

Brewing in the North West 1840-1914: sowing the seeds of service sector management?

Dr Alistair Mutch

Professor of Information and Learning, Nottingham Trent University

Department of Information Management and Systems, Burton Street, Nottingham,
NG1 4BU

Telephone: 0115 848 2429

Fax: 0115 848 6512

Email: alistair.mutch@ntu.ac.uk

Word count: 6445

Brewing in the North West 1840-1914: sowing the seeds of service sector management?

Abstract

This article explores the contours of brewing in the north west of England in the period 1840 to 1914. While accounts of the region have been dominated by considerations of cotton and engineering, it is argued that there was considerable innovation in the brewing industry in the region, notably in the development of the direct management of public houses in Liverpool. However, such success failed to ensure the expansion of companies outside the region and the article considers the factors which may have led to this. It concludes that the heterogeneity of practice in the region, in particular the tension between Liverpool and Manchester, meant that the baton of innovation was passed to the Birmingham brewers, whose further development of retailing lay at the heart of their eventual importance at national level.

Keywords: brewing; public house management; Liverpool; Manchester.

Brewing has been relatively neglected in accounts of the industrial and economic development of the North West.¹ There is much justification for this, giving the epoch shaping importance of cotton and engineering in the region. However, it might be just a little too easy to draw a contrast between the thrusting and dynamic textiles and engineering sectors and the sleepy conservatism of brewing. The latter is, to be sure, a sector with some profoundly conservative tendencies, as we will see, but part of the problem lies with how we define the field.² If we incorporate the distribution networks that accompanied the production of beer, then, especially if we explore the Liverpool experience, we can get more of a sense of innovation. In particular, the use of direct management of public houses in the city prefigured developments elsewhere. However, this is simply to raise another set of questions, which are why did this innovation not spread more widely within the region and why did the region's brewers, including the major firms, ultimately fail to export their success to a national level? In order to answer these questions, we need first to consider the shape of the

sector in the north-west during the period. This then forms the backdrop for a sharper focus on differences between Liverpool and Manchester. This enables us to explore some key innovations but also suggests some reasons for why the region never developed the organizational 'clout' that developed around the major Birmingham brewers. However, before proceeding to these explorations, we need first to consider some questions of definition and evidence.

The boundaries of the area under consideration include the modern administrative county of Cheshire. This is in part because during the period Warrington was both an important brewing centre and administratively within Lancashire's boundaries. It is also because of the relation of Stockport to greater Manchester. The mention here of Warrington also points to a problem in 'locating' particular companies. The data which are drawn upon below place the important firm of Peter Walker & Son as a Cheshire firm, because their brewing operation was based in Warrington. However, the business was run from Duke Street in Liverpool and its pubs dominated the city's streets. The purpose of looking at the region as a whole is to identify some key features. As we will see one of those features is that brewing activities were very different in parts of the region. As we know, much nineteenth century business was intensely local in its focus and this was particularly true of brewing. Its prime product, beer, was a high volume and low value product whose distribution was therefore generally constrained by existing means of horse-drawn transport. Breweries, therefore, tended to be local affairs, sitting at the centre of local distribution outlets. The coming of rail, of course meant some prospects for changing this and they were ones which were seized upon by Peter Walker & Son in particular. However, for many of the more remote areas there was little competition expect where local zones of influence overlapped.

One caveat to this was the growing importance of bottled beer during the nineteenth century, especially the products of Burton on Trent. Burton possessed natural advantages in its gypsum rich water which enabled it to produce bright and light ales which were widely popular. The development of the rail network meant that these products could be distributed on a national scale. The importance of some markets in the north west can be seen in the note in the directors' minutes for Allsopps in 1865 recording 'Reports from London & Liverpool as to the requirements in Ales this

Season.³ However, companies such as Bass and Allsopps tended to work through agencies in the remoter areas and through other brewers in urban areas. It wasn't until 1891 that Allsopps bottled their own beer in Barrow, for example.⁴ In addition, over the century the development of brewing science meant that other breweries were able to emulate the Burton product. It would be fair, though, to argue that the North West as a whole never developed products with a national appeal during this period (the development of brands such as Boddington's was a much later development). Rather it was more likely to be southern companies such as Whitbread with their greater orientation to the free trade who were more able to take advantage. So it is possible to argue that the prospects for expansion out of the North West were to some extent limited by product considerations.

