

Minutes of the Third Workshop of the Global Collaboratory on the History of Labour Relations 1500-2000

28 and 29 November 2008, IISH Amsterdam

Present: Turaj Atabaki, Óscar Bascuñán, Bhaswati Bhattacharya, Aad Blok, Tarcisio Botelho, Ulbe Bosma, Andrea Caracausi, Stefan Dormans, Sara Farris, Lex Heerma van Voss, Karin Hofmeester (minutes) Reza Jafari, José Miguel Lana Berasain, Jacques van Gerwen, Joern Janssen, Erdem Kabadayi, Gijs Kessler, Marco van Leeuwen, Marcel van der Linden, Jan Lucassen, Daan Marks, Christine Moll-Murata, María Inés Moraes, Shireen Moosvi, Elise van Nederveen Meerkerk, Matthias van Rossum, Tirthankar Roy, Ariadne Schmidt, Jun Seong-Ho, Jan Luiten van Zanden, Michael Zeuske

Session 1: 28 November 10.00-12:00

Karin Hofmeester starts by stating that the project group is very happy that last April Christine Moll Murata has joined us as member. The project has benefitted greatly from this addition. Karin shortly welcomes two new members of the collaboratory: María Inés Moraes (covering Uruguay); Tarcisio Botelho (Brazil), Jun Seong-Ho (Korea) as well as a long time member who has already contributed to the collaboratory but is now a first time visitor to the workshop: Tirthankar Roy (India 1900 and 2000). She explains the main goals of this workshop: getting an overview of the data gathered and of trends and developments across cross sections for the specific areas of each participant. To encourage discussions on these long term trends members of the project group will all present a 'first move'.

A report of the progress is given: after our discussions in Vienna the taxonomy and the list of definitions are adapted and by now data (almost 17.000 records) has been gathered on:

Netherlands 1800; 1900, 2000

Italy 1900-2000 and 1800 is in the pipeline

Spain 1800, 1900

USA 1900

China 1800, 1900, 2000 (including notes on the 1800 data)

Japan 1900, 2000 we received a paper on data for 1800

Taiwan 1900-2000

Indonesia 1900 and 1800 is in the pipeline

Data on India has been gathered and is now being entered

Brazil 1800

Karin concludes that Europe is nicely covered for the more modern cross sections, as is Asia and Latin America is well on its way. The Islamic world, or the Middle East/ Ottoman Empire is still an era that needs to be covered, we will devote a special workshop to that next year, as well as to Africa. All efforts up until now to have a workshop with Andreas Eckart, Gareth Austin, Fred Cooper, John Thornton, Jutta Bolt, and others have failed, though they are willing to participate, so we will continue our efforts and organize a separate Africa workshop as well. Names of specialists in both fields who are not afraid of guestimations and who have a bit of time left are very welcome!

As for the future plans of the Collaboratory, a fourth workshop will be organized on 13-14 March 2009, preceded by a small Middle East workshop; an Africa workshop will be organized in Spring 2009 as well. In August 2009 we will present data and preliminary results during the World Economic History Congress, see: <http://www.wehc2009.org/programme.asp?sid=190>

On 27-28 November 2009 a final workshop on Labour Relations and Work Ethics will be held in Germany.

Funding for this project will as far as NWO is concerned stop in March 2009, Gerda Henkel Stiftung sponsoring continues until 2010. However, the IISH expects to continue working on the database for quite a while.

Michael Zeuske starts a series of short presentations. For this larger audience he recaptures shortly the information on the census (or better, series of censuses) which started in Spanish America in 1776. (For more detailed information, see the minutes of the Latin America Workshop). The census gives information on free labour, but also on slave labour, as well as free labour by hired slaves. The archives also give information on rebellion against the census (in the Mexican textile manufacturing area). Apart from this census data, Michael can also provide micro data on Cuba. **He suggests making maps of Spanish America, depicting the various economic-cultural regions: i.e.: mining regions; plantation regions; frontier areas, mission areas etcetera.**

María Inés Moraes presents data on Uruguay 1500-1800, which was by that time was not a single country. There are colonial censuses on the following cities and hinterlands: Monte Video; Buenos Aires and Corrientes. Jesuit records exist of the Jesuit towns along the Rio Uruguay (see also the minutes of the Latin America workshop). For the Porte Allegre area no censuses exist. For Montevideo she presents more detailed information about HISCO codes for the 1800 cross section.

