislation was 'framed in the interests of the working class elite' and reflected 'the biases of these eminently respectable militants' of the Arsenal (199). The Pioneer explained its implications and advised readers to consult the WLP office in the event of any difficulties (200).

The divisions at the Arsenal were perpetuated on the estates and in the different tenants associations. Wohl suggests that the artisan class persisted as a stratum after 1890 because of the difference between 'accommodation regarded as "artisan standard" and the abysmal dwellings of labourers, casuals and outworkers' (201). The Office of

Works (OoW) provided 1,290 houses for artisans and 2,654 four-roomed wooden bungalows, known as hutments on nine sites around Woolwich (202). This was provision on a far greater scale than for state munitions workers, or those in the private sector, elsewhere (203). The second largest amount of state housing in one area was an estate of 708 dwellings in Sheffield (204). The architect who had designed Letchworth and Hampstead Garden Suburb, Raymond Unwin, designed the houses of the Well Hall estate, in Woolwich and despite the cost, he received widespread praise for his work (205). The Garden City and Town Planning Magazine thought Well Hall 'wonderful... there is not a colony of workmen's houses in the world which approaches the general excellence of the Woolwich scheme' (206). The Pioneer said that 'it will approximate very closely to [Walt] Whitman's ideal of the great city' and a worker who described it in the Pioneer asked 'who wouldn't be a munitions worker in Woolwich nowadays?' (207).

The Well Hall Garden City Tenants Association (WHTA) was formed and soon had 700 members. The chair, Jack Mills, said that it aimed not to 'oppose the powers that be [but] to promote the happiness and wellbeing of the residents'. The Vice-President, Crooks, saw the WHTA as a means of encouraging neighbourly behaviour. As Arsenal workers could neither strike for more pay nor leave work without a certificate, one of the few ways by which they could make material gains and not be undermined by blacklegs or dilutees, was by not paying the rent. One of the first actions of the WHTA was to organise a successful rent strike in 1915. The money which was saved was pooled and spent on a new social centre. The estate had no shops, churches, doctors or schools; it relied upon the workplace as the social centre. 'RB' wrote in the Pioneer, 'a stronger material tie could hardly exist. When it is quickened by comradeship and a growing sense of our garden

citizenship, then might our community show a better way of living to many another industrial centre' (208). The WHTA continued to campaign. In 1920 it defied the 1920 Rent Act when members decided to refuse to pay a rent increase to the OoW. There were court proceedings, and eventually the arrears were paid and the case went to arbitration (209).

Even after Well Hall had been constructed it was impossible for Arsenal workers to find accommodation in the locality and the existing transport arrangements were inadequate for mass commuting so the hutments were built and hostels which provided accommodation for 7,000 people by 1917, were built. The hutments inhabitants lived in what a Ministry of Munitions Inspector called 'literally human packing cases' made from inferior materials, without adequate foundations, ventilation, drainage or access by road. Furthermore, 'the external aspect is hideous' and one of the sites, according to the Lewisham Board of Guardians, was 'fit only for use as a preserve for wildfowl and water fowl' (210). One resident recalled that 'it was a dismal area... The names of the roads weren't inspiring, rather gloomy echoes of war: Rifle Road, Torpedo Terrace' (211). Another remembered being summoned to work by the ringing of a brass shell case hanging outside one of the huts and being 'up to my eyes in mud and water' (212). Even the Evening Standard in an article written during a rent strike, which pointed out how fortunate the residents were to have anywhere to live, called them 'not too cheerful looking' (213). The Government Hutments Tenants Protection League (GHTPL) was formed in November 1918 to campaign for rent reductions of 5/- a week so that tenants might purchase coal as the hutments were damp and many tenants expected to lose their jobs and receive only 24/- a week in benefit. After five deputations to the Minister of Munitions the rents were reduced by 2/6d for the winter. David Englander argues that this action was used as model

for tenants elsewhere and was viewed with consternation by landlords (214). The GHTPL fought to get the rents permanently reduced, for the reduction of tram fares and for general improvements to the estates, but as people moved away the campaigning faded. By December 1919 only 20 people attended the GHTPL Annual General Meeting and at the end of the following year when 1,930 wartime hutments were still occupied, the GHTPL lost its funds when the locally based Farrows Bank collapsed in December 1920 (215).

Before the war there was some state housing which 'facilitated the continued operation of the 'invisible hand' and the laissez-faire principles by providing a temporary prop' (216). Immediately after the war it appeared if there would be more state housing. The press and the Cabinet demanded, in the words of Lloyd George's election promise of November 1918, 'Homes For Heroes'.

Churchill made the point that

work should be taken to to the workmen rather than that large numbers of workmen should be discharged from Woolwich and Enfield and left to find accommodation where no housing accommodation exists (217).

As the government had built during the war it was a reasonable assumption by the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners that such properties would require maintenance and that the government might continue to build as it was committed to the further provision of housing and by its own admission there was a perceived need for 300,000 new post-war dwellings. Even the Evening Standard held the view that 'we are by no means averse to the principle of nationalisation of certain great utilities', and then gave the example of subsidised housing (218). In fact as early as 1917 the Housing Panel of the Department of Reconstruction ruled out government house building and in August 1919 the Cabinet decided that it was 'undesirable that the Government should itself manage houses... every

effort should therefore be made to transfer Government houses to local authorities, or failing them, to approved public utility societies' (219). Sheila Marriner argues that although some building firms gained economic advantages through enforced war-time standardisation, most still lacked sufficient finance to build and that in regard to this the government was totally unsympathetic and utterly intransigent (220).

Although it opposed rent increases the Woolwich council focused on its own administration of housing (221). It built more dwellings between the wars than any other London borough. In January 1920 the council sponsored a national conference for local authorities on housing, and in February work on a 2,700 home estate commenced, the cost of which came for the government on the understanding that the local and county councils would pay for the upkeep (222). The Woolwich council complied with all the government's strictures in regard to the building work, it secured the site, obtained materials and put up £250,000, but there were delays, and the figure of 1,200 houses was reduced to 300. The Pioneer blamed this on Addison, the appropriate Minister (223). His 'Ministry of Muddle and Misdeed' was 'increasing the exasperation of the people' (224). This was a similar response to that of the Pioneer to unemployment, which could lead to a 'serious inflammatory campaign amongst the common people', or to squatting which it argued was 'a demonstration of the inefficiency of the government' (225). Although there were 3,000 more people in Woolwich in 1920 than there were in 1914 and there was a housing list with 2,000 names on it, the Pioneer described the situation in terms of comic opera, rather than as an aspect of capitalist economics; 'the situation is Gilbertian', an example of 'political roguery', and 'enough to make the proverbial cat laugh' (226).

Sir Alfred Mond was the first Commissioner of the Office of Works, which was the government body responsible for building homes. He was enthusiastic for the government to build; for it to employ ex-Servicemen as builders and to compel local authorities to take responsibility for the completed houses (227). The Treasury's opposition to the scheme led Mond to modify his views (228). In addition, although courts often found in its favour, the government found rent collection on its estates difficult and, backed by the recommendations of the 1922 Geddes Committee, made concerted efforts to sell those properties that it owned (229). By 1923 Mond had changed his views. He said that from his experience it was 'impossible to carry on the industries of the country from a government department... a curiously paralysing influence seems to over everybody as soon as they begin to work for the state'. In 1925 a solution which reflected the importance of community self-help was found when the RACS purchased most of the government houses and thus added over 1,200 dwellings to the 3,500 that it already owned (230). By contrast Sir Kingsley Wood took up the issue of hutments sanitation with both Kellaway and the local council. Sir Kingsley Wood, accompanied by a surveyor and a local MR councillor inspected the hutments and told the GHTPL that 'I cannot believe that the rent charged is a fair one... I am considerably impressed with the justice of your case'. In addition the local magistrates thought the huts insanitary (231). He was also invited to the GHTPL fundraising party, and in 1929 Wood's firm of solicitors represented a hutments tenant who was being evicted, by Eltham Parks Estates Limited, for rent arrears (232).

Alternatives to the constitutionalist approach were presented, and, as with Poplarism, marginalised. Although Mills lent his support to 400 LCC tramworkers who were living in a Ministry of Munitions hostel and who occupied

it when they were told to leave, in general there was little support for such action (233). There were squatters living rent-free in Woolwich hutments for over a year but such direct action was not seen as a significant example to follow (234). Women wanted to run their own hostel, rather than it being closed. They received more support from Sir Kingsley Wood than the WLP and eventually the hostel was not dismantled but destroyed (235). The difference came to the fore when the GHTPL organiser, George Haley, (a navy at the Arsenal and also a Labour Party activist), stood against Mills in the 1919 town council election (236). All three seats in the ward were won by the Conservatives, who gained enough votes to beat Labour even if all of Haley's 'independent labour' votes had gone to Labour. Indicative of the continued prominence of the Arsenal is the fact that one of the MR victors was an Arsenal worker who had been on the council from 1906 (237). Two of the Labour candidates were engineers and the third one labelled himself as an artisan. Mills went on to become an Alderman, a home owner, (after he was evicted for rent arrears during a rent dispute in 1921) and PPS to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (238). Haley countered the local labour community, lost his job at the Arsenal, got into debt and was evicted (239).

For established men at the Arsenal in the mid-nineteenth century their employer was, 'a vague non-profit making body confused with concepts of Britain's power, and with working-class patriotism' (240). This view, coupled to their control of the largest local trader and a significant local employer, the RACS, and their experience of running their own company, the AFC, provided the Arsenal workers with an unusual perspective on the world of business which determined their view as to the best means by which they might secure alternative work for the Arsenal. The emphasis, throughout the campaign, on constructive change,

eliminating the defects of society rather than totally rejecting it, owed more to local moral codes than the 'Goom to Jesus' Snowden. Visionaries ,even socialist ones, clearly did not appeal to the practical Arsenal men, whereas a vicar, or a pastor, who offered constructive, piecemeal, change did. MacDonald might have offered an elaborate theoretical edifice, but on an everyday level the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners recognised the value of their own non-socialist sources of support, including clerics and businessmen. The idea, popular immediately after the war, that ex-Servicemen ought to be provided with work and accommodation, was, in Woolwich, placed within a framework provided by the labour community. The notion of a fair deal for the war heroes was used to promote the continued use of the Arsenal. The availability of accommodation for workers in Woolwich and the stake which the RACS and other local traders had in the locality, encouraged workers to seek alternative work at the Arsenal; to retain their local focus.

Chapter V

no more bloody Woolwich Arsenal for me

Spike Milligan in Hobbs J (ed) 'Rommel?'
'Gunner Who?' 1974 p156

Hall, Schwarz and Durham's work has been employed to show the extent to which the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign contributed to the passive transformation of British society, politics and the state. Their proposal is that 'at the very core' of the passive reform were progressive state administrators who took up the challenges from those outside the state and presented back to the people as state policies (1). In its constitutional form and its statist content the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign exemplifies this process. It had some influence upon new liberals at the Ministry of Munitions and it also contributed to another aspect of the passive transformation, the constitutionalisation of the Labour Party (2). This latter process involved the creation of Labour Socialism, key elements of which were the privileging of responsibility for the community, not class politics, and two-party constitutionalism. Through this study of a specific campaign it has become clearer how the new order, which rested upon a social and political environment constructed on all levels of society, was implemented.

The relatively warm personal contacts between the Ministry of Munitions and the 'Peace Arsenal' campaigners are indicative of the reception that the ideas of the latter received in the Ministry. The shop stewards' All Grades' Committee made a point of inviting a leading Ministry of Munitions official concerned with the Arsenal, Sir Henry Fowler, to visit the borough to see how respectable it was. When he arrived, in March 1919, he was escorted around Woolwich in a RACS car, by Voce, of the AGC. Addison's diary reveals that whilst he wrote almost nothing about workers in it, he was 'seriously impressed' with the shop stewards from Woolwich. The Arsenal workers did not argue for a new form of public ownership, or worker' control, they simply wanted the Arsenal to switch from munitions production to making locomotives. The continuance of state

ownership was not identified with the advance of socialism. Similarly, when the Ministry of Munitions took up the case for 10,000 Arsenal workers in peacetime it proposed the maintenance of a Ministry to run the Arsenal. As Schwarz and Hall put it, the challenge from below was reconstituted in a bureaucratic mould.

An element of the creation of two-party constitutionalism was that nationalised industries were placed in one camp, as state ownership became part of the socialist discourse, and the newly strengthened armaments industry cartels, were firmly in the other camp. Schwarz and Durham argue that this had occurred by 1920 or 1921 and that arguments on the right for a strong state sector were dropped. Pressure from private companies was added to the opposition of the Treasury to further expenditure by the Ministry. This meant that the Cabinet's decision, to disallow state production in any field where it might compete with private production, was buttressed. Although the Ministry's arguments in respect state production at the Arsenal were outweighed, some of its new liberal concepts of state collectivism prevailed in the Labour Party (3).

Schwarz and Durham emphasise the fluidity of the political situation in the period 1918-24. They suggest that the opposition between reformist and revolutionary socialists had not been settled; that only by 1924 had these two categories had hardened into organising principles (4). The Labour Party had to be won to the idea of constitutional gradualism and parliamentarianism. This occurred as a result of a number of decisive battles, both inside and outside the Labour Party. In part it involved the leadership winning consensus for Labour Socialist ideas in the party by pointing out how more abrasive form of socialism might provoke a backlash which would reverse 'Britain's historical "liberal" route' and would result in

an authoritarian anti-socialist bloc (5). Certainly the idea of ousting the Liberal Lloyd George and replacing him with two-party constitutionalism built around Labour and Conservative would have appealed in Woolwich from where the Liberals had long departed. A further aspect of the creation of this consensus was that the leadership 'focused popular energies on the demand for state reforms while limiting the forms of struggle within a particular and narrow conception of legality' (6). This occurred in Woolwich because this agenda addressed local concerns.

The leaders of the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign knew the importance of securing orders for the Arsenal because they remembered the distress after the Boer War, they knew that many Arsenal workers, through owning their own houses, were tied to the locality, where there was little work outside the Arsenal. Other workers were tied to work at the Arsenal through their tenancy agreements. Many owners and tenants would find moving to other accommodation or other work where they might be considered 'skilled' to be a difficult task. The campaigners decided that the best approach was to build a campaign based on the locality, not upon class. There had been a collapse of unity, during the period of the post-Boer War unemployment. In their adaptation of the idea of citizenship to the local circumstances after the war the campaign leaders laid the emphasis upon civic pride and the parochial community. In their readiness to create an understanding between business, unions and the council, in the Joint Town Committee, in their attempts to integrate new forces including as the Workers Union and the National Federation of Women Workers, the campaigners eased the settlement of events at national level.

Of the many "socialisms" which made themselves available in this period, it was this variant, with its commitments

to statism and social engineering, which prevailed - not least because of the critical role played by the state itself in containing the more 'extreme' elements in the Labour formation, while educating the more accommodative elements into a safe place within the pale of the constitution (7)

That which Hall and Schwarz say of Fabianism can be applied to the socialism of the WLP as exemplified in the 'Peace Arsenal' campaign. The campaign provided the focus, around which the new consensus could be constructed. The WLP, one of the first constituency parties, was organised on a geographical basis. This drew in individuals without regard to their occupational or class background. Trade unionists joined as individuals and non-trade unionists were involved at all levels of the party. This structure buttressed the idea of community and individual responsibility to vote, over the concept of class action. The corollary was constitutionalism and efficiency whilst in office. This, despite the example set by Lansbury two miles away in a different economic environment. The early experience of office marked the WLP, it was interested in governing the community, not in acting as a working class pressure group. Hall and Schwarz acknowledge the heterogeneity of "socialisms", but stress the 'immense influence' of the Fabians and new liberals 'in defining socialism, in fixing the character of labour and in setting the targets of what could be achieved politically by the nascent Labour Party' (8). Schwarz and Durham, also highlight the importance of locality and a base in a community and Hinton provides a comment appropriate to Woolwich when he suggests that, 'socialism is the aspiration of a community, not the destiny of a class' (9).

There was already a strong community upon which the labour activists could build the campaign. At the centre were the core workers, and especially their shop stewards who,

despite the potential disruption due to the sudden influx of a vast number of dilutees, and despite the threat to their control over skilled work, maintained their status throughout the war. These workers found links with munitions workers outside the Arsenal difficult to sustain, unless they were buttressed by proximity. The Arsenal site was far larger than other munitions factories, and had employed more men for longer. There were connections with Waltham Abbey and Enfield, but competition for orders and plant weighed against these ties.

The strength of the community also rested upon the fact that there were almost no local employers besides the state, and the state was also a local landlord. Local businessmen did not directly pay for higher wages at the Arsenal and they benefited from the increased expenditure of the recipients of pay awards or larger pensions. Being a garrison town full of current and former Army personnel encouraged many businesses to maintain symbiotic relationships with Territorials and veterans. The ex-Servicemen and traders had a stake in the prosperity of Woolwich, and sought work for the Arsenal. Furthermore the Arsenal workers had experience of running their own businesses, the Pioneer, the Football Club and the RACS. The campaigners targeted not local businesses but large private firms, 'the Munitioneers', as the enemies of alternative work. Despite the limited success of the campaign they dominated the skilled men maintained their importance. As McKinlay and Zeitlin say 'the continued centrality of skilled workers within the division of labour was the basis of the resurgence of workplace militancy after 1935' (10).

Alternative work fitted the mould of previous work in Woolwich. It was organised and financed at national level, it required both skilled and unskilled labour, and it

fitted the Fabian ideal of rational efficiency and administrative neutrality which was the most sophisticated economic policy to justify state intervention that the Labour Party had. The 'Peace Arsenal' campaign failed when the private manufacturers of armaments saw a threat to their profits, their cartel, their virulent anti-unionism and because of, to quote Hall and Schwarz, 'the emergence of a new plutocracy - bankers, stockbrokers investors and so on' (5).

Appendix

The numbers employed at the Arsenal in a selection of years

Date	Number Employed	Wars
1814	5,000	Napoleonic Wars
1840	1,000	
1854	2,500	Crimean War
1856	8,000	Crimean War
1862	9,000	Crimean War
1870	4,975	New Zealand Wars
1880	5,153	First SA War
1895	12,160	
1898	15,293	Sudan War
1900	20,015	Boer War
1901	21,000	Boer War
1902	21,000	Boer War
1905	15,150	
1906	14,000	
1907	13,385	
1912	10,463	
Jul 1914	10,750	
Dec 1914	23,000	First World War
Jan 1915	22,631	First World War
Dec 1915	46,000	First World War
Nov 1916	68,000	First World War
May 1917	74,467	First World War
Nov 1917	74,000	First World War
Feb 1918	69,270	First World War
May 1918	64,977	First World War
Aug 1918	65,462	First World War
Nov 1918	63,827	
Jan 1919	38,203	
Apr 1919	24,628	
May 1919	24,338	
Oct 1919	19,729	
Dec 1919	18,461	
Feb 1920	16,598	
Mar 1921	16,000	
Nov 1922	6,000	
Sep 1940	32,500	Second World War
Aug 1945	15,500	

The largest number of women recorded at the Arsenal during this period was in February 1918 23,877. According to the Labour Year Book 1919 p219 at this time there were about 4,500,000 people employed by the government.

Compiled from Hogg O F G The Royal Arsenal, its background origin and subsequent history volume II pp890-90 914-6;

Official History of the Ministry of Munitions Vol 8 1924, 2

p15; PRO MUN 4 6401; PRO MUN 4 6402; PRO MUN 5/152/1122.11/13;

PRO MUN 5.152/1122.11/9; A report of a speech in Commons by

Kellaway in WP 13/02/20; WP 24/02/22; Labour Year Book 1919

p219. On the numbers of other munitions workers see Hinton J S

The first shop stewards movement 1973 p28. On the numbers at

Chatham see Waters M J 'A social history of the Chatham

Dockyard workforce, 1860-1906' PhD University of Essex 1979

p310

THAMES POLYTECHNIC

Unless stated otherwise all books published in London.
Abbreviations used throughout the footnotes and
bibliography

BSSLH Bulletin of the Society for the Study of
Labour History
EcHR Economic History Review
EDT Erith and District Times
HJ Historical Journal
IRSH International Review of Social History
KI Kentish Independent
NLR New Left Review
OHMM Official History of the Ministry of Munitions
PRO Public Record Office
WDC Woolwich Distress Committee
WH Woolwich Herald, 'the Conservative and Unionist paper
for the Borough'
WP The Woolwich Pioneer and Labour Journal, the WLP
newspaper
WW Woman Worker, the NFWW journal

Chapter I

1

Nottingham C p247 'Recasting bourgeois Britain? The
British state in the years which followed the First World
War' IRSH 31 1986 pp227-47

2

Wald K D 'Advance by retreat? The formation of British
Labour's electoral strategy, Journal of British Studies 27
3 July 1988 pp283-314

See also

Pelling H Social geography of British elections 1883-1911
1967 p422

Sked A and Cook C (eds) Crisis and controversy; essays in
honour of A J P Taylor 1976 p58

3

Marginson P M 'The distinctive effects of plant and company
size on workplace industrial relations British Journal of
Industrial Relations 22 1984 pp1-14

See also

George K D McNabb R Shorey J p250 'The size of the work
unit and labour market behaviour British Journal of
Industrial Relations 14 pp249-67

4

Benyon H Working for Ford 1975

Littler C The development of the labour process in
capitalist societies 1982

5

Parkin F 'Working class Conservatives: a theory of political deviance' British Journal of Sociology 18 3 1967 pp278-90

6

Parkin F 'Social stratification' in Bottomore T and Nesbit R (eds) A history of sociological analysis 1979 pp599-632
John Clarke says that up until the Second World War, 'a class culture has often been identified with specifically local experiences'.