Such a contention, however, requires that we also complete our examination of the background by considering the relation between brewers and the pubs which sold their beer.⁵ Historically many licensed victuallers brewed on the premises for sale to customers, but the nineteenth century saw the triumph of the 'common brewer', that is, the brewing company supplying a range of outlets. Table 1 shows the extent and variability of this process by comparing the returns for Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester.

		Common brewers	Licensed victuallers	Persons licensed to sell beer
1832	Birmingham			
	Liverpool	90	6	4
	Manchester	24	50	25
1850	Birmingham			
	Liverpool	97	2	1
	Manchester	55	28	18
1860	Birmingham	8	49	44
	Liverpool	95	3	2
	Manchester	70	18	2
1880	Birmingham	16	36	49
	Liverpool	98	2	
	Manchester	93	4	3
1900	Birmingham	91	6	3

	Liverpool	100		
	Manchester	100		

Table 1: percentage of brewers by category 1832-1900. Source: Gourvish and Wilson, *British Brewing*, 1994, pp. 70-1.

From these figures it is clear how advanced the process was in Liverpool and how by the second half of the century Manchester was starting to catch up. What is clearly visible is how different practice was in Birmingham, where publican brewers maintained their status until the pivotal decade of the 1880s. What is also important in Manchester for much longer than Liverpool is the beerseller brewing on the premises. In 1830 the Beer Act created a new class of licence by which a payment to the Excise secured a licence to brew beer which was enthusiastically taken up but with different results. In Liverpool such beerhouses provided a market for existing brewers, perhaps because of the poverty of the premises occupied which did not allow for brewing. By contrast many Manchester beersellers also brewed, although in nothing like the numbers found in Birmingham.

Another important relationship was between the growing ranks of the common brewers and the outlets they served. At the beginning of the century most public houses were ‘free’, that is independent businesses either brewing their own beer or free to obtain it from a common brewer of their choice. Over the course of the century, for reasons explored well by Jennings, many pubs came to be ‘tied’ to a particular brewery.⁶ In some parts of the country (notably London and Scotland) publicans were tied by means of loans secured on their property, but in most of the rest of the country pubs came to be increasingly owned by breweries. The most common form of running such pubs was through tenancy, where a nominally independent tenant paid both a ‘dry’ rent (for the premises) and a ‘wet’ rent (by means of a premium of the wholesale price of beer). However, in some parts of the country, notably Liverpool and Birmingham, many pubs came to be under direct management, where a waged employee ran the pub. Liverpool was the source of this often-contested practice, and this is the key innovation which prefigures much later service sector management practices.

Finally, a few words on the nature of the evidence are in order. Much of what follows rests on the experience of particular companies, notably that of Peter Walker & Son, because these are ones for whom we possess detailed historical accounts. The histories of many companies in the region are often a little sketchy, although this account draws on some of the best of these. In addition, the discussion draws on the tenacious work of members of the Brewery History Society (BHS) and other compilers of local gazetteers who assiduously trawl sources such as trade directories looking for evidence of brewery foundation and existence (Barge 1987).⁷ There are many problems with such evidence, not least because it is often difficult to determine just what constitutes the ‘foundation’ of many companies. Given that several have their origins in brewing at a pub, it can be difficult to establish just when this becomes brewing for wider consumption. The evidence which is presented, therefore, should be taken as indicative of broad trends. Given these caveats, the next section looks at some data on the distribution of brewing concerns in the north-west and uses these to draw out some key themes.

Brewing in the north-west at the turn of the 20th century.

It is difficult to establish a point at which to take a snapshot of the universe of brewing companies, because of the degree of fluctuation and change in the key markets. However, an arbitrary census date of 1900 enables us to draw upon the work done by many volunteers and recorded in the BHS publication *A Century of British Brewers*.⁸ This volume is organized by modern administrative counties and contains a wealth of detail. It is limited by the considerations noted above and is often sparse, in particular with regard to the numbers of pubs which a company controlled at any particular point. However, it enables us to isolate some numbers which indicate the broad contours of the field, as outlined in table 2.