Tarcisio Botelho presents data on Brazil 1500, 1650 and 1800. gives a presentation on the available demographic data for Brazil 1500, 1650, 1800. For the pre-colonial period estimations have been made, including a division between free men and slaves. A good source for the colonial period is the census of 1776. For the Sao Paulo region Tarcisio already has detailed information for 1800, consisting of lists of names of heads of households and their occupations. The region had sugar plantations; mining as well as cattle areas and data on labour relations are available.

During the discussions after these three presentations, the importance of qualitative sources is stressed, Thirtankar points at travelogues -including information on labour regimes - on Goa. For 'Uruguay' 1650 and 1800 are doable, for 1900 the sources are less good. **Michael stresses the importance of cities and hinterlands and of economic-cultural regions.**

Hisco codes are included in our databases, Marco points at the fact that starting from two digits, HISCO codes can be used for measures of class and so on. However, for a lot of early cross sections these multi digits codes will be hard to determine. **Jan hopes that a pattern will be found of combinations of HISCO codes and labour relations codes such as we apply.**

José Miguel Lana Berasain presents data from censuses of 1797 and 1900, and as additional sources points at 1787 census for Floridablanca (in Catalonia); and a occupational census of 1920. (See also his powerpoint presentation on the Collaboratory website) He signals the limitations of the 1787 census where labour relations are concerned and how he has solved part of the problems he encountered:

- Uncertainty about the sex of working people (except in the exceptional cases where the source identifies women).
- Underestimation of working women and family workforce (low activity rate).
- In order to distinguish artisans as self-employed or employers, José assumed that there was one master for each journeyman.
- There is no way to identify the agricultural workforce correctly: farmers and tenants could be producers for the market or for the household, self-employed or employers (4 or 12 or 13); day-labourers (“jornaleros”) could be only workers or also small producers for the household or market
- The problem of servants. There are three categories: “criados de escalera arriba” (domestic service), “criados de escalera abajo” (workers in services and agriculture) and “domesticos” (mainly salaried workers in agriculture). Probably men and women are mixed.
- The register of nobles. This is a heterogeneous category: some provinces counts only heads of family, others family members, two provinces all the population. The aggregated data of 402.059 has been rectified to 106.870 as noble heads of family.

For 1591-2001 he concludes with an overview of the total population; for 1797-1900 he gives an overview of working population, HISCO codes and labour relations. He signals:

- No serfdom, no slavery, no tributary labour
- Diminishing of reciprocal labour
- Rise of commodified labour
- Fall of indentured labour (apprenticeship)
- Increase of wage earners for the market
- Relative fall of wage earners for non market institutions (ecclesiastical reform)
- We have to be careful with the number of forced workers (prostitution is the main forced occupation in 1900, but it is not registered in 1797)

Andrea Caracausi presents data on Italy for 1800, 1900 and 2000. The data on 1800 can be found in a census for the Republic of Venice, which records population and non-market economic activities. The data is not published, so Andrea is still working on them in the archives. (This census also contains data on part of the Balkan) . For 1500 and 1650 data can be found in tax registers and archives of guilds. These data will concern cities, and will not contain on women or immigrants. Also, the tax registers only count the tax payers and the people that have some property, such as a house). The list of guilds members, will only ‘count’ only masters, journeymen and apprentices.

