

**Minutes of the Second Workshop of the Global Collaboratory on the History of Labour Relations 1500-2000
14 and 15 March 2008, WISO, Vienna**

Present: Heinz Berger (Vienna University), Alexander Bestria (WISO), Andrea Caracausi , Stefan Dormans (VKS), Sara Farris, Jacques van Gerwen , Karin Hofmeester (minutes) Jože Hudales (Ljubljana University) , Erdem Kabadayi , Gijs Kessler , Jan Kok, Andrea Komlosy (WISO), Angela Kühnen (Gerda Henkel Stiftung), Erika Kuipers , Marcel van der Linden , Jan Lucassen , David Mayer (WISO), Christine Moll-Murata , Shireen Moosvi , Luca Mocarrelli, Annemarie Steidl (WISO), Sigrid Wadauer (WISO), Hermann Zeitlhofer (WISO), Michael Zeuske

Session 1: 14 March, 10-12.30

After a welcome by Andrea Komlosy and an introduction to the research done at WISO, Karin Hofmeester thanks WISO for its hospitality and David Mayer in particular for his organizational work. Erika Kuipers and Michael Zeuske are introduced, just like Stefan Dormans, who , like Jan Kok, participates in the workshop as an 'observant' for the Virtual Knowledge Studio. For the newcomers and the guests from Vienna University (Hermann Zeitlhofer, Heinz Berger and Annemarie Steidl, Alexander Bestria , Sigrid Wadauer) and Jože Hudales from the University of Ljubljana Karin shortly summarizes the background and main goals of the Collaboratory.

She continues summing up the main goals of this workshop: to see where we stand; what data are gathered up until now; what work still needs to be done; if the database is working as it should; if our set of definitions of labour relations is workable etc.

Karin gives a short report of the progress of the project. It was presented at the SSHC in Chicago and the ESSHC in Lisbon and received very well on both conferences. Also important is the fact that an international advisory board that made a midterm review of the IISH, was very enthusiastic about the project.

Data gathering for Europe is going very well. During this workshop these data will be presented. Not present at the workshop but working very hard on the data for Spain is José Miguel Lana Berasain. A good thing is also that we have close contacts with the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, who are happy to co-operate with us. An overview of their project on the Occupational Structure of Britain 1379-1911 is circulated. (It is also posted on the collaboratory website: (see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

The data gathering for Asia is also going well, for India data will be presented by Shireen Moosvi and Tirthankar Roy (represented by Karin); data for China and Japan are gathered by Christine Moll Murata and data on Indonesia, gathered by Ulbe Bosma is on its way.

Karin expresses the hope that now Michael Zeuske is here, the data gathering process for Latin America will also get a boost.

A real problem is Africa. Michel Doormont who planned a separate workshop for Africanists has been too busy to effectuate his plans. Furthermore, Jan Pieter Smits has found another job, not related to Africa unfortunately, and will probably not be very active in the collaboratory. To solve these problems, the project leaders have decided to start organizing an Africanist workshop themselves, with the help of Ulbe Bosma. Consequently, Kwamina Panford, who has not sent in any data yet, will be invited for this separate workshop and not for this one.

After this short report of progress Karin shortly summarizes the program of the workshop.

After this introduction Michael Zeuske asks where seamen and slave traders should be positioned geographically in the database. Jan Lucassen suggests including them in the data on the country under whose colours the ships sail, though this rule might not be applicable to all areas. Marcel van der Linden suggests postponing further discussions regarding the content of the database to the afternoon session.

Jan Lucassen gives a presentation on the possibilities of the integration of Global Labour History and Global Economic History, which was one of the recommendations of the above mentioned international advisory board that reviewed the research policy of the IISH. For our specific project he points at five developments in Global Economic History which have links with our activities, i.e. the reconstruction and/or study of

1. National Accounts
2. Capital-, raw material-, and labour markets
3. Labour productivity
4. Income inequality
5. Institutional Economics

Ad 1 Jan remarks we could use the labour force estimates made in this project, concerning 2 he points at the usefulness of conference held in Utrecht in 2005 on the economic history of labour markets. Concerning point 3 he refers to data already gathered data on the labour productivity of sailors, weaver and spinners, on the analyses of human capital formation; the definition of skills and the role of apprenticeship systems of guilds. Point 4 refers to analyses made of income inequality between countries as well as within and point 5 to research already done on labour law, labour organisations (guilds, unions etc.) and their influence on labour productivity.