Date of foundation	Cheshire	Cumbria	Lancashire	Gtr Mcr	Merseyside	Total
Pre 1800	3	8	3	1	2	17
1801-1850	1	2	7	17	7	34
1851-1875	2	4	10	17	8	41

1876-1900	5	5	10	27	7	54
Not given	3	12	12	7	4	38
Total	14	31	42	69	28	184
Pre 1800	21.4	25.8	7.1	1.4	7.1	9.2
%						

Table 2: North West breweries by county and date of formation. Source: based on data in Barber, *Century of British brewers*, 2005.

A noticeable feature is the large number of companies with over 100 years of trading history in Cumbria. This points to the conservatism of trading and production patterns in rural areas, where breweries were tightly integrated with the agricultural economy. Jennings, for example, was founded in 1828 in the village of Lorton in the Lake District by a local farmer, John Jennings, whose father was a maltster. (The company remained independent until 2005, when it was taken over by Marstons).⁹ The company moved in 1874 to Cockermouth and the Cumbrian pattern is of long established breweries at the heart of market towns. A list of the long-established companies is in appendix A; it is noticeable that of the list only Greenall Whitley and Duttons of Blackburn could really be considered as in the front rank of companies. Much of the dynamism, that is, came from companies founded towards the middle of the nineteenth century, as with Peter Walker & Son and Robert Cain & Sons in Liverpool (both 1848), Threlfalls in Salford (1861) Frederic Robinson in Stockport (1838) and Wilsons of Manchester (1834).

The fate of the oldest established company on the list, The Lion Brewery of Chester alerts us to a trend towards consolidation which was already starting to become apparent. In 1902 the company was acquired by Bent's Brewery of Liverpool. It owned twenty pubs but traded mainly with 'hotels and private family concerns in the suburb'.¹⁰ By contrast to this long established family concern, Bents was publicly quoted in 1890, when it had 120 public houses. Its vice-chairman, Archibald Salvidge was a significant figure in Liverpool politics.¹¹ The company is also interesting in that, although founded by John Bent in 1823, it later fell under the control of Edward Chevalier, a former Customs official. It marked an early example of the loosening of family control, although most of the companies in the sector were firmly in the hands of the founding family and their descendants. Table 3 indicates when companies were

dissolved or amalgamated and shows that, while there was some movement in the years before the First World War, it was really the inter-war years which saw the process accelerating.

Date of dissolution	Cheshire	Cumbria	Lancashire	Gtr Mcr	Merseyside	Total	Total %
Pre 1914	3	4	10	15	6	38	22.4
1914-1940	4	12	20	27	14	77	45.3
1940-1970	4	8	7	21	6	46	27.1
Post 1970	0	3	3	2	1	9	5.3
	11	27	40	65	27	170	

Table 3: dissolution of North West breweries. Source: based on data in Barber *Century of British brewers*, 2005.

The process of amalgamation was, however, a continuous one but one which tended in this period to produce localized consolidation. In 1890, for example, William Clarkson, who had breweries in Liverpool and Burton and an estate of 80 pubs, offered his business to Peter Walker & Son

He would prefer that your Company should have the working of his properties rather than that they should pass into the hands of third parties He is desirous of leaving the business entirely and he would feel more easy if that business which he has been so long associated with and has built up with such care were in the hands of first class people such as your Company rather than left to be manipulated by other parties.¹²

This process led to considerable reduction in the number of brewers in both Liverpool and Manchester, as indicated in table 4

Common brewers in Liverpool and Manchester		
	Liverpool	Manchester
1832	56	29

1841	74	84
1850	88	99
1860	73	118
1870	80	102
1880	70	94
1890	39	64
1900	28	39

Table 4: common brewers in Liverpool and Manchester. Source: Gourvish and Wilson, *British brewing*, 1994: pp. 70-1.

A similar process is observed by Timmins in Lancashire.