Clarke J p240 'Capital and culture: the post-war working class revisited' in Clarke J Critcher C and Johnson R (eds) Working class culture, studies in history and theory 1979

7

Hall S and Schwarz B 'State and society 1880-1930' in Schwarz B and Langan M (eds) Crises in the British state 1880-1930 1985 pp7-32

Schwarz B and Durham M '"A safe and sane labourism": socialism and the state, 1910-24' in Schwarz B and Langan M (eds) Crises in the British state 1880-1930 1985 pp126-50

8

Hoare O and Smith G N (eds and trans) Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci 1971 pp105-20

9

Hoare and Smith ibid pp229 207 243

(a)

10

Mayer A J The persistence of the old regime Beckenham 1981 ppx 1-15

11

Foster J p138 'The state and the ruling class during the General Strike' Marxism Today May 1976 pp137-48

12

Foster J pp4 27 'British imperialism and the labour aristocracy' in Skelley J (ed) The General Strike 1926 1976 pp3-57

13

Foster 'British' ibid pp10-11

14

Foster 'British' ibid pp39-41

15

Demaris R p7 'Lloyd George and the development of the

government strike breaking organisation' IRSH 20 1975 pp1-15

16

Foster 'British' op cit pp18 27

Foster J pp104-7 'How imperial London preserved its slums' International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 10 3 1979 pp93-114

17

Foster 'British' op cit p24

18

Middlemas K Politics in industrial society, the experience of the British system since 1911 1979

Maier C S Recasting bourgeois Europe: stabilisation in France, Germany and Italy after World War I Princetown 1975

19

Lowe R 'corporate bias' SSRC Newsletter 50 11/83 pp17-18

20

Beloff M p277 'The Whitehall factor: the role of the higher civil service 1919-39' in Peele G and Cook C (eds) The politics of reappraisal 1975

Burk K p86 'The Treasury; from impotence to power' in Burk K (ed) War and the state: the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 pp84-107

Davidson R and Lowe R 'Bureaucracy and innovation in British welfare policy 1870-1945' in Mommsen W J The emergence of the welfare state in Britain and Germany 1850-1950 1981 pp263-295

Fraser P pp125 132 135 138 'The impact of the war of 1914-18 on the British political system' in Foot M R D (ed) War and society, historical essays in memory of J R Western 1928-71 1973 pp123-39

Middleton R 'The Treasury and public investment: a perspective on interwar economic management' Public Administration 61 Winter 1983 pp351-70

21

Newman N 'The role of the Treasury in the formation of British economic policy 1918-25' PhD Durham University 1972

French D p7 'The rise and fall of 'business as usual' in Burk K (ed) War and the state: the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 pp7-31

Lowe R 'Welfare Legislation and the unions during and after the First World War' HJ 25 2 1982 pp437-441

Whiteside N 'Industrial labour and welfare legislation after the First World War a reply' HJ 25 2 pp443-446

22

Peden G C pp169-70 'The 'Treasury View' on public works

and employment in the interwar period' EcHR 37 2 pp167-181
Peden G C p378 'The Treasury as the central department of
government, 1991-1939' Public Administration 61 Winter 1983
pp371-385

Lowe R pp279 286 'The erosion of state intervention in
Britain 1917-24' EcHR 31 1978

23

PRO T 172/832 of 18/04/18

24

Lowe R 'The Ministry of Labour: fact and fiction' BSSLH 41
1980 pp23-7

Barnett A 'Iron Britannia' NLR 134 1982 p43 notes
Middlemas's absence of an analysis of financial and
overseas institutions

25

McKibbin R The evolution of the Labour Party 1910-24 1974
p240

See also

McKibbin R 'Arthur Henderson as Labour Leader' IRSH 23 1
1978

26

McKibbin R 'Labour and politics in the Great War' BSSLH 34
1977 pp4-5

27

Jones G S and Samuel R p326 'The Labour Party and social
democracy' in Samuel R and Jones G S Culture ideology and
politics, essays for Eric Hobsbawm 1982 pp320-9

See also

Chamberlain C 'The growth of support for the Labour party
in Britain' British Journal of Sociology 24 1973 pp474-89

Massey D Spatial divisions of labour, social structures and
the geography of production 1984 pp68-9

Maguire M pp74-5 'Work, locality and social control' Work,
employment and society 2 1 1988 pp71-87

28

Hinton J S 'Disconnecting socialist aspirations from class
consciousness' BSSLH 51 pp38-9. Thompson notes how the
labour movement during this period was 'exceptionally
responsive to problems of local social and economic
context'. Thompson E P T 'Homage to Tom Maguire' in Briggs
A and Saville J Essays in labour History 1967 p276

29

Winter J M Socialism and the challenge of war: ideas and
politics in Britain 1912-18 p974

Waites B A 'The effect of the First World War on aspects of
the class structure of English society' PhD Open
University 1983 p22

30

Jeffreys J B The story of the engineers 1945 p134

31

Wrigley C A history of British industrial relations volume II 1914-39 1986

Reid A pp69-70 'Trade unionism and the state in Britain during the First World War' in Tolliday S and Zeitlin J (eds) Shop floor bargaining and the state, historical and comparative perspectives Cambridge 1985 pp46-74

Whiteside N p83 'Public policy and port labour reform: the dock decasualisation issue, 1910-50' in Tolliday S and Zeitlin J (eds) Shop floor bargaining and the state, historical and comparative perspectives Cambridge 1985 pp75-107

32

More C Skill and the English working class 1870-1914 1980 pp233-4 226-37

Cole G D H Trade unions and munitions Oxford 1923 p4

Roberts R The classic slum Harmondsworth 1971 p200

Waites 'The effect' op cit p420

33

Henderson A p36 'The industrial unrest: a new policy required' Contemporary Review 115 1919

Goodrich C The frontier of control, 1st edition 1920, 1975

Jeffreys K and Hennessey State of emergency; British governments and strikebreaking since 1919 1983 p32

Cole M I Beatrice Webb's Diaries 1912-24 1952 p82

Middlemas K (ed) Thomas Jones' Whitehall Diaries Vol I Oxford 1969 pp69-103

PRO Cab 24/71 GT 6425 of 02/12/18

Times 01/02/19

Herald 08/03/19

Williams W Full up and fed up. The worker's mind in crowded Britain N Y 1921

Williams R The new labour outlook 1921

Orton W Labour in transition 1921

Gleason A What the workers want 1921

34

Webb B and Webb S The decay of capitalist civilisation 1923 p164

PRO WC 539 Cab 23/9 of 03/13/19

Demaris op cit p3

McIvor A p632 'A crusade for capitalism: the Economic League 1919-39' Journal of Contemporary History 23 4 1988 pp631-55

Morgan J 'The political career of Christopher, Viscount Addison (1869-1951)' University of Leicester PhD 1979 p43

Cline P K pp100-01 'Eric Geddes and the 'experiment' with businessmen in government 1915-22' in Brown K O (ed) Essays

in anti-labour history: responses to the rise of labour in Britain 1974 pp74-103

35

Halevy E The era of tyrannies 1st edition Paris 1938 1960 edition p180

White S 'Ideological hegemony and political control: the sociology of anti-Bolshevism in Britain 1918-20' Scottish Labour History Journal 9 Edinburgh June 1975 p3

Cronin J E 'Coping' op cit pp113 119-20

Englander D and Osbourne J 'Jack Tommy and Henry Dubb: the armed forces and the working class' HJ 21 3 1978 pp593-621

36

Pribicevic B 'Demands for workers' control in the railway, mining and engineering industries 1910-22' D Phil Oxford University 1957 p438

This point is reiterated in

Coates K and Topham A Industrial democracy in GB: a book of readings and witnesses for workers' control 1968 p97

Englander and Osbourne op cit p593

Dallas G and Gill D The unknown army, mutinies in the British army in WWI 1985 pp89-99

PRO Cab 24/14 GT 832 labour situation week ending 23/05/17

37

WP 11/04/19 report of lecture to Woolwich troops on the evils of Bolshevism

KI 30/05/19

38

Hall and Schwarz op cit pp27 29

39

Wrigley op cit

40

Hall and Schwarz op cit p7

41

Hall and Schwarz op cit pp28

Foster 'British' op cit pp33-4

This view of the importance of Lloyd George is confirmed in the most recent work on the Coalition

Morgan K O Consensus and disunity: the Lloyd George coalition government 1918-22 1979

42

Hall and Schwarz op cit p26

43

Hall and Schwarz op cit p11

Dangerfield G The strange death of liberal England 1984 edition

44

Clarke P F Lancashire and the New Liberalism Cambridge 1971. For a critique of Clarke's notion of class see Howkins A 'Edwardian Liberalism and industrial unrest' History Workshop Journal 4 1977 pp141-61

45

Hall and Schwarz op cit p27

Morgan K O 'The new Liberalism and the challenge of Labour' in Brown K O Essays in anti-labour history 1974

46

Hall and Schwarz op cit p26

47

Hinton J The first shop stewards' movement 1973 p46

Hall S p39 n675 'The rise of the representative/interventionalist state 1880s-1920s' in McLennan G Held D and Hall S (eds) State and society in contemporary Britain, a critical introduction 1984 pp7-49

48

WP 29/11/18

49

Schwarz B p111 'Conservatism and corporatism' NLR 106 1988 pp107-128

Hall and Schwarz op cit p29

The criticism of Middlemas is in

Lowe 'corporate' op cit

Lowe 'The Ministry' op cit

Dintenfass M 'Politics in industrial society' BSSLH 41 1980 pp63-5

50

Schwarz B p80 84 'The corporate economy 1890-1929' in Langan M and Schwarz B Crises in the British state 1880-1930 1985 pp80-103

51

Hall and Schwarz op cit p13

52

Schwarz B 'The corporate' op cit p84

53

Hall and Schwarz op cit p14

54

Hall and Schwarz ibid p14

The uneven development of the Labour Party is acknowledged in

Savage M The dynamics of working-class politics, the labour movement in Preston 1880-1940 Cambridge 1987 pix. See also

pp7-20 36-41 166

Macintyre S A proletarian science, Marxism in Britain 1917-33 1986 p2

Dickie M 'Thesis report' BSSLH 53 1988 p36

55

Hall and Schwarz ibid p15

56

Hall and Schwarz ibid p16

57

Hall and Schwarz ibid p21

58

Hall and Schwarz ibid p23

59

Hall and Schwarz ibid pp20 26

WP 05/09/19

WP 13/02/20

WP 26/02/20

WP 26/03/20

WP 09/04/20

WP 07/22

60

Hall and Schwarz ibid p14

61

Hall and Schwarz ibid p28

62

Snell H Men movements and myself 1938 p138

63

Snell ibid pp55 66-7

64

Cole J A The view from the peak 1979 p143

Election results Times 19/04/19

Drucker H M Doctrine and ethos in the Labour Party 1979

pp12-17 stresses the contribution of working-class practices to the Labour Party ethos.

Inglis has traced how the labour movement permitted the transfer of religious sentiments Inglis K S Churches and the working class in Victorian England Toronto 1963

65

Hall and Schwarz op cit p20

66

Taylor A J P English History 1914-45 Oxford 1965 p1

67

Thorne J Handbook to the environs of London 1st edition 1876, Bath 1970 edition pp379 474

Jefferson E F E The Woolwich story 1890-1965 1970 p143

Booth C Life and Labour of the people of London Third series No 5 1902 pp87 92-3

KI 24/02/66

Report of the Woolwich Medical Officer of Health 1901 p91

68

Jefferson ibid pp16 18 19 143

Dyos H J 'The suburban development of Greater London south of the Thames 1836-1914' PhD University of London 1952 pp117 294-5

Hickman G M 'the origins and changing functions of settlement in South East London with special reference to the flood plain of the borough of Deptford' PhD University of London 1951 p128

Major J B Erith and neighbourhood Erith 1901

Waugh M 'Suburban growth in North West Kent 1861-1961' PhD University of London 1968 pp56-7 150

'Southeastern' The tramways of Woolwich and South East London 1963

McLeod H Class and religion in the late Victorian city 1974 p6

69

PRO Cab 37/125/4 of 03/03/15

PRO MUN 5/48/30/4 of 12/04/15

Haas J M p224 'Trouble at the workplace: industrial relations in the Royal Dockyards, 1889-1914' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 58 138 1985 pp210-25

Postan M M British War Production 1952 pp431ff

70

Crossick An artisan elite in Victorian society, Kentish London 1840-80 1978 pp252-3

71

Hoare and Smith op cit pp265-6

72

Hoare and Smith op cit pp323-4

73

Hoare and Smith op cit pp258 148 264-5

74

Smith J pp44 49 'Labour tradition in Glasgow and Liverpool' History Workshop Journal 17 1984 pp32-46

75

Hoggart R The uses of literacy 1957 p20. He was referring to post-1945 Britain but the idea is appropriate to a study

of Edwardian society according to Meacham S p1363 '"The sense of impending clash", English working-class unrest before the First World War' American Historical Review 77 1972 p1343-1364

On the importance of the local to pre-war politics see Schiechen J A p413 'State reform and the local economy; an aspect of industrialisation in late Victorian and early Edwardian London' EcHR 28 3 1975

Clarke P F 'The electoral position of the Liberal and Labour Parties 1910-14' English History Review 40 1975 pp828-37

76

Hobsbawm pp44-7 'Labour in the Great City' NLR 166 1988 pp39-51

Macintyre A proletarian op cit p37

See also

Waites 'The effect' op cit 275

77

WP 01/05/22

78

Hall and Schwarz op cit pp14-15

79

Taylor A J P op cit p121

Bond B and Roy I (eds) War and society: a yearbook of military history II 1977 pp65-85

McHugh P Prostitution and Victorian social reform 1980 p32

80

Thom 'The ideology of women's work, 1914-20' PhD Thames Polytechnic 1982 p212

Copy of taped interview with Thomas Mason, in the possession of the author

Watson W Men and machines, an autobiography of an itinerant mechanic 1935 p60-61

81

Benenson H 'Victorian sexual ideology' International labor and working class history 25 1984 pp1-23

82

Alexander S pp138-9 'Women, class and sexual difference' History Workshop Journal 17 1984 pp125-49

83

Phillips A and Taylor B 'sex and skill: notes towards a feminist economics' Feminist Review 6 1980

Cockburn agrees, 'the purposeful differentiation between skilled and unskilled workers was also a step in the construction of gender'

Cockburn C p49 'The material of male power' Feminist Review
9 1981 p41-58

84

Norris G M p478 'Industrial paternalist capitalism and
local labour markets' Sociology 12 pp469-490

85

Melling J p221 '"Non-commissioned officers": British
employers and their supervisory workers 180-1920' Social
History 5 2 1980 pp183-223

Joyce P Work society and politics: the culture of the
factory in later Victorian England Brighton 1980 p460

86

Durham M and Schwarz B 'Constitutionalism and
extraparliamentary action: socialism and the definition of
politics 1910-20' Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies
History Series SP No75

MacManus' views have been dramatised in a play, Rowbotham S
Friends of Alice Wheeldon 1986 p161

87

Seal L Slow motion, changing masculinities, changing men
1990 p97

Willis suggests that 'manual labour is suffused with
masculine qualities and given certain sensual
overtones...[it] takes on masculine lights and depths and
assumes a significance beyond itself'

Willis P Learning to labour 1977 p159

88

Drake B Women in Trade Unions reprinted 1984

Braybon G Women workers in the First World War 1981

89

Frow E and Frow R Engineering Struggles, episodes in the
story of the shop stewards movement Manchester 1982 pp49-51

90

Hinton J p63 'The beginning of modern British politics'
BSSLH 24 1972 p60-66

91

Hinton The first op cit p18

92

Jeffreys op cit p134

93

WP 02/09/21

94

Hobsbawm E J The forward march of labour halted 1981 pp13-14

95

Hall and Schwarz op cit p8

More recently Professor John Griffiths reiterated this point; 'the old liberal fallacy has returned once again as the new liberal dilemma' Guardian 14/06/89

96

Times 19/04/19

97

Wainwright H and Elliot D The Lucas plan, a new trade unionism in the making 1982

Wainwright H and Benyon H The workers' report on Vickers 1979

Woodhouse T Schofield S and Southend P in Dumas L J and Thee M Making peace possible 1990

Guardian 01/03/88

Independent 01/03/88

98

Trebilcock C p271 'British armaments and European industrialisation, 1890-1914' EcHR 26 1973 pp254-72

Trebilcock C 'rejoinder' EcHR 24 1971 pp464-6

Hogg O F G The Royal Arsenal, its background, origin and subsequent history Volume II Oxford 1963

99

Daily Telegraph quoted in KI 28/09/19

100

Thom D 'The ideology' op cit pp187-8 641

101

Thompson E P The Making of the English working class Harmondsworth p13

Macintyre A proletarian op cit p2

102

Hinton J p100 'Self-help and socialism, the squatters movement of 1946', History Workshop Journal 25 1988 pp100-26

103

Hall and Schwarz op cit p29

(b)

104

Woolwich Labour and Trades Council evidence to the McKinnon Wood committee

105

Jefferson op cit pp15 149

1907 Factory and workshop census of London 1911-12 pp73-88

106

Jones G S Outcast London a study in the relationship between the classes in Victorian society 1st edition 1971 1984 p152

Connolly J Old days and ways 1912 p101

Booth op cit pp58 391

Report of the Woolwich Medical Officer of Health 1901 p91

107

Cole G D H Workshop organisation 1st edition 1923 1973 edition p18

For similar comments see the recollections of a man born 1899 in Woolwich, the son of an Arsenal worker. No 236 in the Family Life and Work experience Archive collected by Paul Thompson and Thea Vigne, housed at the University of Essex

Burke T The outer circle, rambles in remote London 1921 p46

Mudie-Smith R (ed) The religious life of London 1904 p339 203

Foxwell Munition lasses 1917 p11

108

McKibbin The evolution op cit p8

See also

Rolfe E 'The growth of south east London 1836-1914 with special reference to the development of communications' PhD University of London Vol I (of II) p169; Volume II maps 12 19 20 21 23

Dyos op cit pp3 98 254-5

Crossick op cit pp28 31-2 55

109

Thompson P Socialists Liberals and Labour, the struggle for London 1885-1914 1967 p311 319

110

Clarke P F 'review' p159 English History Review 1974 pp157-63

111

Foster 'How imperial' op cit p110

112

WP 29/10/20

113

Times 26/10/06

Times 10/11/06

114

Hoare and Smith op cit p312-3

115

WP 24/09/06

116

Jefferson op cit p56-7

WDC Report 1906

WBC Joint Employment Committee Report 1904-05

Slater G War and Peace 1906 p66-69

Times 17/12/06

117

Times 06/04/07

Times 16/10/06

Times 09/04/07

118

Brown K D 'Conflict in early British welfare policy: the case of the Unemployed Workmen's Bill of 1905' Journal of Modern History 43 1971 pp615-629

Belay F and Pelling H Labour and politics 1900-1906, a history of the Labour Representation Committee 1958 p203

119

Times 02/10/06

Times 16/10/06

Times 28/09/06

Times 24/09/06

120

Marder A J British Naval policy 1880-1905 1941 pp30-32 35 37

Ashworth W 'Economic aspects of the late Victorian naval administration' EcHR 22 3 1969 pp491-505

121

Times 10/09/06

Marder A J From Dreadnought to Scarp Flow 1961 p156

WP 07/22

122

Labour Leader 03/05/07

Labour Leader 02/08/07

Labour Leader 23/08/07

Labour Leader 19/04/07

Justice 20/04/07

123

Justice 17/02/06

Newton D J British Labour, European Socialism and the struggle for peace 1889-1914 Oxford 1985 pp57-68 70-73 82

Porter B Critics of Empire: British radical attitudes to colonialism in Africa 1895-1914 N Y 1968 pp105-6 137

124

Marder British op cit pp331-2
WP 04/10/18

125

TUC Conference Report 1913 p339

126

WP 25/10/18

127

Newton op cit pp184-5 240
Labour Leader 18/04/10
Labour Leader 03/02/11
Labour Leader 17/03/11
Labour Leader 02/02/12
Times 24/09/06

128

On the Henderson committee see
Labour Leader 23/11/05
Labour Leader 07/12/06

129

PRO ZHC17083 Henderson committee report pp22 449 469 471

130

Jefferson op cit p64

131

Jefferson ibid p107

132

WP 04/10/18

133

PRO MUN 4 6402

134

Justice 20/04/10
WP 15/04/10
Barrow L 'Determinism and environmentalism in socialist thought' in Samuel R and Jones G S (eds) Culture ideology and politics, essays for Eric Hobsbawm 1982 pp194-213

135

Price R Labour in British society, an interpretive history 1986 p152

Thompson P op cit p228

Pierson S British socialism: the journey from fantasy to politics Cambridge Mass 1979 pp158-68

- 136
Dove I p24 'Women's suffrage and the Woolwich Labour Party'
South London Record 1 1985 pp24-32
- 137
Thom 'The ideology' op cit p213
- 138
On the Men's Political Union, of which Ingram was a member,
see Duval V D Why I went to prison 1910
- 139
Olcott T pp33 43 'Dead in the centre; the women's trade
union movement in London 1874-1914' London Journal 2 1 1976
pp 33-50
- 140
Snell op cit pp72 184
KI 30/05/19
WH 15/04/10
Dove 'Women's' op cit p18
- 141
Grinling Fifty years of pioneer work in Woolwich 1922 p11
- 142
Dove I Yours in the cause, suffragettes in Lewisham,
Greenwich and Woolwich 1988 pp15 16 20
- 143
Jeffreys op cit p134
- 144
Bauman Z Between class and elite, the evolution of the
British labour movement. A sociological study 1st edition
1960 trans Patterson S Manchester 1972 p155-156
- 145
1864 ASE rule book cited by Southall H R 'Regional
unemployment patterns in Britain, 1851-1914: a study of the
"Trade Union Percentage of Unemployment" with special
reference to engineering workers' PhD University of
Cambridge 1983 p88
- 146
Southall ibid p64
- 147
Durham M and Schwarz B 'Constitutionalism' p23
- 148
Southall op cit p72

149

Hinton The first op cit p182

150

Thom 'The ideology' op cit p219 notes the how trade union leaders calmed a major disturbance by women in the canteen which spread to the engineers' downing tools in sympathy

151

Thom 'The ideology' ibid pp73-4 193 212 219

Thom D and Ineson A p101 in 'TNT poisoning and the employment of women workers in the First World War' in Weindling P The social history of occupational health 1985 pp89-107

WP 16/02/17

WW 03/17

Elizabeth Robinson said that she did not consider the dangers of the work. Yesterdays Witness Accession No 003136/02. Department of Sound Archives Imperial War Museum.