Apart from these projects/topics there are also tools from the Global Economic History field we should explore, such as the Global Economic History Network (GEHN) and already existing datasets such as the dataset from David Eltis on slave voyages (see: slavevoyages.org). Jan stresses the importance of co-operation and states that the time is right for big datasets. At

this point in time, standards should be set that should endure for at least the coming decennia. We should present our data on conferences such as the World Economic History Congress to be held in Utrecht in August 2009.

After Jan's presentation Gijs Kessler asks if we should not be 'speaking the same language' as the economic historians, to be able to use their data and to ensure that they can also use our data. Jan responds that if we want to communicate we should indeed speak their language but since we have something to offer to the economic historians, they should learn to use our data too.

Shireen Moosvi points at the necessity to use data on real wages and prices to be able to 'communicate' with economic historians and at the difficulties of using aggregate numbers on the one hand and exact samples of micro data on the other. Jan Lucassen responds that good datasets bridge the gap between aggregate and micro data, for example by showing the steps that are made to come from micro data to aggregate data.

After a short break Hermann Zeitlhofer presents an Overview of Historical Statistics of the Austrian part of the Habsburg Empire. (For his ppt presentation see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop). Hermann points at the economic diversity of the several regions (from highly industrialized to less developed). There are 'reliable', 'modern' censuses for the years 1857, 1869, 1880, 1890, 1900, 1910 (in Hungary: 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900, 1910). For the pre-statistical period there are not very reliable state-run statistics (Census 1754; military conscriptions, tax cadastres, etc) and the official *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie* (21 Bde., 1828-1853) that contains data on social status (nobility, etc.) but not on occupations or labour relations. There are few examples of useful data from the pre-statistical period: the non-state-run collected data (e.g. Vienna Database on European Family History, see <http://wirtges.univie.ac.at/famdat/>) and the Census of religious belief, made in Bohemia in 1651. This contains household listings which usually describes labour relations. A joined Czech-Austrian research project done in 1992-1999 made a data sample of 35.000 people from this dataset. Several publications are based on this sample. (See the ppt presentation for the titles). Hermann continues by pointing at the restrictions of the data of the Austrian censuses from 1857 onwards: variations in the scheme of occupations; no differentiation between main and additional jobs and no data on occupations for women and children (1857 and 1869).

Heinz Berger elaborates further on the Vienna Database on European Family History which also includes micro data on Italy for 1813 and 1906, including data on occupations. He also point at the work of Kevin Shurer for the UK. (See a short overview of the data presented at <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

Annemarie Steidl presents micro data derived from Viennese guild documents, containing data on masters, journeymen and apprentices; on migrations; apprenticeships etc. from butchers, chimney sweeps, silk weavers, purse makers and dress makers. (For her ppt presentation see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

Jože Hudales presents an overview of the historical demography of Slovenia.

After these presentations, Jan asks the presenters if we should revise our view on European labour relations if we take into consideration the specific labour relations in this area such as Gutsherrschaften linked to second serfdom, but also the totally different relations in the village communities in the Alps. According to the four presenters, one cannot draw such conclusions based on the data they have gathered, also the categorization Jan referred to seems to simplistic.

Session 2: 14 March, 14.00-17.30

Andrea Caracausi presents the data gathered and entered in the database for Italy for 1911 and 2001. Andrea and Luca Mocarrelli entered occupational data divided by age and gender; they were able to enter HISCO branch codes but encountered some difficulties with selecting HISO minor codes. They entered labour relation codes based on our Taxonomy but were not always able to differentiate between 13 (employers) and 14 (wage earners). Also the information needed to enter the subdivisions of 14 (piece rate/time-rate) were not given in the sources. The industrial censuses will enable them to differentiate between 13 and 14 and they will also enter these data. There is also an early 19th century census they will enter. (The data on Italy can be found at the website of the collaboratory see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then the folder Users and finally the folder of Andrea Caracausi).