At St Helens, for example, Greenall's rebuilt their brewery in 1856-57, adding considerably to its capacity. Around ten years later they acquired and closed Speakman's Denton Green Brewery, giving them a virtual monopoly of brewing in the district. In Blackburn, too, three of the dozen or so breweries that operated in the town during this period closed, with the more successful, including Dutton's and Thwaites, extending capacity.¹³

The figures suggest a process of considerable dynamism at mid-century, aided by relatively low barriers to entry. In 1849, for example, Joseph Holt who had been working as a carter at Strangeways Brewery began brewing behind a pub before moving to Ducie Bridge brewery in 1855.¹⁴ What the century also saw was the emergence of particular patterns of operation of the distribution network. In Manchester, as in the rest of the region, the running of pubs was dominated by the tenanted tied house, but Liverpool developed a very different pattern.¹⁵ It is to this contrast that we turn next.

Managers and tenants; pubs and beerhouses; Liverpool and Manchester

In 1904 Hubert Wilson, director of Wilson's Brewery in Manchester, went to look at some beerhouses in Hulme which were being disposed of by the Empress Brewery. It was duly recorded that '...in consequence of such an inspection the company decided

to decline'.¹⁶ We can only assume that the beerhouses were in poor condition and in this regard they may well have been typical of many in the Manchester area. We have noted that the Beer Act of 1830 created the new class of beer-only licences, which were enthusiastically taken up in many centres, no more than in Manchester and Liverpool. However, the consequences were different in each case. Manchester became the home of the beerhouse, having disproportionately more than other comparable towns and cities. This appears to have created a considerable demand reflected in the large numbers of common brewers. It also created opportunities for aspiring small businesspeople, as the tenancy of a beerhouse would be within the reach of a skilled worker. As Roberts noted of Salford

The less ambitious among skilled workers had aims that seldom rose above saving enough to buy the ingoing of a beerhouse, open a corner shop or get a boarding house at the seaside. By entering into any business at all a man and his family grew at once in economic status, though social prestige accrued much more slowly.¹⁷

This integration with the local social structure had its counterpart in the built form. If we venture a little beyond our time period we can draw on the observations made of Bolton

The pub isn't much different from the other houses in the block, except for the sign with its name and that of the brewing firm that owns it, but its lower windows are larger than those of the others, and enclosed with stucco fake columns that go down to the ground.¹⁸

This stands in stark contrast to the experience in Liverpool. There was the same enthusiastic response to the possibilities of the beer house, but this brought pressures to convert into full licences, pressures which proved too strong for the magistrates in the 1860s. The consequence was that not only did Liverpool have many more full licences than Manchester, but that the ranks of common brewers were gradually consolidated so that a few companies came to dominate the streets of Liverpool. Chief amongst these was the firm of Peter Walker & Son, which also was the originator of the direct management of pubs. By the end of the century the majority of the city's

pubs were directly managed and this was reflected in the built environment. For Liverpool is the home of the lavish Victorian show pub, reaching its apogee in the world famous Philharmonic, 'England's most magnificent public house'.¹⁹ It is arguable that this difference between the two cities prevented the emergence of collective organization amongst brewers that might rival that of Birmingham. It also might have contributed to the relative failure to expand out of the region, and so we examine the reasons behind this stark contrast in a little more detail.

Of course, considerations of geography and economy do much to explain the two divergent patterns. Liverpool is distinctive in its focus on the river and its docks (Milne 2000). This brought the trade from the docks directly into the city centre from an early stage, unlike the much later development of docks in Salford, relatively insulated from more central locations. This means that large pubs are to be found not only to cope with influxes of sailors on the docks themselves but also in the centre. Indeed, it was reported that

In Liverpool some of the brewers owning dockside houses have an organisation by which, when vessels are due to arrive, squads of barmen are drafted to the premises, where it is known the normal trade will for a certain period be doubled or even trebled.²⁰

There was a powerful incentive, that is, to run the estate as a collective rather than as individual establishments, and direct management was ideal for this. However, this does not explain all, for elaborate pubs are to be found in Liverpool suburbs which in other towns would only grace the town centre. And, with a few exceptions, Manchester did not seem to develop a tradition of ostentatious city centre pubs, certainly nothing like on the scale of Liverpool.²¹ Economic factors also have their part to play, especially the tradition of casual dock employment. The structure of the Liverpool docks, strung out along the Mersey with no easy means of travel between them until the Overhead Railway late in the nineteenth century, meant that dockers lived close to the docks to be in the best position to obtain work. The enormous tidal range of the Mersey meant that access to the docks was irregular, not only conditioning the irregular working patterns of the dockers but also releasing vast numbers of sailors into the city at the same time.²² Such customers, paid off at the end

of a voyage, had substantial sums with which to consume and tastes which often ran to spirits rather than beer. By contrast, Manchester and Salford had a more suburban and beer centred pattern of consumption, in which local divisions were monitored closely in the pub:

