INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

ENGLISH WORKING-CLASS INTERNATIONALISM, 1846-1864

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

DUANE CHARLES ANDERSON

Norman, Oklahoma

1976

ENGLISH WORKING-CLASS INTERNATIONALISM, 1846-1864

APPROVED BY

William H. Maehl, Jr.

Gordon A. Craig

Jonathan W. Spurgeon

A. T. Carlson

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PREFACE

In a recent bibliographical article, William H. Maehl, Jr., noted the ". . . cautious participation of some English working men in an international labor movement" as one of the areas of British labor history that lacked adequate treatment.[1] I intend in this study to fulfill that void. This study fits the mainstream of current British historiography. Labor and social history encompass the most exciting fields in the discipline. This history-from-below approach aims at a "total" reconstruction of society instead of the myopic view from the top. Although much of this particular work focuses on London, because that was where the refugees congregated, its scope is national.[2] Its generalizations aim at a definition of the internationalists' contributions to the English labor movement's emergence as a modern force. Labor history in the mid-Victorian period has long been neglected and much remains to be done. With reference to the decline of Chartism and the rise of a socialist labor movement, the choice between traditional political radicalism and restructuring socialism faced the English

---

[1]"'Jerusalem Deferred': Recent Writings in the History of the British Labor Movement," Journal of Modern History, XXXI (September, 1969), 335-67.

[2]Dorothy Thompson, "Chartism as a Historical Subject," Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, no. 20 (Spring, 1970), 10-13 calls for studies of a general nature rather than a continued emphasis on local studies.

working class in the 1850s. I trust that the discussion of English working-class internationalism found below explains the alternatives available and why respectability emerged triumphant.

Some two and one-half years have elapsed since I began this project in earnest. I have spent many lonely evenings in my study, inundated with books, notecards and xerox papers and have often asked myself why I am doing this. There are numerous more exciting activities, both intellectual and physical, that entice other people and give their lives meaning. Why have I chosen history? Not because I am masochistic, though one frequently wonders whether any historian truly has hold of his senses, and not because it isolates me from the "real" world, because if history does anything it encourages one to want to improve the world, not withdraw from it. Rather, I am drawn to history-from-below because I despise injustice. The internationalists saw injustice and fought it. If my writing about their gallant encounter with the established authority structure can shed any light upon the universal struggle for justice and equality of opportunity, then every day, every hour spent on this study was worth-while. Consequently, I warn my reader that although I regard objectivity with reverence, my sympathies are with the internationalists.

As always, my debts are great. I acknowledge the aid and assistance of many people and institutions: to the History Department at the University of Oklahoma for a Graduate Assistantship in the form of a National Defense Education Fellowship between 1970 and 1973; to the Graduate College of the University of Oklahoma for a travel grant that partially paid for a research trip to England; and to the staff of

Bizzell Memorial Library at the University of Oklahoma for office space, inter-library loan books and generous assistance at all times. A note of appreciation is also in order for the staffs at the following institutions and libraries: the Institute of Historical Research, London; the Reading Room of the British Museum; the British Museum Newspaper Library at Colindale; the Public Record Office; the Bishopsgate Institute; the Goldsmiths' Library of the University of London Library; the British Library of Political and Economic Science at the London School of Economics and Political Science; Balliol College Library, Oxford; the Manchester Public Library; the Co-operative Union Library, Holyoake House, Manchester; and the Central Reference Library, Newcastle upon Tyne.

On a more personal level, I owe a deep sense of gratitude to several people. Dr. William H. Maehl, Jr., has directed my dissertation with the peerless skill of one who knows intimately Chartist historiography and sources. His patience with me and his insistence upon academic excellence were instrumental in the completion of this study. Dr. Jonathan W. Spurgeon has influenced my approach to the study of history more than I can express; his advice on the dissertation was most constructive. My thanks also to the other members of the dissertation committee: Dr. Gordon D. Drummond and Dr. Dougald T. Calhoun. And last but not least, I offer my thankful appreciation to my parents, Charles L. and Gladys R. Anderson for their encouragement and assistance over the years and to my grandparents, Alvin L. and Olive Anderson, who made possible my trip to England, but, more importantly, who tendered guidance throughout the last twenty years through example and deeds

rather than words. And last I applaud Lynn for her faith in me as a historian and for her ever-present reminder that history is made through the interaction of people, not through the historian's analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCFP	Central Committee of the Friends of Poland
CEDC	Central European Democratic Committee
DCPR	Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration
ELDA	East London Democratic Association
LAPF	Literary Association of the Friends of Poland
LOC	London Organization Committee
LTC	London Trades Council
LWMA	London Working Men's Association
NCA	National Charter Association
NLIP	National League for the Independence of Poland
PIL	People's International League
SFI	Society of the Friends of Italy

ENGLISH WORKING-CLASS INTERNATIONALISM, 1846-1864

CHAPTER I

INTERNATIONALISM BEFORE 1848

In the nineteenth century Europe's political exiles congregated in England. Their benefactors were the English liberals. These men guarded against the possibility that foreign governments might influence the British Government's refugee policy. During a House of Commons debate about such a likelihood, Lord Palmerston responded, on April 1, 1852, ". . . letters and proclamations from unhappy refugees will be as harmless as a torch upon the turnpike road."[1] Although he called the issue insignificant, he concealed the extent to which Her Majesty's Government involved itself with the liberal and democratic political exiles who accepted the shelter offered them by England.

The concern of the British government stemmed mostly from the political and social reform philosophes of the refugees, although from time to time foreign governments pressured the Queen's ministers on the subject. Once in England the refugees dreamed about and sometimes planned revolutions in their homelands. To keep their spirits high they formed

---

[1]Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. CXX (23 March-27 April, 1852), p. 512. (Hereinafter referred to as Hansard's.)

societies for the promotion of their goals and for the preservation of their movements' continuity. Their reforming mentality brought them into contact with English working-class reformers and both groups recognized the similarities of their objectives. This recognition of common purposes of political and social change in England and on the continent created a sense of community between them. From this unity emerged an awareness of a working-class international identity.

My purpose in this study is to analyze the English working-class participation in the international labor movement between the founding of the Fraternal Democrats in 1846 and the formation of the First International in 1864. According to traditional labor history accounts, the mid-Victorian labor scene existed in a lull between the Chartist political agitation of the previous decades and the socialist labor revival of the 1880s. Most labor historians of this period have focused upon emerging trade unionism and upon middle-class parliamentary radicalism. In this study I will investigate the partially successful efforts of some English workers to create an essentially proletarian identity for the English labor movement. That they failed does not demean their effort. Their agitation fell within the mainstream of nineteenth-century political and social dissent and they were a vital link in the historical development of the English social conscience. They represented the other side of the mid-Victorian labor movement.

Radical social and political movements succeed either by convincing the existing power structure to adopt their programs or by taking over existing institutions and imposing their policies on society. The international labor movement sought reform of the dominant social and

political structures in order to establish a democratic government in England and to create independent democratic nations in Europe. The more democratically-inclined elements of the movement toyed with achieving change through violent means, but gradually the respectable reformists defused them and the movement sought reforms peacefully. My intention is to explain why the internationalists failed to achieve their objectives.

Within the context of explaining the movement's failure, I will resolve several interconnected problems. First, what was the movement's social composition in relation to its participants' motives? I will extend this investigation beyond the leadership to the rank-and-file whenever possible. Second, how extensively and to what degree was the English working-class's commitment to the international labor movement? Third, what was the movement's impact on the English labor movement in both long- and short-term influence? And fourth, how did the tensions within the English labor movement affect the inner dynamics of the international labor movement? In the first chapter I discuss the emergence of a modern international labor movement in England. In succeeding chapters the focal points are: the emergence of a dominant social reform theme, the government's reaction to the movement, the expectation of reform to accompany the Crimean War and the movement's evolution into a respectable labor movement.

The international labor movement matured after Chartism had peaked. Organized, political Chartism had burned out on the damp field at Kennington Common. Rising real income was drawing the worker's allegiance away from radical politics and the middle class enjoyed an

era of prosperity. The high noon of Victorian England must have fulfilled G. M. Young's belief that ". . . of all decades in our history, a wise man would choose the eighteen-fifties to be young in." Yet, what at first glance appears a serene quiescent society, emerges upon closer examination as a ruptured and struggle-torn country in the midst of change. Although a period of political stagnation, it was also one in which social forces were altering the structure of society. England was a country of workers, both agricultural and industrial, by the mid-nineteenth century. In 1851 nearly one-third of these workers were a part of industrial society. English workers emerged from the mid-Victorian years as a true industrial, class-conscious proletariat, which felt an internal identity resulting from common experiences as opposed to others whose interests were not identical. Five groupings constituted the social stratification of early and mid-Victorian England. Regarding the authority structure, which is the basis of social class and political power, the upper class was in a dominant position because it controlled both the social and political sides of society. The middle class was deferential, as was working class B which included those on the bottom rungs of urban and rural society. The middling class of petite bourgeois, aspiring professional men and artisans was non-deferential towards the authority structure in its concern for a more open society. Working class A of industrial proletariat and workers in traditional domestic industries was also non-deferential, but it sought government economic and social protection rather than political gains.[2] The internationalists'

---

[2]G. M. Young, Victorian England, Portrait of an Age (2nd ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 77; George Kitson Clark, The

attempt to fuse the political objectives of the middling class with the economic and social goals of working class A was a manifestation of the shifting social structure of mid-Victorian England.

The motivation for English working-class internationalism varied. Hatred of Roman Catholicism accounted for an affinity of some English workers for the Italian patriots who faced the opposition of the Papacy. In viewing the Poles, religion hardly counted; rather, Russophobia figured prominently in the English workers' sympathy. For others, the international interest resulted from the free trade economics of the Manchester School with its concept of European markets for English goods. The humanitarian appeal of helping struggling Europeans motivated others. And most important, many were drawn to the movement out of an ideological commitment shared with the refugees.[3]

Regarding motivation, a distinction existed between the working-class leadership and the rank-and-file. More than their followers, working-class leaders acted out of an ideological conviction. Although they disagreed violently over their beliefs, they perceived that the

---

Making of Victorian England (New York: Atheneum, 1962), p. 58; E. J. Hobsbawm, Industry and Empire (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 154; S. G. Checkland, The Rise of Industrial Society in England, 1815-1885 (London: Longman, 1964), p. 217; Harold Perkin, The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 231-37. For an extensive discussion of class consciousness see E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), pp. 9-11 and Ralf Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), pp. 144-54. The five class model of R. S. Neale, "Class and Class-Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century England: Three Classes or Five," Victorian Studies, XII (September, 1968), 5-32 is used throughout in this study.

[3]Norbert J. Gossman, "British Aid to Polish, Italian and Hungarian Exiles, 1830-1870," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII (Spring, 1969), 244-45.

common denominators were social, economic and political freedom. They connected the refugees' hope for liberation with the desire for additional reform in England. This expectation peaked during the 1848-49 revolutions and during the Crimean War, but it never totally disappeared. At these highpoints of internationalist hope, this ideological commitment was strongest in the movement's rank-and-file. Otherwise, their commitment to internationalism was minimal.

The refugees living in England determined the movement's earliest character. These advocates of romantic lost causes and democratic ideas migrated to England after abortive revolts in their homelands and settled mostly in London. Poles, Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Hungarians, Scandinavians, Spaniards and Belgians came at various intervals during the 1830s, 1840s and 1850s. They espoused reform and revolution in the name of every "ism" known to the nineteenth century: socialism, communism, nationalism, liberalism, and conservatism. For example, the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 resulted in an exodus of some 9,000-10,000 Polish rebels to western Europe. In 1834 nearly 500 of them resided in England; the number rose to 760 by 1851 and stabilized there for the next decade.[4] The Polish émigrès played a key role in the formation of an English working-class international outlook.[5] Scores of additional refugees arrived in England after short-lived rebellions in

---

[4]Peter Brock, "Polish Democrats and English Radicals, 1832-1862," Journal of Modern History, XXV (June, 1953), 142, footnote 10.

[5]Ibid., 139-40; Simon MacCoby, English Radicalism, 1832-1852 (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1935), pp. 366-67; John H. Gleason, The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), pp. 113-34; and Henry Weisser, "Polonophilism and the British Working Class, 1830-1845," Polish Review, III (Spring, 1967), 78-96.

the German states during the 1830s and 1840s, and after the Cracow insurrection of 1846. Another major influx came after the revolutions of 1848-49. With the failure of the Second Republic in France more French democrats arrived in England.[6] Thereafter, individuals rather than groups fled to England, but did so in decreasing numbers. Thus, diversity characterized refugee relations in England.

The lack of unity within the Polish exiles, for example, illustrates this problem. They were split along aristocratic-conservative and liberal-democratic lines. Prince Adam Czartoryski led the former group. The latter group lacked unified leadership. The Polish democratic exiles included a wide range of opinions within themselves. The Lud Polski section was socialist and a special brand of social radicalism characterized the Polish Democratic Society. Also included within the democratic wing of the Polish exiles were two groups that lacked this socialist orientation. Young Poland acted in the tradition of early nineteenth-century liberalism and a number of right-wing democratic gentry under the leadership of the exiled General Owernicki fit this category but only because they were without the aristocratic bearing of Prince Czartoryski.[7]

---

[6]See, for example, Georges Duveau, 1848: The Making of a Revolution (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. 200, who contends that the exodus of Frenchmen to England peaked after August 25, 1848, June 19, 1849, and December 1851.

[7]Brock, "Polish Democrats and English Radicals, 1832-1862," Journal of Modern History, XXV, 140. For additional discussion of these divisions see Brock's other writings: "The Birth of Polish Socialism," Journal of Central European Affairs, XIII (October, 1953), 213-31; "Zeno Swietoslawki, a Forerunner of the Russian Narodniki," American Slavic and East European Review, XIII (1954), 566-87; "The Polish Revolutionary Commune in London," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXV (1956), 116-28; "Polish Socialists in Early Victorian England: Three Documents,"

Early English internationalist activity reflected this diversity. Consequently, no unified movement ever existed. This proclivity towards organizations and diverse philosophies hampered the internationalist cause in England, especially since the English labor movement was itself deeply divided after 1848 regarding its tactics and objectives. A detailed account of British working-class awareness of Europe between 1815 and 1848 has appeared elsewhere recently.[8] What follows here is a discussion of the movement's source of inspiration, an introduction of some of the major personages who overlap the 1848 watershed and an analysis of the formation of several organizations that led the international labor movement into the mid-Victorian era.