152

Fraser H Women and war work 1918

Braybon G and Summerfield P Out of the cage; women's experiences in two world wars 1987 pp109-10

153

Tape 566/07/04 Caroline Rennies, nee Webb, aged 76 recalls her dismissal from the Arsenal and the demonstration of 19//11/18. Department of Sound Archives Imperial War Museum. See also

Yesterdays Witness Accession No 003136/02 and 'We are the Arsenal girls' BBC TV Yesterday's Witness Women at War Vol 5 Accession No 0003142/01. Department of Sound Archives Imperial War Museum

This is also described in

Hamilton M A Mary Macarthur, a biographical sketch 1925.

WW 12/18

Thom 'The ideology' ibid p221

154

Hyman R 'The Workers Union 1898-1929' Oxford D Phil 1968 pp80 184 214

Hyman R The Workers Union Oxford 1970 p107

Thom 'The ideology' ibid p198

Pelling A history of British trade unionism Harmondsworth 1963 p129

Hobsbawm E J p131 'General labour unions in Britain 1889-1914' EcHR 1948-9 pp123-42

155

WP 10/22

WP 08/07/21

156

KI 26/10/1889

Hobsbawm E J p11 'The nineteenth century London labour market' in Centre for Urban Studies (eds) London aspects of change 1964 pp2-28

157

WP 02/04/20

WP 16/07/20

158

WP 06/02/14

WP 19/04/14

WP 19/06/14

WP 10/07/14

WT&LC Minutes 19/11/14

PRO MUN 5 53 deputation of 18/07/17

WP 29/11/18

Wigham E The power to manage, a history of the Engineering Employers' Federation 1973 p84

159

WP 13/12/18

WP 27/12/18

160

For the numbers employed at the Arsenal see PRO 4 6401 and Appendix

161

PRO MUN 4 3494 letters of 10/06/19, 26/06/19 and 11/06/19

WP 21/05/12

162

PRO MUN 4 6394 letter of 11/12/19

PRO MUN 5/152/1122.11/21 correspondence

163

KI 31/01/19 on the establishment of a WBC committee with a brief to collect a grant for the roads as they had suffered so much due to wartime activities.

Reay W T The Specials, how they served London. The story of the London Special Constabulary 1920 pp80 178-80 189-91 204-5 comments on the state of the roads

On the physical condition of the buildings and roads of Woolwich during this period see

Williams M John Wilson of Woolwich, an apostle to the people 1937 p9

Booth op cit pp90-91

Times 07/09/21

Thorne op cit p70

Jefferson op cit pp145-6

164

WP 24/01/19

165

Cline op cit p88

166

Newman p137

Johnson P B Land fit for heroes, the planning of British reconstruction Chicago 1968 p375

167

PRO MUN 4 6401 memo GT6601

168

Times 26/09/19

169

PRO MUN 4 6369

WP 24/01/19

170

WH 18/04/19

171

WH 09/05/19

EDT 16/05/19

EDT 23/05/19

172

KI 23/05/19

173

WP 26/03/20

KI 23/05/19

174

WP 22/11/19

175

WP 18/06/19

176

WP 27/12/18

177

PRO MUN 4 6402 on the shortage of dairy appliances
The Report on the Engineering Trades (New Industries)
Committee 1918 Part VIII. In this, the case is made for
the large-scale production, in Britain, of milk-cans.
Eventually some private armaments firms turned to milk
churn production Peden G 'Arms, government and businessmen
1935-45' in Turner J (ed) Businessmen and politics, studies
of business activity in British politics 1900-45 1984 p132

178

WP 25/10/18 on economic production

PRO MUN 5 216/.1995/6 on the inefficiency of small
production runs of churns

179

WH 11/07/19

KI 11/07/19

WP 11/07/19

180

PRO MUN 4 6394

PRO MUN 5/208/1912/5

181

PRO Cab 23/15 meeting of 07/08/19

Aldcroft D H The interwar economy in Britain 1919-39 1970

182

The Engineer 18/07/19. There is a copy of the relevant
article in PRO MUN 4 6402. Also it was reprinted in WH
26/12/19

183

PRO MUN 4 6401 memo 22/02/19

PRO MUN 4 6402

PRO MUN 4 3494 letter of 05/06/19

184

WP 14/03/20

185

WP 26/05/20

186

This committee, about which little is recorded, was
variously referred to in the Pioneer as the Woolwich United
Trades Discharges Committee (26/09/19) and the United Trade
Union Discharges Protest Committee (03/10/19). In the
Times it is called the United Trade Union (Discharges)
Committee (26/09/19). Henceforth it will be referred to as
the UTUDPC. See also

KI 19/09/19

KI 26/09/19

WP 26/09/19

187

WP 10/10/19

188

PRO MUN 4 6401

189

WH 26/09/19

190

WP 26/09/19

191

WP 20/09/19

WP 03/10/19

WP 10/10/19

192

WP 05/12/19

193

PRO MUN 4 6394

PRO MUN 4 6402

194

PRO MUN 4 6394

195

WP 26/03/20

196

WP 19/12/19

WP 27/02/20

WH 19/12/19

KI 19/12/19

KI 12/12/19

WBG Proceedings 27/12/19

197

WP 27/01/22

WP 24/02/22

WP 02/03/22

198

WP 01/05/20

199

KI 18/07/19

WP 30/07/20

WP 02/07/20

Croydon and Surrey Labour Outlook 03/27

Blewitt N The peers the parties and the people, the General Elections of 1910 1972 pp285 464

Fay C R Life and labour in the nineteenth century Cambridge 1st edition 1920, 3rd edition 1943 p255

Howard C p77 'Expectations born to death: local Labour party expansion in the 1920s' in Winter J (ed) The working class in modern British history, essays in honour of Henry Pelling Cambridge 1983 pp65-81

200

WP 02/11/18

WP 04/06/20

WP 09/04/20

WP 02/07/20 in which a ward report from Grinling is principally devoted to organisational matters

201

WP 07/05/20

202

WP 22/02/20

203

WP 19/12/19

204

WP 16/01/20

WP 21/05/20

WP 13/08/20

WP 10/09/20

WP 29/10/20

WP 17/12/20

WP 12/22

205

WP 27/06/20

206

WP 08/10/20

207

PRO MUN 4 3481 memo 04/02/19

PRO MUN 4 6401

208

Davenport-Hines R P T 'The British armaments industry during disarmament 1918-36' PhD University of Cambridge 1979

209

WP 24/02/22

210

EDT 23/04/20

211

Hinton 'Disconnecting' op cit p38

212

Job London's Arsenal p17

Hinton The first op cit p27

213

WP 03/07/20

WP 30/07/20

WP 15/10/20

214
WP 22/10/20

215
WP 17/12/20
WP 24/12/20
WP 19/11/20
WP 14/10/20

216
WP 05/11/20
WP 12/11/20
WP 19/11/20
WP 26/11/20
WP 31/12/20

217
WP 31/12/20

21
WP 15/07/21

219
WP 07/01/21
WP 14/01/21

220
WP 13/08/20
WP 20/08/20
WP 15/10/20
WP 22/10/20

221
WP 17/03/22

222
Slater G p318 'Unemployment in Woolwich' in Astor A et al
The third Winter of unemployment, the report of an enquiry
undertaken in the Autumn of 1922 1922 p304-25

Section (c)

223
Hall and Schwarz op cit p27

224
Hall and Schwarz op cit p25 their emphasis

225
Hall and Schwarz op cit p19

226
Tawney R H p7 'The abolition of economic controls 1918-21'
EcHR 8 1943 pp1-30

Trimble W F 'The Naval Aircraft Factory, the American Aviation industry and government competition 1919-28' Business History Review 60 2 1986 pp175-198
Reid D 'The Third Republic as manager: labour policy in the Naval Shipyards, 1892-1920' IRSH 30 1985 pp183-206. On the conversion of the arsenal in Roanne, France, to the repair and production of railway materials see WP 29/11/18

227

KI 28/03/19

Times 19/04/19

PRO MUN 5/11/200/58

On the ease of conversion in Coventry see Carr G
'Engineering workers and the rise of labour in Coventry 1914-39' PhD University of Warwick 1978 p157

228

Lowe R 'The demand for a Ministry of Labour, its establishment and initial role 1916-24' PhD University of London 1975 p135

229

Williams W H Who's Who in Arms 1935 p12

230

PRO Cab 24/71 WC 510 6/12/18

PRO Cab 24/71 GT 6479 15/12/18

231

Hay J R The development of the British welfare state 1880-1975 1978 p10

232

Evening Standard 27/10/19

Hannington Unemployed struggles 1919-39 1977 edition pp3-8.
Hannington was the chair of the Joint Shop Stewards Committee at Slough

233

KI29/08/19

234

PRO MUN 4 Co-ordinating (Supply and demobilising) committee 10/10/19

235

PRO Cab 24/112 CP1945 MWR 09/10/20

Carr op cit p119

Hunter I G 'Working class representatives in elective local authorities on Tyneside 1883-1921' M Litt University of Newcastle 1978 p293

236

PRO MUN 4 6738

PRO MUN 4 5560

NUR Journal 21/03/19 cited in Bush J Behind the lines, East London labour 1914-19 1984

237

Herald 11/01/19

Herald 18/01/19

Herald 25/01/19

238

Ames E and Rosenberg N 'Enfield Arsenal in theory and practice' Economic Journal 78 1968 pp827-42

PRO WO 32/4734 para 13

Enfield Gazette and Observer 22/11/18

Enfield Gazette and Observer 29/11/18

Enfield Gazette and Observer 06/12/18

Enfield Gazette and Observer 18/02/19

Ward D M The other battle, the history of BSA 1946 p12

239

Enfield Gazette and Observer 17/01/19

See also

Enfield Gazette and Observer 24/01/19

Enfield Gazette and Observer 31/01/19

Enfield Gazette and Observer 07/03/19

Enfield Gazette and Observer 28/03/19

240

Hall and Schwarz op cit p26

241

WP 01/04/21

242

Hamilton Ellis C Twenty locomotive men 1958 p1

243

Eversley D E C 'The Great Western Railway and the Swindon Works in the Great Depression' University of Birmingham Historical Journal 5 3 1957 p188

244

1907 Census of Production cited in Hinton J S 'Rank and file militancy in the British engineering industry 1914-18' PhD University of London 1969 p15

Henderson committee report op cit pp473 478 481

245

Cole J A op cit p85

246

WP 26/09/19

KI 29/08/19

247

Marx K Capital Vol I 1938 edition p396

248

Lyne R M pp70-71 'The military railways of Kent Part I' Journal of the Railway and Canal Historical Society 24 4 03/82 pp69-73

See also

Lyne R M 'The military railways of Kent Part II' Journal of the Railway and Canal Historical Society 24 5 07/82 pp110-20

Lyne R M 'The military railways of Kent Part III' Journal of the Railway and Canal Historical Society 24 6 11/82 pp167-70

249

Price R Labour in British society, an interpretative history 1986

Hinton J S The first op cit pp95-6

250

Rubin G R p940 'Law as a bargaining weapon: British labour and the restoration of Pre-war Practices Act 1919' Historical Journal 32 4 1987 pp925-945

251

Glasgow Herald 21/10/18 cited in Rubin ibid p930

252

Zeitlin J 'The labour strategies of British engineering employers 1890-1922' in Gospel H F and Littler C (eds) Managerial strategies and industrial relations 1983 p46

More C op cit pp33-4

See also Cole G D H Trade unions op cit p196

253

Hinton The first op cit pp53-93

254

Kirby M W p293 'Product proliferation in the British locomotive building industry 1850-1914: an engineers' paradise?' Business History 30 3 1988 pp287-305

255

McKenna F 'Victorian railway workers' History Workshop Journal 1 1976 pp26-73

256

Walby S p227 'Theorising patriarchy' Sociology 23 2 1989 pp213-34

257

Rose S O p208 'Gender antagonism and class conflict:

exclusionary strategies of male trade unionists in 19th century Britain' Social History 13, 2 1988 pp191-208

258

WP 17/02/22

259

WP 28/01/21

260

Hinton The first op cit p56

261

WP 13/05/19

262

Railway and Travel Monthly 18 106 02/19 p123

Railway and Travel Monthly 22 132 04/21 p273

Labour Party Labour Speakers Handbook 1929 p116

Armitage S The politics of decontrol of industry: Britain and the US 1969 pp2-4

263

Times 05/12/18

See also

Times 11/12/18

Railway Gazette 03/01/19 p4

264

WP 27/12/18

265

PRO MUN 5/208/1912/2 report of 01/02/19

266

WP 05/12/19

267

Bland D E 'The role of the state in British economics from 1870-1914' M Litt University of Durham 1967 pp79-88

268

Davies E The case for railway nationalisation c1912 p190

269

Eversley op cit p180

270

Cain P J 'Railway combination and the government 1900-1914' EcHR 25 4 1972 p623

271

Petter M 'The Progressive Alliance' History 58 1973 pp45-59

272

Davies E op cit p247

273

Times 23/05/12

274

Alderman G The railway interest Leicester 1973 p220

275

KI 27/12/18

276

Armitage op cit p63

See also pp65-6 72

277

Taylor A J P op cit p130

278

HC Deb 17/03/19 Vol 113 Col 1780

See also reports of debates of 15/05/18 (HC Debates Vol 106 Col 393) in the Railway Gazette 22/11/18 p544

279

WP 05/03/20

280

Times 11/12/19

281

Daily Herald 25/10/19

282

Beveridge Collection Munitions V 43 Court case of 18/04/16
PRO MUN 5/18/202/2

283

WP24/06/21

284

WP 19/04/19

285

PRO MUN 4 6685

286

WP 17/12/20

287

Railway and Travel Monthly 20 118 02/20 p139

288

PRO MUN 4 6402

289
PRO MUN 4 5953

290
WP 03/01/19

291
Times 25/09/19

292
Labour Research Department Labour and capital in the engineering trades 1922 p7

293
PRO MUN 4 6401

294
WP 24/01/19
WP 17/02/22

295
Evening News 29/11/19
letter from Thomas, secretary of the AGC, Daily News 16/12/19

296
Times 17/12/19

297
WP 19/12/19

298
Evening News 29/11/19

299
PRO MUN 5/208/1912/3 letter of 10/07/19

300
PRO MUN 4 6685 05/06/19

301
Railway and Travel Monthly 20 117 01/20 p71
Railway and Travel Monthly 17 100 08/18 p133
Railway and Travel Monthly 19 114 10/19 p285

302
Evening Standard 29/11/19

303
WP 21/01/21

304
Railway and Travel Monthly 19 113 09/19 p209
Railway and Travel Monthly 18 106 02/19 p71

Railway and Travel Monthly 17 104 12/18 p362
Railway and Travel Monthly 21 128 12/20 p401
Travel and Transport Monthly 24 145 05/22 p347

305

Evening Standard 31/12/19

306

Evening Standard 29/11/19

307

Evening Standard 06/03/19

308

Stock Exchange Gazette 18/12/19

309

Railway and Travel Monthly 19 116 12/19 p425

Railway and Travel Monthly 20 117 01/20 p71

310

PRO MUN 4 5909

Leslie R F (ed) The history of Poland since 1863 Cambridge
1987 p140

311

Pollitt H A war was stopped! c1920

312

PRO MUN 4 6394

313

WP 04/02/21

314

Taylor A J P op cit p163

315

Railway Magazine May/June 1944 90 551 p131 obituary

Railway and Travel Monthly 11/17 15 91 pp307-8 has the
specifications and an illustration of the 2-6-0

On Richard E L Mainsail (1868-1944) see also

Marshall J A A biographical dictionary of railway engineers
1988 pp154-5

Dendy Marshall C F and Kidner R W A history of the SR
revised edition 1963

316

Transport and Travel Monthly May 1922 24 145 p347

WP 03/03/22

317

WP 03/02/22

318

WP 03/02/22

WP 24/02/22

319

Jackson A A London's Metropolitan Railway 1986 pp282-3

320

Jackson A A 'The great government locomotive sales of 1919-27' Railway World 47 555 1986 pp408-11

Railway Magazine 90 551 May/June 1944 pp186-7

321

Tape of Mason op cit There is no supporting evidence that any Woolwich locomotives went to Russia

322

Hogg op cit p1001

323

Baker C The metropolitan railway South Godstone 1951 p47

324

Slater 'Unemployment' op cit p321

325

Marx op cit p428-9 464

326

WP 24/01/19

Chapter II

- 1
Hall and Schwarz op cit p24
 - 2
Labour Party Annual conference report 1917 p163
WP 15/07/21
 - 3
Schwarz 'The corporate' op cit p93
 - 4
Harris J p151 'Bureaucrats and businessmen in British food control 1916-19' in Burk K (ed) War and the state: the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 pp135-56
 - 5
PRO MUN 4 3481 8/11/18
 - 6
Fraser P op cit p124
 - 7
Money L C The triumph of nationalisation 1920 p17
 - 8
Abrams P p48 'The failure of social reform: 1918-20' Past and Present 24 1963 p43-64
 - 9
Schwarz 'The corporate' op cit p100
 - 10
WP 05/01/19
 - 11
Cronin J E p220 'The British state and the structure of political opportunity' Journal of British Studies Vol 27 3 July 1988 pp199-231
 - 12
Cronin 'The British' ibid p204
- (a)
- 13
WP 20/09/19
 - 14
WP 07/22

15

B B Gilbert David Lloyd George, a political life, the architect of change 1863-1912 Columbus Ohio 1987 unnumbered preface

16

The President of the National Liberal Federation quoted in Labour Party Labour Speakers op cit p139

17

Schwarz B p50 'Conservatism and "caesarism", 1903-22' in Langan M and Schwarz B (eds) Crises in the British state 1880-1930 1985 pp33-62

18

There are details of the use of the press as a means of dividing workers in Morrison N J 'Official responses to industrial unrest in postwar Britain 1919-21' PhD University of Wales 1986 p42

19

Speech of 31/07/18 quoted in Tawney op cit p17

20

Lloyd George September 1919 quoted in Labour Party Labour Speakers op cit

21

PRO WC 539 Cab23.9 dated 03/03/19

22

Thomas Jones cited by Middlemas Thomas Jones op cit p147

23

Middlemas Thomas Jones op cit p134-7

24

Lenin quoted in Thompson P The Edwardians the remaking of British society 1st edition 1975 1984 edition p269

25

Arnstein W L Britain Yesterday and Today 1830 to the present Lexington Mass 1976 p209

26

Morrison op cit p41

27

WP 31/01/19

28

KI 03/10/19

WH 24/11/19

WH 19/12/19

Times 20/01/19

PRO MUN 4 6394 Johnson committee 22/7/19

PRO MUN 4 6401 PRO MUN 5/152/1912/4
PRO 5/152/1122.11/21

29
KI 10/10/19

30
The CSOF, under protest, suspended the layoffs due for when the
PM visited on the understanding that fresh notices could be
served after the visit. PRO MUN 4 6394 letter of 28/11/19
KI 21/11/19
WP 05/12/19
EDT 05/12/19

31
WP 19/12/19

32
PRO MUN 4 6394
Daily Gazette 29/11/19
WP 12/12/19
KI 05/12/19
Daily Herald 05/12/19

33
Evening Standard 28/11/19
WP 24/01/19

34
Times 29/11/19

35
KI 12/12/19
Times 29/11/19

36
WP 05/12/19
KI 05/12/19
Daily Herald 05/12/19

37
WP 29/11/18

38
WP 01/12/19
EDT 05/12/19

39
WP 05/08/21

40
WP 01/04/21

41

WP 19/08/21

42

Cowling M The impact of Labour 1920-24 Cambridge 1971 p27
Middlemas Thomas Jones op cit p3 and passim

43

Morgan J op cit p107

44

Johnson op cit pp108-9

45

Addison C Politics from within 1924 pp203-4

46

PRO MUN5/63/322/22 conference with the ASE on the trade card,
5/5/17

47

Addison C Politics op cit pp154-7 quotes his diary for 14/7/17
and the Daily Express for 21/7/17

48

Addison C Four and a half year Vol II 1934 p595 reference to
diary entry of 29/11/18

49

Lord Riddell's intimate diary of the Peace Conference and After
1933 pp240 242
Wrigley op cit p236

50

Johnson op cit pp306-7

51

On the liquor trade, the milk trade and transport see Aldcroft
op cit p18, chapter 2 & chapter 5.
See also Davies E op cit p51

52

Newman op cit p146

53

Economist 21/02/18
Lloyd George papers F/28/5/16 Inverforth to Lloyd George
26/11/19 cited in Newman op cit p147

54

Committee on the machinery of government Cd9230 1918

55

PRO Cab 24/67/GT 6401 of 18/10/18

PRO WC 23/8 491 of 24/10/18
Lloyd George papers F/28/5/16 Inverforth to Lloyd George
28/10/19 on the benefits of a Ministry of Supply and see also
F/28/5/17 Inverforth to Lloyd George 26/11/19 cited in Newman
op cit p148

56
PRO Cab 24/77 G T 7007 of 20/3/19
PRO Cab 23/8 WC 5000 of 8/11/18.

57
Tawney op cit pp9, 11

58
PRO Cab 26/1 Minutes of the Home Affairs Committee of the
Cabinet 25th meeting of 31/3/19

59
PRO Cab 24/78 letter by First Lord of the Admiralty covering G
T 7193 dated 3/5/19 & 2/5/19).

60
PRO Cab 24/65 GT5863 from Churchill 1/10/18

61
Johnson op cit pp76,99 125-7 286-9
PRO Cab 24/67 GT6004 15/10/18

62
Tawney op cit p17

63
PRO Cab 24/71 GT 6427 3/12/18
PRO Cab 24/71 GT6479 14/12/18
Johnson op cit p278

64
Johnson op cit p205

65
Cowling op cit p24

66
Bentley M p49 'The liberal response to socialism 1918-29' in
Brown K Essays in anti-labour history, responses to the rise of
labour in Britain 1974 pp42-73

67
PRO Cab 23/8 WC491 (1) 24/10/18
Johnson op cit pp278-81

68
Labour Leader 12/12/18

69

PRO MUN 5/165/1125/5 minute of 29/11/18

70

PRO MUN 4 6401 Downing St conference of 19/11/19

71

Jeffreys op cit p385.