These divisions could be marked in many public houses, where workers other than craftsmen would be frozen or flatly ordered out of those rooms in which journeymen foregathered. Each part of the tavern had its status rating; indeed, 'he's only a tap-room man' stood as a common slur.²³

In Liverpool, by contrast, there seems to have been much less attachment to particular pubs, something reflected in the common practice of naming pubs after the current manager rather than the traditional inn names. It would appear, too, that there was a far greater tradition of women drinking in Liverpool pubs than in Manchester (and indeed in other parts of the region). In a fictionalized account the Liverpool journalist Hugh Shimmin notes of one pub

The vaults were long and narrow, but what space there was between the windows and the counter was well filled with men and women, chiefly the latter, in various stages of intoxication. ...At the far end of the vaults a small apartment was boxed off, with seats round the sides.²⁴

In Liverpool most space inside pubs was given over to one long drinking compartment, with a fairly vestigial 'snug', in contrast to the smaller rooms into which other pubs were divided.²⁵

Such factors suggest why full licences for the sale of spirits and wine as well as beer might be eagerly sought after in Liverpool. Full licences in their turn, especially on the scale needed to supply fluctuating demand, required considerable capital investment. All these were factors which might be thought to provide incentives towards the direct management of pubs, but they cannot explain all. For we need to understand why in Birmingham, a citadel of publican brewers until the later nineteenth century and, like Manchester, the home of the skilled engineering worker, direct pub management also took hold at the end of the century. And there are other

dock cities, notably London, in which, as we will see, direct management never became established. We cannot provide an answer to all these paradoxes here. But they do suggest that two further factors, the nature of local regulation and the business strategies of key companies, had an important role to play.²⁶

One clear difference between Manchester and Liverpool is that the licensing magistrates in the former set their faces firmly against the notion of the management of pubs. In their view (as with many other benches across the country) managers were not fit and proper persons as they had no vested (property) interest in the conduct of the pub. While there were arguments about the extent to which companies practiced deception by producing sham tenancy agreements to cover what were de facto managers, the official position remained one of opposition. By contrast the Liverpool bench was more divided, in turn reflecting the conflictual nature of politics in the town. Liverpool politics was characterized by a Liberal elite based on merchants confronting popular Conservatism.²⁷ This matter was complicated by sectarian divides. Popular Conservatism was tightly bound up with Protestantism, and was supported by the major brewers. The ranks of Irish Catholics who might also have been the natural allies of the Liberals were split by a religious and temperance orientation amongst traditional leaders and a pub-based nationalism which eventually won out.²⁸ This meant that licensing decisions were fraught with controversy.

The first wave of such controversy came to a head in the 'Free Licensing' movement of the 1860s.²⁹ Faced with pressure to convert beer house licences into full licences, some magistrates began to advocate the dropping of the traditional test of the needs of the neighbourhood. Led by merchants such as Robertson Gladstone, with adherence to laissez faire ideals (ideals which had been much to the fore in recent battles over control of the docks), this faction argued that the market would establish whether pubs were required or not. For a number of years in the 1860s control moved back and forward between competing factions, the result being the conversion of large numbers of beerhouses into full licences. Eventually the matter was settled by an Act of Parliament in 1869 which saw beerhouses returned to the control of the magistrates. The Liverpool bench responded by promptly closing as many as they could on grounds of structural inadequacy. This marked an epoch of tight control by the Liverpool bench, harried as they were by the attentions of temperance advocates.