English working-class awareness of European workers and their problems was minimal before the late 1840s. Under the stress of full-scale industrialization and the grievances it caused the English worker,

---

Polish Review, VI (1961), 33-52; and "The Socialists of the Polish Great Migration" in Essays in Labour History, ed. by Asa Briggs and John Saville (London: Macmillan, 1960), pp. 140-73.

[8]Henry Weisser, British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815-1848 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975) presents a comprehensive study of this neglected aspect of British labor history. He places great importance on emerging class consciousness and upon the significance of the left-wing exiles who lived in London, but fails to investigate fully all the sources available for such a study. For example, he virtually ignores the Home Offices Papers. For the beginnings of his study of this area see his "The British Working Class and European Affairs, 1815-1848," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1965. For greater detail on particular points see his articles: Polonophilism," Polish Review, XII, 78-96; "The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846," Polish Review, XIII (Winter, 1968), 3-19; "The Role of Feargus O'Connor in Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848," The Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal, VI (April, 1969), 82-90; and "Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848," Historical Journal, XIV (March, 1971), 49-66. Another recent study that looks at Chartist internationalism in greater depth than is the wont of Chartist historians is David Jones, Chartism and the Chartists (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975).

the labor movement had little time for internationalism. Consequently, it gave only passing notice to Europe. But when the European worker did receive the English worker's attention, it was sympathetic and understanding. Several early working-class organizations reflected this feeling.

The achievement of international working-class awareness was one of the many objectives of the London Working Men's Association. Founded on June 16, 1836, by William Lovett, Henry Hetherington, James Watson and John Cleave, it claimed the honor of making one of the first international addresses between working men of different countries. Occasioned by the Belgian police persecution of Jacob Katz, who had organized a Flemish Worker's Society, it was issued to the workers of Belgium. A Belgian working men's group replied with a similar address.[9] The East London Democratic Association was another of these early working men's organizations; it reflected a left-wing proletarian orientation. Formed in 1837 by Charles Neesom, Allen Davenport and the young George Julian Harney, it sought a popular following, although it never achieved one.[10] The ELDA paid considerable attention to the working classes on

---

[9]William Lovett, Life and Struggles of William Lovett (London: MacGibbon, 1967), pp. 80-82 and A. Müller Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III (1938), 189-91. Lehning prints both addresses in the appendix of his study. See also George Howell, A History of the Working Men's Association (Newcastle upon Tyne: Frank Graham, n.d.), pp. 51-55 for the address of the English group. Weisser, Working-Class Movements, pp. 66-78 discusses the LWMA at length. He contends that the LWMA's claim to having made the first international address was untrue because in 1834 the Owenite journal The Pioneer exchanged letters with a group of workmen in Nantes (see p. 54), but he does admit the LWMA address was significant in that it was "widely noticed."

[10]J. T. Ward, Chartism (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1973), p. 76; D. J. Rowe, "The Failure of London Chartism," Historical Journal,

the continent. Similar to many early nineteenth-century romantic revolutionary societies, it drew its inspiration from the Robespierrean phase of the French Revolution. Although one Chartist historian labelled its members ". . . a violent revolutionary clique,"[11] it posed little threat to the political structure.

The ELDA failed but Harney emerged from it as a leading internationalist, who maintained intimate friendships with many continental refugees and conspirators. He moved from the ELDA briefly into the LWMA, from which he shifted into the Chartist movement. He belonged to the extremist section of the working-class movement. Before he was nineteen Harney had been imprisoned three times for selling unstamped or illegal newspapers. In 1843, while a sub-editor for Feargus O'Connor's newspaper, the Northern Star, he met Friedrich Engels and began an acquaintance and intellectual relationship that lasted throughout their life-times. The Chartist failure in 1848 convinced Harney that the independent working-class movement had to become socialist as well as democratic. That conviction and his acquaintance with most of the socialist and democratic refugees in London led him into becoming an indefatigable proponent of working-class internationalism. A romantic, somewhat violent figure, he nevertheless publicized socialist doctrine through his newspaper writing and his public speeches. In his person were fused the twin doctrines of democracy and socialism, the one drawn from Robespierre and the French Revolution and the other drawn from the

---

XI (No. 3, 1968), 473; and Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 188.

[11] Mark Hovell, The Chartist Movement, ed. by T. F. Tout (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1918), p. 66.

socialists he knew. He ultimately concluded that an independent radical working-men's movement was folly and withdrew into middle-class respectability, but in the 1840s and early 1850s he was a central figure in English working-class internationalism.[12]

Harney was but one of several significant internationalists of this early period. James Bronterre O'Brien, the intellectual of the Chartist movement, visited France in 1836 and had translated into English Buonarroti's history of Gracchus Babeuf's conspiracy of equals. In 1838 he published the first volume of his Life of Robespierre. His search for social reform led him into modern evolutionary socialism. Although not intimately involved in the international movement, he contributed to it through his writings and to a lesser extent by his infrequent participation in some of the organizations.[13] Two others who deserve mention are Robert Owen who corresponded with various European socialists and whose Utopian societies bridged the gap between the Old and the New World,[14]

---

[12]A. R. Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge (London: Heinemann, 1858) is a peerless biography for Harney, although G. D. H. Cole's chapter on him in Chartist Portraits (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1941), pp. 268-99 is well done. For Harney's relationship with Engels see Peter Cadogan, "Harney and Engels," International Review of Social History, X (Part I, 1965), 66-104 and for his published surviving letters, both to and from many European democrats, see Frank Gees Black and Renée Métiver Black, eds., The Harney Papers (Assen: Van Gorcum and Co., 1969).

[13]See Alfred Plummer, A Political Biography of Bronterre O'Brien, 1804-1864 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971) and his earlier article "The Place of Bronterre O'Brien in the Working Class Movement," Economic History Review, II (January, 1929), 61-80. Cole, Chartist Portraits, pp. 239-67 offers an illuminating chapter on O'Brien.

[14]John F. C. Harrison, Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America (New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1969) and Lewis L. Lorwin, Labor and Internationalism (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), pp. 14-16.

and Augustus Hardin Beaumont, who entertained a fleeting interest in European radical movements in the 1830s.[15]

Also prominent among these early internationalists was William Lovett, one of the founders of the LWMA, who publicized internationalist ideas by writing pamphlets for various organizations. In 1844 he wrote an address to the French workers for the National Association for Promoting the Political and Social Welfare of the People, which was formed to further working class education. He identified the interests of the working classes of France and England as similar and warned them that their governments did not have their interests at heart. The pamphlet was published on September 10, 1844, at the height of the diplomatic squabble between the English and French Governments over the Texas Question.[16] His reaction to a foreign situation was characteristic of the working-class international movement in England. Internationalism was alien to the English working-class experience. They had to be educated to their role, but the proper method of teaching it to them was never decided. That concern was always at the forefront of the internationalists' activities.

Another characteristic was the central influence upon the internationalist organizations of the refugees. In London, Karl Schapper,

---

[15]William H. Maehl, Jr., "A. H. Beaumont: Anglo-American Radical (1798-1838)," International Review of Social History, XIV (Part 2, 1969), 237-50.

[16]National Association for Promoting the Political and Social Welfare of the People, Address of the National Association for Promoting the Political and Social Welfare of the People to the Working Classes of France on the Subject of War (2nd ed.; London: C. H. Elt, [1844]). This may well be the group formed by Lovett and John Collins in 1840 for promoting the political and social improvement of the people. See Ward, Chartism, p. 141 and Hovell, The Chartist Movement, pp. 203-208.

Joseph Moll and Heinrich Bauer, all exiles of abortive rebellions in their German homelands, formed the Deutsche Bildungsverein für Arbeiter in 1840.[17] It provided a variety of social services for German exiles in London and served as a cover for the League of the Just, which was a secret German revolutionary society. In the early 1840s the League was under the influence of Wilhelm Weitling, a utopian communist who spent some time in London in 1844. By then his ideas were on the decline and those of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were on the rise. From its exchange of ideas with the Chartists, the League of the Just was introduced to the concept of mass working-class organization. In return it provided the English with experienced revolutionaries who were willing to guide their hosts into international laborism.[18] Schapper, for example, helped Lovett and William J. Linton form the Democratic Friends of all Nations in 1844.

Linton entered the ranks of the Chartists after the failure of the Newport riot in 1839. An artisan by origin and one of the master wood engravers of the nineteenth century, he participated in the mid-Victorian international labor movement as fervently as anyone. Testy, irascible and nearly always in debt, he was the care-free soul who happened onto an impossible cause. His internationalism originated from his

---

[17] Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 194-95 and Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, p. 72, footnote 1.

[18] David Fernbach, "Introduction" in Karl Marx, The Revolutions of 1848, Vol. I of Political Writings, ed. by David Fernbach (3 vols.; New York: Vintage Books, 1973-74), pp. 26-27; Weisser, Working-Class Movements, pp. 127-29; Carl Wittke, The Utopian Communist, A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), pp. 90-99; and David McLellan, Karl Marx, (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 168-70.

acquaintance with Joseph Mazzini, the liberal Italian patriot, whom he probably met in late 1841. From this association grew his concern for continental democrats. Throughout these years he was deeply involved in the movement. His periodical, the English Republic, publicized Mazzinian ideas and organizations in the 1850s. Ultimately, his dedication to the movement derived from his sincere humanitarian commitment to assisting the refugees not only in the cause of freedom but also in their constant fight for economic survival in England. In 1866, totally disillusioned with English working-class politics he reluctantly emigrated to New York.[19]

The first manifesto of the Democratic Friends of all Nations, to which Linton belonged, was written by Lovett although it was signed by Schapper and the Polish exile Louis Oborski. An excerpted version of this address was printed in the Northern Star, making its sentiments available to the Chartist readers. In effect, this group had from its inception non-English inspiration and Chartist participation. Although short-lived, it occupied a significant position in the mid-1840s transition period of English working-class internationalism.[20]

At the end of this transition stage a series of revolutionary upheavals occurred in Europe that altered the international labor movement.

---

[19]F. B. Smith, Radical Artisan: William James Linton, 1812-1897 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973). See also his memoirs, William J. Linton, Memories (London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1895) and European Republicans (London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1893).

[20]Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 195. For this manifesto see Democratic Friends of all Nations, Address to the Friends of Humanity and Justice among all Nations (London: J. Cleave, 1845) and Northern Star, February 1, 1845. See also Smith, Radical Artisan, p. 59.

Both the refugees and their English allies fell under a messianic spell in expecting momentous changes in the political and social structures of England and various continental countries.[21] This expectation encouraged an already enthusiastic leadership to form new organizations in which internationalism played a central part, not an adjunct role. Their agitation introduced internationalism to more English workers than had the earlier, insular English groups.

In 1846 and 1847 two types of organizations vied for the English workers' participation in an international labor movement. Each group's perception of the movement took on the philosophies of the refugees with whom it associated. Consequently, neither side had much affinity for the other. Those on the left favored the creation of a working-class leadership for the movement, but the "respectable" groups discouraged such an initiative in favor of continued aristocratic and middle-class guidance. Thus, an analysis of these organizations is essential for determining their social composition and their impact upon the British labor movement.

The Fraternal Democrats and the Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration represented the left-wing of the movement.[22] The Fraternal

---

[21] J. L. Talmon, Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960) presents the best exposition of this subject.

[22] These groups have received considerable attention from Marxist historians. Fedor Rothstein, From Chartism to Labourism (London: M. Lawrence, 1929) argues that the Fraternal Democrats were strong advocates of proletarian internationalism and believes that the Chartists played an important role in the movement; he relied almost entirely upon radical newspapers for his sources. More recently, Julius Braunthal, History of the International (2 vols.; New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967), I, 73 labels the Fraternal Democrats the first organized expression of working-class solidarity. Salme A. Dutt, "Chartism and the Fight for Peace,"

Democrats emerged from two meetings that were attended by leading democrats of all persuasions from England, France, Poland, Switzerland, the Germanies, Italy, Ireland, Scotland and Turkey. The first gathering occurred on September 22, 1845, in the City Chartist Hall where they met to commemorate the French Revolution of 1792. The second was held on February 9, 1846, in the White Conduit House in London under the sponsorship of Schapper's organization. The driving force behind the Fraternal Democrats' formation was Harney, who delivered the major addresses on these evenings and stated the philosophical underpinnings of their agitation. He said: "I am convinced that this fraternal union could be accomplished, if the leaders of public opinion throughout Europe would work faithfully to their mission. The cause of the people in all countries is the same--the cause of labour, enslaved and plundered labour." He ended with a call for the workers of all countries to unite.[23] Admittedly he spoke before audiences primarily constituted of foreigners, but a

---

Labour Monthly, XXI (June, 1939), 367-74 places Chartism and the Fraternal Democrats firmly within the concepts of internationalism and democracy, which we traces back to Robespierre. Mary Davis, "The Forerunners of the First International--the Fraternal Democrats," Marxism Today, XV (February, 1971), 50-60 provides an excellent overview of the society and contends that it represented proletarian internationalism at its best. It is the most reasonable of the Marxist works. Recently, a non-Marxist has evaluated these societies and reached radically different conclusions. For his summation see Weisser, Working-Class Movements, pp. 134-78. In an earlier article he found the connection between Chartism and internationalism less valid than the Marxists would admit; see Weisser, "Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848," Historical Journal, XIV, 66: "The Fraternal Democrats were not, then, the most highly developed Chartist leaders with a great mass movement behind them, swelling boldly in their direction. They were rather a foaming eddy, in an unnavigable, turbulent sea." Where Weisser appears to underestimate the Chartist connection, Ward, Chartism, pp. 197-98 concludes somewhat differently: "There now opened a dramatic period of Chartist history."