72

PRO Cab 23/22 46 (20) of 19/08/20

See also Bullock A The life and times of E Bevin 1960 p138

73

Turner J p11 'The politics of business' in Turner J (ed)
Businessmen and politics, studies of business activity in
British politics 1900-45 1984 pp1-19

See also Tawney op cit p11

74

Cab 24/75 WC 533

GT6881 of 22/02/19

Cab 23/9 WC 534

75

Johnson op cit p110

76

On the Ministry of Supply see Newman op cit pp151-2

77

PRO Cab 23/18 Conference of Ministers of 9/12/19.

PRO Cab 23/20 Conference of Ministers of 16/3/20

78

PRO Cab 23/10 WC 564 of 8/5/19.

See also Newman pp148-9

(b)

79

Waites A class society at war: England 1914-18 Leamington Spa
1988 p10

Wright M 'Treasury control 1854-1914' in Sutherland G (ed)
Studies in the growth on nineteenth century government 1972
pp195-226

80

Thompson The making op cit p792

81

Peden G C 'The Treasury as the central' op cit p378

See also

Beloff 'The Whitehall Factor' op cit p277
Beloff M Wars and warfare, Britain 1914-45 1984 p80

82

Hamilton H P p9 'Sir Warren Fisher and the Public Service'
Public Administration 29, 1951 pp3-38
Lowe R pp307 293 303 'Bureaucracy triumphant or denied? The
expansion of the British civil service, 1919-39' Public
Administration Vol 62 Autumn 1984 pp291-310
Davidson and Lowe op cit p286

83

Gilbert B B p432-3 'The reappearance of twentieth century
history' Journal of British Studies Vol 27 No 4 1988 pp429-38

84

Davidson R Whitehall and the labour problem in late Victorian
and Edwardian Britain 1985

85

Yeo S pp54-5 67 'Working class association, private capital,
welfare and the state in the late nineteenth and twentieth
centuries' in Parry N Rustin M Satyamuri C Social work welfare
and the state 1979 pp48-71

86

This is quoted in Greenleaf W H The British Political Tradition
Vol I 1983 pp215-6

87

Zeitlin J 'Industrial relations and the state in Britain 1914-
39' BSSLH 53 1 1988 pp51-6
Skidelsky R p67 'Keynes & the Treasury view: the case for and
against an active unemployment policy 1920-39' in Mommsen W J
The emergence of the welfare state in Britain & Germany 1850-
1950 1981 pp67-89

88

Cronin J 'The British state' op cit p213

89

PRO WO 32473 Question 433 and para 38
PRO MUN 5/152/1122.11/13 mentions the committees which examined
aspects of the Arsenal in 1887, 1900 1902 1907 (twice) and
1911.
See also PRO MUN 5/152/1122.11/11

90

Hogg op cit pp895-6
PRO WO 33/163
Murray Committee on Government Factories and Workshops Cd 3626
1907 PRO WO 33/476

91

Trebilcock R Vickers Brother, armaments and enterprise 1854-1914 1977 pp7-9

Trebilcock 'British armaments' op cit pp271-2

92

Morgan E V Studies in British financial policy 1914-25 1952 pp317-21

93

Lowe 'The demand' op cit p115

Roseveare H The Treasury, the evolution of a British institution 1969 p243

94

This is quoted in Greenaway J R p131 'Warren Fisher and the transformation of the British Treasury 1919-39' Journal of British Studies 23 1 1983 pp125-142

95

Fraser P op cit pp125 132 135

96

Roseveare op cit p243

97

Otto Niemayer quoted in Newman N op cit p150

98

Lowe R 'The erosion' op cit

Peden G C 'Sir Warren Fisher and British rearmament against Germany' English History Review 44 1979 pp29-32

99

PRO Cab 24/84 GT 7729

See also Niemayer minute 29/10/18 House of Lords Record Office T 1/12268 on the demand to re-establish pre war controls, both cited in Ferris J pp867-8 'Treasury control, the Ten Year Rule and British Service policies, 1919-24' HJ 30 4 1987 pp859-883

100

PRO T 171/155 03/09/19 Underlining in original. See also PRO T 171/170

101

Moggeridge D E W The return to gold 1925 Cambridge 1969

102

Cronin 'The British' op cit p223

103

Whiteside N 'Welfare insurance and casual labour: a study of administrative intervention in industrial employment, 1906-26' ECHR 32 4 1979 pp507-522 514

104
Hall and Schwarz op cit p30

(c)

105
PRO T.172/655 Sir Thomas Heath's evidence to the Select
Committee on National Expenditure 08/05/19 QQ420-1 426 460

106
Churchill 23/01/19 quoted in Labour Party Labour Speakers op
cit p117
See also
PRO Cab 23/9 WC 514 08/01/19

107
Pollard S The development of the British economy 1914-67 1969
p62 See also
OHMM Vol I p1 & Vol 8
Thom 'The ideology' op cit p187

108
PRO Cab 37/128/19 Asquith to Cabinet 19/5/15 & OHMM with which
Hay finds 'serious faults' Hay D p189 'The Official History of
the Ministry of Munitions 1915-19' EcHR 14 1944 p185-90

109
OHMM IV p48
See also the definition of Susan Lawrence in Labour Woman III
August 1915 p315 which includes all the miscellaneous contracts
listed in the Board of Trade Gazette

110
Carter H The control of the Drink Trade in Britain, a
contribution to national efficiency during the Great War 1915-
1918 1st edition 1918 this edition 1919 p78-9

111
Addison in HC Deb 14/11/18 Vol 110 Col2962). Disposal of
Surplus Property: statement of receipts etc to 31/3/20 Cd 850
1920 p3
On the factories see OHMM Vol I Part I p32 passim

112
Tawney op cit
Rubin G 'The origins of industrial tribunals' Industrial Law
Journal VI 1977 p162
Churchill cited in Marriner S p130 'The Ministry of Munitions
1915-19 and government accounting procedures' Accounting and
Business Research 10 37a 1980 pp130-42

113
Lloyd E M H Experiments in state control 1924 p24

114

WP 09/04/20

115

WP 7/22 cites Kellaway 24/06/19

Lloyd George in the Commons 18/08/19

Money op cit pp48-71

116

Davies A The case for nationalisation 1920 pp66-7

117

PRO MUN 4 176 letter of 04/07/17

118

Marriner 'The Ministry' op cit p130-1. On the competence of the Ministry of Munitions see the 1st and 2nd Reports of the Committee on National Expenditure 1917, Treasury Papers 172/653, and the Auditor General's Appropriation Account for 1916-17

119

PRO MUN 4 6369

120

Bacon R From 1900 Onwards 1940 pp171-2 178

121

Job op cit p12

Times 14/04/19

122

Star 07/03/19

123

Economist 21/12/18

124

Times 29/08/19

Economist 06/07/18

125

Pollard S 'The decline of shipbuilding on the Thames' ECHR 3 1953

126

Haas op cit p210

127

PRO MUN 4 6394 letter of 19/12/19

128

WP 28/05/19

- 129
Raine G E The nationalisation peril revised ed 1920 pp71-8 90-1
- 130
PRO MUN 4 6394
- 131
Tawney op cit p7
- 132
Cline P K op cit
- 133
Churchill in the Commons 22/08/16
- 134
Johnson P B op cit p452
- 135
Wrench J E Struggle 1914-1920 1925 pp333 423 quoted in Marwick
A The deluge, British society and the First World War, 1st
edition 1965, 1967 edition pp274
- 136
Johnson op cit p12
- 137
Johnson ibid p41
- 138
PRO Cab 27/42 GT 6047 19/10/18
- 139
Johnson op cit p297
- 140
Johnson op cit pp311-313
PRO Cab 23/8 WC 510 6/12/18
- 141
Morgan E V op cit pp65-6
- 142
Disposal of Surplus Property: statement of receipts etc to
31/3/20 Cd 850 1920 p6 & p9
- 143
PRO MUN 5/11/200/48 WHW 07/10/43
- 144
Johnson op cit p449
PRO Cab 23/18 HAC 09/10/19

145

PRO MUN 4 5726

146

WH 13/06/19

Daily Gazette 04/11/19

Star 01/11/19

Star 03/11/19

Evening Standard 03/11/19

Star 31/10/19

Star 03/11/19

KI 18/07/19

147

Daily Herald 01/02/19

148

PRO MUN 5/216/1993/3

149

PRO MUN 5 6851

In Peace Time Productions F W Carter stressed the need to increase the output of boot and shoes according to a review in WH 19/12/19

See also Lloyd E M H op cit pp153-4

150

KI 25/07/19

151

WP 19/03/20

152

WP 19/08/21

153

WP 12/22

154

PRO MUN 4 6402 Council Committee on the Control of Woolwich Arsenal 05/03/18. Thorne, Adamson and Jimmy Thomas were recommended for places on the committee

155

PRO MUN 5/152/11.22.11/9 John Hills 22/03/18

156

PRO MUN 4 6738

157

The terms of reference for the McKinnon Wood Committee of Enquiry into the Royal Ordnance Factories, Woolwich included a commitment to considering control, administration organisation, layout, equipment, the industrial and housing conditions at

Woolwich, and the nature and distribution of the work carried out there. In addition the Committee had to have 'due regard to the importance of efficient and economic production and the necessity for providing a reserve of productive power'. PRO MUN 5/152/1122.11/8. The members of the committee were Thomas McKinnon Wood, 1855-1927. Liberal MP for the Rollex Division of Glasgow, Financial Secretary to the Treasury 1911-12, Secretary of State for Scotland 1912-1916, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Financial Secretary to the Treasury (again) 1916. Involved in the decision making process regarding the fate of the Clyde Workers Committee activists 1916. One of the two Coalition Liberals, though without a 'coupon' to lose their seats in a three cornered fight in the election of 1918.

William Adamson, 1863-1936 Scottish miners' leader, Fife MP 1910 Chair PLP 1917-21. A notoriously boring speaker. Even Labour Leader, 17/2/21, called him 'dour' and sympathised with those who had to 'sit down to Mr Adamson's plate of thick porridge - there always seems such a lot of it'. Abrams P op cit pp49-50 wrote of him that he was 'caught in the ideology of reconstruction... His was an extreme form of the delusion common to the social reformers of 1918'.

Admiral Sir Reginald Bacon, 1863-1947. Director of Naval Ordnance at the Admiralty 1907-09, Managing Director of Coventry Ordnance Works 1910-125, Controller of Munitions Inventions 1918. It was Bacon who asked the Managing Director of William Foster & Co to construct a new form of tractor which became the 'tank'.

Admiral Sir Richard Peirse, 1860-1940. Naval member of the Board of Invention and Research, 1916-18

Will Thorne, 1857-1946. Founder and General Secretary of NUGW 1889-1934, Labour MP for West Ham.

Sir William Furse, 1865-1953, Master General of Ordnance, 1916-1920

John Henderson, 1846-1922 Liberal backbench MP and chartered accountant

G F S Hills War Office official

Lord Marchamley, 1855-1925, cotton spinner later Chief Whip for Campbell Bannerman

Sir Holberry Mensforth, 1871-1951. Managing Director at Westinghouse when it merged with Vickers, Director of Westland Aircraft, and John Browns, Director General of Factories at the War Office, 1920-1926

Sir Thomas Munro, 1866-1923. Labour Advisor at Munitions

Sir Henry Fowler, 1870-1938. Director of Production at the Ministry of Munitions, 1915. Superintendent of the Royal Aircraft Factory.

George Currie, 1870-1950. A senior official at the Ministry of Munitions, a Unionist MP and later in the Labour Party

Sir Arthur du Cros, 1871-1955, founder of Dunlop Rubber and early and persistent patron of aviation. Conservative MP from 1909. See also the Directory of National Biography

H S B Brindley, 1867-1920. An engineer who eventually set up and managed Ponders End Shell Factory which produced the

largest single output of 8 inch shells from any source during the war at a price about 66% that paid to armament firms. See also OHMM vol 1,pt 1 pp108-9,115,vol3 part 2 p37, vol 8 part 2 p125. There is an obituary in Engineering 9/4/20 which called him 'despotic'.

158

WP 29/11/18

159

KI 26/04/19

KI 02/05/19

KI 16/05/19

160

The committee submitted four reports,

1st interim report, on danger, 6/11/18

2nd interim report on organisation and administration, 22/11/18

3rd interim report on the costing system, 12/2/19

final confirmation report 13/3/19

For a summary of the report see Hogg op cit pp991-1000

161

PRO MUN 4 5329

162

PRO MUN 4 5329

163

PRO MUN 4 6394

164

Letter of 20/3/19 attached to PRO MUN 6402. It was from McKinnon Wood in Cannes, to the committee secretary S H Leake

165

Addison Four op cit diary entry of 27/05/15 p83

Addison Politics op cit p65

166

PRO MUN 4 6401 Co-ordinating (Supply and demobilisation) committee 10/10/19

167

Noel-Baker, O Private manufacture of armaments, Vol 2 part 2 chapters 9 2-3. Unpublished typescript at United Nations Library, Geneva, quoted by Davenport-Hines op cit p14

168

For those parts of the report which were accepted and implemented and for those were not, see Hogg op cit pp991-1000 See also PRO MUN 4 6397 and PRO MUN 4 5329

169

Report of the Enquiry into the future of His Majesty's
Factories at Gretna and Waltham Abbey Cd 667 1920

170

Robertson A J p281 'British rearmament and industrial growth
1935-39 Research in Economic History8 pp279-98

Davenport Hines op cit pp23-5

WP 20/09/19

171

Bond B British military policy between the two world wars
Oxford 1980 pp23 33 35 65

172

PRO MUN 4 6394

173

The article was reprinted in WH 26/12/19

174

WP 17/02/20

175

PRO MUN 4 6394

176

Sampson A The arms bazaar 1st published 1977 1978 edition p69

177

KI 26/04/19

178

Cited in Davenport Hines op cit. It was also quoted in the WP
19/08/21

179

Sampson A op cit p71

Davenport Hines op cit p40-43

180

PRO MUN 4 6394

181

Sir Frederick Nathan recommended that the storage and filing of
shells and bombs be transferred to Banbury and Hereford
National Filling Factories. Even without transferring the
necessary plant this would have cost around £3,000. PRO MUN 4
6401, recommendations of E C Given, 11/9/19.

182

Times 11/12/19

Clines op cit p94

183

Morgan K Consensus op cit p289

Roseveare op cit p259

184

WP 07/22

185

On the industry's opposition to the state see Marwick, A op cit, p301 and Turner J pp36 42 'The politics of "organised business" in the First World War' Turner J (ed) Businessmen and politics, studies of business activity in British politics 1900-45 1984 pp33-49

186

Pollard The development op cit p162

187

Turner J 'The politics of "organised business"' op cit p12

188

Sampson op cit pp71-2

Trebilcock C 'Spin off' in British economic history; armaments and history 1760-1914' ECHR 22 1969 p485

Trebilcock C 'rejoinder' op cit

Marwick op cit p333

189

Schwarz 'The corporate' op cit p100

(d)

190

WP 06/22

191

Newbold J T How Europe armed for war 1916 p9 95

192

Slater War op cit pp568-9

Noel Baker P The private manufacture of arms Vol I 1936 pp119-20

193

WP 22/11/07

194

WP 7/22

195

WP 20/09/19

196

Mullally F & Brockway F Death pays a dividend 1944

Sampson op cit p60

There is also a version in Admiral Bacon's From 1900 op cit
pp178-80

197

WP 05/22

198

KI 23/05/19

199

WP 07/22

200

WP 06/22

WP 07/22

201

For the decision making policies of British engineering companies during the period 1890-1914 see McCloskey D N and Sandberg L 'From Damnation to Redemption: judgements on the late Victorian entrepreneur' Explorations in Economic History 1971 pp89-108 and
Payne P L British entrepreneurship in the nineteenth century, 1974

202

WP 07/22

203

WP 07/22

204

quoted in Hyman 'The Workers Union 1898-1929' op cit p156

205

ASE manifesto issued the day before the lockout, Wigham op cit
p49

206

Wigham ibid p44

207

Hyman 'The Workers Union 1898-1929' op cit pp170-1
Murray G War or Peace? 1923 pp5-8

208

Barefoot W Twenty five years of the WLP 1903-28 1928

209

Attfield J With light of knowledge: 100 years of education in the RACS 1877-1977 1981

210

WP 07/22

211

Job op cit p6

WP 07/22

212

WP 08/22

213

Waters M J 'A social history of the Chatham Dockyard workforce, 1860-1906' PhD University of Essex 1979 p127

214

Committee of Inquiry into the organisation and administration of the Manufacturing Departments of the Army C5116 Q113

Secret Committee on Reserves (1900 unpub)

Murray Committee on Government Factory and Workshops 1907 Cd 3626

Trebilcock 'Spin off' op cit

215

Ashworth W op cit p491

Schwarz B p84 'The corporate' op cit p84

Hurwitz S J State intervention in Great Britain. A study of economic control and social response, 1914-1919 1st edition

1949 1968 p61

216

Mitchell B R and Deane P Abstract of British historical statistics Cambridge 1962 p398

217

Trebilcock C 'War and the failure of industrialisation: 1899 and 1914' in Winter J M (ed) War and economic development, essays in memory of David Joslin Cambridge 1975 pp139-164

218

Irving R J pp150-2 'New Industries for old? Some investment decisions of Sir W G Armstrong, Whitworth and Co ltd 1900-1914' Business History 17 2 1973 pp150-75

219

Irving ibid p158 172-3

See also

Marder British op cit p20

220

Murray Committee op cit QQ1952-4974

PRO T 181/50 Annex II noted French 'Some aspects of social and economic planning for war in GB c1905-1915' PhD University of London 1978 p56

Trebilcock The Vickers brothers op cit pp38-40

- 221
Marder British op cit p39
- 222
WP 07/22
- 223
Reader W J Imperial Chemical Industries, a history Volume I
1970 p137
- 224
Dawson to Murray Committee op cit Cd 3626 Q2353
- 225
PRO WO 32/4734 R H Brade to Secretary of Admiralty 14/08/07
cited in French op cit p62
- 226
Trebilcock The Vickers brothers op cit pp75-8 11
Conference on the utilisation of Arsenal machinery 1907 d 3514
QQ274 327
- 227
On the debate on the effect on the British economic performance
of high investment in the prewar defence industries see
Trebilcock 'British armaments' op cit
Ashworth op cit
- 228
Irving op cit p168
Slater War op cit
- 229
Marder British op cit pp33-4
- 230
The Economist 01/1901
- 231
Payne op cit pp533 539-40
- 232
Waites A class society op cit pp8-9
- 233
Schwarz 'The corporate' op cit p84
- 234
Slater War op cit pp73-9
- 235
obituary WP 13/2/20

236

Trebilcock 'British armaments' op cit
Trebilcock C p366 '"A Special Relationship", government
rearmament and the cordite firms' EcHR 1966

237

Reader op cit pp140-2

238

WP 28/03/19

239

Hamilton D and Sowan B 'London Small Arms Company, Gunmakers
Lane E3. Part of an interview with Mr J F Banyard, recorded
and transcribed by Denis Smith' London Industrial Archaeology 2
1980 pp42-46

240

Hinton The First op cit pp29-30

241

Addison Four op cit pp89 113

242

New Witness 24/05/17 quoted in Hinton, J S 'Rank and file' op
cit p25 112

243

Fabian News 28/12/16 p2
A similar point was made in the New Statesman 07/11/17 p152

244

Cole Workshop organisation op cit p92
Cole quoted in Green R & Wilson A p24 'Economic planning and
workers control' in Eve M and Musson D Socialist Register, 1982
p21-26

245

PRO MUN 4 6402

246

Hurwitz op cit pp77-8

247

Wrigley op cit p52

248

Newbold op cit p93

249

Trebilcock C pp10-11 'Legends of the British armaments industry
1890-1914: a revision' Journal of Contemporary History 5 4 1970
pp3-19