As for the 1911 and 2001 census: the 1911 census has aggregated data on labour relations: so sometimes we don't find a distinction between 13 (employers) and 14 (wage earners): or between 12 (independent artisans) and 13 (employers). For 2001 only two distinctions can be made: employee or independent. For 17 branches this census gives data on the number of economically active, divided by gender and age group. The final result of the data is certainly less detailed about labour relations, but disaggregates data regarding sex and age. As for HISCO minor codes: it is hard to determine them as the census does not divide between workers in certain occupations, but between sectors.

As long term trends between 1900 and 2000 he signals an increase in the number of wage-earners for the market and for non-market institutions, as well as an increase of the number of employers.

During the discussion after these two presentations Jan asks if the 1900 census of Spain gives information on the North-African cities Ceuta, Mellila and Oran. José confirms this. It is also stressed that the census of the Republic of Venice might give us some information on the Balkan part of the Ottoman Empire. Tarcisio asks if the project already has someone for Portugal, if not a colleague of his who also works on the HISCO project might be interested.

Session 2: 28 November 13.00-18:00

Jacques van Gerwen gives a presentation on how the number of entrepreneurs (self-employed and employers, numbers 12 and 13 in our taxonomy) developed in the 20th century. To solve the problem of the difficult distinction between employers (in our definition someone with who employs three or more wage-earners) and self-employed, it might be helpful to use a business census to check the size of the average business. In the Netherlands we see a decrease in the number of small businesses (< 5 employees) in the period 1930-1980, in 1980's, we see an increase. This trend is also seen in the US and the UK. The number of entrepreneurs is rising and the share of small entrepreneurs in that rise is large.

During the discussion Jacques remarks that now, about 20% of all entrepreneurs in the Netherlands is female, whereas 30% of all working women were entrepreneurs. In the discussion Jan remarks that entrepreneurs who only have one customer are regarded as wage earners.

Shireen Moosvi presents data on India 1500, 1650, 1800. She starts by showing us data on Metra 1663 and (see her powerpoint presentation on the Collaboratory website). Data is given on the number of households and the occupation of the head of household, based on that she has calculated the total population for Metra. **Question is now: how to extrapolate this data to the rest of India?**

She uses the sample censuses made round 1800, assuming the population density was as high in 1800 as it was in 1881, when a occupational census was held, enabling her to count the number of people in certain professions in certain regions.

Tirthankar Roy presents data on 1901 and 2001, showing the total population; the number of workers, subdivided by workers for the market, being either self-employed; wage-workers or undefined/unaccounted for and workers for non-market institutions. He also gives data on indentured emigrants (mainly wage-workers). For the first cross section data on the princely states is combined with data on the colonial empire. For 2001 we look at data for the Indian Union.

His 'problems' with the data is that the combination of several occupations by one worker is found very often in India. In one sector someone might be the main worker, in the other just the helping worker. **These dual jobs can have two different HISCO codes as well as two different labour relations:** in one job a worker might be employed as a free worker, in the other he might be an unfree worker. One could be a wage worker and an artisan within the household. One could also be a wage worker and a tenant farmer.

To obtain data Tirthankar uses certain rules: in general if in an agricultural society a capitalist development takes place we see a decreasing labour force participation and an increase of the number of wage workers. Furthermore he would like to estimate the percentage of people working in the household industry; in the agrarian labour regime; as indentured workers and in the service sector by interpolating the data for the latter half of the 20th century. **He wonders if we as a laboratory can build a model to handle data on regions and cities.**

For 1800 he wants to use Parliamentary Papers and regional census data to construct indicative tables. Tirthankar and Shireen both use the regional census data from 1881 and can co-operate on the Bengal census.

Ulbe Bosma presents data on the Javanese (not the European and Chinese population which is very well documented) inhabitants of Java: the most important starting point of the data-gathering process. As large trend we see for 1800-1900:

- A population growth from 4,5 million to 30 million
- Considerable rural changes from probably 90 percent subsistence agriculture to 56 percent by-employment

However, this big picture should be nuanced. He gives an overview of sources: Raffles presenting large fragments of Census (1811); Cultivation Reports (1830-1870); Umbgrove Report (late 1850s) and the problems we have using them: a.o. different definitions and counting methods. For Java a clear decrease in the number of landholding farmers is shown, as well as an increase in the number of agricultural workers with by-employment, though not so much in industry. One of the diagrams he presents shows the percentage of the labour force having by-employment.