[23] Northern Star, September 27, 1845, p. 5 and February 14, 1846, p. 3.

few Englishmen were present and his views were available to all through the radical press. His position was significant because it underlined the proletarian, socialist orientation of the Fraternal Democrats. The next month the Fraternal Democrats formed the DCPR to correlate the pressure for Polish freedom. This group operated as a subcommittee with a propagandistic orientation. Oddly enough, though, no Poles were on it.[24]

The Fraternal Democrats and the DCPR entertained proletarian attitudes and appealed to the working class. Their most significant meetings were held to commemorate past revolutionary events, such as the yearly celebration of the September 22, 1792, French Revolution and the November 29, 1830, uprising in Poland. They met in the evenings in order to allow workers to attend and included enough entertainment to offer an alternative to an otherwise dreary night. The prospect of seeing and hearing, or actually conversing with, an exiled revolutionary acted as a magnet that drew workers into the meetings, as did the likelihood of listening to a variety of songs performed in foreign languages by refugees sometimes dressed in their native garb. At times, the series of monotonous, repetitious speeches must surely have tried the audience's patience. Yet, the seriousness of their cause was presented earnestly enough to prompt participation, however meager.

In formally organizing themselves, the Fraternal Democrats adopted rules. The most significant points were: for membership the endorsement of two old members was required; people living outside London were eligible; dues were one-half penny a week; non-attendance for a

---

[24] Northern Star, March 28, 1846, p. 1.

period of three months resulted in loss of membership; secretaries represented each country; the Committee of Secretaries managed the organization; and the order of business for meetings commenced at 8:00 p.m. Their motto was "All men are brethren" and the underlying philosophy was based upon political equality, common ownership of the land and its products and the condemnation of hatreds between nations. Such a program, however slow to emerge and however limited in appeal, reflected the non-deferential, political consciousness of its framers.[25]

The Fraternal Democrats sought to project their international philosophy upon the English working class. They attempted to achieve a state of class consciousness amongst the workers by extolling the virtues of solidarity of peoples and the similarities of interests of workers throughout the world. Thus, they recorded accurate though idyllic descriptions of their meetings:

> It is a large room in the White Conduit House, on the evening of September 21st. It is almost nine o'clock; the rooms are brightly illuminated with gas, the tables are filled with the good things of the earth, around them are seated men of all countries, yet they are as one family--the great family of man.[26]

Tackling this theme on a practical level, Harney wrote an address for the Fraternal Democrats during the height of the 1846 war scare between Britain and the United States in which he exhorted the workers of both countries to oppose war because war only benefited the privileged classes. He contended that wars were more harmful to workers than to others in society because the proletariat sustained most of the deaths and paid

---

[25] Northern Star, January 16, 1846, p. 6.

[26] Ibid., October 3, 1846, p. 6.

most of the taxes used to retire the war debts.[27] On this point he echoed O'Connor's views about the David Urquhart's foreign policy movement in 1840. The internationalists' objective was the creation of a better Europe, but the European despots stood in the way. Consequently, the internationalists eventually claimed that a free Poland was a preliminary to the achievement of their goal. Poland's freedom became a precursor to greater freedom in England and other countries. But since Russia would not willingly release the Poles, a "just war" was required to accomplish this dream. As Linton said, they rejected non-intervention ". . . because they hold that the intervention of the strong to save the weak from oppression is a duty as much binding upon nations as upon individuals."[28] Even Harney finally accepted the need for a "just war." Although he still thought war was abhorrent, it looked better than slavery. In an address that he wrote for the Fraternal Democrats and forwarded to Foreign Secretary Palmerston, he wrote: "Our cause is the cause of right and justice, progress and freedom. Up then men of every land."[29]

The Fraternal Democrats belong on the left of the political spectrum. But how far left? Harney laid down the society's principles in three categories. First, "All men are brethren," but kings, aristocrats and other classes monopolizing politics are usurpers. Second, "We believe the earth and all its natural productions to be the common property of all; . . ." Third, "We condemn the 'national' hatreds which have hitherto divided mankind as both foolish and wicked; . . ." But,

---

[27] Northern Star, March 14, 1846, p. 6.

[28] Ibid., March 28, 1846, p. 1.

[29] Ibid., December 12, 1846, p. 7 and January 16, 1847, p. 6.

unchanged since his days in the ELDA, Harney also drew inspiration from Robespierre and Babeuf, and the radical phase of the French Revolution in general.[30] The Left in England also found inspiration from Cromwellian Republicanism, although no references were made to its radical elements such as the Levellers and the Diggers who were practically unknown in this period. For example, a DCPR policy address attacked Palmerston for a weak show against Russian oppression in Poland. It claimed that a time had existed when English statesmen knew how to act under such circumstances, but now, "worn-out" aristocrats ruled England. Although a return to one-man rule was unacceptable, the good old days of Oliver Cromwell offered an alternative. An infusion of the "young blood of democracy" would correct the present aristocratic system.[31] In one of his more startling statements, Harney also invoked past English history for support. He intertwined a demand for English intervention and war, if necessary, to help Poland with a historical condemnation of Palmerston that asked: "Men of England, countrymen of Blake and Cromwell, has it come to this, . . . [are we] content ourselves with the crawling remonstrance, the pitiful, sneaking, hypocritical protest of a worn-out dandy aristocrat?"[32] The equation of the democratic men of the nineteenth century with the Puritans of the English Revolution formed a cogent plank in the internationalists' appeal to public opinion.

---

[30] Northern Star, September 26, 1846, p. 7.

[31] Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration, The Seizure of Cracow. The Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration to the People of Great Britain and Ireland (London: n.p., 1846).

[32] Northern Star, February 27, 1847, p. 7.

Thus, it is unfair at this juncture to label the Left wing of the international labor movement as either socialist or communist. George Lichtheim writes that the two crucial questions in the 1840s that separated socialists from communists were the importance of the "Mountain" of 1793-94 as the proper model for the inescapable "proletarian dictatorship" before the classless society emerged and the irrelevance of Jacobinism to the organization of labor. The communist answered "yes" to the first question and "no" to the second; his was a proletarian movement that rejected the existing social order. The socialist reversed his responses to these questions; his was a philanthropic movement that called for peaceful reorganization of society. Yet, Lichtheim recognizes intermediate positions. Followers of the Buonarroti and Blanqui traditions were a fringe minority in England, even among the refugees. But the "'republican socialist' ideology which combined republican democracy (but not Jacobin dictatorship) with the aims of Labor" fits the sketch drawn above of the international labor movement participants in England.[33]

Two further observations about the Left are in order at this point. It appealed to the proletariat, or more generally, the workers, to achieve its goals without middle class assistance. In that sense it came closer to being communist than socialist, according to Lichtheim's analysis. As demonstrated above, the Fraternal Democrats appealed openly and directly to the workers. They turned their backs on secrecy and ritual, which characterized primitive social movements, and became a modern social movement in infancy. The mass following that the Fraternal

---

[33]George Lichtheim, A Short History of Socialism (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), pp. 52-55.

Democrats sought was emerging in the 1850s, but proletarianization occurred slowly and mostly in the North rather than in London where much of the internationalist effort concentrated. The internationalists stood little chance of success until proletarianization was completed.[34]

With their modernity came a desire to avoid middle-class assistance that lessened their chance of success. It meant that they were faced with the same problem that the Chartists had encountered: whether or not to cooperate with the parliamentary radicals and their allies. Failure to do so led to endless ideological wrangling between the Left and the respectable middle-class moderates who sought similar objectives. The Literary Association of the Friends of Poland and the People's International League represented the "respectables." The LAFP emerged after the 1830-31 Polish Revolution. It argued the case for Polish liberation as a precursor for more reform in England, and although it survived until the 1880s it accomplished little. Due to its efforts parliament voted the Polish exiles on its lists an annual subsidy of £10,000 until 1852. But the organization's philosophy was so in line with the aristocratic Prince Czartoryski that the LAFP secretary, Lord Dudley Stuart, struck off his lists those Poles who associated with Chartism and other leftist ideas. Thus, the organization best positioned to help the Polish cause pursued a highly partisan approach. Its meetings were held in the afternoon, not in the evenings, resulting in few,

---

[34]See Eric Hobsbawm's chapter on ritual in social movements in his Primitive Rebels (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 150-74 and Richard N. Price's discussion of proletarianization of the Manchester bricklayers in his "The Other Face of Respectability: Violence in the Manchester Brick-Making Trade, 1859-1870," Past and Present, no. 66 (February, 1975), 110-32.

if any, workers attending. Its membership was drawn from the elite of society: earls, lords and gentlemen. The LAFP's biases were obvious.[35]

The People's International League was slightly closer to the proletarian orientation of the Fraternal Democrats. Unlike the LAFP, the PIL was a new organization. A resolution passed at a December 16, 1846, meeting of middle-class radicals in the National Hall in Holborn led to the establishment of the PIL on April 28, 1847.[36] With a membership fee of one shilling a year, it included on its committee Linton as secretary, James Watson, the radical Chartist printer; Thomas Cooper, the Chartist; Douglas Jerrold, a man of letters; W. J. Fox, an orator of the Manchester School; and later T. S. Duncombe, an M. P.; James Stansfeld, a lawyer; P. A. Taylor, Sr., a Manchester School man; Henry Vincent, the teetotal Chartist; and Richard Moore, a woodcarver and one of the early members of the LWMA, and number of others.[37] The majority of its members came from the "respectable" people of society, and many had previous association with the old Democratic Friends of all Nations.

---

[35]Little is available for the LAFP, but A. J. P. Taylor, The Trouble Makers (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958), pp. 42-45 is a good introduction. Otherwise, Brock, "Polish Democrats and English Radicals, 1832-1862," Journal of Modern History, XXV, 142, footnote 1, touches upon it and Tadeusz Grzebienowski, "The Polish Cause in England a Century Ago," Slavonic Review, (July, 1932), 81-87 is useful for the 1830s. For the LAFP's guiding spirit, Lord Dudley Stuart, see Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, eds., Dictionary of National Biography (22 vols.; London: Oxford University Press, 1959-60), XIX, 76-77.

[36]Northern Star, December 26, 1846, p. 2. The historiography of the PIL is practically non-existent. A brief general introduction is found in Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 59-62.

[37]Smith, Radical Artisan, p. 59; Linton, Memories, p. 100; J. L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond, James Stansfeld (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932), p. 23; and W. J. Linton, James Watson: A Memoir (Manchester: Abel Heywood and Son, 1880).

The People's International League was Mazzinian in its origins and objectives.[38] Its objective was to influence British foreign policy by marshalling public opinion. Its members sought to make ". . . Englishmen cognizant of the processes through which the progressive destinies of Europe are being worked out; so that whenever European affairs may call for interference, they may be in no doubt as to the course to be pursued."[39] The emphasis on the manipulation of public opinion was central to all international philosophy. Its rhetoric was intended to result in the interference of Britain on the continent to further liberal democracy. Yet, the League insisted that it did not call for armed intervention, just for England's moral support for "Right."[40]

The PIL launched a publicity campaign to further its goals. Mazzini suggested that articles defending the PIL ought to be sent to sympathetic papers and mentioned those edited by Jerrold and John Saunders.[41] Regular notices appeared in Saunders' People's Journal, in William Shirrefs' People's Press and Monthly Historical Magazine and in George Jacob Holyoake's Reasoner.[42] Copies of their first address were

---

[38]Linton, European Republicans, p. 61.

[39]Guiseppe Mazzini, Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini, 1846-70 (6 vols.; London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1864-70), VI, 288. This quote is taken from the "Address of the Council of the People's International League" which is printed in its entirety in the Appendix by Mazzini; see pages 285-308. Smith, Radical Artisan, p. 60 contends that Linton had rewritten Mazzini's draft extensively and that Mazzini failed to acknowledge his services.

[40]Mazzini, Life and Writings, VI, 288, 297-98.

[41]E. F. Richards, ed., Mazzini's Letters to an English Family [the Ashursts], 1844-1872 (3 vols.; London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1920-22), I, 55-56.

[42]People's Journal, April 10, 1847, p. 30; May 8, 1847, p. 38;

sent to all members of Parliament and to the entire press of England, and, claimed Linton, it was printed in many of the continental radical newspapers.[43] In addition, Linton sought support among known sympathizers through the use of informative circulars asking for assistance.[44]

As it was, by late 1847 the PIL claimed four hundred members and more than a thousand sympathizers. But it suffered from financial woes. The members' efforts continued throughout the revolutionary plagued years of 1848 and 1849, but it finally dispersed in 1850. At that time Mazzini urged the participants to go on to other projects. Linton's explanation of its demise pointed out the difficulties of maintaining sustained action: some members thought action unnecessary and others became indifferent. The PIL, however, failed to gain a proletarian following.[45]

---

and May 22, 1847, p. 42. Copies of this little-used journal are at the British Museum. It was published under the above title from 1846 to 1848 and then became the People's and Howitt's Journal until 1851 when it expired. Saunders came from the Hetherington-James Watson clique; see Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 65-66. See also Carl Ray Woodring, Victorian Samplers: William and Mary Howitt (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1952), pp. 115-43. People's Press and Monthly Historical Magazine, August, 1847, pp. 210-22; September, 1847, pp. 242-45; and October, 1847; pp. 272-73. Reasoner, Vol. II, 1847, pp. 285-87; Utilitarian Record, 1847, p. 7. The latter was published in conjunction with the Reasoner.

[43]Linton, Memories, p. 101.

[44]W. J. Linton to [ ], May 18, 1847, A. 9, Cowen Collection, Central Reference Library, Newcastle upon Tyne; "Report of a Public Meeting, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, on Monday, November 15, 1847, 'To Explain the Principles and Objects of the People's International League,'" A. 13, Ibid.; and W. J. Linton to George Jacob Holyoake, November 12, 1847, No. 234, Holyoake Collection, Holyoake House, Manchester.

[45]Smith, Radical Artisan, p. 62; Richards, ed., Mazzini's Letters, I, 144; and Linton, Memories, p. 103.