Conference on Utilisation of Arsenal Machinery Cd 3513 1907 QQ
135-280

250
WP 07/22

251
On the notion of a an 'arms ring' see
Malder British op cit especially p16, p20 pp27-28
Seldes G Iron, blood and profits, New York 1934
Perris G H The War Traders 1914
Newbold op cit
Noel Baker op cit
WP 07/22
For a dismissal of it see
Trebilcock C 'Radicalism and the Armaments Trust' in Morris A J
A (ed) Edwardian radicalism 1900-14 1974 pp180-201

252
quoted in Keynes J M Economic consequences of the peace 1920
p133
See also Taylor A J P op cit p129
McEwan J M 'Unionist and Conservative MPs 1914-39' PhD
University of London 1959 p87 pp44ff and tables passim

253
Marwick op cit p301

254
Gilbert B B British social policy, 1914-39 1970 p24

255
Pollitt H Dynamite in the Dock 1935 p11

256
Twelfth report of the proceedings under the Conciliation Act
1896: 1914-18 1919 p29

257
FBI Archives 200/F/3/D1/1/9 held at the Modern Record Centre
Warwick University

258
McKinlay A and Zeitlin J p33 'The meanings of managerial
prerogative: industrial relations and the organisation of work
in British engineering, 1880-1939', Business History 31 1989
pp32-47

259
Demaris op cit pp1-3
Adams 'Lloyd George and the labour movement' Past and Present 3
1953 pp59 61-2
Morgan K O Consensus op cit p368

260

PRO MUN 4 6394 correspondence of 04/12/19 & 11/12/19
WAC 31/10/19

261

Morrison op cit p14

262

Middlemas Politics op cit p327

Chapter III

1

Hall and Schwarz op cit p26

2

Hall and Schwarz ibid p20

Schwarz B and Durham M 'A safe' p146

3

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p142

4

WP 02/09/21

5

WP 28/10/21

6

WH 11/11/21

7

Mills WP 28/10/21

8

Hart WP 26/08/21

9

Hall and Schwarz op cit p28

See also Carsten F L Revolution in Central Europe London 1972
pp111-115

10

Gerber L G 'Corporatism in comparative perspective: the impact
of the First World War on American and British labor relations
Business History Review 62 1 Spring 1988 pp93-127

11

Weekes B M 'The ASE 1880-1914' PhD Warwick 1970 Chapter 1

12

Hinton The first op cit p337

13

WP 07/22

14

KI 18/07/19

WP 24/12/20

Section (a)

15

KI 26/10/1889

16

Brown V A 'Class relations in Erith 1889-1900' MA Thames Polytechnic 1986 pp17 37-8

17

See the Torpedo Tatler 'Special Scotch Number', August 1910
Cole recalls the move being 'bitterly resented' Cole J A op cit p138

18

Acton Gazette and Express 11/04/19 See also
Acton Gazette and Express 14/02/19 on the conversion of Acton factories

19

Acton Gazette and Express 24/01/19

20

Acton Gazette and Express 04/02/19
Acton Gazette and Express 23/05/19
Acton Gazette and Express 30/05/19

21

Webb B & Webb S Industrial democracy 1st edition 1902, 1926 edition. In this instance they are referring to the AEU of which the ASE was a major part.
Croucher R 'The ASE and local autonomy 1898-1914' MA University of Warwick
Hinton The first op cit p76
Howell D British workers and the Independent Labour Party 1888-1906 Manchester 1983 pp84-9 95

22

Marder British op cit p27
KI 16/11/1889

23

Sheperd E C The fixing of wages in government employment 1923 pp2 9 13 21

24

KI 24/08/1889
KI 03/11/1889
KI 07/12/1889

25

Hyman R 'The Workers Union 1898-1929' op cit pp253-7

26

WP 20/08/15

27

McGuire P J 'Unofficial trade union movements and industrial politics 1915-226 D Phil University of Sussex 1978 pp388-9 429

28

Thompson P Socialists op cit p250

29

WP 13/12/18

30

Wal Hannington introduction to Job op cit p1
Cole Workshop organisation op cit pp18 84

31

Bush op cit p182

Middlemas Politics op cit p102-3

32

Watson op cit pp140-2

33

Mason tape op cit

34

WP 19/11/15

35

Sheperd op cit p23

36

Addison Politics op cit p176

Addison Politics Vol II op cit p155-7

37

Daily Express 21/07/17

38

Wigham op cit p83

Woolwich Gazette 13/01/1899

39

Gilbert B B British op cit p7

40

KI 20/01/22

41

Job op cit pp11-12

42

Ruben 'Law' op cit pp209 248

KI 07/02/19

43

Murphy J T Preparing for power 1st edition 1934 1972 reprint
p145

44
Davidson R 'The myth of the servile state' BSSLH Autumn 1984 62
pp62-7

45
Carr G op cit pp498-500

46
Watson op cit p143

47
Hogg op cit pp975-6

48
WP 03/06/21

49
Job op cit pp10-11

50
WP 27/05/21

51
Hinton The First op cit p129

52
Thom 'The ideology' op cit p156
Waites B A 'The effect' op cit p388
PRO MUN 2.28 20/11/17

53
Bush op cit p143

54
Socialist 15/05/19 cited by McGuire op cit p394

55
WP 08/04/21

56
WP 15/04/21

57
Hogg op cit p992

58
WP 22/11/18

59
WP 29/11/18
PRO MUN 1. 16 01/12/18
PRO MUN 1. 17 13/01/19

60

Hyman The Workers op cit p197

61

WP 14/02/20

62

Thom 'The ideology' op cit p191

63

WP 21/01/21

64

WP 01/07/21

65

WP 22/07/21

66

The Worker 12/04/19 cited in Hinton The First op cit p319

67

WP 29/10/20

68

WP 02/04/20

WP 23/04/20

69

WP 09/01/20

70

Burke T op cit p46

See also Jefferson op cit p56

71

Rodgers T p106 'Sir Allan Smith, the industrial group and the politics of unemployment 1919-24' Business History 28 1 1986 pp100-23

72

Hayburn R p286 'The National Unemployed Workers' Movement 1921-36: a reappraisal' IRSH 28 3 pp279-295

73

Zeitlin J 'Craft control and the division of labour: engineers and compositors in Britain 1890-1930' Cambridge Journal of Economics 1979 pp263-74

74

Daily Herald 25/10/19

75

Brockley News 29/02/24

Brockley News 04/04/24

76

McKibbin R p301 'Why was there no Marxism in Great Britain?'

EngHR 4/84 pp297-331

Hannah L 'Managerial innovation and the rise of the large scale company in interwar Britain' ECHR 27 1974 pp252-270

77

PRO MUN 4 6401

78

Ministry of Supply Information Branch 16/12/47 ref FO'S/OWS 1B
47023 letter to Enfield Urban District Council 328.94. Copy in
Enfield Archives

79

Jefferson op cit p115

Woolwich Trade and Industry Exhibition handbook 1929

WBC Official Town Guide 1925

Slater 'Unemployment' op cit pp308, 317

Thom 'Women munition workers at Woolwich Arsenal in the 1914-18 war' MA University of Warwick p26

80

WBC Official Town Guide 1925 p29

Llewelyn Smith H The new survey of London life and labour vol
ii London industries I 1932 p124

81

WP 17/03/22

82

Chislehurst and Kentish Times 01/11/29

Census of England and Wales 1921 part 3 LAN-MON

83

Gittings D Fair Sex, family size and structure 1900-39 1982 p26

Gillespie J A 'Economic and political change in the East End of London during the 1920s' PhD University of Cambridge 1988 p21

84

Jevons H S 'The causes of unemployment part II' Contemporary Review July 1909

85

Cole G D H A century of co-operation Manchester 1944 p371

86

Pelling H A history pp261-2

87

Confidential report on the state of employment in the UK in July 1918 prepared by the Industrial (War Enquiries) branch of the Board of Trade p32 in Waites 'The effect' p388

88

Board of Trade Committee on Industry and trade Survey of Industrial Relations 1926 p87

89

Clinton A The trade union rank-and-file, trades councils in Britain 1900-40 Manchester 1977 pp196 87 50

90

Furse K Hearts and pomegranates, the story of 45 years 1875-1920 1940 p342

Katherine Furse was C-in-C Women's VAD

91

WW 02/19

92

Thom 'The ideology' pp98 161 163

PRO Cab 27/49 meeting about the lack of training for women 21/02/19

93

WW 02/19

WW 02/21

KI 03/11/19

KI 10/11/19

Herald 25/01/19

WP 10/01/19

94

Baker in Guardian 17/02/19

Mills in WP 21/02/19

95

Ministry of Labour leaflet quoted in Thom 'The ideology' op cit p234

96

Englander and Osbourne op cit p611 615

Daily Herald 25/03/16

97

Woolwich Gazette 07/01/19

KI 10/01/19

WP 02/01/20

98

Yesterday's Witness Vol 4 Accession No 003136/02

'We are the Arsenal Girls' BBC TV Yesterday's Witness Women at

War Vol 5 Accession No 003142/01
Imperial War Museum

99

Gore E The better fight, the story of Dame Lilian Barker 1965
p91

100

Thom D 'Women workers at the Woolwich Arsenal' Oral History p64
Waites 'The effect' op cit pp390-1

WW 02/19

KI 04//04/19

WP28/03/19

On the creche see

WP 09/04/20

101

Hamilton P Three years or the duration p100

KI 10/03/77 interview with Bessie Cushen nee Hicks

Thom D 'The ideology' op cit p221

KI 10/03/77 interview Florence Kemp b1900

102

PRO MUN 2.17 09/11/18

103

WW 12/18

104

WP 28/11/19

PRO MUN 4 6394

105

Gore op cit p90

KI 04/04/19 interview with Barker

106

WP 06/02/18

107

WP 30/05/19

108

WP 06/02/20

109

PRO MUN 2.1914/06/19

110

WW 06/19

111

WP 25/10/18

112
WP 06/02/20

113
WW 11/18

114
WP 06/12/18

115
WP 06/12/18

116
WW 02/19

117
WW 02/21

118
Hill committee report PP1918 xiv Cd9239

119
Boston S Women workers and trade unions 2nd edition 1987 pp138-9

120
Thom D 'Women workers' op cit p64

121
WP 15/07/21

122
WP 29/07/21

123
WP 15/04/21

124
Stark D 'The origins and development of a single-industry town: Barrow-in-Furness 1890-1910' MA University of Lancaster 1972 p11
See also Marshall J D Furness and the Industrial Revolution Barrow 1958 p399

125
Joyce op cit p231
Filby p219 'The Newmarket racing lad: tradition and change in a marginal occupation' Work employment and society 1 1987 pp205-224

126
Todd N 'A history of labour in Lancaster and Barrow-in-Furness c1890-1920' M Litt University of Lancaster pp34 88 184-7
There are also similarities with the rise of labour in the

north east, where Hawthorne's Engineering and Armstrong's were dominant see

Hunter op cit p284

127

Hobsbawm E J 'custom, wages and work load in 19th century industry' in Labouring Men 1964 pp344-70

Branca P 'A new perspective in women's work: a comparative typology' Journal of Social History 9 1975 pp129-53

128

Giddens A The class structure of the advanced societies 1973 pp152-3

129

Giddens ibid pp285-7

130

Nairn T 'The English working class' in Blackburn R (ed) Ideology in social sciences 1972 p188

131

Monds J 'Workers control and the historians: a new economism' New Left Review 97 1977 pp81-100. Hinton's response is in the same issue

132

Gore op cit p65

Christian Science Monitor cited in KI 28/03/19

133

Lloyd George War memoirs 1936 p192

134

Census of England and Wales 1921 part 3 LAN-MON

135

WP 26/08/21

136

WP 11/22

137

Campbell C 'The making of a Clydeside working class, shipbuilding and working-class organisation in Govan' Our History Pamphlet 78 1986 p8

138

Booth op cit pp116-7

McLeod Class and religion op cit p34 40

London Statistics 104-5 18

Jackson J A 'The Irish in London - a study in migration and settlement in the past 100 years' MA University of London 1958 pp95-102 275 280

Benjamin H W 'The London Irish: a study in political activism
1870-1910' PhD Princeton n d pp307 316 94. Copy in Senate
House library

139

WP 29/11/18

On the Irish League's support for Crooks see Woolwich Gazette
19/12/02

140

Lilly Paine, local labour activist, transcript of interview
with I Dove 01/79

141

KI 03/05/19

142

WP 29/10/20

WP 20/01/22

143

WP 23/01/20

144

WP 20/08/20 See also
Jackson J A op cit pp247-8

145

WP 06/05/21

146

WP 13/05/21

147

PRO MUN 5.53 shop steward delegation to the Ministry of
Munitions 18/07/17

148

PRO MUN 4 6401

149

Evening Standard 14/03/19

Evening Standard 01/03/19

150

Enfield Gazette and Observer 10/01/19

Enfield Gazette and Observer 28/03/19

151

WP 19/03/20

WP 19/03/20

152

WP 24/12/20

153
WP 28/03/19

154
WP 12/08/21

155
Daily Herald 25/09/25
On the passivity and conservatism of Portsmouth labour,
particularly during an earlier period, see Hall D R 'A
geographical study of social divisions in Portsmouth' PhD
University of London 1978 pp44 11

156
WH 21/01/19

157
Evening Standard 01/12/19
Evening Standard 28/11/19
Evening Standard 29/11/19
Evening Standard 03/11/19

158
WP 12/08/21

159
Evening Standard 06/03/19

160
WP 21/02/19
On the plans see
PRO WC 514 8/1/19
PRO WC 565 6/5/19
PRO Cab 24/9
PRO Cab 23/10
OHMM part 1 pp80-81

161
Evening Standard 06/03/19 See also
Evening Standard 20/03/19

162
Evening Standard 03/03/22

163
WP 04/03/21
For evidence of continuing support for the campaign for the
cattle market see
WH 04/03/21
WH 11/3/21

164
Kentish Leader 04/21

165

WP 31/12/20 repeat

166

WP 08/10/20

167

Bush op cit p143

168

Waites 'The effect' op cit p338

169

Thom 'The ideology' op cit p226

Section (b)

170

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p126 135 141

171

Macintyre S p108 'Socialism, the unions and the Labour Party after 1918' BSSLH 31 1975 pp101-111. He is quoting Labour and the New Social Order 1918

172

Macintyre 'Socialism' ibid p108

173

Marquand D Ramsay MacDonald 1977 p90

174

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' op cit pp126 136

175

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p135

176

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid pp136 142

177

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p146

178

Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p146

179

Macintyre A proletarian op cit p60
The same point about the lack of attention to practicalities is made in Marquand op cit p92

180

Crossick op cit pp227-8

181
Crossick ibid pp222 226 229-30

182
Crossick ibid p242

183
Crossick op cit pp220-1 240

184
Howell op cit p264

185
Crossick ibid p216

186
Crossick op cit p208, 210, 215, 222-224, 246

187
Petter M op citp40

188
Crossick ibid p213

189
Crossick ibid p246

190
Crossick ibid p240-1

191
Watson op cit p140
See also Waters op cit p130

192
Bentwich H If I forget thee, some chapters of autobiography 1912-29 1973 pp80 98

193
Crossick op cit pp241-2
Clinton A The trade union rank and file, Trades Councils in Britain 1900-40 Manchester 1977
Laxton J D 'The making of a Labour victory: Woolwich in the years up to 1903' BA Thames Polytechnic 1975 appendix B

194
Crossick op cit pp212 227

195
Todd op cit pp134-6
Cole G D H A history of the Labour party from 1914 1948 p174

196
KI 26/09/19

- 197
Labour Leader 02/21
- 198
Morrison in London Labour Chronicle reprinted in WP 01/04/21
- 199
Gillespie op cit p391
- 200
Gillespie ibid p397
Jones G S Outcast London a study in the relationship between the classes in Victorian society 1st edition 1971 1984 edition pp348-9
- 201
Hyman R The Workers Union op cit pp200 205 223
- 202
WP 20/09/19
- 203
WP 01/07/21
- 204
WP 08/04/21
- 205
WP 02/09/21
- 206
WP 22/11/18
- 207
WP 03/02/22
- 208
WP 08/07/21
- 209
The Italian Communist Party General Secretary during that period, Gramsci, argued in favour of individual membership of the PCI and disparaged the Labour Party for the lack of individual members. Hoare and Smith op cit p335
- 210
WP 22/07/21
WP 29/07/21
WP 05/08/21
- 211
WP 19/08/21

212
WLP Minutes 18/11/19

213
WP 02/09/21

214
KI 18/07/19

215
KI 18/07/19

216
Hall and Schwarz op cit pp14 21

217
Crossick op cit p232

218
quoted in Yeo S p46 'A new life: the Religion of Socialism in
Britain 1883-1896' History Workshop Journal 4 1977 pp5-56

219
WP 09/09/21

220
WP 03/03/22
WP 07/10/21

221
WP12/22

222
Crossick op cit p215

223
WP 25/10/18

224
WP 29/10/20

225
WP 02/03/22

226
WP 10/22

227
WP 07/22

228
WP 08/07/21

229
Jefferson op cit p184

230
WP 02/04/20
WP 21/01/21

231
Chislehurst and Kentish Times 01/11/19

232
Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' op cit p142

233
WP 09/22

234
WP 08/22
WP 09/22

235
WP 10/06/21

236
WP 08/07/21

237
Sutton D p64 'Liberalism, state collectivism and the social relations of citizenship' in Langan M and Schwarz B (eds)
Crises and the British state, 1880-1930 1985 pp63-79

238
Crossick op cit 225-6

239
28th Co-operative conference handbook 1896

240
Hinton J 'The labour aristocracy' NLR 32 p72-7

241
WP 11/04/19

242
EDT 30/05/19
WH 11/02/19

243
WH 20/06/29
WH 18/02/21

244
WP 02/09/21
WLP Minutes 18/03/21

WLP Minutes 31/05/21
WLP Minutes 23/06/21

245
WP 16/04/20
WP 28/05/20

246
Morgan Consensus op cit pp217 219
Marquand D op cit pp273-5
WLP Special General meeting 08/02/21

247
WP 19/03/20

248
McKibbin The evolution op cit p242

249
Snell op cit p205
WH 11/02/21

250
WP 20/01/22

251
Cowling M op cit p56
Cook C The age of alignment, electoral politics in Britain 1922-29 1975 p11
Marquand op cit pp274-5
Symons J Horatio Bottomley 1955 p262 168-9

252
Snell op cit pp204-5

253
WH 18/02/21
WH 04/03/21

254
WH 11/03/21

255
WH 18/02/21

256
WP 19/11/20

257
Brockley News 29/02/24
WP 22/07/21

258
WP 09/22

259

WP 25/02/21

WP 19/08/21

260

WP 02/09/21

WP 09/09/21

~~261~~

Daily Herald 25/09/25

WP 24/02/22

262

WP 25/03/21

263

Suthers R B Mind your own business: the case for municipal housekeeping 1929 p116

264

Nottingham op cit p241

265

WP 09/09/21

266

WP 02/09/21

267

WP 25/03/21

268

WP 21/01/21

269

WP 02/07/20

WP 16/09/20

270

WP 07/01/21

WP 18/03/21

WP 26/08/21

There was a precedent. 200 people broke up a Woolwich Guardians meeting in 1908 according to Jefferson op cit p104

271

WP 30/09/21 See also

WP 16/09/21

WP 23/09/21

272

WP 07/10/21

WH 07/10/21

273

WP 20/09/19

274

WP 21/01/21

275

WP 07/01/21

WP 28/01/21

WP 25/03/21

WP 16/09/21

276

Alice and Jack Loveman, who were active Communists in Woolwich at the time. My copy of the transcripts of their interview with Iris Dove

See also

WP 10/02/22

WP 03/02/22

WP 24/02/22

277

Evening Standard 28/10/19

Evening Standard 29/10/19

Star 31/10/19

Daily Gazette 29/10/19

Craysford Chronicle and District Times 31/10/19

278

WH 07/10/21

279

Craysford Chronicle and District Times 03/02/22

WP 24/02/22

WP 03/02/22

280

Times 02/09/21

Times 03/09/21

281

Star 07/04/19

282

WP 15/10/20

283

WCC Diamond Jubilee Review 1889-1949 p48

284

Gillespie op cit

Donoghue B and Jones G Herbert Morrison: portrait of a politician 1973 pp36-93

285

KI 07/11/19

286

Gillespie op cit pp414-19

287

WP 09/09/21

288

WP30/09/21

289

WP 23/09/21

290

WP 06/22

291

WP 10/22

292

WLP Minutes 27/01/22

293

WLP Minutes 10/02/21

294

WP 05/11/20

295

WP 09/22

296

Jefferson op cit p98

297

Chislehurst & District Times 30/10/25

WLP Special General Committee meeting 17/06/27

298

Howard C J 'Henderson, MacDonald and the leadership in the Labour Party 1914-22' PhD University of Cambridge 1978 p140

299

WP 28/10/21

WP 21/03/22

300

Herald 13/12/19

301

Hancock K J p334 'The reduction of unemployment as a problem of public policy, 1920-29 EcHR 15 1962-3 p328-43

302

WP 12/12/20

303

WP 16/09/21

WP 23/09/21

304

WP 07/01/21

305

Keith-Lucas B 'Poplarism' Public Law Spring 1962 pp52-80

Lansbury G My life 1928

Postgate R Life of George Lansbury 1951

306

Cronin J 'The British state' p221

307

Briggs E and Deacon A p51 'The creation of the Unemployment Assistance Board Policy and Politics 2 1 1973 pp43-62