Karin shortly presents the very preliminary but already impressive data gathered by José Miguel Lana Berasain (who could not come to the conference) on Spain, containing population data for 1787 for provinces, cities and villages, including data on occupation and labour relations. For 1797 he has entered population data divided per age group; gender; marital status and he has already made a preliminary overview of data for 1797 – 1900 and 2001. (The data on Spain can be found at the website of the collaboratory see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then the folder Users and finally the folder of José Miguel Lana Berasain).

Erdem Kabadayi explores the (im)possibilities of data gathering for the Ottoman Empire. He stresses he will restrict his research to the borders of today's Turkey. For 2006 the data is online available. The first census was held in 1843, which was based on households and set up for gathering income yielding assets for taxes. Proto-industry is missing in this census. Furthermore the data is not aggregated. It contains many volumes of original data, not yet published in any aggregate form.

For 1900 we can rely on censuses from 1893 or 1899 and 1905-06, however they do not give data on occupations. There is an industrial census from 1913/1915 but it only contains aggregated data on a limited number of industries in eight urban centers in West Anatolia.

In the discussion that follows after Erdem's presentation Jan suggests that Erdem could de-aggregate the data from the 1913/1915 industrial census for the eight urban centers from the 1843 census. Marcel suggests that instead of one estimation, one should enter a lower and upper limit. Karin states that there are minimum and maximum fields in the database. Erdem points at another helpful source: the report of the British foreign affairs (available at the Public Record Office) with data on wages and standard of living of textile workers in several countries. (For an overview of this report see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop. Here, you can also find the translated data from the 1913/1915 census).

A general discussion starts on what to do with people who work every now and then and people who work for co-operatives.

After a short break Sara Farris gives a presentation on Non-Western critics of essentialist ideas on labour. She focuses upon the most recent critiques and reception of Weber's Sociology of Religion in China, India and several Islamic countries (from the early nineties onwards). She concentrates on the reception that focuses upon work ethics and economic mentalities. After an analysis of most important critics, she concludes that especially in India, the ethnic and regional dimension is very important, it needs therefore to be carefully taken into account. Furthermore she stresses that juridical sources, labour laws and shifts in this field are crucial and have certainly to be considered. An attentive look at these sources in the case of Islam immediately showed the fallacies in Weber's discourse. Also reports from officials in the colonies seem to be a crucial source of information. And finally anthropological and sociological studies are also indispensable point of reference as in the case of caste and jati system or for the definition of Islamic Work ethic.

In view of these thoughts Sara has prepared a bibliography that mainly focuses upon these general geographical/cultural areas (South Asia, China and Islam) but it also contains several important references to more general and not specifically located studies that deal with the general framework of work and economic ethics. (For the full text of the presentation and

the bibliography see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

Christine Moll Murata gives a presentation on Western and Chinese perceptions of Max Weber's study on Confucianism and Daoism. Central question of Weber's work is if protestant ethics and the rise of capitalism are related in Europe, then why is there no indigenous capitalism in China, which has Confucianism, an ethic system with similarities to Protestantism („soberness“, „rationality“, but Weber claims that in other respects Confucianism is „traditional-irrational“). According to Weber China 'lacked' economic and commercial legislation; efficient and specialized bureaucracy; rational fiscal and monetary policies; independent citizenship (Bürgertum); independent guilds; a rational system of science and technology and capitalist enterprises. These assumptions were based on the contemporary Sinological studies available to Weber and have in the meantime been refuted or largely qualified by Western and Chinese scholarship. Recent points of contention are: Confucian ethics actually do lead to a kind of commercial ethics that foster commercial capitalism, which came to rise in the 16th century, but did not lead to an industrial capitalism. (For the ppt presentations see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

In the closing discussion Karin refers to the desiderata mentioned in the report of the first meeting: strict guidelines for data gathering and entering and an adapted taxonomy of labour relations. The first is established, the latter not yet completely. Some practical cases presented by Shireen Moosvi are solved, using the existing category. (People working for the bureaucracy and for the army are wage-earners for non-market institutions). Other questions/difficulties are: people who work only now and then (should we not differentiate a bit more in the category not-working) and people who work for co-operatives. Marcel states that people working for co-operatives can either work for wages, or be collectively self-employed. Adding more categories does not seem to be the answer to the problems. Jacques van Gerwen stresses the fact that we should look at the total labour force, adding another element to the taxonomy for a group which only forms a small part of the total labour force seems unproductive.