The "respectables" hindered the creation of a unified proletarian international movement. They were suspicious of the lower orders and sought to guide them rather than cooperate. Although they pursued the same objective of Polish independence, they eschewed public pressure from below. They argued that a working-class agitation that bordered on violence harmed the Polish cause; on that score they were correct because experience had shown that recent public demonstrations had accomplished little in England. Consequently, they cautioned their weaker allies to practice patience and, in the correct tradition of English Radicalism, allow them to pressure the government in parliamentary debates.[46] But their pressure was so low key as to hardly influence anyone. The old Radical Lord Brougham thought he had fulfilled his duty simply by asking the government to produce papers and correspondence--and lapsed into silence whether or not the request was granted. Lord Beaumont scarcely exceeded Brougham in diligence.[47] In the Commons the fight was carried by Joseph Hume, R. Monckton Milnes and Dr. Bowring, all Radicals. They argued eloquently the case for Polish freedom and decried Prussian, Austrian and Russian violations of the Vienna Treaty, but always acquiesced to the Government's defense of its non-intervention

---

[46] Northern Star, May 9, 1846, p. 7 as reprinted from the Morning Advertiser. The Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the People of Great Britain and Ireland, drawn up by Lord Dudley Stuart (London: E. Detkens, 1846) reiterated the Association's stand and emphasized the group's dislike of the Cracow Manifesto, which was entirely too communistic.

[47] Hansard's, LXXXV (24 March-1 May, 1846), pp. 574-79; LXXXVII (4 June-24 July, 1846), p. 1361; and LXXXVIII (27 July-28 August, 1846), pp. 602-19.

policy.[48] Perhaps, raising the subject and hoping that over a period of time these calm inquiries would move the Government to change its policy was the best that could be obtained. The internationalists further to the left throught more could be gained and looked to the present not the indefinite future.

The "respectables" public meetings fitted this pattern. For example, during the height of the Cracow insurrection against Austria an LAFP associated meeting was called to counter an immensely successful soiree that the Fraternal Democrats and DCPR had sponsored. The Marquess of Northampton took the chair. In the audience were: Earl Fitzwilliam, Lord Warncliffe, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, Lord Dudley Stuart, R. Monckton Milnes, Dr. Bowring, T. S. Duncombe, Urquhart and Lt. Charles Szulczewski, the secretary of the LAFP. Speaker after speaker found a violation of international law in the Austrian annexation of Cracow. Lord Beaumont suggested that England was as guilty as Austria and thought Austria deserved punishment. What that punishment was, though, he forgot to say. Urquhart stressed Turkish sympathy for Poland. Others offered equally unilluminating speeches. They were harmless internationalists compared to men such as Harney or Linton. The most exciting and productive activity of this particular gathering occurred after its completion when Major Beniowski, who probably participated in the 1839 Newport uprising, assaulted Urquhart who had charged him with being a Russian

---

[48] Hansard's, LXXXVIII (27 July-28 August, 1846), pp. 815-38; XC (16 February-15 March, 1847), pp. 861-95, 1157-1224; XCI (16 March-26 April, 1847), pp. 26-103. For Lord Palmerston's motives regarding Cracow see Jasper Ridley, Lord Palmerston (London: Constable and Company, 1970), pp. 428-29.

agent.[49] Nevertheless, the "respectables" did manage to keep the Polish issue before Parliament. But their traditional orientation precluded significant cooperation with the proletarian oriented wing of the movement. That basic internal problem was never overcome and only infrequently was it smoothed over to allow temporary common action.

One common ground did exist, though. English working-class internationalism was tied to events on the continent. It reacted to the treatment dealt out to the workers in Europe; the ebb and flow of the organizations formed in England depended upon the politics practiced in Paris, Berlin, Vienna and St. Petersburg. Three unconnected events spurred the internationalists to action. Throughout the winter of 1845-46 Sir Robert Peel, then Prime Minister, sought a settlement of the Oregon Question with the United States. The excitement generated by this prolonged discussion created an issue about which the Fraternal Democrats agitated.[50] The event most responsible for the flurry of Fraternal Democrat activity was the Cracow insurrection of February 18-25, 1846. The uprising, instigated by agents of the Polish Democratic Society, fueled internationalism in England.[51] Reports of the Cracow affair first appeared in the Northern Star on March 14 and continued throughout the

---

[49] Northern Star, March 6, 1847, p. 6. In an 1840 pamphlet Urguhart had accused Beniowski of being a Polish agent of the Russian Government and Beniowski now sought justice. For Beniowski see Brock, "Polish Democrats and English Radicals, 1832-1862," Journal of Modern History, XXV, 146-47 and Hovell, The Chartist Movement, pp. 176-77, 181-83, 187.

[50] Northern Star, March 7, 1846, p. 6. See Norman Gash, Sir Robert Peel. The Life of Sir Robert Peel after 1830 (London: Longman, 1972), pp. 500-504.

[51] Weisser, "The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846," Polish Review, XIII, 3-19. See also Lewis Namier, 1848: The Revovution of the Intellectuals (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1946), pp. 12-18.

year and into 1847. The Fraternal Democrats responded to a direct call for support made by the Polish exiles in England. A Polish address of March 12 called upon Englishmen on the basis of common interests to aid the Poles.[52] Without the Cracow incident it is unlikely that the Fraternal Democrats could have advanced internationalism as much as they did. It is more likely that they would not have even tried. The uprising had the same effect on the LAFP and the PIL. A third impetus to internationalist action was Palmerston's decision to intervene militarily in conjunction with Spain to help the Portuguese Queen Maria de Gloria put down the civil strife in her country. Although he ultimately convinced the English radicals that his actions benefitted the Portuguese radicals by softening the retribution dealt them, the English internationalist frowned upon his intervention. Public meetings and Parliamentary inquiries resulted.[53]

The purpose of all this agitation and forming of organizations was to obtain aid for the struggling nationalities in Europe. The "respectables" took their case directly to Parliament and made little headway. The others had long since concluded that nothing could willingly be gained from that body and worked to create a mass following similar to the Anti-Corn League or Chartism of an earlier period in order to force the power structure to change its policy. Naturally they turned to the Chartist organization for assistance. Much of the organizational history

---

[52] Northern Star, March 21, 1846, p. 1.

[53] Northern Star, June 12, 1847, p. 8 and June 19, 1847, p. 5; Hansard's, XCIII (2 June-6 July, 1847), pp. 22-24, 121-25, 260-61, 382-420 and 472-596. See also Ridley, Lord Palmerston, pp. 429-34.

of internationalism during this period involved the attempt to secure the allegiance of various Chartist leaders.

Internationalist efforts to gain Chartist participation were moderately successful. Some of the converts did make a profound difference to the movement. One such man was Philip McGrath, the President of the Chartist Executive, who joined the Fraternal Democrats on October 19, 1846.[54] He remained active until the early 1850s. Another was Henry Hetherington. He had come to Chartism through a career as a radical newspaperman in the early 1830s and had spent a short time in Belgium. He and John Cleave, both among the founders of the LWMA, were credited by Hovell with infusing in Lovett and George Jacob Holyoake the ". . . uncompromising free-thought of revolutionary France."[55] He leaned towards the "respectables" but his contribution was cut short by his death in 1849. A third adherent was Holyoake. He was a life-long socialist and was involved in the Secularist movement. He moved at will among Chartists, internationalists and refugees. In the international labor movement he gravitated towards the sector to which Linton belonged. Similar to many early nineteenth-century radicals, Holyoake published or edited a number of journals and frequently opened his columns to the internationalists.[56]

---

[54]Northern Star, October 24, 1846, p. 7. For his biography see Reynolds's Political Instructor, April 20, 1850, p. 185.

[55]See Hovell, The Chartist Movement, pp. 56-58, 308 and R. G. Gammage, The History of the Chartist Movement, 1837-1854 (London: Merlin Press, 1969), p. 7 for character sketches. The older biographies, which are weak, are George Jacob Holyoake, The Life and Character of Henry Hetherington (London: J. Watson, 1849) and Ambrose G. Baker, Henry Hetherington, 1792-1849 (London: The Pioneer Press, n.d.).

[56]Joseph McCabe, Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake (2 vols.; London: Watts and Co., 1908). See also George Jacob Holyoake,

Of greater significance to the Left in the international labor movement was the conversion of Ernest Jones. From an aristocratic background, the multi-lingual Jones received his education in Holstein, where his father had retired. After the family returned to London in 1838, Jones played the young man-about-town, dabbled in literary circles and entered the legal profession in 1844. Facing serious financial problems as a result of having bought a country estate and finally going bankrupt in 1846, Jones was converted to Chartism, so he wrote, by chancing upon a copy of the Northern Star in the winter of 1845. He rapidly rose to a position of leadership and became one of the most prominent advocates of proletarian internationalism. He adopted a socialist philosophy and moved easily in refugee circles. During the 1850s he strove to maintain organized Chartism, eventually falling out with other leaders, and became the foremost advocate, after Harney, of English participation in an international labor movement. The People's Paper, which he edited between 1852 and 1858, served him on both causes. He was gradually convinced of the impossibility of an independent workers' movement and retired in middle-class respectability as a barrister in Manchester.[57]

Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life (2 vols.; London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1892) and Bygones Worth Remembering (2 vols.; T. Fisher Unwin, 1905). Of some value is Richard J. Hinton, English Radical Leaders (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1875), pp. 256-71. A biography that appeared too late for use in this study is Lee E. Grugel, George Jacob Holyoake (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1976).

[57]The best biography of Jones is John Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist (London: Lawrence and Wishart, Ltd., 1952), although Cole, Chartist Portraits, pp. 337-57 provides a good account too. Earlier and shorter accounts of his life are found in [James Crosley], Ernest Jones. Who is he? What has he done? (Manchester: A. Heywood and Son and Reform League, 1868); Frederick Leary, The Life of Ernest Jones (London: Democrat Publishing Office, 1887); David P. Davies, A Short Sketch of the Life

The cause of Poland was near to his heart. In 1831 he had set out from Holstein for Poland to help in the insurrection, but merely wandered about lost for three days.[58] In 1846 he flung himself into that cause with abandon. His diary shows that he regularly attended the meetings of the DCPR and became its permanent chairman on July 18, 1846. Logically, he also joined the Fraternal Democrats.[59]

Internationalist efforts to convert Feargus O'Connor failed, however. Although he was a demagogue coated with blarney, O'Connor's charisma had propelled him to dominance in the Chartist movement by the mid-1840s. He was and remained to the end a confirmed British nationalist.[60] Despite allowing his sub-editor Harney a free hand to include a considerable amount of international news in the pages of the Northern Star, O'Connor was less at peace with internationalism than Weisser suggests. Even though he became the Fraternal Democrats' Treasurer, he

---

And Labours of Ernest Jones (Liverpool: The "Journal of Commerce," 1897); and W. H. Mainwaring, "Ernest Jones: Chartist," Plebs, XI (March, 1919), 21-23. See also George Howell, MSS. Ernest Jones Biography, 3 vols., Howell Collection, Bishopsgate Institute, London. An abridged selection of it appeared in the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle between January 1 and October 8, 1898; for a pastebook copy of it see George Howell, Ernest Jones, the Chartist, Howell Collection.

[58]Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, p. 13.

[59]May 20, 1846, July 6, 14, 20, 1846, "Jones' Diary," 1844-47, Manchester Public Library; May 20, 1846, "Ernest Jones Diary," 1844-47, Howell Collection; and Northern Star, May 23, 1846, p. 7.

[60]Weisser, Working-Class Movements, pp. 150-54; for greater detail see his article "The Role of Feargus O'Connor," Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal, VI, 82-90. A recent but inadequate biography of O'Connor that devotes little attention to his internationalism is Donald Read and Eric Glasgow, Feargus O'Connor, Irishman and Chartist (London: Edward Arnold, 1961).

retained his skepticism about the value of internationalism.[61] At the first anniversary celebration of the Fraternal Democrats O'Connor vehemently objected to the calls for proletarian class consciousness that Schapper and Harney offered. O'Connor championed the superiority of the English. He compared the French Revolution of 1793 with the Chartist movement and concluded that the latter would succeed where the former failed because the French had hastily taken up arms while the Chartists prepared themselves by ignoring violence. His message was that political liberty must precede social equality. Weisser interpreted this speech as an exception for an otherwise conciliatory O'Connor.[62] Rather, it was the crux of his position. Internationalism to O'Connor was an irritant, a ploy for attention by men lesser than he. He could afford to be tolerant of it before 1848. Tolerance--even amusement--not "peaceful coexistence," best describes his reaction. Later when his hold on Chartism began to slip he lashed out at the international labor movement and fired Harney for being too cosmopolitan.

In spite of the common knowledge of O'Connor's doubts, the internationalists sought his good will. For example, in July 1846 he defeated Hobhouse, the Whig candidate, on a show of hands at the hustings, but did not go to the poll. Marx and Engels sent him a letter of congratulations in which they praised his paper as the only democratic paper in England.[63] Their action was a part of the internationalists' search for support.

---

[61] Northern Star, June 6, 1846, p. 1.

[62] Northern Star, September 26, 1846, p. 7; Weisser, Working-Class Movements, p. 154.

[63] Northern Star, July 25, 1846, p. 1.

An organizational structure and a mass following were necessary for the internationalists to succeed. Their purview extended beyond London. A provincial proselytizing effort began after a September 9, 1846, meeting of the DCPR. That committee impressed three Chartists, who were about to go on speaking tours, to act as its representatives and enroll members in the countryside. Christopher Doyle set out for Scotland, and McGrath and Thomas Clark went to the English countryside.[64] By late November considerable progress was achieved: new members were enrolled in Manchester, Glasgow, Greenock, Alexandria in the Vale of Leven, Enderlie, Johnstone near Paisley, Linlithgow, Falkird, Hamilton, Alva, Tillocoultey, and Crieff.[65] Thus, Scotland had its quota of internationalists. Scottish sincerity ran as deep as that of their English counterparts. Their participation in the movement, though peaking and slumping more prominently than in England, lasted well into the 1850s.[66] Numbers were small, but enthusiasm was high. So long as a foreign issue prevailed the establishment of provincial committees was possible.

In addition to those listed above, the first annual report of the DCPR recorded adherents in Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh, Dumfries, Carlisle, Newcastle upon Tyne, Shields, Sunderland, Hull, Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield, Halifax, Barnsley, Sheffield, Liverpool, Preston, Bolton, Oldham, Ashton, Rochdale, Nottingham, Derby, Leicester, Northampton, Bath, Bristol, Brighton, Southampton, Isle of Wight, Norwich, Exeter

---

[64] Northern Star, September 12, 1846, p. 7.