308

KI 10/01/19

309

Briggs and Deacon op cit p51

310

WP 09/09/21

WP 16/09/21

311

WP 19/08/21

312

Johnson op cit pp482-3

313

WP 03/04/20

314

Thomson B Queer People 1922 pp211 293

315

Hall and Schwarz op cit p27

Chapter IV

(a)

1

Crossick op cit pp25 101-4

2

Schwarz 'Conservatism' op cit p34
Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' op cit p143

3

Obituary WP 07/09/20
WP 02/01/20

4

WP 19/03/20
KI 23/05/19

5

On Woods' initiation to the Royal Artillery Lodge of
Oddfellows, Manchester Unity at the Co-operative Institute see
KI 24/01/19 KI 17/01/19
On Wood's career see Jefferson op cit p352
Yeo S 'Working-class association' op cit p58

6

In January 1919 Wood became a circuit steward at the City Road
Wesley Chapel WH 10/01/19

7

Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909

8

Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909
WP 01/06/20

9

Armstrong G (ed) London's struggle for socialism 1848-1948 1948
pp36-8

10

WP 25/3/21

11

Slater G 'Co-operators, the state and the housing question'
Contemporary Review 2/01 pp254-63

12

Booth op cit p129

13

Message F 'Sir William Anderson 1854-1898; a forgotten engineer

of Erith and Woolwich' Woolwich and District Antiquarian Society Proceedings Vol 35 1976 pp11-17

14

Booth ibid pp95-6

15

Woolwich Trade and Industry Exhibition handbook 1929

16

Attfield J With light op cit p31

Attfield J 'Education for social change' BSSLH 43 1981 p5-6

Reading Industrial Co-operative Society journal 01/1898

Reading Industrial Co-operative Society journal 03/1899

Grinling C 'Fifty years of pioneer work in Woolwich' in Davis W T and Neville W B (eds) The history of the RACS 1922 pp89-90 99 142

17

WP 19/08/21

18

EDT 05/09/19

Jefferson op cit pp268-9

Daily Herald 02/03/27

Daily Herald 10/01/28

Daily Herald 09/01/28

Chislehurst and District Times 08/04/27

Comradeship 01/19

19

Shaw G B 'Major Barbara' 1905 Act I p462 in Shaw G B The complete plays 1934 It is likely that the model for the factory was Nobel's not Woolwich. See Crompton L Shaw the dramatist 1971 p115

20

WP 21/01/21

Grinling Fifty years op cit p6

21

KI 23/11/1889

22

Joy B Forward, Arsenal! A history of the Arsenal Football Club written with its approval and co-operation 1954 p5

Mason D 'Football - an aspect of the politics of working-class leisure, 1888-1914' MA Thames Polytechnic 1979 pp 10 25

23

Korr C P 'West Ham United and the beginnings of professional football in East London 1895-1914' Journal of Contemporary History 13 1978 p211-32

Mason D ibid p26

Mason A Association football and English society 1863-1915
Brighton 1980 p249
Taylor I R pp142-3 'Soccer consciousness and soccer
hooliganism' in Cohen S (ed) Images of deviance Harmondsworth
1971 pp124-64
Day R 'The motivation of some football club directors: an
aspect of the social history of association football 1890-1914'
MA University of Warwick 1976 pp91-8 56

24

An analysis of the 1,522 shareholders in 1893 appears in
Day ibid p125
See also
Woolwich Football Flash 01/09/06

25

Woolwich Football Flash 20/10/06
Times 04/04/07
Times 22/06/04
Times 10/10/06
Times 30/09/07
WDC report 1905/06 p5
Mason D op cit p42

26

Day ibid p20
Howard C J 'Henderson, MacDonald' op cit p98
Jones G S op cit p169
Wheeler R F p195 'Organised sport and organised labour, the
Workers Sports Movement' Journal of Contemporary History 13
1978 pp191-210
On Easton and Anderson see
Brown V A 'Class relations' op cit pp20-1

27

Times 12/04/13
Obituary Times 15/01/35
Mason D op cit pp17 34-8 40 46-7
Joy op cit p21
Glanville B Arsenal Football Club 1952 pp1-9
WP 19/03/11
Day ibid pp87-118

28

Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909

29

Pethick Lawrence F Fate has been kind 1942 pp57-66 details
Pethick Lawrence's other newspaper interests.
Hopkins D 'The membership of the Independent Labour Party,
1904-10: a spatial and occupational analysis' IRSH 20 1975
pp175-97

30

WP 27/12/18

31

WP 01/10/20

WP 17/03/22

WP 01/05/22

Star 10/03/22

McGuire op cit pp56-7

Holton R J pp348 261-2 'Daily Herald v Daily Citizen 1912-15,
the struggle for a Labour daily in relation to "the labour
unrest"' IRSH 19 1974 pp347-76

32

WP 11/06/20

33

WP 27/12/18

34

WP 07/22

Job op cit

35

WP 29/04/21

WP 01/04/21

36

WP 06/05/21

37

On the Eltham Times see Brown V A op cit p3

Kelly's Woolwich Plumstead Eltham Shooter's Hill and Charlton
Directory 1920

Kelly's Woolwich Plumstead Eltham Shooter's Hill and Charlton
Directory 1907 p7

38

McGuire op cit pp56-7

Holton op cit p384

39

WP 08/10/20

40

WP 02/04/20

41

WP 17/03/22

42

WP 24/01/19

WP 27/12/18

43

WCC Diamond Jubilee op cit

44

Carter op cit p89

Booth op cit p94

45

Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909

46

WCC Diamond Jubilee op cit pp12-13

47

Diary of G West 30/03/16 cited in Thom D 'The ideology' op cit
p214

Annual Report of the Woolwich Medical Officer of Health 1915
pp9 10 23 60

48

WP 04/10/18

49

WP 25/10/18

50

KI 11/04/19

51

WH 09/05/19

52

WH 12/12/19

53

KI 11/04/19

54

Times 28/09/06

55

WP 19/08/21

56

WP 08/07/21

57

KI 24/01/19

58

KI 09/05/19

59

WP 28/01/21

WP 04/02/21

60

WP 06/05/21

51

WP 05/11/20

62

WCC AGM 27/01/24 minutes in WCC General Meetings Book September 1923 - April 1952

WP 11/06/20

63

WP 02/07/20

WP 30/07/20

64

WCC meeting 22/01/24 minutes in WCC General Meetings Book September 1923 - April 1952

Woolwich Trade and Industry Exhibition handbook 1929

(b)

65

Crossick op cit p139

66

Booth op cit p23

67

Masterman C F G 'The problem of south London' in Mudie-Smith R The religious life of London 1904 pp215-6

68

McLeod D H 'Membership and influence of the churches in Metropolitan London 1885-1914' PhD University of Cambridge 1971 analysis of Daily News survey between pp137-8

69

Booth op cit p103

70

Rochester Diocesan Society A short account of the spiritual needs of the ten Metropolitan Boroughs in South London 1902

71

McLeod 'Membership' op cit pp139-43 155

McLeod H Class op cit 1974 pp93-4

Church Times 14/09/17

72

Rochester Diocesan Society op cit
WP 21/09/17

73

KI 05/01/1899

KI 19/01/1889

KI 04/05/1889

74

WH 11/07/19

75

Kentish Leader 11/21

76

From the critical response of the Workers Union see WP 10/03/22

77

Jefferson op cit p119

78

Snell op cit pp66-73

79

WP 04/06/20

WP 14/10/21

80

KI 13/04/1889

KI 08/06/1889

KI 22/06/1889

KI 24/08/1889

KI 31/08/1889

KI 97/09/1889

KI 14/09/1889

81

Horsley J W I remember: memories of a 'sky pilot' in the prison and the slum 1911 chapter 6. Horsley also wrote a book on masonic jurisprudence and a number of works on prisons.

82

McLeod D H 'Membership' op cit pp139 158-9

83

WP 11/03/21

84

Times 24/12/06

85

Times 10/01/07



86

Times 14/04/07

87

Booth op cit pp120-1

88

Booth ibid pp112-3

89

WP 03/03/22

WP 10/03/22

90

WP 13/12/18

91

KI 09/05/19

92

Church Times 07/09/17

93

Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909

94

Mason tape op cit

95

Booth op cit p120

96

Brown K D 'Nonconformity and the British labour movement: a case study' Journal of Social History Vol 8 1975

Haw G Christianity and the working classes 1906 p83

97

Williams M op cit 1937 p81

98

Booth op cit p107

99

Clayton F S John Wilson of Woolwich, a Baptist Pastorate of fifty years 1927 pp12-3

100

Williams M op cit p43

101

Williams M ibid pp75-6

102

Williams M ibid p82

- 103
Williams M ibid p42
- 104
Williams M ibid p124
- 105
WP 26/03/20
WP 20/02/20
- 106
Yeo 'A new life' op cit pp42-3
- 107
WP 23/12/20
- 108
WP 07/12/20
- 109
WP 05/22
- 110
WP 12/12/19
- 111
Frow and Frow op cit p439
- 112
Labour Leader 12/12/18
- 113
WP 09/09/21
- 114
WP 24/12/20
- 115
Woolwich Invalid Children's Aid Committee Annual Reports
KI 06/06/19
WP 23/04/20
- 116
Locke M Traditions and controls in the making of a polytechnic, Woolwich Polytechnic 1890-1970 Thames Polytechnic 1978 p11
Brooks C An educational adventure, a history of Woolwich Polytechnic 1955 pp14-15

(c)

- 117
Booth op cit pp92-3

- 118
obituary in KI 19/09/19
- 119
Jefferson op cit pp135-6
- 120
Crossick op cit pp144 237 242
- 121
Cunningham H The Volunteer Force, a social and political history 1859-1908 1975 p98
- 122
Beckett I F W 'The English Rifle Volunteer Movement 1859-1908'
PhD University of London 1974 p268
Similarly there were Volunteer Companies formed at the Enfield
Small Arms Factory and from the workforce at the Royal
Gunpowder Mills, Waltham Abbey. See Beckett I F W Riflemen
form; a study of the Rifle Volunteer Movement 1859-1908
Aldershot 1982 p67
- 123
Beckett 'The English' ibid p75
Beckett I F W Riflemen form ibid p117
- 124
Cunningham op cit p53
- 125
WP 19/10/21
- 126
Beckett 'The English' op cit p156 173 175-7 374-5
See also
Price R An imperial war and the British working class: working
class attitudes and reactions to the Boer War 1899-1902 1972
pp13 229
Keegan J The face of battle 1976 p22
- 127
Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909
- 128
Newton op cit pp161-3
- 129
Roberts S N The Kent Artillery Volunteers Lee Green 1951
Borough of Woolwich Home Owners' Association handbook 1911
- 130
Obituary in WP 30/01/20
Jefferson op cit pp85 85 117

131

WP 07/10/21

132

Lowe R 'The demand for a Ministry of Labour' op cit p130

133

WP 20/02/20

WP 10/02/20

134

WP 30/04/20

135

Kentish Leader 08/21

WP 15/07/21

136

WP 07/05/20

Parliamentary answer to Albert Hope MP. The average in Ministry factories was 27.5%.

137

Carr op cit p119

138

KI 28/03/19

139

WH 13/06/19

140

WP 04/11/21

141

WP 24/02/22

142

Streatham News, Balham News and Borough of Wandsworth Chronicle
25/04/19

143

WP 21/10/21

144

WP 29/11/18

WP 31/12/20

145

WP 24/02/22

146

WP 04/06/20

147

Jefferson op cit pp181-82

Englander and Osbourne op cit p619

148

Thomson B op cit p296

149

WP 04/06/20

150

EDT 05/12/19

EDT 19/12/19

151

WP 17/12/20

152

EDT 27/06/19

EDT 11/04/19

KI 18/04/19

There were over 2,000 members of the branch according to the KI 31/01/19 and over 4,000 according to Crutcher in KI 27/06/19

See also

KI 31/10/19

KI 29/08/19

KI 22/08/19

The Woolwich branch of the National Union of Clerks also had links with the NFDDSS KI 06/06/19

153

EDT 07/11/19

154

KI 21/03/19

155

Acton Gazette and Express 16/05/19

156

Acton Gazette and Express 26/09/19

157

Woolwich Gazette 21/10/19

158

Woolwich Gazette 08/04/19

159

WP 08/04/21

160

KI 17/10/19

161
WP 11/04/19

162
KI 05/09/19

163
Daily Herald 14/10/19

164
WH 20/06/19
WH 18/08/19

165
Woolwich Gazette 04/11/19

166
EDT 03/10/19

166
East London Advertiser 25/10/19
KI 03/10/19
KI 10/10/19

167
WP 20/02/20

168
WP 27/02/20
Chislehurst and District Times 26/05/20 reported 1,000 members
of the NFDDSS on the march, and 15,000-20,000 marchers

169
Mason tape op cit

170
WP 09/04/20

171
WP 27/02/20

172
WP 20/02/20

173
WP 27/02/20

174
WP 20/02/20
Job op cit p17

175
WP 27/02/20

- 176
WP 28/05/20
- 177
WP 05/03/20
- 178
WP 12/03/20
- 179
WP 18/06/20
- 180
WP 17/02/22
- 181
KI 18/05/19
- 182
EDT 29/09/19
WH 06/06/19
KI 28/09/19
- 183
KI 11/07/19
- 184
Englander D Landlord and tenant in urban Britain 1838 -1918
1983 pp238-9
- 185
WCC Diamond Jubilee Review op cit p48
- 186
Swenarton M and Taylor S 'The scale and nature of the growth of owner-occupation in Britain between the wars' EcHR 38 1985
pp373-92
- 187
Jackson A A Semi-detached London, suburban development, life and transport, 1900-29 1973 p193
- 188
Brooks C The First 100 years of the WEBS 1947 p131
- 189
Quoted in Laxton op cit p12
- 190
Booth op cit pp86 128
- 191
Wohl A S The eternal slum, housing and social policy in

Victorian London 1977 pp303 312
Dyos op cit p142

192
Thom D 'Women munition workers' op cit p22
Laxton op cit p378

193
London County Council op cit pp64-5
Wohl The eternal ibid pp307 312 368
Dyos op cit pccxxiii

194
WP 29/01/15

195
Englander op cit pp125-6

196
Englander ibid pp238-9

197
Times 27/08/1900
Jefferson op cit p8

198
Star 08/03/19

199
Englander op cit p264

200
WP 16/07/20

201
Wohl A S 'The housing of the working class in London 1815-1914'
in Chapman S D (ed) The history of working class housing: a
symposium 1970 pp13-54

202
Beaufoy S L G 'Well Hall estate, Eltham' Town Planning Review
1950 pp259-71
Englander op cit p264
WH 04/07/19

203
On the scope of the estate see
OHMM Vol V pp25-6
Thom D 'The ideology' op cit pp56 213
Hills A B 'The Progress Estate' University of London Diploma
1972
Swenarton M Homes fit for heroes, the politics and architecture
of early state housing in Britain 1981
On the lack of provision elsewhere see

PRO MUN 4 6375

Dyos op cit civ

Jordan J R 'Homes for heroes: housing problems at the end of the First World War, with special reference to the work of the Ministry of Reconstruction and the years 1914-1925' MA

University of Kent 1971 pp70-4

Marriner S p28 'Sir Alfred Mond's Octopus: a nationalised house building business' Business History 21 1 1979 pp23-44

204

Marriner 'Sir Alfred' ibid p29

205

Wolfe H Labour supply and regulation Oxford 1923 p91

Jordan op cit pp86-8

Jones D T 'The Well Hall estate, Eltham London SE9. How successful were the solutions to the functional, social and aesthetic problems faced by the designers of the Well Hall estate?' Open University undergraduate project 1975. Copy in Woodlands

206

Garden City and Town Planning Magazine 6 7 p128

Garden City and Town Planning Magazine 6 10 p198

207

WP 13/08/15

WP 24/03/16

208

WP 31/12/15

209

WP 24/09/20

WP 01/10/20

WP 05/11/20

WP 19/11/20

Times 02/11/20

210

Star 28/10/19

211

Mr J Temple quoted in Kennett J The Eltham Hutments 1985 p9
On an estate built by the munitions firm William Beardsmore in 1915 the streets were named after contemporary generals. See Melling J pp284-5 'Employers, industrial housing and the evolution of company welfare policies in Britain's heavy industry: West Scotland 1970-1920' International Review of Social History 26 1981 pp255-301

212

Mr A Sparrow quoted in Kennett ibid p4

213

Evening Standard 04/03/19

214

Englander op cit 278 284-5

215

WP 19/08/21

EDT 12/12/19

Englander op cit pp272-3

Advertisement Star 01/02/19.

The collapse had adverse effects on the savings of working people as Mills and Will Thorne stressed when they took up the case in the Commons

WP 21/12/20

WP 04/02/21

WP 28/1/21

WP 25/3/21

Many small shopkeepers lost their savings as well WH 28/01/21 Farrow's existed 1907-20 and some record of its activities exist in PRO T 172/1209 13669.

On the London Association of Depositors and Current Account Holders, the committee which promoted the interests of those who lost their money see WP 1/4/21

216

Rodger R p139 'Political economy, ideology and the persistence of working class housing problems in Britain 1850-1914'

International Review of Social History 32 2 1987 pp109-143

217

WP 02/07/20 See also

WP 30/07/20

218

Evening Standard 06/03/19

219

Memo of Chamberlain 01/08/19 cited in Marriner 'Sir Alfred' op cit pp23-5

220

Marriner S pp178-9 182 'Cash and concrete, liquidity problems in the mass production of "Homes for heroes"' Business History July 1976 18 2 pp152-89

221

Following a sanitation campaign errant landlords were brought to book WP 9/22. See also

WP 11/06/20

WP 15/10/20

222

WP 13/02/20

WP 06/02/20
WP 30/01/20

223

WP 19/03/20
WP 30/04/20

224

07/05/20

225

WP 03/12/20

226

Bush op cit p108
WP 13/02/20
WP 30/04/20

227

PRO T161 Box 64 File 546797 'A scheme for the organisation of government housing under the auspices of the Office of Works with a view to the maximum employment of ex-Servicemen, presented to the Cabinet Committee 29/09/20

228

PRO TI 12422/50926 Memo to the Chancellor 05/06/19

229

Times 05/10/22

230

The sale of the land to the RACS was reported in Brockley News 01/11/24. On the first RACS housing see Slater G 'Co-operators' op cit

231

Woolwich Gazette 04/02/19
Woolwich Gazette 25/02/19
Woolwich Gazette 11/03/19
KI 24/01/19

232

WP 07/11/21
Brockley News 01/11/24

233

WP 04/06/20

234

WH 03/12/20
Englander op cit p285

235

EDT 10/09/19

WH 24/10/19
WW 06/19
WP 14/02/19
WP 13/02/20
WP 30/01/20

236

WP 13/12/19 See also
WP 29/01/18
WP 13/12/18

237

Brockley News 29/02/24

238

EDT 31/10/19
Brockley News 29/02/24

239

WP 16/09/21
EDT 11/04/19
EDT 27/06/19

240

Crossick op cit p72

Chapter V

- 1
Hall and Schwarz op cit p26
Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' op cit p146
- 2
Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p146
- 3
Hall and Schwarz op cit p26-7
Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p145-6
- 4
Schwarz and Durham 'A safe' ibid p127
- 5
Schwarz and Durham 'Constitutionalism' op cit p58
- 6
Schwarz and Durham 'Constitutionalism' ibid p2
- 7
Hall and Schwarz op cit p26-7
- 8
Hall and Schwarz op cit p24
- 9
Hinton 'Disconnecting' op cit
Schwarz and Durham 'Constitutionalism' op cit p44
- 10
McKinlay and Zeitlin op cit p44
- 11
Hall and Schwarz op cit p13

Bibliography

(a) government records

Secret Committee on Reserves 1900
Committee of Inquiry into the organisation & administration of the Manufacturing Departments of the Army
1907 Factory and workshop census of London 1911-12
Murray Committee on Government Factories and Workshops Cd 3626 1907 PRO WO 33/476
Henderson report on the Conference on Utilisation of Arsenal Machinery Cd 3513 1907 PRO ZHC17083
Haldane Committee on the machinery of government Cd 9230 1918
Report on the Engineering Trades (New Industries) Committee 1918 Part VIII
Hill committee report 1918 Cd9239
Reports of the McKinnon Wood Committee MUN 5 152/1122.11/8
Twelfth report of the proceedings under the Conciliation Act 1896: 1914-18 1919
Report of the Enquiry into the future of His Majesty's Factories at Gretna and Waltham Abbey Cd 667 1920
Disposal of Surplus Property: statement of receipts etc to 31/3/20 Cd 850 1920
Board of Trade Committee on Industry and Trade Survey of Industrial Relations 1926
Ministry of Supply Information Branch 16/12/47 ref FO'S/OWS 1B 47023 letter to Enfield Urban District Council 328.94
Principal classifications of correspondence
Cab 23, War Cabinet Minutes
Cab 24, GT Papers
T171 172 173 Treasury Papers relating to state production and employment. T172 on the collapse of Farrow's Bank T161 on housing
WO 33 on the Arsenal
Mun 4 and Mun 5, Ministry of Munitions reports and correspondence
Beveridge Collection Munitions from the British Library of Economic and Political Science in the London School of Economics, papers collected by Beveridge during the period that he was at the Ministry of Munitions
Census of England and Wales 1901 1911 1921 from Office of Population Census and Surveys

(b) private and local government publications

Annual Reports of the Woolwich Medical Officer of Health 1901, 1915
WBC Joint Employment Committee Report 1904-05
WCC Diamond Jubilee Review 1889-1949 1949
Woolwich Distress Committee Minutes
Woolwich Invalid Children's Aid Committee Annual Reports
Borough of Woolwich Home Owners' Association handbook 1911
28th Co-operative Society handbook 1896
Woolwich Trade and Industry Exhibition handbook 1929