The temperance movement acquired a militant edge in Liverpool, fuelled by Liberal opposition to the alliance between beer and Conservatism. One result was that the magistrates, supported by the police, came to see that control of pubs was best done through, rather than against, the pub-owning companies. In this, house management, policed as it was by company inspectors, was a valuable ally. Temperance advocates protested against this alliance, but to no avail. By 1914

The Licensing Committee... have never hesitated to express the opinion that where you have brewers in control of a house it is better for the management of the house to have a brewer's manager as licensee rather than a tied tenant.³⁰

This was at considerable odds with the position in most other parts of the country where, with the exception of Birmingham, managers were tolerated at best and forbidden as a matter of course. The success of house management in Liverpool, therefore, owed much to the character of licensing regulation. But it also depended on the nature of the companies who controlled the city's pubs, most notably Peter Walker & Son.

Formed as a father and son partnership in the late 1840s, the company appeared to have started managing pubs in the following decade.³¹ From the beginning, its operations were characterized by detailed record keeping and the monitoring of activities. On this basis the company built up a significant estate. Its success was copied by others, notably Robert Cain & Sons, which also had most of its houses under management. These two companies came to dominate the pubs of Liverpool and ultimately were to merge after the First World War. However, what is instructive in the current context is to compare their practices with the response of other brewing companies in the region. A good opportunity to do this is presented by the minutes of evidence to the 'Peel Commission' on Licensing in the 1890s. Evidence on behalf of Peter Walker & Son was given by the company secretary, Ernest Ellis, who proudly declared that 'the founders of my company are generally credited with being the originators of the [managerial] system'.³² He produced a forthright defence of the system, pointing to its advantages in enabling control and discipline. The next witness was Thomas Down, managing director and secretary of Greenall Whitley, who we

remember brewed in Warrington alongside Peter Walker & Son. When asked his opinion of pub management he responded ‘I know nothing of the managerial system, but I believe the houses of Messrs. Walker in Warrington are as well conducted as they can be, and they are mostly under management’.³³ This statement points to the remarkable lack of channels for debate and comparison in an industry known for its traditionalism and secrecy. Another witness, James Groves of Groves and Whitnal, gives us a perspective from Salford when he observed that they employed no managers ‘first of all, from a deliberate preference, and secondly, because a large number of our houses are beerhouses’.³⁴ This set of evidence nicely illustrates the differences in practice between the two cities and some contrasts with the situation elsewhere, which we consider in the next section.

Success and failure in North West brewing

From this brief overview it should be clear that brewing in the north west of England in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not a homogenous sector. In many parts of the region, brewing was part of a stable and traditional approach, tightly integrated with the rural economy and providing a familiar part of the landscape of market towns. In the more industrialized areas, most companies adhered to the common practice of supplying a dense network of local outlets, increasingly tied to take the products of the brewery. This practice lay at the heart of many successful organizations and some have managed to retain this approach throughout the period and into more recent times.³⁵ In this sense they may be considered a success, if not sharing the dynamism of the cotton and engineering sectors which employed so many of their drinkers. However, at the level of larger organizations, especially those based in the major urban centres such as Liverpool and Manchester, we might argue that ultimately there was the failure to move beyond their localized strength to expand into the rest of the country. We have seen that in some ways the region did not possess distinctive products with a broader appeal and that might have been one constraint on expansion. But we have also seen that the region, in the shape of Liverpool, was the birthplace of a distinctive ‘managerial system’ for running pubs which, in the direct management of public houses and the development of a distinctive built form of pub,

prefigured many later developments. One remaining question, therefore, is why this practice failed to spread.

We have seen that regulatory responses were different in Manchester and Liverpool. This was in sharp contrast to the position in Birmingham, where the Birmingham brewers were at the centre of a powerful and unified trade association, the Birmingham and Midland Counties Wholesale Brewers' Association (BMCWBA). Surviving records only enable us to be tentative here, but something of the reach of the Association's activities can be gleaned from its surviving reports. In 1914, for example, it notes

As long ago as 1893 the Association took a leading part in the organisation of the great meeting in Bingley Hall which provided Mr Chamberlain with the opportunity for a masterly and eloquent statement in defence of the interests of the Wholesale and Retail Trade.³⁶

This points to the importance of municipal management in the traditions of Birmingham and the symbiotic relationship between good management of the locality and good management of the pub. While there were still bitter disagreements about the nature and pace of change, the general thrust was towards a common managerialism. This was in stark contrast to the position within Liverpool and between Liverpool and Manchester. These tensions may have prevented the emergence of a body like the BMCWBA which, amongst other activities, was able to provide its members with common managerial agreements, ratified in advance with magistrates and a register of barmen and managers.³⁷ These practices advanced the dramatic development of the fortunes of common brewers in the area and, in particular, the rise of Mitchells and Butlers who were to form the continuing heart of one of the major companies to emerge after the Second World War, Bass.