[65] Northern Star, November 28, 1846, p. 1

[66] Alexander Wilson, The Chartist Movement in Scotland (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970), pp. 259-61.

and "all other places in England, Scotland and Ireland."[67] Unfortunately, a register of members was not printed. The committees were concentrated in the traditional radical and Chartist areas: the Scottish Lowlands, the manufacturing districts around Manchester in Lancashire, the new industrial cities in west Yorkshire and in Newcastle upon Tyne. Internationalism, therefore, had much in common with recent Chartism, and through that connection the movement's ideas achieved a wider dissemination than otherwise would have been possible. That was a preliminary for organized agitation with any hope of success.

Equally as basic was the problem of instilling internationalism in the masses. The Chartist experience and the Anti-Corn Law agitation provided the model for the internationalists. All international organizations pursued their goals through the propagandistic mediums of the public meeting and the written word. In the meetings and the tea parties their ideas were expounded to the faithful and the curious in a friendly atmosphere and done so frequently by prominent refugees. To reach larger audiences the newspaper and the pamphlet were utilized. Both were traditional radical techniques. Committee meetings as well as public celebrations were publicized. The internationalists placed great faith in their manifestos. These documents were issued to explain a particular group's philosophy, to advise the working class about a particular international problem, to commemorate past revolutions and to circulate recent revolutionary ideas.[68] Because they had easy access to various

---

[67] Northern Star, April 10, 1847, p. 1.

[68] For examples of these addresses that were published in the Northern Star see its numbers for March 14, 1846, March 28, 1846, and December 5, 1846. For examples of pamphlets see: Polish Democrats,

radical newspapers and printers, public knowledge of their activities and ideas was readily available and dissemination posed little problem for them.

The major difficulty that confronted them was convincing the English worker that a common bond of interest existed between himself and his continental counterpart. Harney attacked this problem on a practical level. Before Chartist audiences he praised the People's Charter. On one occasion he argued that the triumph of the Charter ". . . would be the salvation of millions throughout Europe."[69] Thus, the idea was introduced that a connection existed between the Charter and international freedom. This concept became one of central importance to internationalist wooing of English workers. It was a natural bridge between Chartism and internationalism. Harney's approach found both acceptance and rejection among Englishmen. One James Fisher, living in Bradford, Wiltshire, wrote to the DCPR: "Let there become a democracy and Poland shall not long be the victim of hereditary butchers." But a James Brown of Preston, Lanchasire wrote: Neither aid or agitation for Poland were advisable; indifference was not the problem, but the misery of the working class in Preston was.[70] Convincing English workers that the wrongs done to foreign workers were related to their own political and economic sufferings remained the unsolvable riddle that confronted the internationalists.

Sixteenth Anniversary of the Revolution of November 29, 1830 (London: n.p., 1846) and Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration, The Seizure of Cracow. The Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration to the People of Great Britain and Ireland (London: n.p., 1846).

[69] Northern Star, June 19, 1847, p. 5.

[70] Ibid., July 17, 1847, p. 2.

The appeal put to the "men in fustian jackets" challenged them to broaden their horizons because political and social problems in the internationalists' vocabulary were universal in nature, as were the solutions. Yet the problem was to describe universal issues in terms that were comprehensible to the English worker. The expectations for Italian unification that were raised by the election of the liberal Pope Pius IX filtered into the internationalist program and offered Jones an opportunity to bridge the gap. At a public meeting, mostly of workers, held in the Eastern Institute, Commercial Road, in Tower Hamlets, Jones moved a resolution approving the accession of Pius IX. He said:

> Men of France, Italy and Germany--Liberty is a tree of long growth in England. It was planted at Runnymede; it was sunned by the fires of Smithfield; it was watered by the blood of Marston Moor, and the veins of Charles; it was fanned by the prayers of the Puritan, and dewed by the tears of the Exiles [John Frost]--and now it is beginning to bloom beneath the fostering hand of the Charter.[71]

By appealing to history Jones drew upon an experience of all peoples: in the dim past despotism existed everywhere. If England could escape the worst of the oppression, then surely others could and who could best lead the efforts of others to achieve freedom? The English worker with his Charter. Though offensive to some exiles, his rationalization must surely have appealed to the most downtrodden English worker in the audience.

Convincing the English worker that he had a place in the international movement was difficult. Maintaining interest among the faithful was hardly less formidable. Formal organizations and public meetings constituted the obvious initial methods for keeping up enthusiasm. Another practice was the use of the refugees; few international meetings

---

[71] Northern Star, October 16, 1847, p. 1.

were complete without a quota of European exiles on the speaker's stand. An awareness of the activities of various continental revolutionary societies also encouraged the internationalists in England. Thomas Frost, a Chartist and a casual participant in the international labor movement, noted that a regular correspondence was maintained between the Fraternal Democrats and various European secret societies.[72] In October 1846 Engels requested of Harney that he write frequently to Marx and other communists in Brussels.[73] This correspondence resulted in a common exhortation to further the international labor cause.

The Cracow uprising offered examples of this international communication. The DCPR sent an address, dated July 16, 1846, entitled "To the Electors of France," which advised the French to help the English create an independent Poland.[74] Although ostensibly for French consumption, and published in the Parisian La Réforme, the response accorded it came from the Polish exiles living in France in the form of their own address to the French.[75] Furthermore, the Poles in France replied directly to the DCPR with a warmly-worded address, which was signed by Joseph Wysocki and Victor Hellman at Versailles.[76] The worst fears of the English "respectables"--international revolutionary conspiracy--

---

[72]Thomas Frost, Forty Years' Recollections (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1880), p. 126.

[73]Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, Correspondence, 1846-1895, trans. and ed. by Donna Torr (London: Martin Lawrence, Ltd., 1934), p. 4.

[74]Northern Star, July 25, 1846, p. 7.

[75]Ibid., August 1, 1846, p. 7.

[76]Ibid., August 15, 1846, p. 7.

remained unconfirmed, but the potential existed. The elaboration of these common objectives heartened the internationalists in England and enabled them to seek their goals with greater determination.

In order to cement that common bond a new technique was initiated in late 1847. Prominent foreign intellectuals were introduced to English audiences. Marx provides the best example of this endeavor. Harney referred to Marx at a public meeting at the Crown and Anchor Tavern on the evening of October 25. Two hundred Chartists attended and heard his statement.[77] Marx was then a leading member of the democratic-revolutionary Democratic Association that had been established in Brussels. It was formed on September 27, 1847, to counteract an international congress of free traders that had met in Brussels from September 16 to 18 and "to show the fraternization of workers of various countries."[78]

Marx came to London in November to attend the second congress of the Communist League. The Democratic Association authorized him to establish contact with the Fraternal Democrats. He spoke before his first English audience under the guidance of the Fraternal Democrats and the DCPR. At the anniversary celebration of the Polish Revolution of 1830, held on November 29, 1847, Marx, speaking in German, emphasized the need for a ". . . congress of working men, to establish liberty all over the world" and praised the Chartists as the "real democrats" of England. Parts of his speech were translated into English for the Northern Star

---

[77] Northern Star, October 30, 1847, p. 1.

[78] Walter Haenisch, "Karl Marx and the Democratic Association of 1847," Science and Society, II (Winter, 1937), 85-86.

readers.[79] Harney carefully toned down the translation of Marx's hardheaded advice about the proper place for English working-class agitation, but from another source Marx's exact sentiments are available:

> Poland, therefore, must be freed, not in Poland, but in England. You Chartists should not express pious wishes for liberation of nations. Defeat your own enemies at home and then you may be proudly conscious of having defeated the old order in its entirety."[80]

Nevertheless, the Fraternal Democrats thereafter maintained a correspondence with the Democratic Association, which acted as a central agency for a number of similar working-class organizations throughout Belgium and Holland. Harney disseminated information about the group within England. The Fraternal Democrats issued an address to the Brussels group. A report of the Democratic Association's celebration of the Polish Revolution appeared in the Northern Star and Harney urged the establishment of closer relations between the two organizations. His plan called for a combined conference the following year in Brussels and one in London in 1849.[81] The February 1848 revolution in Paris negated that hope because news of the revolt dispersed the members of the Democratic Association.

---

[79]Northern Star, December 4, 1847, p. 1; Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, p. 27. Julius West, A History of the Chartist Movement (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920), pp. 234-35 sees Marx's participation as an effort to get English workers involved in internationalism.

[80]Deutsche-Brusseler-Zeitung, December 9, 1847, in Marx, The Revolutions of 1848, p. 100.

[81]Northern Star, December 11, 1847, p. 1 and December 18, 1847, pp. 2, 6. He wanted to hold the meeting on the anniversary of the 1830 Belgian uprising, but erroneously cited September 25 instead of the correct date August 25.

The organization of internationally-minded English workers was advanced considerably before 1848. Since formal organization was a prerequisite for achieving reform, the internationalists had advanced themselves a considerable distance towards their goal. From a sporadic beginning international sentiment had become a step-child of the English labor movement. The internationalist leadership included intelligent and dedicated men who were fervently committed to their cause. By the end of 1847 more English workers were cognizant of their place within a supra-national working class than at any previous time. Internationalist meetings and propaganda reached a substantial portion of the workers in London, although the impact in the countryside was problematical. The impetus given the movement in 1846 and 1847 came from the agitation that flourished on the continent. Without revolutionary upheaval it is doubtful whether Harney's expectation of future international working-class cooperation could have been conceivable. Despite differences over ideology and the proper method of achieving political and social reform, the internationalists confidently faced the future as 1848 began.

CHAPTER II

REVOLUTION AND SOCIAL REFORM, 1848-1850

In 1848 and 1849 revolution dominated European politics. England escaped upheaval of the kind that ravaged the continent, but events beyond the English Channel sent shock waves into the English labor movement. Organized Chartism revived itself for the last time in the spring of 1848 and the internationalists in England desperately attempted to emulate the brief successes of their compatriots in Europe. Although Chartism's revival pre-dated the continental revolutions, it was foreign stimuli that inspired internationalist action. They sought immediate expansion of political democracy. With the agitation's failure, the internationalists forged to the forefront of the demoralized English labor movement and infused into it social reform ideas of varying socialistic natures. Because the forces of order emerged unscathed, historians have frequently underrated the depth of English working-class sympathy for the revolution of 1849-49. Nevertheless, especially among the leadership, the expectation of revolution in England was high and its coming was perhaps nearer to realization than at any time since 1830-32.[1]

---

[1]For analyses of the Chartist reaction to the Revolutions of 1848-49 and their impact on them see Elie Halévy, Victorian Years, 1841-1895, trans. by E. I. Watkin (London: Ernest Benn, Limited, 1851), pp. 236-45; Ward, Chartism, pp. 199-216; Hovell, The Chartist Movement, pp. 284-94; West, A History of the Chartist Movement, pp. 237-60; John Saville,

Some historians have concluded that the rallying of the middle class to the Government was the real significance of 1848 in England.[2] Frequently cited in support of this contention is Lady Palmerston's letter to Lady Huskisson. Of the April 10 Chartist fiasco, she wrote:

> Your letter reminded me that I ought to give you private details of our "revolution" as the papers, though full, could only give the public ones. Our terrace was divided into districts and all the servants made special constables. . . . I am sure that it is very fortunate that the whole thing occurred, as it has shown the good spirit of our middle classes.[3]

But other sectors of English society were equally enthused by the revolutionary disturbances and were moved differently. Lady Charlotte Guest, widow of the iron-master Josiah John Guest, entered a notation in her diary about attending a Polish ball as its patroness on May 29 and another on June 30. From her writing emerges an alternative perspective. On the 29th she wrote: "It was immediately reported that there was alarm of the Chartists having risen, . . ." On June 30 she noted that nothing but the events in Paris were being talked about.[4] Within the middle class and

---

"Chartism in the Year of Revolution (1848)," Modern Quarterly, VIII (Winter, 1952-53), 23-33; and Gammage, Chartist Movement, pp. 291-358. More specific accounts of the English working-class internationalists in these years are found in Rothstein, From Chartism to Labourism, pp. 141-53 and Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 146-98. For a discussion of English Radicalism in general during this period see MacCoby, English Radicalism, 1832-1852, pp. 283-306.

[2]See, for example, Asa Briggs, "National Bearings" in Chartist Studies, ed. by Asa Briggs (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1959), p. 299 and William L. Langer, Political and Social Upheaval, 1832-1852 (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 70-71.

[3]Quoted in Briggs, "National Bearings" in Chartist Studies, ed. by Briggs, p. 299.

[4]Lady Charlotte Guest, Extracts from her Journal, 1833-52, ed. by the Earl of Beesborough (London: John Murray, 1950), pp. 214, 216.

the middling level of society, and especially at the lower levels, excitement, enthusiasm and hope rather than fear greeted the continental revolution. If in the end authority prevailed, for the immediacy of the years 1848-49 the internationalists gained heart and attempted to participate with their brethren in Europe.

The news of the outbreak of revolution on the continent had a significant impact on the English working-class leadership. It was felt equally by both those who were already internationally oriented and by those who were not. Harney, Michelot, Schapper, Oborski and Frost were attending a Fraternal Democrat monthly meeting when they learned about Louis Philippe's abdication. Frost wrote:

> The effect was electrical. Frenchmen, Germans, Poles, Magyars, sprang to their feet, embraced, shouted, and gesticulated in the wildest enthusiasm. Snatches of oratory were delivered in excited tones, and flags were caught from the walls, to be waved exultantly, amidst cries of "hoch!" "Eljin!" "Viva la Republique!" Then the doors were opened, and the whole assemblage descended to the street, and, with linked arms and colours, flying, marched to the meeting place of the Westminster Chartists in Dean Street, Soho. There another enthusiastic fraternization took place, and great was the clinking of glasses that night in and around Soho and Leicester Square.