Further steps to be taken:

- Rereading of sources and government documents behind reports
- Analysis of 19th century trends with regard to the introduction of wage labour relations on Java and a more precise picture of the pressure of compulsory services/labour
- Data collection for Outlying Provinces
- Data collection for 1500, 1650
- For 2000 sectoral data can be used of the Groningen Growth & Development Centre, in addition data of the Statistical Yearbook can be used for a division of labour relations

Christine Moll Murata presents data on China, Japan and Taiwan, 1800, 1900 and 2000. She gives a short overview of the sources used and of the problems they offer in homogeneity, comprehensiveness and focus, though the Taiwan and Japan 1900 and 2000 sources are good. **To grapple with the country seize and and the quality of the data for China, she suggests – in co-operation with Shireen and Tirthankar, to define macro-regions and gather data specifically on these regions.**

Jun Seong-Ho presents data of one of the series of household censuses held by the Choseon Dynasty in Korea on a regular base from 1638 till 1910. The censuses give information about active economic population, divided by gender and age, including family relations. For the Tanseong region the censuses are now being digitized. For more information on this source as well as the information it can give on labour relations and HISCO code, see his paper on the Collaboratory website.

During the discussion on these presentations one of the conclusions is **that local studies can help us** estimate the percentage of workers per profession. We should also make a paper on the methodological steps we have taken to construct our datasets. The project group will make a model for such a paper. Marco suggests that **budget studies** might help us to make our estimations.

Gijs Kessler presents data on Russia, i.e. the country with its former Soviet Union borders post World War II. For 2000 the whole region has produced 16 separate censuses, so he restricted himself to the Russian federation, meaning some 55% of the total 2000 population.

For the 1897 census there is detailed information on wage-earners for non-market institutions (label 18). The labels 12, 13 and 14 (self-employed, employers and wage-earners for the market) have not been differentiated by the census takers and no primary data is kept, so Gijs has taken these labels together. **He stresses that label 4: leading producers within the household is specifically designed with an eye on pre-modern self-sufficient households, however, also in non self-sufficient households agricultural workers can be found in that category. He has calculated the number of 'household leading producers' as the number of people having indicated agriculture as their main employment, minus the number who were registered as agricultural labourers. This is an important point for further discussion on the definition of label 4 and wage workers in agriculture in general .**

For the 2000 Russian federation census labels 14 and 18 (wage-earners for non-market institutions) can not be distinguished. Gijs has adapted the definition of label 1 'Cannot work or cannot be expected to work: those who cannot work, because they are too young (≤ 6 years), too old (≥ 75 years), ¹ disabled, or are studying' to < 15 and > 75 . He raises several other questions, a.o.: Census Russia > 60 not supposed to work, but what do people between 60 and 75 do? Are they economically active? Are they not supposed to work? Are they household producers?

If we compare Russia 1900 and 2000 data we see a clear decrease of label 5 and an increase in label 12-14 and 14-18. See also his report on the Collaboratory website.

Erdem Kabadayi Stresses the unsolved problem of the 1843 census, which was not published in an aggregate way, only original data is available. No sufficient body of secondary literature is found to tackle this problem. Next source is the 1913 industrial census, containing lump sum data on eight urban centres in West Anatolia. These data are not specified per city, secondary literature that can differentiate these data is also not available. Data for Turkey are available for 1927.

During the discussion on these presentations **it is suggested that Erdem should try to track the data on the eight cities in the 1843 census and present them as lump sum data. These could then also be compared with the 1927 data which Erdem will enter for the next workshop.**

Marco suggests that **Gijs could contact Vladimir Vladimirov** who works with some of the original data of the 1897 census. This could help him test his assumptions.