Gijs Kessler addresses a very fundamental issue: what is our definition of labour relations and what are the ordering principles behind the taxonomy? He discovered two ordering principles: the hierarchy of labour relations and the degree of commercialization. Marcel states there are in fact three ordering principles:

1. What is the hierarchy of labour relations?
2. What is the degree of commodification?
3. If people work for wages, how are they paid?

Erika Kuijpers suggests breaking up labour relation in several elements, so you can enter certain elements in the database without having to choose between strict definitions. Shireen suggests using two typologies, one for the pre 1800 period and one for the period after 1800. Gijs asks why the distinction between working for wages in the market and non-market sector has been made and why self-employed people should be entered in a taxonomy on labour relations. Karin and Marcel stress that the taxonomy is only a tool and that the main goal of the project is to find global shifts in labour relations. Therefore all data on the cross section 1500 to 2000 should be made compatible, we will not escape from a reductionist scheme, but we will make the ideas behind the taxonomy explicit.

Session 3: 15 March, 10-12.30

Jan starts summarizing the discussions of yesterday and gives an overview of the basic assumptions of the project. What we want to know is: what were the major shifts in labour relations worldwide in the period from 1500 to 2000 and how can we explain these shifts? Our research project is linked to the projects that analyse the relationship between labour relations and worldwide income inequality. The project leaders will produce a written text on our definition of labour relations, Jan starts with a kick off:

Labour relations are all human relations regarding work. We can discern three levels

1. On the decision level we have to see:
 - a. Who has to work or not
 - b. Those who have to work: what kind of work do they do?
 - c. How is labour divided between
 - i. Work within the household
 - ii. Work outside the household (=labour)
2. Second set of questions concerns: in exchange for which remuneration do people work?
3. If we look at work outside the household:
 - a. What is the work unit?
 - i. Do people work as individual or as a group?
 - ii. If they work as group: what is the composition of the group?
 - iii. What are the power relations within the group?
 - b. What is the time unit?
 - i. Can vary between one hour and a lifetime
 - c. How is the organization of the task settled?
 - i. How about work order; quality control etc.
 - d. What is the remuneration people work for?
 - i. The minimum of remuneration is food and boarding

Our main task is how to explain measure shifts world wide from 1500 to 2000. The creation of the database is an intermediary step. To be able to explain the shifts, we should not only compare the 'tables' but also the labour ideologies.

A practical point is that we have to show the steps that have led to our guestimations, we should be transparent, the David Eltis database (see above) is an example. Shireen suggests that our steps should be visible in our database . [NB: in the Eltis database the problem is solved outside the database: unfortunately the link to the methodology pages does not work on the slavevoyages.org website, but this is what they state:

“The database is the product of unprecedented collaboration among scholars from all countries in Europe, Africa, and North and South America involved in the past in the trans-Atlantic slave trade. It consists of data variables, which incorporate information drawn directly from archival and published variables, and imputed variables inferred by researchers who have developed the database from their knowledge of voyages or calculated directly from data encountered in primary sources. Essays in the methodology sub-section describe the procedures followed in verifying the integrity and consistency of the data and in imputing new from raw data. The sub-section also includes the on-line version of the codebook, a list of variables and table showing their availability in different sections of the website, and detailed instructions about how to use the query interface for the data base.” See <http://slavevoyages.org/tast/database/index.faces#>]

Next, Erika presents data on Holland for the cross sections 1500 and 1650. Before doing so she points at an article from Robert Knecht on labour contracts. He also has designed a taxonomy of labour relations, Erika asks for comments. The paper is downloadable from the ESSHC website if you follow the link

<http://www2.iisg.nl/esshc/programme.asp?selyear=9&pap=6876>

As for the data on Holland: for 1500 these are based on the *Informacies* from 1514, which gives main sources of income. She points at the results and restrictions of the data from this source. Less than half of the income earned in the countryside is earned in agriculture, about half of that is wage labour. About 45% of the population lived in cities, 22% worked in the tertiary sector. Next she presents data on 1650, based on the marriage banns from Amsterdam couples. Her analyses show 28% of self employment and 65 % of wage labour. She concludes with summing up several difficulties in applying the taxonomy on her data: the textile industry was characterized by a large share of subcontracting: where does this fit into the taxonomy? People working in the building sector can have a wide variety of labour relations (from employer to wage earners). Work in the local transport sector is highly regulated wage labour within a guild system and finally should we not see the contracts of some sailors as bonded labour?