Leaving the celebration, Frost hurried home to Croyden where he went to the local meeting-place of the Chartists to inform them of the joyous news. An artisan responded: "Now we shall get our rights."[5]

Others in the labor movement substantiated Frost's account of the influence of the February Revolution. J. B. Leno was an Uxbridge poet, who along with Gerald Massey edited the Spirit of Freedom. In 1851 he moved to London as a printer and remained active in Chartist and radical circles well into the 1860s. He wrote that because of the European

---

[5]Frost, Forty Years' Recollections, pp. 127-30.

revolutions in early 1848 he ". . . was for rebellion and civil war, save by revolution." For him the examples of America, France and Italy underlined the belief that force was the means to change.[6]

Somewhat less violent, but equally influenced by the events of 1848, was the Cheltenham journalist W. E. Adams. He belonged to the Harney-Jones group in the early 1850s, but eventually moved into the Linton-Mazzinian republicans. His account of his conversion is worth quoting.

> This passion [for politics] was stimulated by the French Revolution of 1848. I was a reader of Reynold's Miscellany. One day, soon after the proclamation of the Republic in France, there appeared in it a picture of the members of the Mountain--Ledru-Rollin, Louis Blanc, Pierre Leroux, Victor Schoelcher, and the other ardent Republicans and Socialists who composed the extreme Left of the National Assembly. . . . The stirring events in Paris and the newer literature that began to be issued sent the young men of my age wild with excitement and enthusiasm. I had previously read the Rights of Man and other political works of Thomas Paine, which had seduced me from bed at five o'clock for many mornings in succession. And now I was fairly in the maelstrom.[7]

If Frost, Leno and Adams were that excited by the 1848 Revolutions, then the refugees and the hard-core English working-class internationalists operated in a virtual delirium. The actions of Harney and Jones during this period, for example, reflected that febrile spirit. They and other internationalists sought an English counterpart to the February Revolution. As a result of their efforts, the cause of the international labor movement was furthered in England. The movement's impact on the English

---

[6]J. B. Leno, The Aftermath (London: Reeves and Turner, 1892), pp. 28-29. See also Ward, Chartism, pp. 221, 234 and Gammage, Chartist Movement, p. 346.

[7]W. E. Adams, Memoirs of a Social Atom (2 vols.; New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1903), I, 118-19. John Saville's "Introduction" in this 1967 reprint is the only biographical material of any length available on Adams.

working class is best gauged through the activities of the various international organizations. The Fraternal Democrats and the People's International League had already taken notice of the Sonderbund War in Switzerland. Although the fighting was confined to late 1847, the Swiss were still working on a reform of their federal system and the liberal Cantons slighted the conservative Catholic Cantons in the discussions. An unsigned PIL pamphlet, originally published in Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine in October 1847, discussed the political problems of Italy, Switzerland and Austria with reference to their failure to recognize the sovereignty of the people.[8] Moreover, in an effort to bring pressure on Palmerston to help the Federal Swiss Government against the threatened intervention of Austria and France, Mazzini wrote a pamphlet defending the Swiss Federal Diet, and Linton, Copper and R. H. Horne delivered seventeen lectures in London on the problem. This agitation was the high point of the PIL activities; its secretary Linton had never been so busy writing and corresponding with old supporters and adherents, some even in the provinces.[9] The Fraternal Democrats adopted a more cautious approach in their address. They praised the National Diet for ending the war, but questioned the wisdom of interference by any foreign governments.[10] That

---

[8]"Italy, Switzerland, and Austria," October, 1847, International Affairs Bundle, Howell Collection.

[9]See Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 61-62 and R. J. Conklin, Thomas Cooper the Chartist (Manila: University of the Philippines Press, 1935), pp. 322-23.

[10]The address is printed in the Northern Star, December 18, 1847, p. 5. See also Fraternal Democrats, Address of the Fraternal Democrats Assembling in London to the Members of the National Diet of Switzerland (London, 1847).

address was published in several foreign newspapers most notably in La Réforme, Brussels German Gazette, Débat Social and La Suisse.[11]

But it was France that held their interests above all else. The Fraternal Democrats, perhaps because they were more conscious of what was happening in foreign countries, issued an address dated January 31, 1848, to the French proletarians that practically predicted the coming revolt. In it the Fraternal Democrats foresaw better times ahead for the French workers and expressed a keen interest in the reform banquets. They pledged fraternity with the French workers and denounced tyranny. Their recognition of the significance of the banquets to the Parisian working men underlined the similarities between the English and French working classes.[12] The public meeting was central to both of them, and the Fraternal Democrats recognized it because of their position as the cutting edge of the international labor movement.

The Fraternal Democrats sensed that great events were about to occur in Europe. At the February 21, 1848, commemoration meeting of the 1847 Cracow insurrection, Jones deplored the conduct of the bourgeoisie, called for proletarian unity and contended that conflict between the ruled and the rulers was at hand. In this acrimonious meeting, Harney violently called for revolutionary struggles and said that if hell did not exist one would have to be created for the "miscreant Metternich."[13]

---

[11]Charles Keen reported this accomplishment at a regular meeting of the Fraternal Democrats. See the Northern Star, January 8, 1848, p. 1.

[12]Northern Star, February 5, 1848, p. 8. For the role of the banquets in the 1848 Revolution see Georges Duveau, 1848: The Making of a Revolution, pp. 17-19.

[13]Northern Star, February 26, 1848, p. 3.

Then, after the French uprising became public knowledge, a public meeting of the London Chartists, held on March 2, adopted an "Address to the People of Paris," which the Executive Committee of the National Charter Association, the Fraternal Democrats and the Metropolitan Delegate Committee of the Chartists of London had accepted earlier. It congratulated the French and assured them that the English people supported them. At a meeting of the Fraternal Democrats on February 28, at which it was claimed that hundred were turned away for lack of space, William Dixon, a Chelsea plasterer, claimed that the time was at hand for the English people to win their own freedom. Charles Keen, one of Harney's lackeys, verbally abused capitalists and moved that insurrection was a sacred right of the people. Jones believed that the French revolution would spread throughout Europe and republics would be established everywhere.[14] That same evening the moderates, led by Linton, held a meeting in the National Hall, Holborn. They passed motions offering flowery praise to the French for their achievement in gaining more freedom.[15]

These statements represented the feelings of the Internationalists in early 1848. The news of Louis Philippe's abdication spurred them and other English workers into action. They were ready. What they needed was a foreign event to give them courage.

The effect of the revolution in France on the Chartists cannot be doubted either. Already underway in the winter of 1847-48, the third National Petition progressed well and its advocates thought in terms of

---

[14] Northern Star, March 11, 1848, p. 1.

[15] Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 71-72.

several million signatures. O'Connor's Land Company lecturers, McDouall, West and Kydd were speaking before large crowds. Now, the revolution in Paris created a new impetus for action and the number of middle- and working-class public meetings increased, as did the vehemence of the speakers. London as well as the provinces participated.[16] The chronology of Chartist events in these turbulent months need not be retold here, other than to note its existence and that part of the stimulus to the movement's revival emanated from the February Revolution in France.

The agitation of the English internationalists during this period requires careful analysis. For the first time they had an opportunity to extend the periphery of their listeners beyond the small coterie of confirmed followers. Due to the excited atmosphere their exhortations should have fallen upon willing ears, and sometimes did. Yet, despite Jones' earlier contention that "every member of the [Fraternal Democrats] is a thorough Chartist, and that Chartism is a test of admission . . ." and despite the fact that all five Englishmen (Dobson Collett, Linton, Harney, Jones and McGrath) who went to Paris to congratulate the Provisional Government were Chartists, the most damning evidence against the internationalists being a mass movement was their failure to capture either the Chartist leadership or a substantial section of the Chartist membership at this opportune moment.[17]

---

[16] Northern Star, March, 1848, passim; see also Ward, Chartism, pp. 199-200. For a discussion of O'Connor's Land Plan see Joy MacAskill, "The Chartist Land Plan" in Chartist Studies, ed. by Briggs, pp. 304-41.

[17] Northern Star, February 5, 1848, p. 8; Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 72-74; and Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 158-60.

Instead, the internationalists quibbled among themselves over who would carry the international banner in England. The PIL and the Fraternal Democrats vied with each other for control of the movement. They competed to be the first in Paris to congratulate the Provisional Government. Mazzini, Linton and Collett arrived in Paris on March 1. Collett returned to London immediately but Linton remained for a week of hobnobbing with prominent revolutionaries. He found the realities of revolution less likeable than his imaginary, literary revolution. Still, upon returning from Paris he hoped for imminent changes in England.[18] The Fraternal Democrats' deputation of Harney, Jones and McGrath, who were accompanied by the German Democrats, Schapper, Moll and Bauer, arrived on March 4 and visited the leaders of the new French Government. In contrast to the moderates, the experience enhanced their revolutionary zeal.[19] Although both groups were in Paris at the same time, they ignored each other. The Provisional Government conveniently followed suit and treated each as if it were the only English representatives in Paris.

Once back in London they flung themselves into the flurry of activity that was already underway. March saw the moderates and the Fraternal Democrats engaged in a struggle for control of the English agitation, a prospect made impossible given the renewed strength of the O'Connerite Chartists. Linton and Watson formed the London Charter Union on March 22; it was in effect a subcommittee of Cooper's People's Charter

---

[18]Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 72-73; Linton, Memories, pp. 103-104; and Richards, ed., Mazzini's Letters, I, 76.

[19]Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 158-60 and Northern Star, March 11, 1848, p. 5.

Union. The Linton-Watson group accomplished nothing and little more can be said for its parent organization. O'Connorite strength simply overwhelmed both.[20]

The Fraternal Democrats waged a more determined, if not more successful, effort to capture the Chartist movement for their cause. They portrayed the French Revolution as a concept that the English working man could comprehend. From Paris, McGrath, Jones and Harney informed the Chartists that the French were forming a government on the basis of the Charter.[21] Before he had gone to Paris, Jones defended the French Republic on Thursday evening, March 2, at a meeting in Lambeth at which an attendance of 5,000 persons was claimed. Among others there who spoke in favor of the French Revolution were Harney and the Polish exile, N. Szonakowski. But in the end it was O'Connor's speech about English reforms and the Charter that dominated the evening's speeches.[22] Another public meeting called by the Metropolitan Delegate Council met on the evening of Monday, March 6, at Clerkenwell Green. Before some 8,000-10,000 people, Doyle, Clark and G. W. M. Reynolds praised events in France. Reynolds, a novelist and republican journalist, earlier that day had harangued a middle-class rally in Trafalgar Square which was called to protest against the income tax, and caused a West End riot that lasted three days.[23] These and other efforts fell short of the Fraternal Democrats' objective.

---

[20]Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 76-78 and Ward, Chartism, p. 220.

[21]Northern Star, March 11, 1848, p. 5.

[22]Ibid., p. 1.

[23]Ibid.; Ward, Chartism, pp. 199-200; and Smith, Radical

When the Fraternal Democrats gathered on Monday evening, March 20, their spirits were high. They issued two addresses; one went to the French people and the other to the people of Great Britain and Ireland. They exhorted everyone to sign the National Petition and to publicize the success of the French Provisional Government to anyone willing to listen. The address to their domestic audience was subtitled "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," and so that phrase found its way into the internationalists' vocabulary.[24] The Fraternal Democrats even issued an address to the Irish ultra-radicals Smith O'Brien, John Mitchell and Francis Meagher in which their violent sentiments were applauded.[25]

Then the Chartist Convention met in the John Street Institution on April 4 as a preparatory measure to the presentation of the National Petition to the House of Commons on April 10. The Fraternal Democrats, far from having captured the convention, were at this time a mere sideshow. Revolutionary speeches characterized their own meeting held on April 4 before a crowded assemblage. Harney had had enough of petitions; he wanted a delegation to go to the Queen to ask her to appoint a ministry that favored the Charter. Then, if the Petition, was rejected by the Commons, the Chartist Convention ought to make itself a permanent organization. The example to follow was the continental revolution. Another

---

Artisan, p. 75. For Reynolds see Stephen and Lee, eds., Dictionary of National Biography, XVI, 928-31. Adams, Social Atom, I, 235 wrote of Reynolds: ". . . it was rather as a charlatan and a trader than as a genuine politician that G. W. M. was generally regarded by the rank and file of Chartism."

[24] Northern Star, March 25, 1848, p. 5. The address to the French people was drawn up on March 20 and the other was drawn up on March 23.

[25] Ibid., April 1, 1848, p. 5.

delegate, a Mr. West, from Stockport, contended that the time had arrived for "short speeches and active work."[26]

The Kennington Common debacle of April 10 hardly qualified as the climax they sought. The National Petition added no luster to their cause. Chartism was a joke. Internationalism was without the mass following its leaders had hoped for. Thus, they reverted to rhetoric, although it was somewhat more violent than in the past.

During this upheaval, save for the Polish Cracow celebration of February 22 and the French banquet held on March 28, the continental exiles in England adopted a low profile. In part that resulted because many of them had gone home to participate in their own revolutions; in part, it was due to the anti-foreign feelings in England. The Revolution in France produced unemployment and foreign workers were the first ones laid off; the English who were forced out of France returned home embittered. Despite efforts by the internationalists to shunt the blame for this solely on the French capitalists, many English workers reacted with intense hostility towards all foreigners.[27] Moreover, the Government enacted new laws aimed against the agitators. A Crown and Government Security Bill, the so-called Gagging Act, was read for a third time on April 18; it dealt with the Chartists. An Aliens' Removal Act, which allowed the deportation of foreign revolutionaries, was approved on May 11. It severely affected the internationalists.[28]

---

[26] Northern Star, April 8, 1848, p. 5.

[27] Northern Star, March 11, 1848, p. 5; see also Halévy, Victorian Years, 1841-1895, pp. 243-44.