Marcel van der Linden stresses the many forms of unfree labour in the 19th and 20th century. His presentation will be published on the collab website.

Jan Lucassen signals a general trend in Europe as well as Asia in 1900 and 2000: an increase of free wage labour. Point of discussion is of course: when can we speak of a free person. Our definition is: gainfully employed, free to choose his/her employer. Is also depending on legal and institutional arrangements; the length of the contract and the period of notifications. In this respect it remains a question where to put military conscript? Most logical is label 18 and **what about apprenticeships?** José had assumed one journeyman for each master, in literature we also find examples of 2 journeymen for each master. His presentation will be published on the Collaboratory website.

During the discussions after these presentations it is stressed that wage labour transforms over time; that there are various concepts of law and punishments which will be hard to compare.

Discussions about Gijs calculation of wage labourers in agriculture and Jan's remarks on free labour and apprentices coincide and José stresses the need to reconsider the double dimensions of the 'jornaleros': day workers in agriculture who may also be working for the household.

Session 3: 29 November 10.00-15:00

Jan Lucassen recapitulates the ideas behind the collaboratory: a fact finding mission reconstructing total; population > the part of it that consisted of gainful workers > the labour relations under which they worked. Our figures and interpretations are not only of interest to academia, but can also lead to considerations about the actual world. Our data and our interpretations – as we have seen during this workshop the level of disaggregation of our later data can be dictated by the smaller regions we have data for on the earlier periods – can also be enriched by maps of cultural and economic regions, linked to means of subsistence and images that can tell us more about social relations.

During the discussion after Jan's presentation the issue of copyright of images is raised as well as the technological (im)possibilities of drawing simple maps. The project group promises to dive into these matters.

Christine Moll Murata presents data on self-employed people in the countries we have data for in our database. General trend is that self-employment is on the rise. Problems are: what is exactly the definition of a self-employed worker? ILO speaks of 'own account workers'. Numbers of self-employed in the statistics are determined by the decision to include agriculture or not. Are family members included or excluded? What if family members work in agriculture, not in self-sufficient households but for the market? (Here the discussion touches upon the topic raised by Gijs

yesterday). She also touches upon the number of journeymen for each master, comparing Spain with China. Christine's presentation will be published on the Collaboratory website.

In the discussion after Christine's presentation Michael states that jornaleros can be wage earners and/or self-employed people. To help solve the issue Jan suggests you may use other statistics such as occupations statistics to find out more about the size of the enterprise, which may tell us something about the status of the workers. Sometimes small masters are subcontracting work for larger masters.

Gijs adds that in agriculture the line between label 4 and label 12 is blurred. Since large numbers of workers can be found in agriculture, this can have major consequences for your percentages. José states that though the development of a capitalist labour market leads to proletarianisation, at the same time we see the development that landless workers are converted to (part-time) peasants via tenancy. The Jornalero's main condition is wage earner; their additional condition is 'self-employed' peasant. Tirthankar points at the importance of the ownership of assets: who owns the tools and or the licensee to produce?

Another important point is: what do we take as common denominator is E (economically active population) including or excluding family members?

Jun stressed it is important but difficult to know which part of the family worked as kin producers.

Karin Hofmeester presents data on women's and child work. Based on previous research by others it she states that a good starting point would be to try to estimate minimum and maximum female labour force participation rates, if no exact data are available. For North Western Europe these min's and max's could range between 25 and 50 % for 1500, 1650 and 1800. In 1900 we see a decrease for the European countries we have data for, and an increase for most of the countries in 2000.

As for child labour, previous research shows that it was abundant in pre-industrial agricultural societies. For the later cross sections we see in Western economies during the transformation of industrial production from labour to capital intensive a decrease child labour in that sector and an increase in services. After industrialisation we see the 'adulting' of labour market and family income, i.e. children enter the labour market and at a later age. One would expect same in underdeveloped economies, is not the case parallels notwithstanding. She concludes with a wish list: Both for women and child work: we should be collecting more quantitative data; we should look at influence compulsory education on child labour and relation between school absenteeism and increase child labour; we should be looking at sources for composition family income, however: the height family income can not be sole explanation for increase or decrease women and child labour. Therefore we should look at demand side child labour, we should be linking women and child labour, looking from demand side. We should use case studies, compare and extrapolate them.