Woolwich Worthies from the Pioneer 1909
available in the Local History Library, Greenwich
Woolwich Board of Guardian Minutes from the Greater London
Record Office

(c) labour and business records

Woolwich Labour Party Minutes
Woolwich Trade and Labour Council Minutes of meetings
available in the Local History Library, Greenwich
WCC General Meetings Book September 1923 - April 1952 from
Woolwich Chamber of Commerce
Federation of British Industries records, available in the
Modern Record Centre, University of Warwick
TUC Conference Report 1913
Labour Party Conference Report 1917

(d) tapes and transcripts of taped interviews

Personal copy of taped interview with Thomas Mason, who
worked at the Arsenal from 1915
Family Life and Work experience Archive collected by Paul
Thompson and Thea Vigne, housed at the University of Essex
Department of Sound Archives, Imperial War Museum
Lilly Paine, local labour activist, transcript of interview
with I Dove 01/79
Alice and Jack Loveman, personal copy of the transcripts of
an interview with Iris Dove
tapes of women workers at the Arsenal from Imperial War
Museum Department of Sound Records
KI 10/0377

(e) non-socialist newspapers

Acton Gazette and Express
Brockley News
Chislehurst and District Times
Church Times
Craysford Chronicle and District Times
Daily Express
Daily Gazette
Daily News
Daily Sketch
East London Advertiser
Erith and District Times
Evening News
Evening Standard
Guardian
Independent
Kentish Independent
Star
Stock Exchange Gazette
Streatham News, Balham News and Borough of Wandsworth
Chronicle
Times
Woolwich Football Flash

Woolwich Gazette
Woolwich Herald

(f) labour, co-operative and socialist press

Comradeship
Croydon and Surrey Labour Outlook
Daily Herald/Herald
Fabian News
Kentish Leader
Labour Leader
Labour Woman
London Labour Chronicle
New Statesman
Reading Industrial Co-operative Society journal
Torpedo Tatler
Woman Worker
Woolwich Pioneer

(g) non-socialist periodicals

Garden City and Town Planning Magazine
Economist
Railway and Travel Monthly/Travel and Transport Monthly
Railway Gazette
Railway Magazine

(h) theses

Beckett I F W 'The English Rifle Volunteer Movement 1859-1908' PhD University of London 1974
Benjamin H W 'The London Irish: a study in political activism 1870-1910' PhD Princeton no date
Bland D E 'The role of the state in British economics from 1870-1914' M Litt University of Durham 1967
Brown V A 'Class relations in Erith 1889-1900' MA Thames Polytechnic 1986
Carr G 'Engineering workers and the rise of labour in Coventry 1914-1939' PhD University of Warwick 1978
Croucher R 'The ASE and local autonomy 1898-1914' MA University of Warwick
Davenport-Hines R P T 'The British armaments industry during disarmament 1918-36' PhD University of Cambridge 1979
Day R 'The motivation of some football club directors: an aspect of the social history of association football 1890-1914' MA University of Warwick 1976
Dyos H J 'The suburban development of Greater London south of the Thames 1836-1914' PhD University of London 1952
French D 'Some aspects of social and economic planning for war in GB c1905-1915' PhD University of London 1978
Gillespie J A 'Economic and political change in the East End of London during the 1920s' PhD University of Cambridge 1988
Hall D R 'A geographical study of social divisions in Portsmouth' PhD University of London 1978
Hickman G M 'the origins and changing functions of

settlement in South East London with special reference to the flood plain of the borough of Deptford' PhD University of London 1951

Hills A B 'The Progress Estate' University of London Diploma 1972

Hinton, J S 'Rank and file militancy in the British engineering industry 1914-18' PhD University of London 1969

Howard C J 'Henderson, MacDonald and the leadership in the Labour Party 1914-22' PhD University of Cambridge 1978

Hunter I G 'Working class representatives on elective local authorities on Tyneside 1883-1921' M Litt University of Newcastle 1978

Hyman R 'The Workers Union 1898-1929' D Phil University of Oxford 1968

Jackson J A 'The Irish in London - a study in migration and settlement in the past 100 years' MA University of London 1958

Jones D T 'The Well Hall estate, Eltham London SE9. How successful were the solutions to the functional, social and aesthetic problems faced by the designers of the Well Hall estate?' Open University undergraduate project 1975. Copy in Local History Library, Greenwich

Jordan J R 'Homes for heroes: housing problems at the end of the First World War, with special reference to the work of the Ministry of Reconstruction and the years 1914-1925' MA University of Kent 1971

Laxton J D 'The making of a Labour victory: Woolwich in the years up to 1903' BA Thames Polytechnic 1975

Lowe R 'The demand for a Ministry of Labour, its establishment and initial role 1916-24' PhD University of London 1975

McEwan J M 'Unionist and Conservative MPs 1914-39' PhD University of London 1959

McGuire P J 'Unofficial trade union movements and industrial politics 1915-22' D Phil University of Sussex 1978

McLeod D H 'Membership and influence of the churches in Metropolitan London 1885-1914' PhD University of Cambridge 1971

Mason D 'Football - an aspect of the politics of working-class leisure, 1888-1914' MA Thames Polytechnic 1979

Morgan J 'The political career of Christopher, Viscount Addison (1869-1951)' University of Leicester PhD 1979

Morrison N J 'Official responses to industrial unrest in postwar Britain 1919-21' PhD University of Wales 1986

Newman N 'The role of the Treasury in the formation of British economic policy 1918-25' Durham University PhD 1972

Pribicevic B 'Demands for workers' control in the railway, mining and engineering industries 1910-22' Oxford University D Phil 1957

Rolfe E 'The growth of south east London 1836-1914 with special reference to the development of communications' PhD University of London Vol I & II

Southall H R 'Regional unemployment patterns in Britain,

1851-1914: a study of the "Trade Union Percentages of Unemployment" with special reference to engineering workers' PhD University of Cambridge 1983

Stark D 'The origins and development of a single-industry town: Barrow-in-Furness 1890-1910' MA University of Lancaster 1972

Thom D 'The ideology of women's work, 1914-20' PhD Thames Polytechnic 1982

Thom D 'Women munition workers at Woolwich Arsenal in the 1914-18 war' MA University of Warwick 1975

Todd N 'A history of labour in Lancaster and Barrow-in-Furness c1890-1920' M Litt University of Lancaster

Waites B A 'The effect of the First World War on aspects of the class structure of English society' PhD Open University 1983

Waters M J 'A social history of the Chatham Dockyard workforce 1860-1906' PhD University of Essex 1979

Waugh M 'Suburban growth in North West Kent 1861-1961' PhD University of London 1968

Weekes B M 'The ASE 1880-1914' PhD University of Warwick 1970

(i) articles

Abrams P 'The failure of social reform 1918-20' Past and Present 24 1963 pp43-64

Adams 'Lloyd George and the labour movement' Past and Present 3 1953

Alexander S 'Women, class and sexual difference' History Workshop Journal 17 1984 pp125-49

Ames E and Rosenberg N 'Enfield Arsenal in theory and history' Economic Journal 78 1968 pp827-42

Ashworth W 'Economic aspects of the late Victorian naval administration' EcHR 22 No 3 1969 pp491-505

Attfield J 'Education for social change' BSSLH 43 1981 pp5-6

Barnett A 'Iron Britannia' NLR 134 1982 pp5-96

Beaufoy S L G 'Well Hall estate, Eltham' Town Planning Review 1950 pp259-71

Benenson H 'Victorian sexual ideology' International labor and working class history 25 1984 pp1-23

Beveridge W H 'The Unemployed Workman's Act 1906-07' Sociological Review I 1908 pp79-83

Branca P 'A new perspective in women's work: a comparative typology' Journal of Social History 9 1975 pp129-53

Briggs E and Deacon A 'The creation of the Unemployment Assistance Board' Policy and Politics 2 1 1973 pp43-62

Brown K D 'Conflict in early British welfare policy: the case of the Unemployed Workmen's Bill of 1905' Journal of Modern History 43 1971 pp615-629

Brown K D 'Nonconformity and the British labour movement: a case study' Journal of Social History 8 1975 pp113-8

Cain P J 'Railway combination and the government 1900-1914' EcHR 25 4 1972

Chamberlain C 'The growth of support for the Labour party

in Britain' British Journal of Sociology 24 1973 pp474-89

Clarke P F 'review' English History Review 1974 pp157-63

Clarke P F 'The electoral position of the Liberal and Labour Parties 1910-14' English History Review 40 1975 pp828-837

Cockburn C 'The material of male power' Feminist Review 9 1981 pp41-58

Cronin 'The British state and the structure of political opportunity' Journal of British Studies 27 3 1988 pp199-231

Davidson R 'The myth of the servile state' BSSLH 62 1984 pp62-7

Demaris R 'Lloyd George and the development of the government's strike breaking organisation' IRSH 20 1 1975 pp1-15

Dickie M 'Thesis report' BSSLH 53 1988 p36

Dintenfass M 'Politics in industrial society' BSSLH 41 1980 pp63-5

Dove I 'Women suffrage and the Woolwich Labour Party' South London Record 1 1985 pp24-32

Englander D and Osbourne J 'Jack Tommy and Henry Dubb: the armed forces and the working class' HJ 21 3 1978 pp593-621

Eversley D E C 'The Great Western Railway and the Swindon Works in the Great Depression' University of Birmingham Historical Journal 5 3 1957

Ferris J 'Treasury control, the Ten Year Rule and British Service policies, 1919-24' Historical Journal 30 4 1987 pp859-883

Filby 'The newmarket racing lad: tradition and change in a marginal occupation' Work employment and society 1 1987 pp205-224

Foster J 'The state and the ruling class during the General Strike' Marxism Today May 1976 pp137-48

Foster J 'How imperial London preserved its slums' International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 10 3 1979 pp93-114

Garside W R 'The failure of the radical alternative: public works, deficit financed and British interwar unemployment' Journal of European Economic History 3 1985 pp537-555

George K D, McNabb R and Shorey J 'The size of the work unit and labour market behaviour' British Journal of Industrial Relations 14 pp249-67

Gerber L G 'Corporatism in comparative perspective: the impact of the First World War on American and British labor relations' Business History Review 62 1 1988 pp93-127

Gilbert B B 'The reappearance of twentieth century history' Journal of British Studies Vol 27 No 4 1988 pp429-38

Greenaway J R p131 'Warren Fisher and the transformation of the British Treasury 1919-39' Journal of British Studies 23 1 1983 pp125-142

Haas J M 'Trouble at the workplace: industrial relations in the Royal Dockyards, 1889-1914' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 58 138 1985 pp210-25

Hamilton D and Sowan B 'London Small Arms Company, Gunmakers Lane E3. Part of an interview with mr J F

Banyard, recorded and transcribed by Denis Smith' London Industrial Archaeology 2 1980 pp42-46

Hamilton H P 'Sir Warren Fisher and the Public Service' Public Administration 29, 1951 pp3-38

Hancock K J 'The reduction of unemployment as a problem of public policy, 1920-29' EcHR 15 1962-3 p328-43

Hannah L 'Managerial innovation and the rise of the large-scale company in interwar Britain' EcHR 27 1974 pp252-70

Hay D 'The Official History of the Ministry of Munitions 1915-19' EcHR 14 1944 p185-90

Hayburn R 'The National Unemployed Workers Movement 1921-36; a reappraisal' IRSH 28 3 pp279-295

Henderson A p36 'The industrial unrest: a new policy required' Contemporary Review 115 1919

Hinton J 'The beginning of modern British politics' BSSLH 24 1972 p60-66

Hinton J 'Disconnecting socialist aspirations from class consciousness' BSSLH 51 pp38-9

Hinton J 'The labour aristocracy' NLR 32 p72-7

Hinton J 'The revolutionary movement in Britain' BSSLH 19 1969 pp42-9

Hinton J 'rejoinder to Monds' NLR 97 1976 pp100-104

Hinton J 'Self help and socialism, the squatters movement of 1946' History Workshop Journal 25 1988 pp100-26

Hobsbawm E J 'Labour in the Great City' NLR 166 1988 pp39-51

Hobsbawm E J 'General Labour Unions in Britain 1889-1914' EcHR I 1948-9 p123-142

Hopkins D 'The membership of the Independent Labour Party: a spatial and occupational analysis' IRSH 20 1975 pp175-97

Howkins A 'Edwardian Liberalism and industrial unrest' History Workshop Journal 4 1977 pp143-61

Holton R J 'Daily Herald v Daily Citizen 1912-15, the struggle for a Labour Daily in relation to "the labour unrest"' IRSH 19 1974 pp347-76

Irving R J 'New Industries for old? Some investment decisions of Sir W G Armstrong, Whitworth and Co ltd 1900-1914' Business History 17 2 1973 pp150-75

Jackson A A 'The great government locomotive sales of 1919-27' Railway World 47 555 1986 pp408-11

Jevons H S 'The causes of unemployment part II' Contemporary Review July 1909

Keith-Lucas B 'Poplarism' Public Law 1962 pp52-80

Kirby M W 'Product proliferation in the British locomotive building industry 1850-1914: an engineers's paradise?' Business History 30 3 1988 pp287-305

Korr C P 'West Ham United and the beginnings of professional football in East London 1895-1914' Journal of Contemporary History 13 1978 p211-32

Lowe R 'corporate bias' SSRC Newsletter 50 11/83 pp17-18

Lowe R 'Welfare Legislation and the unions during and after the First World War' HJ 25 2 1982 pp437-441

Lowe R 'Bureaucracy triumphant or denied? The expansion of the British civil service, 1919-39' Public Administration

Vol 62 1984 pp291-310

Lowe R 'The Ministry of Labour: fact and fiction' BSSLH 41 1980 pp23-7

Lowe R 'The erosion of state intervention in Britain 1917-24' EcHR 31 1978 pp270-286

Lyne R M 'The military railways of Kent Part I' Journal of the Railway and Canal Historical Society 24 4 03/82 pp69-73

Lyne R M 'The military railways of Kent Part II' Journal of the Railway and Canal Historical Society 24 5 07/82 pp110-20

Lyne R M 'The military railways of Kent Part III' Journal of the Railway and Canal Historical Society 24 6 11/82 pp167-70

McCloskey D N and Sandberg L 'From Damnation to Redemption: judgements on the late Victorian entrepreneur' Explorations in Economic History 1971 pp89-108

Maguire M 'Work, locality and social control' Work, employment and society 2 1 1988 pp71-87

Macintyre S 'Socialism, the unions and the Labour Party after 1918' BSSLH 32 1975 pp101-111

McIvor A 'A crusade for capitalism: the Economic League 1919-39' Journal of Contemporary History 23 4 October 1988 pp631-55

McKenna F 'Victorian railway workers' History Workshop Journal 1 1976 pp26-73

McKibbin R 'Arthur Henderson as Labour leader' IRSH 23 1 1978

McKibbin R 'Why was there no Marxism in GB?' English History Review 1984 pp297-331

McKibbin R 'Labour and politics in the Great War' BSSLH 34 1977 p3-4

McKinlay A and Zeitlin J 'The meanings of managerial prerogative: industrial relations and the organisation of work in British engineering, 1880-1939', Business History 31 1989 pp32-47

Marginson P M 'The distinctive effects of plant and company size on workplace industrial relations' British Journal of Industrial Relations 22 1984 pp1-14

Marriner S 'Cash and concrete, liquidity problems in the mass production of homes for heroes' Business History July 1976 18 2 pp152-89

Marriner S 'Sir Alfred Mond's Octopus: a nationalised house building business' Business History 21 1 1979 pp23-44

Marriner S 'The Ministry of Munitions 1915-19 and government accounting procedures' Accounting and Business Research 10 37a 1980 pp130-42

Meacham S 'The sense of impending clash', English working class unrest before the First World War' American Historical Review 77 1972 pp1343-1364

Melling J 'Non commissioned officers': British employers and their supervisory workers 1880-1920' Social History 5 2 1980 pp183-223

Melling J 'Employers, industrial housing and the evolution of company welfare policies in Britain's heavy industry:

West Scotland 1970-1920 International Review of Social History 26 1981 pp255-301

Message F 'Sir William Anderson 1854-1898; a forgotten engineer of Erith and Woolwich' Woolwich and District Antiquarian Society Proceedings Vol 35 1976 pp11-17

Middleton R 'The Treasury and public investment: a perspective on interwar economic management' Public Administration 61 1983 pp351-70

Monds J 'Workers control and the historians: a new economism' New Left Review 97 1976 pp81-100

Norris G M 'Industrial paternalist capitalism and local labour markets' Sociology 12 pp469-490

Nottingham C 'Recasting bourgeois Britain? The British state in the years which followed the First World War' IRSH 31 1986 pp227-47

Olcott T 'Dead in the centre; the women's trade union movement in London 1874-1914' London Journal 2 1 1976 pp 33-50

Parkin F 'Working class Conservatives: a theory of political deviance' British Journal of Sociology 18 3 1967 pp278-90

Payne P L 'The emergence of the large scale company in GB 1870-1914' EcHR 20 1967

Peden G C 'Sir Warren Fisher and British rearmament against Germany' English History Review 44 1979 pp29-32

Peden G C 'The Treasury as the central department of government 1919-39' Public Administration Vol 61 1983 pp371-85

Peden G C 'The 'Treasury View' on public works and employment in the interwar period' EcHR 37 2 pp167-181

Petter M 'The Progressive Alliance' History 58 1973 pp45-59

Phillips A and Taylor B 'sex and skill: notes towards a feminist economics' Feminist Review 6 1980

Pollard S 'The decline of shipbuilding on the Thames' EcHR 3 1953

Reid D 'The Third Republic as manager: labour policy in the Naval Shipyards 1892-1920' IRSH 30 1985 pp183-206

Rodger R 'Political economy, ideology and the persistence of working class housing problems in Britain 1850-1914' International Review of Social History 32 2 1987 pp109-143

Rodgers T 'Sir Allan Smith, the industrial group and the politics of unemployment 1919-24' Business History 28 1 1986 pp100-23

Robertson A J 'British rearmament and industrial growth 1935-39' Research in Economic History 8 pp279-98

Rose S O 'Gender at work': sex class and industrial capitalism' History Workshop Journal 21 1986 pp113-31

Rose S O 'Gender antagonism and class conflict: exclusionary strategies of male trade unionists in 19th century Britain' Social History 13, 2 1988 pp191-208

Rubin G R 'the origins of industrial tribunals' Industrial Law Journal 6 1977

Rubin G R 'Law as a bargaining weapon: British labour and the restoration of Pre-war Practices Act 1919' Historical

Journal 32 4 1987

Schwarz B 'Conservatism and corporatism' NLR 1988 pp107-128

Schiechen J A 'State reform and the local economy; an aspect of industrialisation in late Victorian and early Edwardian London' EcHR 28 3 1975

Slater G 'Co-operators, the state and the housing question' February 1901 Contemporary Review pp254-263

Smith J 'Labour tradition in Glasgow and Liverpool' History Workshop Journal 17 1984 pp32-56

Swenaton M and Taylor S 'The scale and nature of the growth of owner-occupation in Britain between the wars' EcHR 38 1985 pp373-92

Tawney R H 'The abolition of economic controls 1918-1921' EcHR 8 1943 pp1-30

Thom D 'Women workers at the Woolwich Arsenal' Oral History

Trebilcock C 'British armaments and European industrialisation, 1890-1914' EcHR 26 1973 pp254-72

Trebilcock C pp10-11 'Legends of the British armaments industry 1890-1914: a revision' Journal of Contemporary History 5 4 1970 pp3-19

Trebilcock C '"Spin off" in British economic history; armaments and history 1760-1914' EcHR 22 1969

Trebilcock C 'rejoinder' EcHR 24 1971 pp464-6

Trebilcock C p366 '"A Special Relationship" government rearmament and the cordite firms' EcHR 1966

Trimble W F 'The Naval Aircraft Factory, the American aviation industry and government competition 1919-1928' Business History Review 60 2 1986 pp175-198

Walby S 'Theorising patriarchy' Sociology 23 2 1989 pp213-34

Wald K D 'Advance by retreat? The formation of British Labour's electoral strategy, Journal of British Studies 27 3 July 1988 pp283-314

Waters M 'Craft consciousness in a government enterprise: Medway Dockyardmen 1860-1906' Oral History 5

Wheeler R F 'Organised sport and organised labour, the Workers Sports Movement' Journal of Contemporary History 13 1978 pp191-210

White S 'Ideological hegemony and political control: the sociology of anti-Bolshevism in Britain 1918-20' Scottish Labour History Journal 9 1975

Whiteside N 'Industrial labour and welfare legislation after the First World War, a reply' HJ 25 2 pp443-446

Whiteside N 'Industrial welfare and labour regulation in Britain at the time of the First World War' IRSH 25 1980 pp307-331

Whiteside N 'Welfare insurance and casual labour: a study of administrative intervention in industrial employment, 1906-26' EcHR 32 4 1979 pp507-522

Whiteside N 'Welfare legislation and the unions during the First World War' HJ 23 4 1980 pp857-74

Yeo S 'A new life: the Religion of Socialism in Britain 1883-1896' History Workshop Journal 4 1977 pp5-56

Zeitlin J 'Craft control and the division of labour:

engineers and composers in Britain 1890-1930' Cambridge Journal of Economics 1979 pp263-74
 Zeitlin J 'Industrial relations and the state in Britain 1914-39' BSSLH 53 Part 1 1988 pp51-6