[28] See Halévy, Victorian Years, 1841-1895, p. 243. For the House of Commons discussions on the Aliens' Removal Act see Hansard's,

The Fraternal Democrats recognized the threat. On the evening of Thursday, May 4, when it appeared that the Aliens' Bill would become law, they met to reorganize their society. Harney commented that both the Gagging Bill and the Aliens' Bill showed the necessity for dissolving the existing society. His motion carried and the society as it existed was dissolved. A committee was appointed to revise the organization. Their intentions were still to act as a "Foreign Affairs Committee."[29] Equality, Liberty and Fraternity were adopted as the society's motto and common ownership of property was their goal. In order to comply with the Aliens' Bill, the foreign contingent was dropped from the Executive. Harney remained the society's secretary, assisted by Edwin Gill, T. Ireland became treasurer and J. Overton, Charles Keen, W. Baitromp and John Arnott were the four members-at-large. May 4 was the new anniversary date, and in order to broaden its membership, yearly dues of 1s were adopted. Although that was a decrease of about one half of the previous dues of ½ penny per week, it failed to save the organization.[30]

The Government's repression succeeded. The activities of the internationalists waned throughout the remainder of the year. Not only did the movement lose its foreign members, but it was shorn of many of its

---

XCVII (7 April-26 May, 1848), pp. 135-38, 508, 560-87 and 851-71. It passed the third reading by a vote of 141 to 22. The noes included most of the prominent Radicals in the Commons. For the text of the Alien's Removal Act, which did not apply to any refugee who had lived in England for seven years, see Great Britain, Parliament, Parliamentary Papers (House of Commons & Command), 1847-48, Vol. VI (Bills, vol. 6), 18 April 1848, "An Act to authorize for One Year, and to the End of the next Session of Parliament, the Removal of Aliens from the Realm," 11 & 12 Vict., ch. 20.

[29] Northern Star, May 6, 1848, p. 8.

[30] Ibid., May 27, 1848, p. 6.

English leaders. Disillusionment accounted for some temporary withdrawals. Linton and Holyoake, for example, had brought out the Cause of the People in May, but with increasing debt and with numerous Chartist uprisings failing in the summer Linton retired to the Lake District in September and the paper folded.[31] Jail sentences or transportation removed others from active participation. On the evening of June 6, Jones was arrested in Manchester for a speech he had given some days earlier at Bishop Bonner's Fields, London. He and five other Chartists were convicted of seditious speech and sentenced to two years imprisonment.[32] Thus, one of their most effective orators was lost.

Even some of the less significant internationalists fell to the Government's new laws. For example, an insurrection set for the evening of August 16, that had been planned in the murky underworld of the London pubs, was put down by the police before it has scarcely started. Its leaders, including William Cuffay, a mulatto tailor, were charged, convicted and transported for life under the Treason Felony Act largely on the basis of evidence of two agents provocateurs, Thomas Powell and George Davis.[33] A Chartist since 1839 and a member of the

---

[31]Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 80-84.

[32]Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 31-33; Northern Star, June 10, 1848, p. 5; and John MacDonell, ed., Reports of State Trials (New series; 8 vols.; London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1888-98), VI, 783-830.

[33]MacDonnel, Reports of State Trials, VII, 382-486; Public Record Office, Treasury Solicitor and King's (Queen's) Proctor, 11/139 and 11/140. See also Gammage, Chartist Movement, pp. 337-40 and F. C. Mather, Public Order in the Age of the Chartists (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 210-11. The progress of the trials was followed in the Northern Star, September 30, 1848, p. 7, October 14, 1848, p. 4 and November 11, 1848, p. 4. For the connection between the

Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration, Cuffay became a martyr.[34]

The incident involving Cuffay had a two-fold significance. First, it underlined the effectiveness of the Government's repression. Second, it provided an excellent example of the Government's continued use of police spies to control English dissidents. Indeed, the authorities' use of undercover agents was wide-spread in 1848. Moreover, the police began a regular observation of new refugees as they began arriving in June, 1848. On June 7, Frank M. Faulkner, the Custom House manager at Folkstone in Kent, wrote to Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary, offering his services in ascertaining the objectives of the large numbers of foreigners who arrived daily. Apparently, his offer was accepted because on June 12, Inspector John Haynes wrote a report citing a figure of sixty-seven foreigners having arrived in Folkstone between June 1 and 10.[35] In the Thames Division of the Metropolitan Police, Superintendent J. Evans kept track of the arrival of new refugees. His reports included the date of arrival, the port of departure, the number of foreigners on board and sometimes their destination or place of residence in London.[36] London ceased to be the carefree refugee heaven of pre-1848. So few of the old

---

Metropolitan Police and Powell and Davis see Public Record Office, Home Office, 45/3136 and 40/59 (Hereinafter cited as H.O.).

[34] Reynolds's Political Instructor, April 13, 1850, p. 177 and Northern Star, March 28, 1846, p. 1 and November 28, 1846, p. 1.

[35] Public Record Office, Metropolitan Police Offices, 2/43 (Hereinafter cited as Mepol.). The letters are dated June 7 and June 12, 1848. For Grey see Mandell Creighton, Memoir of Sir George Grey, Bart., G. C. B. (Newcastle upon Tyne: Privately Printed, 1884).

[36] See Mepol. 2/43 for his two reports dated June 13 and another dated June 26.

stalwarts remained that a public dinner called by the Fraternal Democrats for Karl Schapper, who was briefly passing through London, turned out only a few survivors of the German Working Men's Association.[37] Added to that was constant police harassment.

Consequently, internationalism became relatively inactive in the latter half of 1848. With Chartism discredited, with continental revolutions still in a state of flux, with many of the international leaders in jail, with effective suppression resulting from the Gagging and Aliens' Acts, the surprise was that the movement survived at all. Their most exciting activity was Harney's letters in the Northern Star which began appearing after his return from Paris. Signed under the pen-name, "L'Ami du Peuple," they belied his identification with Marat and offered his readers discourses on a wide variety of revolutionary topics, but hardly any action.[38] The movement was in such disarray that it was impossible to hold a public celebration of the September 22, 1792, French Revolution. Instead of the traditional festive celebration, Harney hosted a small dinner party for a few close friends.[39] The Fraternal Democrats' 1849 New Years' address recognized the movement's failure. "The blows of tyranny have thinned our ranks." They believed that England had not seen comparable tyranny since the Stuart kings. Though depressed by events, they concluded that the basic cause of defeat was ignorance: "Believing that knowledge is power, our mission shall be to help to remove that

---

[37] Northern Star, July 8, 1848, p. 6.

[38] See, for example, Northern Star, August 12, 1848, p. 5, and August 26, 1848, p. 3.

[39] Ibid., September 30, 1848, p. 7.

fatal ignorance. . . ."[40] Thus, revolution having been tried and the English workers found wanting, the internationalists returned to the process of education. Once again, idle speeches and seldom-read proclamations formed the core of their activities.

1849 witnessed a regrouping of the international labor movement. At the Fraternal Democrats' celebration of the first anniversary of the February Revolution Harney spearheaded an attempt to unify ultra-Radicals among the Chartists. Wearing red ribbons or scarves, they gathered on the evening of February 26 at the Literary and Scientific Institution. Harney called for a union of Socialists and Chartists. Holyoake supported him. O'Brien, hardly a friend of Harney, spoke at length about the need for proletarian unity and then endorsed the motion. Clark followed suit, as did Walter Cooper, a Scottish working-class lecturer. Other speakers included Robert Buchanan, ex-publisher of the Socialist Spirit of the Age, Keen, Dixon and Edmund Stallwood, a Chartist.[41]

Harney was clearly directing the international movement in England at this time. Schoyen contends that the events of 1848 convinced Harney that the English working-class movement had to be socialist as well as democratic.[42] This desire accounted for his conciliatory efforts to engage a man such as Holyoake in his following. Perhaps, he believed that through Holyoake he could include the Owenites, maybe even Robert Owen, in his proposed alliance. A glance at Owens' brief statements on the

---

[40] Northern Star, January 6, 1849, p. 5.

[41] Northern Star, March 3, 1849, p. 5; Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, p. 184. For Stallwood's biography see Reynold's Political Instructor, April 27, 1850, pp. 192-193.

[42] Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, p. 178.

1848 revolutions should have revealed to Harney the gulf that separated them and the unlikelihood of cooperation.[43]

At the same time Harney maintained communications with many of the prominent French Republicans and Socialists. Surviving letters from 1848 and 1849 indicate that he knew Étienne Arago, a Republican forced into exile in 1849; Martin Bernard, a friend of Blanqui and Barbés, who as an extreme leftist fled France to escape imprisonment; Louis Blanc, a Utopian Socialist; and Marc Caussidière, a revolutionary democrat and prefect of police in Paris in 1848 who went into exile in June, 1848. They wrote him asking favors and space in the Northern Star for their publications. He obliged them frequently.[44] More important, Harney continued his correspondence with Engels.

His intimate connection with Engels underlined Harney's position in 1848-49 as the leading exponent of state socialism in England. He held that distinction only briefly, though. As Harney wrote to Engels on March 19, 1849, he encountered difficulties with O'Connor over the extent to which internationalism and socialism ought to appear in the pages of the Northern Star. In March, they clashed over O'Connor's fear that Harney was turning the paper into a "foreign journal altogether." A caustic debate was aired in the Northern Star in March and Harney realized that his editorial influence was about to wane. To counter this decline,

---

[43]See Robert Owen, To the Government and People of Europe and America (London, 1849), in H.O. 44/39. Similar manifestoes are found in the Robert Owen Correspondence, Holyoake House, Manchester; see Nos. 1,563, 1,742 and 1,744.

[44]Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 3-5. For an example of Harney's compliance see the Northern Star, June 30, 1849, p. 5 where he printed a letter from Blanc on current events in France.

he announced to Engels in a letter dated May 1, 1849, his plans for a new journal. He called it the Democratic Review of British and Foreign Politics, History and Literature and described it as "the organ of European Democracy."[45]

The appearance of the Democratic Review coincided with a new flurry of revolutionary activity on the continent. The Mazzinian Roman Republic, established in February 1849 and defended by Guisippe Garibaldi, finally fell to the counter-revolution in June. Secondly, the Hungarian revolution organized under Louis Kossuth's leadership in April was entering its final phase. The agitation surrounding both questions focused upon the English internationalists' educational policy towards the English working class.

The failure of the Roman Republic aroused an abusive outburst of working-class opinion in England. The Fraternal Democrats issued an address to the people of France in which they severely castigated President Louis Napoleon for interfering against Mazzini. Already, the Prince-President received the ire of the internationalists; they labelled him the "Special Constable of Europe" in a snide reference to his brief stint as a special constable in London during the 1848 Chartist disturbances. They warned Frenchmen that the Prince would undermine their constitution. Ledru-Rollin and the Moutain were their favorites.[46]

---

[45]For the two letters to Engels see Cadogan, "Harney and Engels," International Review of Social History, X, 67-70. For two of O'Connor's letters to Harney on this question see Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 61-63. The key letters which aired the debate publicly are in the Northern Star. O'Connor's major attack on Harney was printed on March 24, 1849, p. 5. See also Rothstein, From Chartism to Labourism, pp. 147-48.

[46]Northern Star, June 16, 1849, p. 5.

Events in Rome moved Linton, who was still living in the Lake District, to write Holyoake urging action. He was pleased to read in the Reasoner that sympathy existed in London for Mazzini.[47] But he thought more was required. "I would be glad if the People's Charter Union, the John St. folks, the City Mechanics, and others, would use the opportunity to protest in the strongest manner possible against the impossible foreign policy of our most impossible government." He included a copy of a petition he had earlier drawn up and sent to Colonel Perronet Thompson, an M. P. and radical freethinker. His petition called for English intervention in order to aid Mazzini and he urged others to devise similar petitions expressing their beliefs.[48]

Indeed, the two rebellions captured public opinion in England for the remainder of the year. Public meetings were held throughout the country from July to November. Again, the traditional radical centers of England dominated the scene. Some gatherings were called by the Fraternal Democrats, some by the parliamentary radicals and others by local public officials. The number of meetings indicated more than a passing fancy on the part of the English for the Italian and Hungarian causes. All were enthusiastically in favor of Italy and Hungary gaining their freedom, but they disagreed over the methods Englishmen should adopt in helping them achieve it.[49]

---

[47] Reasoner, June 6, 1849, Vol. I, no. 158, pp. 355-60.

[48] W. J. Linton to George J. Holyoake, June 6, 1849, No. 313, Holyoake Collection. For the petition see the Northern Star, June 30, 1849, p. 5. A good example of this rhetoric is Linton's article "The Non-Intervention Policy" in the Reasoner, 1849, Vol. II, new series, no. 2, pp. 25-27.

[49] See the Northern Star, July-November, 1849.

At a crowded meeting in the Literary Institution, John Street on Tuesday evening, July 24, violent diatribes against the Government's inaction dominated the speeches. Among others present were Harney, O'Connor, Reynolds, Watson, Clark, Dixon, McGrath, Hetherington, Moore and Major Beniowski. Moore censured the British Government for not protesting the French intervention in Rome. Clark declared the time would come when through a national representation the people of England would have the power to help distressed nations. O'Connor gave a violent speech that appeared out of character for him, except that as always he rose to the occasion with a bombastic speech. He said: "Ay, and now if England did her duty, and sent her 'raw lobsters' and 'Picadilly butchers,' her horse, foot, and artillery to fight the battles of the brave Hungarians, the English people would be more tranquil in the midst of unparalleled suffering in the absence of those conservators of the peace, if they were engaged in so noble a struggle." He then declared that if England did not assist in the establishment of peace in Europe, she would soon find herself ". . . a beggar at the door of the foreigner." The audience cheered both ideas wildly. He told them what they wanted to hear. But then idle words about far-away events were easy to come by. Harney called for England to recognize the Kossuth Government and to intervene with force, if necessary. But Major Beniowski topped them all; if it looked as though Austria and Russia were going to win he advised Kossuth to put the torch to every city and town in Hungary.[50]

---

[50] Northern Star, July 28, 1849, p. 5. See Harney's letter in the series L'Ami du Peuple in the Northern Star, August 4, 1849, p. 5 for a similar statement of his position. For Kossuth's efforts to engage Palmerston's sympathy see Eugene Horváth, "Kossuth and Palmerston, 1848-1849," Slavonic and East European Review, IX (March, 1931), 612-31 and Ridley, Lord Palmerston, p. 481.