In their efforts to expand out of the North West, Peter Walker and Son had no such support. They faced local problems when seeking to bring their managerial system to towns such as Crewe. Here they faced the steely determination of the magistrates to resist such 'alien' practices. However, of more significance for the ultimate failure of the broader expansion plans of the company was their experience in London.³⁸ In

1911 Peter Walker and Son bought the De Beauvoir Arms in Hackney. This was part of a planned move into London which saw the purchase of stores and several other pubs. The De Beauvoir Arms was the test case, which saw the company come up against not only the magistrates but also a powerfully organized Licensed Victuallers Association. The company had already attempted to win favour with such bodies by having their London agent host the annual dinner, but to no avail. They sought to have Percy Burford installed as manager, but the magistrates, in line with the common practice in London, refused to accept anything other than a tenant. They were being a little disingenuous here, as were the Licensed Victuallers, because there is evidence of multiple publicans putting managers into houses for which they formally held the licence, but the outcome was a check to the company's ambitions. This combined with divisions within the controlling family to see the company taken over after the First World War by the much smaller Liverpool firm of Robert Cain & Sons to form Walker Cain. The pubs remained branded as Peter Walker & Son, but the power shifted to the Cain family. With that came a retreat to the Liverpool heartlands. While there was local expansion, the company eventually merged with Tetley of Leeds to form the short lived Tetley Walker in 1960. This disappeared three years later into the giant Allied Breweries, a merger with Ansells and Ind Coope. In practice it was to be the latter company which provided much of the leadership of the new company.³⁹

However, this lies much beyond our period. During the years up to 1914 brewing was a significant part of the North West's industrial landscape. In many places the sector was indeed a conservative and traditional one. But enough evidence has been presented here to show how elements of considerable dynamism were present. The heterogeneous nature of the region, however, together with other factors, meant that other centres, notably Birmingham, were to have more success with the formula devised in the North West.

Appendix A: breweries established in eighteenth century and still in existence in 1900

Brewery	Location	Date founded	Age in 1900
Cheshire			
Chester Lion	Chester	1642	258
Chester Northgate	Chester	1760	140
Lonsdale & Adshead	Macclesfield	1790	110
Cumbria			
Brampton Old Brewery	Brampton	1785	115
Carlisle Old Brewery	Carlisle	1756	144
Whitwell, Mark & Co	Kendal	1757	143
Maryport Brewery	Maryport	1780	120
Glasson's Penrith	Penrith	1754	146
Breweries			
Hartley's Ulverston	Ulverston	1755	145
Henry Spencer	Whitehaven	1790	110
Workington Brewery	Workington	1795	105
Lancashire			
Dutton's Blackburn Brewery	Blackburn	1799	101
Massey's Burnley Brewery	Burnley	1750	150
Yates & Jackson	Lancaster	1669	231
Greater Manchester			

Boddingtons	Manchester	1778	122
-------------	------------	------	-----

Merseyside

Higson's Brewery	Liverpool	1780	120
------------------	-----------	------	-----

Greenall Whitley	St Helens	1762	138
------------------	-----------	------	-----

Source: extracted from data in Barber, *Century of British brewers*, 2005

¹ J. Walton, *Lancashire : a social history, 1558-1939*, (Manchester, 1988); G. Timmins, *Made in Lancashire: a history of regional industrialisation*, (Manchester, 1988).

² T. R. Gourvish and R. G. Wilson, *The British brewing industry 1830-1980*, (Cambridge 1994); A. Mutch, *Strategic and organizational change: from production to retailing in UK brewing 1950-1990*, (London 2006).

³ National Museum of Brewing (NMB), Burton. Allsopps 1a Directors minute book 1865-1887, 14 December 1865.