(For the ppt presentation see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

Jacques presents data on the Netherlands for 1800, 1900 and 2000. After stressing the limits of the used sources, Jacques shows figures on the labour force as part of the total population for the three cross sections as well as the employment structure; a gender division of the labour force for 1849-2000; and the share of entrepreneurs of the total labour force for 1899-2000. Types of labour relations which are applicable to the Netherlands are : 1, 2, 3 (monasteries), 7 (conscripted soldiers up until 1997 and convicts), 8 (civil servants), 12, 13 and 14. Problems that arose while attributing labour relations, are the lack of sufficient data to discern the difference between self-employed and entrepreneurs; the number of unpaid family workers and the underestimation of female labour participation.

(For the ppt presentation see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

In the discussion that follows, a.o. on the compatibility of data, it is stressed that for the early years we can – in most cases – do no more than add up local data. (This is also done by the Cambridge group)

After a short break Karin gives a presentation of the new Liferay collaborative software. It has tools for easy up- and downloading of data, including version management and it has a forum. A short instruction is handed out.

Michael Zeuske shortly presents the situation of the sources for Latin America, dividing the period from 1500-2000 into three stages:

I: Spanish Empire 1500-1750: availability of some estimates for certain regions

II: 1750-1810/98: some censuses for the whole empire (available in Sevilla) most important: the one from 1744 (Michael will certainly need help entering the data from this source)

III: 1830/1900-2000 nation states; for several countries there are national censuses.

For a detailed map see: see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna.

In the discussion afterwards the importance of a separate Latin America workshop is stressed.

After the lunch break Shireen presents data on India for 1500 and 1650

For 1500 there are sketchy estimations, though there is data for some Mughal towns (total population and make up of workforce); there is more detailed data for the 1650 cross section on occupational structure (town level); for 1800 there is data on district level, including age and gender division. She stresses that for India 1600 would be a more sensible year than 1650 and points at some problems in attributing labour relations to certain groups. (The problem of the labour relations of the ruling aristocracy and the soldiers were already discussed, see page 6 of these minutes). Merchants are either self-employed or employers.

Shireen strongly suggests not to give a false notion of exactitude in the database; it should be made clear how the data is extrapolated/guestimated.

(For the an overview of the India 1500-1650 data see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

Karin shortly presents the data produced by Thirtankar Roy on India 1900-2000. He provides data on total population; occupational structure and labour relations for 1901 and 2001. His data can be found as work in progress at <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then the folder Users and finally the folder of Thirtankar Roy).

Christine presents data on Japan 1900 for the total population and the economically active part of it; the employment by industry and the (large) numbers of people who have subsidiary jobs; finally she compares total population (including gender division) and labour force data for Japan 1900 with China 1933. (For the ppt presentation see <https://collab.iisg.nl>, then go to the History of Labour Relations site, to the private pages and choose Documents and then Presentations from Vienna workshop).

The workshop ends with a general discussion. It is unanimously decided that national census data is better than ILO data. Occupational titles do not have to be translated into English, as long as HISCO codes are added.

Project leaders should provide a short text on how to count Total labour force as part of the total population; we should be able to pinpoint the group of non-working people. Gijs stresses the need to abolish the differentiation between for working for market and non-market institutions, Jacques would like to see another group above nr 12 and 123 (self-employed and employers) which should be called entrepreneurs. Erika stresses the fact that we should not be too cautious with extrapolations for the early years, contemporary censuses are very often also based on extrapolations. Project leaders insist that data should remain comparable and transparent.

For the very near future it is decided that Karin will put all the presentations of this workshop on the internet. The project group will start looking for extra money. For NWO we need a database by the end of 2008, also a last workshop will be held by the end of 2008. The Gerda Henkel Stiftung has a deadline in May 2010, two major conferences and maybe also a smaller workshops (for example on Latin America) might also be financed by the Henkel Stiftung.