(j) books and pamphlets

Addison C Four and a half years a personal diary from June 1914 to January 1919 Volumes II 1934

Addison C Politics from within Vol I & II 1924

Aldcroft D H The interwar economy Britain 1919-39 1970

Alderman G The railway interest Leicester 1973

Armitage S The politics of decontrol of industry, Britain and the US 1969

Armstrong G (ed) London's struggle for socialism 1848-1948 1948

Arnstein W L Britain Yesterday and Today 1830 to the present D C Heath Lexington Mass 1976

Attfield J With light of knowledge: a hundred years of education in the RACS, 1877-1977 1981

Bacon R From 1900 Onwards 1940

Baker C The metropolitan railway South Godstone 1951

Barefoot W Twenty-five years history of the WLP 1903-28 1928

Barrow L 'Determinism and environmentalism in socialist thought' in Samuel R and Jones G S (eds) Culture ideology and politics, essays for Eric Hobsbawm 1982 pp194-213

Bauman Z Between class and elite, the evolution of the British labour movement. A sociological study 1st edition 1960 trans Patterson S Manchester 1972

Bealey F & Pelling H Labour and politics 1900-1906, a history of the Labour Representation Committee 1958

Beckett I F W Riflemen form; a study of the Rifle Volunteer Movement 1859-1908 Aldershot 1982

Beloff M 'The Whitehall factor: the role of the higher civil service 1919-39' in Peele G and Cook C (eds) The politics of reappraisal 1975

Beloff M Wars and warfare, Britain 1914-45 1984

Bentley M 'The liberal response to socialism 1918-29' in Brown K (ed) Essays in anti-labour history responses to the rise of labour in Britain 1974 pp42-73

Bentwich H If I forget thee, some chapters of autobiography 1912-29 1973

Benyon H Working for Ford 1975

Blewitt N The peers the parties and the people, the General Elections of 1910 1972

Bond B British military policy between the two world wars Oxford 1980

Bond B and Roy I (eds) War and society: a yearbook of military history II 1977

Booth C Life and Labour of the People of London Third series No 5 1902

Boston S Women workers and trade unions 2nd edition 1987

Braybon G Women workers in the First World War 1981

Braybon G and Summerfield P Out of the cage; women's

experiences in two world wars 1987
Brooks C An educational adventure, a history of Woolwich Polytechnic 1955
Brooks C The first hundred years of the Woolwich Equitable Building Society 1947
Bullock A The life and times of E Bevin 1960
Burk K 'The Treasury; from impotence to power' in Burk K (ed) War and the state: the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 pp84-107
Burke T The outer circle, rambles in remote London 1921
Bush J Behind the lines, East London labour 1914-19 1984
Caine H Our girls. Their work for the war 1917
Campbell C 'The making of a Clydeside working class, shipbuilding and working-class organisation in Govan' Our History Pamphlet 78 1986
Carsten F L Revolution in Central Europe 1972
Carter H The control of the Drink Trade in Britain, a contribution to national efficiency during the Great War 1915-1918 1st edition 1918, 1919 edition
Clarke J 'Capital and culture: the post war working class revisited' in Clarke J Critcher C and Johnson R (eds) Working class culture, studies in history and theory 1979
Clarke P F Lancashire and the New Liberalism Cambridge 1971
Clayton F S John Wilson of Woolwich, a Baptist Pastorate of fifty years 1927
Cline P K 'Eric Geddes and the "experiment" with businessmen in government 1915-22' in Brown K O (ed) Essays in anti-labour history: responses to the rise of labour in Britain 1974 pp74-103
Cline P K 'Winding down the war economy: British plans for peacetime recovery 1916-19' in Burk K (ed) War and the state, the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 p157-81
Clinton A The trade union rank and file, Trades Councils in Britain 1900-40 Manchester 1977
Coates K and Topham A Industrial democracy in GB: a book of readings and witnesses for workers' control 1968
Cole G D H A century of co-operation Manchester 1944 p371
Cole G D H A history of the Labour Party from 1914 1948
Cole G D H Trade unions and munitions Oxford 1923
Cole G D H Workshop organisation 1st edition 1923 1973 edition
Cole J A The view from the peak 1979
Cole M I (ed) Beatrice Webb's Diaries 1912-24 1952
Connolly J Old days and ways 1912
Cook C The age of alignment, electoral politics in Britain 1922-29 1975
Cowling M The impact of Labour 1920-24 Cambridge 1971
Crompton L Shaw the dramatist 1971
Cronin J E 'Coping with labour 1918-26' in Cronin J E and Schneer J Social conflict and the political order in modern Britain 1982
Crossick G An artisan elite in Victorian society, Kentish

London 1840-1880 1978
Cunningham H The Volunteer Force, a social and political history 1859-1908 1975
Dallas G and Gill D The unknown army, mutinies in the British army in WWI 1985
Dangerfield G The strange death of liberal England 1935 1984 edition
Davidson R Whitehall and the labour problem in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain 1985
Davidson R and Lowe R 'Bureaucracy and innovation in British welfare policy 1870-1945' in Mommsen W J The emergence of the welfare state in Britain and Germany 1850-1950 1981 pp263-295
Davies A The case for nationalisation 1920
Davies E The case for railway nationalisation 1913
Dendy Marshall C F and Kidner R R W A history of SR revised edition 1973
Donoghue B and Jones Herbert Morrison: portrait of a politician 1973
Dove I Yours in the cause, suffragettes in Lewisham, Greenwich and Woolwich 1988
Drake B Women in Trade Unions reprinted Virago 1984
Drucker H M Doctrine and ethos in the Labour Party 1979
Durham M and Schwarz B 'Constitutionalism and extra-Parliamentary action: socialism and the definition of politics 1910-20' Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham SP75 1984
Duval V D Why I went to prison 1910
Englander D Landlord and tenant in urban Britain 1838-1918 1983
Fay C R Life and labour in the nineteenth century Cambridge 1st edition 1920 1943 edition
Foster J 'British imperialism and the labour aristocracy' in Skelley J (ed) The General Strike 1926 1976 pp3-57
Foxwell A K Munition lasses 1917
Fraser H Women and war work 1918
Fraser P 'The impact of the war of 1914-18 on the British political system' in Foot M R D (ed) War and society, historical essays in memory of J R Western 1928-71 1973 pp123-39
French D 'The rise and fall of 'business as usual' in Burk K (ed) War and the state: the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 pp7-3
Frow R and Frow E Engineering struggles, episodes in the story of the shop stewards' movement Manchester 1982
Furse K Hearts and Pomegranates: the story of 45 years 1875-1920 1940
Giddens A The class structure of the advanced societies 1973
Gilbert B B British social policy, 1914-39 1970
Gilbert B B David Lloyd George a political life, the architect of change 1863-1912 Columbus Ohio 1987
Gittings D Fair Sex, family size and structure 1900-39 1982

Glanville B Arsenal Football Club 1952

Gleason A What the workers want 1921

Goodrich C The frontier of control 1st edition 1920 1975 edition

Gore E The better fight, the story of Dame Lilian Barker 1965

Green R & Wilson A 'Economic planning and workers control' in Eve M & Musson D Socialist Register, 1982 p21-26

Greenleaf W H The British Political Tradition Vol I 1983

Grinling C Fifty years of pioneer work in Woolwich 1922

Grinling C 'Fifty years of pioneer work in Woolwich' in Davis W T and Neville W B (eds) The history of the RACS 1922

Halevy E The era of tyrannies 1st edition Paris 1938, 1960 edition

Hall S 'The rise of the representative/interventionalist state 1880s-1920s' in McLennan G, Held D and Hall S (eds) State and society in contemporary Britain, a critical introduction 1984 pp7-49

Hall S and Schwarz B p29 'State and society 1880-1930' in Schwarz B and Langan M (eds) Crises in the British state 1880-1930 pp7-32

Halsey A H (ed) Trends in British society since 1900 1972

Hamilton M A Mary Macarthur, a biographical sketch 1925

Hamilton P Three years or the duration, the memoirs of a munitions worker 1914-18 1978

Hamilton Ellis C Twenty locomotive men 1958

Hannington W Unemployed struggles 1919-36. My life and struggles amongst the unemployed 1st edition 1936 1977 edition

Harris J 'Bureaucrats and businessmen in British food control 1916-19' pp135-56 in Burk K (ed) War and the state: the transformation of British government 1914-19 1982 pp84-107

Hartmann H 'Capitalism, patriarchy and job segregation by sex' in Blaxell M and Regan B (eds) Women and the workplace Chicago 1976 pp137-70

Haw G Christianity and the working classes 1906

Hay J R The development of the British welfare state 1880-1975 1978

Hinton J S The first shop stewards movement 1973

Hoare Q and Nowell Smith G (eds & trans) Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci 1971

Hobsbawm E J 'custom, wages and work load in 19th century industry' in Labouring Men 1964 pp344-70

Hobsbawm E J The forward march of labour halted 1981

Hobsbawm E J 'The nineteenth century London labour market' in Centre for Urban Studies (eds) London, aspects of change 1964 pp2-28

Hogg O F G The Royal Arsenal, its background, origin and subsequent history Volume II Oxford 1963

Hoggart R The uses of literacy 1957

Holton B British syndicalism 1910-14 1976

Horsley J W I remember: memories of a 'sky pilot' in the

prison and the slum 1911

Howard C 'Expectations born to death: local Labour party expansion in the 1920s' in Winter J (ed) The working class in modern British history, essays in honour of Henry Pelling Cambridge 1983 pp65-81

Howell D British workers and the Independent Labour Party 1888-1906 Manchester 1983

Hurwitz S J State intervention in Great Britain. A study of economic control and social response, 1914-1919 1st edition 1949 1968

Hyman R The Workers Union 1970

Inglis K S Churches and the working class in Victorian England Toronto 1963

Jackson A A London's Metropolitan Railway 1986

Jackson A A Semi-detached London, suburban development, life and transport, 1900-29 1973

Jefferson E F E The Woolwich story 1890-1965 1970

Jeffreys K and Hennessey State of emergency; British governments and strikebreaking since 1919 1983

Jeffreys J B The story of the engineers 1945

Job C London's Arsenal 1945

Johnson P B Land fit for heroes, the planning of British reconstruction 1916-1919 Chicago 1968

Jones G S Outcast London a study in the relationship between the classes in Victorian society 1st edition 1971 1984 edition

Jones G S and Samuel R 'The Labour Party and social democracy' in Samuel R and Jones G S Culture ideology and politics, essays for Eric Hobsbawm 1982 pp320-9

Joy B Forward, Arsenal! A history of the Arsenal Football Club written with its approval and co-operation 1954

Joyce P Work society and politics: the culture of the factory in later Victorian England Brighton 1980

Keegan J The face of battle 1976

Kelly's Woolwich Plumstead Eltham Shooter's Hill and Charlton Directory 1920

Kelly's Woolwich Plumstead Eltham Shooter's Hill and Charlton Directory 1907

Kennett J The Eltham Hutments 1985

Keynes J M Economic consequences of the peace 1920

The Labour Party Labour Speakers Handbook 1929 1929

Labour Research Department Labour and capital in the engineering trades 1922

Lansbury G My life 1928

Leslie R F (ed) The history of Poland since 1863 Cambridge 1987

Littler C The development of the labour process in capitalist societies 1982

Llewelyn Smith New survey of London life and labour vol II London industries I 1932

Lloyd E M H Experiments in state control 1924

Lloyd George D War Memoirs 1936

Locke M Traditions and controls in the making of a polytechnic, Woolwich Polytechnic 1890-1970 1978

London County Council London Statistics 1900-25 Vol 23
Lord Riddell's intimate diary of the Peace Conference and
After 1933
McHugh P Prostitution and Victorian social reform 1980
Macintyre S A proletarian science, Marxism in Britain
1917-33 1986
McKibbin R The evolution of the Labour Party 1910-24
Oxford 1974
McLean I The legend of the Red Clyde Edinburgh 1983
McLeod H Class and religion in the late Victorian city
1974
Maier C S Recasting bourgeois Europe: stabilisation in
France, Germany and Italy after World War I Princetown 1975
Major J B Erith and neighbourhood Erith 1901
Marder A J British Naval policy 1880-1905 1941
Marder A J From Dreadnought to Scapa Flow The Royal Navy
in the Fisher Era 1904-1919 Vol I The road to war 1904-1914
Oxford 1961
Marquand D Ramsay MacDonald 1977
Marshall J A A biographical dictionary of railway
engineers 1988
Marshall J D Furness and the Industrial Revolution Barrow
1958
Marwick A The deluge British society and the First World
War 1st edition 1965 1967 edition
Mason A Association football and English society 1863-1915
Brighton 1980
Marx K Capital Volume I 1938
Massey D Spatial divisions of labour, social structures
and the geography of production 1984
Masterman C F G 'The problem of south London' in Mudie-
Smith R The religious life of London 1904
Mayer A J The persistence of the old regime 1981
Middlemas R K Politics in industrial society, the
experience of the British system since 1911 1979
Middlemas R K (ed) Thomas Jones' Whitehall Diaries Vol I
Oxford 1969
Mitchell B R and Deane P Abstract of British historical
statistics Cambridge 1962
Moggeridge D E W The return to gold 1925 Cambridge 1969
Mond A Industry and Politics 1927
More C Skill and the English working class 1870-1914
Money L C The triumph of nationalisation 1920
Morgan E V Studies in British financial policy 1914-25
1952
Morgan K O Consensus and disunity: the Lloyd George
coalition government 1918-22 1979
Morgan K O 'The New Liberalism and the challenge of
Labour' in Brown K Essays in anti-labour history, responses
to the rise of labour in Britain 1974
Mudie-Smith R (ed) The religious life of London 1904
Mullally F and Brockway F Death pays a dividend 1944
Murphy J T Preparing for power 1st edition 1934 1972
reprint

Murray G War or Peace? 1923
Nairn T 'The English working class' in Blackburn R (ed)
Ideology in social sciences 1972
Newbold J T How Europe armed for war 1916
Newton D J British Labour European Socialism and the
struggle for peace 1889-1914 Oxford 1985
Noel Baker, P The private manufacture of arms Vol I London
1936
Official History of the Ministry of Munitions 8 volumes
1920-24
Orbach L F Homes for heroes, a study of the evolution of
British public housing 1915-21 1977
Orton W Labour in transition 1921
Parkin F 'social stratification' in Bottomore T and Nesbit
R (eds) A history of sociological analysis 1979 pp599-632
Peden G 'arms, government and businessmen 1935-45' in
Turner J (ed) Business men and politics studies of business
activity in British, politics 1900-45 1984
Pelling H A history of British trade unionism 1963
Pelling H Social geography of British elections 1883-1911
1967
Perris G H The War Traders 1914
Pethick Lawrence F Fate has been kind 1942
Pierson S British socialism: the journey from fantasy to
politics Cambridge Mass 1979
Pollard S The development of the British economy 1914-67
1969 edition
Pollitt H Dynamite in the Dock 1935
Pollitt H A war was stopped! 1920?
Porter B Critics of Empire: British radical attitudes to
colonialism in Africa 1895-1914 N Y 1968
Postan M M British War Production 1952
Postgate R Life of George Lansbury 1951
Price R An imperial war and the British working class:
working class attitudes and reactions to the Boer War 1899-
1902 1972
Price R Labour in British society, an interpretative
history 1986
Raine G E The nationalisation peril revised ed 1920
Reader W J Imperial Chemical Industries, a history Vol I
1970
Reay W T The Specials, how they served London. The story
of the London Special Constabulary 1920
Reid A 'Trade unionism and the state in Britain during the
First World War' in Tolliday S and Zeitlin J (eds) Shop
floor bargaining and the state, historical and comparative
perspectives Cambridge 1985 pp46-74
Rochester Diocesan Society A short account of the
spiritual needs of the ten metropolitan boroughs comprised
in south London 1902
Roberts R The classic slum Harmondsworth 1971
Roberts S N The Kent Artillery Volunteers Lee Green 1951
Roseveare H The Treasury the evolution of a British
institution 1969

- Rowbotham S Friends of Alice Wheeldon 1986
- Rubin G R War, law and labour: the Munitions Acts, state regulation and the unions 1915-21 1987
- Sampson A The arms bazaar 1977 1978 edition
- Savage M The dynamics of working-class politics, the labour movement in Preston 1880-1940 Cambridge 1987
- Schwarz B 'The corporate economy, 1890-1929' in Schwarz B and Langan M (eds) Crises in the British state 1880-1930 pp80-103
- Schwarz B and Durham M 'A safe and sane labourism': socialism and the state, 1910-24' in Langan M and Schwarz B Crises in the British state 1880-1930 1985 pp126-50
- Segal L Slow motion, changing masculinities changing men 1990
- Seldes G Iron, blood and profits, New York 1934
- Shaw G B 'Major Barbara' 1905 Act I p462 in Shaw G B The complete plays 1934
- Sheperd E C The fixing of wages in government employment 1923
- Sked A and Cook C (eds) Crisis and controversy; essays in honour of A J P Taylor 1976
- Skidelsky R 'Keynes and the Treasury view: the case for and against an active unemployment policy 1920-39' in Mommsen W J The emergence of the welfare state in Britain & Germany 1850-1950 1981 pp67-89
- Slater G War and Peace 1906 p66-69
- Slater G 'Unemployment in Woolwich' in Astor A et al The third Winter of unemployment, the report of an enquiry undertaken in the Autumn of 1922 1922 pp304-25
- Snell H Men movements and myself 1936
- 'Southeastern' The tramways of Woolwich and south east London 1963
- Stucke R B (ed) Fifty years of the Woolwich Labour Party 1903-1953 1953
- Suthers R B Mind your own business: the case for municipal housekeeping 1929
- Sutton D 'Liberalism, state collectivism and the social relations of citizenship' in Langan and Schwarz Crises in the British state 1880-1930 1985 pp63-79
- Swenarton M Homes fit for heroes, the politics and architecture of early state housing in Britain 1981
- Symons J Horatio Bottomley 1955
- Taylor A J P English History 1914-45 Oxford 1965
- Taylor I R 'Soccer consciousness and soccer hooliganism' in Cohen S (ed) Images of deviance Harmondsworth 1971 pp124-64
- Thom D and Ineson A 'TNT poisoning and the employment of women workers in the First World War' in Weindling P The social history of occupational health 1985 pp89-107
- Thompson E P The making of the English working class Harmondsworth 1963
- Thompson E P 'Homage to Tom Maguire' in Briggs A and Saville J Essays in labour history 1967
- Thompson P The Edwardians the remaking of British society

1st edition 1975 1984 edition

Thompson P Socialists, Liberals and Labour: the struggle for London 1885-1914 1967

Thomson B Queer People 1922

Thorne J Handbook to the environs of London containing an account of every town and village and of all places of interest within a circle of twenty miles round London, 1st edition 1876 Bath 1970 edition

Trebilcock C 'Radicalism and the Armaments Trust' in Morris A J A (ed) Edwardian radicalism 1900-14 1974 pp180-201

Trebilcock C The Vickers brothers, armaments and enterprise 1854-1914 1977

Trebilcock C 'War and the failure of industrialisation: 1899 and 1914' in Winter J M (ed) War and economic development, essays in memory of David Joslin Cambridge University Press 1975 pp139-164

Turner J 'The politics of business' in Turner J Business men and politics studies of business activity in British, politics 1900-45 1984 pp1-19

Turner J 'The politics of 'organised business' in the First World War' in Turner J (ed) Business men and politics studies of business activity in British, politics 1900-45 1984 pp33-49

Wainwright H and Benyon H The workers' report on Vickers 1979

Wainwright H and Elliot D The Lucas plan, a new trade unionism in the making 1982

Waites A A class society at war: England 1914-18 Leamington Spa 1988

Ward D M The other battle, the history of BSA 1946

Watson W R Men and machines, an autobiography of an itinerant mechanic 1935

Webb B & Webb S Industrial democracy 1st edition 1902 1926 edition

Webb B and Webb S The decay of capitalist civilisation 1923

Whiteside N 'Public policy and port labour reform: the dock decasualisation issue, 1910-50' in Tolliday S and Zeitlin J (eds) Shop floor bargaining and the state, historical and comparative perspectives Cambridge 1985 pp75-107

Wigham The power to manage. a history of the Engineering Employers' Federation 1973

Williams M John Wilson of Woolwich, an apostle to the people 1937

Williams R The new labour outlook 1921

Williams W Full up and fed up. The worker's mind in crowded Britain N Y 1921

Williams W H Who's Who in Arms 1935

Willis P Learning to labour 1977

Winter J M Socialism and the challenge of war: ideas and politics in Britain 1912-18 1974

Wohl A S The eternal slum, housing and social policy in Victorian London 1977

Wohl A S The housing of the working class in London 1815-1914' in Chapman S D (ed) The history of working class housing: a symposium 1970 pp13-54
 Wolfe H Labour supply and regulation Oxford 1923 Woolwich Chamber of Commerce Diamond Jubilee Review 1889-1949 1949
 Woodhouse T Schofield S and Southend P in Dumas L J and Thee M Making peace possible 1990
 Wright M 'Treasury control 1854-1914' in Sutherland G (ed) Studies in the growth of nineteenth century government 1972 pp195-226
 Wrigley C A history of British industrial relations volume II 1914-39 Brighton 1986
 Yeo S 'Working class association, private capital, welfare and the state in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries' in Parry N Rustin M Satyamuri C Social work welfare and the state 1979 pp48-71
 Zeitlin J 'The labour strategies of British engineering employers 1890-1922' in Gospel H F and Littler C (eds) Managerial strategies and industrial relations 1983

THAMES POLYTECHNIC
 LIBRARY