⁴ NMB. Allsopps 2 Directors' minute book 1890-1893, 18 Dec 1891

⁵ P. Mathias, *The brewing industry in England 1700-1830*, (Cambridge, 1959); P. Jennings, *The local: a history of the English pub*, (Stroud, 2007).

⁶ Jennings, *The local*.

⁷ J. Barge, *A gazetter of Liverpool breweries*, (Swinton, 1987).

⁸ N. Barber, *A century of British brewers plus*, (New Ash Green, 2005).

⁹ Jennings, *The history of Jennings* <<http://www.jenningsbrewery.co.uk/history.htm>>, 2008.

¹⁰ K. H. Hawkins and C. L. Pass, *The brewing industry: a study in industrial organisation and public policy*, (London, 1979), p.29.

¹¹ S. Salvidge, *Salvidge of Liverpool: behind the political scene 1890-1928*, (London, 1934).

¹² Liverpool Record Office (LRO). Peter Walker & Son PWK/1/8 Loose private letters, 28 Nov 1890 from Miller Pech Hughes & Co, to Ernest Ellis.

¹³ Timmins, *Made in Lancashire*, pp. 200-1

-
- ¹⁴ M. Dunn, *Local brew: traditional breweries and their ales*, (London, 1986), p. 187.
- ¹⁵ A. Mutch, 'Manchester and Liverpool public houses compared, 1840-1914', *Manchester Region History Review*, 16 (2003), pp. 22-29.
- ¹⁶ N. Richardson, *A history of Wilson's brewery 1834-1984*, (Swinton, 1983), p.5.
- ¹⁷ R. Roberts, R, *The classic slum*, (Manchester, 1971), p. 6.
- ¹⁸ Mass Observation, *The pub and the people*, (London, 1970), p. 21.
- ¹⁹ G. Brandwood, A. Davison and M. Slaughter *Licensed to sell: the history and heritage of the public house*, (London, 2004), p. 77.
- ²⁰ Anon, 'Advance of the Managerial System', *Brewers' Journal*, October 15 1921, p. 417.
- ²¹ Mutch, 'Manchester and Liverpool'.
- ²² T. Lane, *Liverpool, Gateway of Empire*, (London, 1987).
- ²³ Roberts, *Classic slum*, p. 6.
- ²⁴ J. K Walton and A. Wilcox, *Low life and moral improvement in mid-Victorian England: Liverpool through the journalism of Hugh Shimmin*, (Leicester, 1991), p. 169.
- ²⁵ A. Mutch, 'The design of Liverpool pubs in the nineteenth century', *Brewery History*, 127, (2008), pp. 2-26.
- ²⁶ A. Mutch 'Shaping the public house 1850-1950: business strategies, state regulation and social history', *Cultural and Social History*, 1, (2004), pp. 179-200.
- ²⁷ P. J. Waller, *Democracy and sectarianism: a political and social history of Liverpool 1868-1939*, (Liverpool, 1981).
- ²⁸ J. Belchem, *Merseypride*, (Liverpool, 2000).
- ²⁹ A. Mutch, 'Magistrates and public house managers, 1840-1914: another case of Liverpool exceptionalism?', *Northern History*, 40, (2003), pp. 325-342.
- ³⁰ LRO, 347 JUS 1/7/2, Newscuttings on licensing 1909-1915, 'Tied tenant controversy', *Liverpool Daily Post*, 5 May 1914.
- ³¹ A. Mutch, 'Public houses as multiple retailing: Peter Walker & Son 1846-1914', *Business History*, 48, (2006), pp. 1-19.
- ³² *Royal Commission on Licensing* (Peel Commission) C-8693 1898 XXXVI Third volume of evidence, p. 391.
- ³³ Peel Commission, p. 409.
- ³⁴ Peel Commission, p. 376

³⁵ N. Hyde, *Brewing was a way of life*, (Hale, 1999); L. Pearson, *The history of Robinson's brewery*, (Altrincham, 1997).

³⁶ NMB, Reports of the Birmingham and Midland Counties Wholesale Brewers' Association, 1914, p. 8.

³⁷ NMB, Reports of the Birmingham and Midland Counties Wholesale Brewers' Association, 1912, pp. 19, 36.

³⁸ Mutch, 'Peter Walker & Son'.

³⁹ Mutch, *Strategic and organizational change*.