Karin's presentation will be published on the Collaboratory website.

Elise suggests it is important to look at school attendance in connection to ‘unemployment’ of children, as defined by Cunningham. Ariadne Schmidt states it is better to look at participation rates of women as part of the total population, instead of the female part of the population. Look at age pyramids of societies in combination with the amount of child labour. Both stress it is important to look at the gender division of child workers. Jan mentions the minimum marriage age and the influence it has on the opportunities of work. Gijs asks attention for women who do housekeeping work that is not part of a self-sufficient household. Again the question is raised why label 4 and 5 are only designed for self-sufficient households. Elise supposes a bias in this part of the taxonomy as if there is a hierarchy where 4 is placed above 5. This is not the way the taxonomy is developed: only label 4 is found in the sources usually and we - knowing that they also work – have developed a category for kin producers.

Conclusion, future plans:

Data and interpretations

Apart from gathering the actual data and entering then in the database, we should also make a description of the sources used, not just the title but: when was it made, for what purpose, what data does it contain, what did you use and what not, like Christine did for China and Japan 1800.

NB: the project group will make a ‘model’ paper with example descriptions of sources and methodology.

Small ‘decisions’ such as the male/female ratio you used or double counts can of course also be put in the comment field of the record.

We should explicitly state the considerations we have made to decide to put certain professions in certain labour relations, for example the *jornaleros*.

Important decisions such as

- people working in agriculture: self-employed or wage earners will be discussed on the forum of the collaborative webpages; including influence of the seize of the ‘property’
- also there is the discussion on kin producers who do not produce for the household but for the market, how to keep track of them? Are they part of your total E?
- discussion on masters, journeymen and apprentices, may lead to comparisons between Leiden 17th century and Peking 19th century.

Maybe we could come to a list of professions and the labour relation that is attached to them? José and Michael already opted for a co-operative project in this field, this could be done on the collab website.

If certain combinations of labour relations are very frequent, such as 4 and 14 for people working in agriculture, then maybe we have ‘discovered’ a new category in our taxonomy. **Dual occupations or dual labour relations may point to developments in the labour market: development of a capitalist labour market in agriculture or manufacturing**, so do not try to hide them, but also be brave and make decisions!

Sources:

Apart from national censuses, the following source types have been discussed:

- local microdata to help interpreting, Cuba (Michael), Sao Paolo (Tarcisio) Bengal (Tirthankar and Shireen) known from your own research but also from literature;
- budget information, business and agriculture censuses'
- qualitative sources, such as travelogues on Goa, information in East India Company records

Pieces of data on USA are coming from Sevilla archives, just like Philipines; Balkan 1800 comes from Venice archives, data on Northern African cities Ceuta and Manilla might come from Spanish sources. Inform your colleagues!

Representations

Maps are a very good idea, we will dive into that, technically and financially. Seeing regions as economic-cultural entities makes a lot of sense because very often we only have data on cities and hinterlands and not on 'countries' whatever borders they may have had,

A new perspective in the field of colonization are the missionary areas, especially the Jesuit reductions in South America. Their presence led to the development of capitalist labour markets with strong communal roots. Visual representation is also very attractive, and it is also closely connected to what we already do and have at the IISH, especially the HISCO collections. Efforts of this type may be interesting to Thyssen Stiftung for an additional research grant application

Further information requested from the collab members for the website:

Maps of the covered areas

Short cv's of all contributors

Near future: all participants of the collaboratory are invited to the workshop to be held in Amsterdam on 13-14 March 2009, which will be focusing on the cross sections 1500 and 1650. Appointments are made on which data will be entered by whom.