The John Street group drew up a petition expressing the sentiments of the evening's speeches and sent it to Lord Dudley Stuart and Lord Beaumont for presentation to both houses of Parliament. The moderates were busily engaged in their own round of public meetings and hardly agreed anyway with the Harney group. Under the pressure of Kossuth's representative, Francis Pulzsky, City Alderman Saloman David chaired a public meeting at the London Tavern in Bishopsgate on Monday afternoon at 1:00, July 23. Some twenty M. P.'s were present.[51]

The motions carried at another of Lord Dudley's public meetings, this one convened in Marylebone on July 30, reflected the moderate, conservative predicament. With as many people outside as within the building, although no attendance figures were cited, Hume moved for sympathy, non-intervention and admiration of Hungary's struggle. The motion carried. Colonel Thompson concurred and called for gentle pressure on the English Government on this question. Hetherington agreed; he thought sympathy for Hungary a fine gesture but that the real emphasis ought to be placed on obtaining the ballot for English workers. When Sir De Lacey Evans, Liberal M. P. for Westminster, spoke favorably of Palmerston's foreign policy, he was hissed down. Harney appeared at this meeting even though he had little in common with its sponsors. Well received by the workers in the audience, he appealed directly to them over the heads of the M.P.'s on the platform. He asked for a show of hands of all those who wanted England to go to war with Austria and Russia to defend the

---

[51] Northern Star, July 28, 1849, p. 8 and Dénes A. Jánossy, Great Britain and Kossuth (Budapest: Archivum Europae Centro-Orientales, 1937), p. 80.

independence of Hungary. "THE MEETING RESPONDED WITH ALMOST FRANTIC ENTHUSIASM." He then offered a counter-measure, but no one responded. No doubt, Harney beamed with satisfaction. The moderates were outdone at their own meeting; English sympathy favored intervention, not a do-nothing policy, he thought.[52]

Harney's approach connected the ideas of freedom at home and freedom abroad. It appeared he had struck a sympathetic chord in his audience. The link between the two was intimate and Hungary's revolt offered an opportunity to educate the English workers even more thoroughly about the relationship. To his working-class opponents, such as Thomas Cooper, who advocated reform at home before abroad, Harney replied that he would gladly agree to postpone aid to Hungary if the prospect of reform in England was real.[53] The failures of Chartism in 1848 had reconfirmed his belief that English reform had to come within a European context. In the agitation over Cracow he had first voiced this view. English freedom was inseparable from continental freedom and because revolution came easier in countries beyond the English Channel he gave priority to assistance to others instead of harping about hopeless reform at home.

The practical results of all this agitation were threefold. First, an Italian Refugee Fund, headed by Sidney Milne Hawkes and James Stansfeld, which included mainly respectable radicals on its membership

---

[52]Northern Star, August 4, 1849, p. 1 and Jánossy, Great Britain and Kossuth, p. 81.

[53]Northern Star, August 18, 1849, p. 5.

list, was established to collect funds for the Italian refugees.[54] Second, the moderates formed a Hungarian Association to collect and distribute information about the Hungarian events of 1848-49 and to circulate in shortened form any official documents that were published.[55] Harney scoffed at such efforts; he thought the Fraternal Democrats should be in charge of help for continental democrats.[56] Third, the Fraternal Democrats revised their objectives. The success of the European counter-revolution had convinced Harney of the necessity for a four-fold program: fraternity of nations, abolition of the penny stamp on the press, political emancipation of the English working class and diffusion of knowledge on political and social questions. By November, as a result of the failure of the Hungarian revolt, Harney sought more balance between domestic and foreign objectives. But he still abhorred the existing system: ". . . I am persuaded that we must pull down the old institutions before we can erect the new."[57]

Harney, however, expressed a minority view. Writing in his new journal Reynolds's Political Instructor, Reynolds expressed sentiments more widely accepted because they were just left of moderate. The Revolutions of 1848 had failed, he wrote, but the people would rise again to

---

[54] Northern Star, September 8, 1849, p. 5.

[55] "Hungarian Association," Toulmain Smith Collection, 7215, item 131, Birmingham Public Library as reprinted in the Appendix of Thomas G. Kabdebo, "Lord Dudley Stuart and the Hungarian Refugees of 1849," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XLIV (November, 1971), 268-69.

[56] Northern Star, September 8, 1849, p. 5.

[57] Democratic Review of British and Foreign Politics, History and Literature, Vol. I, November 1849, pp. 201-206, 240, and Northern Star, November 3, 1849, p. 5.

fight tyranny. He contended that physical-force was the only method that could provide justice for the victims of tyranny in Europe, but in England victory would come through the moral influence of public opinion. The physical-force man in England was a traitor to the popular cause.[58] His heroes were Kossuth, Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin, who were respectable revolutionaries untainted by communism or socialism.[59]

Despite their differences, Harney and the popular speaker Reynolds turned the tide of English working-class opinion regarding the Hungarian question against the parliamentary radicals. In London, at least, the operatives favored direct English intervention. With Reynolds vaguely pronouncing for socialism, he and Harney led the assault on those Chartists who counseled cooperation with the middle-class radicals. Harney challenged the Chartist leadership with the Hungarian agitation as the cutting edge of his attack. The Fraternal Democrats, he wrote, did not want to usurp the Chartists and if the Chartist reorganized they would join them; if not, then the Fraternal Democrats would fulfill their mission alone.[60]

The nation-wide Hungarian agitation, which overshadowed the Italian question, reflected English Russophobia. But even if the Russians had not intervened in 1849, the English working-class internationalists would have sided with the continental revolutionaries because the

---

[58] Reynolds's Political Instructor, Vol. I, December 1, 1849, pp. 26-27.

[59] See Reynold's Political Instructor, Vol. I, December 1, 1849, p. 28, December 8, 1849, pp. 34-35, December 15, 1849, p. 49, and December 29, 1849, p. 58.

[60] Northern Star, November 3, 1849, p. 5.

established governments in France (Louis Napoleon), Austria and Russia were under the control of the tyrants they reviled so much. Their sincerity, though weak when called upon for practical aid, emanated from a sense of common experiences with the European revolutionaries: lack of freedom, social oppression and economic depression.[61]

At this juncture Chartism was ruptured by internal dissension. O'Connorite forces and Harney's people clashed in January 1850 over the question of cooperation with the parliamentary radicals. O'Connor and Harney parted ways and Harney was forced to resign from the Northern Star and struck out on his own. Furthermore, the Chartist organization split. Harney's followers captured the executive of the NCA. John Arnott, Thomas Brown, William Davis, James Grassby, Harney, Thomas Miles, John Milne, Reynolds and Edmund Stallwood sat on the new executive. All of them except Miles had had previous connection with the international labor movement through participation in one or another of the organizations formed after 1845. They were also confirmed social reformers. Despite only 500 Chartists members still on the books, the democratic-internationalists had control of the only significant working-class political organization in England. Thomas Clark and the other O'Connorites formed a short-lived National Charter League that advocated cooperation with middle-class reformers. The other organized group was the National

---

[61] Gleason, Genesis of Russophobia, pp. 288-89 contends that English Russophobia resulted from a repugnance towards the Russian government, from a trade rivalry in which England was losing, from accidental encounters and from policy clashes. B. G. Ivany, "The Working Classes of Britain and the Eastern European Revolution (1848)," Slavonic and East European Review, XXVI (November, 1947), 107-25 argues that the English concern resulted from literary efforts and publicity campaigns about Hungary during the 1840s.

Reform League, which O'Brien founded in January of 1850; it too called for social reform. Socialism had finally split the Chartist movement. The temporary victory belonged to those who called for "socialist measures through political means," and they were the internationalists.[62]

The emphasis on socialism and making a commitment to social reform appeared prominently in working-class circles in early 1850. At the Fraternal Democrats' New Years' Eve festival held at the John Street Institution on December 31, 1849, some 300 persons of both sexes turned out for tea. Almost everyone wore "Red" ribbons. According to Harney the members of the Fraternal Democrats varied in their adherence to socialism, but all ". . . the Red Republicans and Social Reformers of the continent have our hearty sympathy and good wishes." Amidst cheers, he declared that the "Red Flag" would trample their enemies and would "rally all the nations around Liberty's Tree."[63] That was essentially the message of the manifesto they published celebrating the February 1848 French Revolution. The people's rights were both political and social.[64]

If, however, the Fraternal Democrats' brand of socialism tended towards extremism, other, new adherents posited for the English worker a calmer and more reasoned socialism. Two new newspapers figured here. In March 1850 the Leader appeared. Its original shareholders included Linton, Thornton Hunt, son of the poet Leigh Hunt, G. H. Lewes, writer and later

---

[62]See Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 194-99; Frances Gillespie, Labor and Politics in England, 1850-1867 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1927), pp. 66-71 (error ridden); and Cole, Chartist Portraits, pp. 263-64.

[63]Northern Star, January 5, 1850, p. 1.

[64]Ibid., March 2, 1850, p. 5.

editor of the Fortnightly Review, W. E. Forster, a wealthy young Bradford worsted manufacturer, the Reverend Edmund Larken, a Christian Socialist, John Minter Morgan, a former Owenite, Thomas Ballantyne, the editor and a former Anti-Corn Law journalist, and Joseph Clayton, the printer. Holyoake was the paper's office manager. The Leader offered English radicals diverse philosophies, but socialism was frequently featured. It was probably Hunt, whom Linton viewed as too "communistic," who wrote the article "What is our Socialism?" English Socialism, the writer contended, drew from all Socialists and depended on no system. It involved the spread of "Common Labour" on a par with competition. That, it was idealistically assumed, would lead the workers to securing all the nation's "material existence" and so free them to begin legislating for a new society. Social reforms preceded political reforms; changes in the political sphere would then grow out of the "convictions" of the nation. Education rather than barricades was the path of British Socialism.[65]

The other new paper was Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper which appeared in May 1850 as an outgrowth of the earlier Reynolds's Political Instructor. Reynolds advocated greater freedom for the English proletariat. He, too, had adopted a brand of vague socialism, although he called for the attainment of political and social rights before the implementation of some form of socialism or communism.[66] The pages of his newspaper were flooded with articles and reports about the international labor movement in the 1850s and 1860s. At first he opened his columns

---

[65] Leader, May 11, 1850, p. 154 and Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 93-99.

[66] See Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, June 9, 1850, p. 4; for similar statements see Reynolds's Political Instructor, Vol. I, February 16, 1850, p. 114 and Vol. I, March 16, 1850, p. 146.

to all shades of radical opinion, but gradually gravitated towards respectability.

In contrast to these moderate papers Harney brought out in June 1850 the Red Republican. Although it only lasted until December, when he changed its name to the Friend of the People, it epitomized the new Chartism better than any other paper of its time. In its first issue, Howard Morton wrote:

> Chartism in 1850 is a different thing from Chartism in 1840. The leaders of the English proletarians have proved that they are true democrats, . . . They have progressed from the idea of a simple political reform to the idea of a Social Revolution.

The enemies of this movement were "all other classes of society put together."[67] Indeed, articles about socialism and communism dominated the pages of this publication and of Harney's Democratic Review. Schoyen believes that Engels wrote the unsigned "Letters from Germany" and "Letters from Paris" in the Democratic Review.[68] Internationalism instead of parochialism reflected the tone of the Chartist leaders.

By the summer of 1850 Harney and Jones, who was released from prison in early July, represented the trend of internationalism and Chartism. Harney now pursued the cooperation of the trade unions. He believed that the key to success for independent working-class politics lay in gaining the adherence of the unions. In the Red Republican he devoted considerable space to strikes and even spoke before public meetings on behalf of strikers. In August 1850, he called a Democratic Conference to

---

[67] Red Republican, June 22, 1850, p. 2. Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 203-204 suggests that Howard Morton was really Helen Macfarlane, the admirer of Marx and Engels and the translator of the first English edition of the Communist Manifesto.

[68] Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 202-203.

cement the unity of the various socialist and trade union groups. Included among those attending were the representatives of the Metropolitan Trades Council whose membership numbered 17,000. By the close of the year the conference had failed to achieve its goal of forming a political party, although its socialistic biases were evident.[69]

Harney also concerned himself with the welfare of the refugees in England. Outraged by the shadowing of some German refugees by Prussian spies and English informers, he wrote a blistering defense of their activities in England, which, he said, they and the Poles performed always in the shadow of dire destitution.[70] In addition, he assisted the Poles in the founding of the Democratic Refugee Committee, which was set up to aid recently arrived exiles. Numbering between 98 and 100, some of Kossuth's Polish Legion soldiers landed at Southampton in March. They became pawns in the struggle between the "respectable" and socialists wings of the internationalists in England. Upon arrival they were provisioned by the Mayor of Southampton. Then Lord Dudley's society whisked some of them off to America. Harney believed that a conspiracy existed to remove these soldiers of democracy from Europe. The Democratic Refugee Committee was designed to disrupt that policy and provide

---

[69]Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 206-208. Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, August 11, 1850, p. 1; August 25, 1850, p. 7; October 13, 1850, pp. 10-11; October 20, 1850, p. 10; and November 17, 1850, p. 10. Northern Star, October 13, 1850, p. 1; October 19, 1850, p. 5; October 26, 1850, p. 5; November 2, 1850, p. 1; November 9, 1850, p. 1; and November 16, 1850, p. 1.

[70]Red Republican, June 29, 1850, pp. 12-13. He wrote this article after a letter from Marx, Engels and August Willich to the Sun exposed the spying of the authorities on their movements. See the Northern Star, June 15, 1850, p. 7 for a reprint of their letter. For an example of one of these spy reports see David McLellan, Karl Marx, pp. 230-31.

the socialists in the emigration with a means of support. Although gallant in intent, it faced an uphill struggle in obtaining employment for those refugees who remained behind in England.[71]

Harney focused his efforts on helping the refugees survive and on reorganizing Chartism. By contrast, Jones appealed directly to the English populace. Upon his release from prison, the Fraternal Democrats feted him on July 10, 1850, at the Craven Arms pub and the NCA did the same on July 11 at the John Street Institution.[72] A martyr of sorts for his two-year prison term he was excellently positioned to spread his social reform ideas throughout the countryside. Being an enthusiastic public speaker, he popularized the Marxian ideas of the Communist Manifesto and other such writings. He espoused socialistic reform to audiences in the Midlands and the North of England during the fall of 1850.[73]

He pledged himself to helping the poor. Similar to Harney and the Fraternal Democrats, he realized that few English workers recognized the connection between social and political reform. "I believe there is little use in holding before them the Cap of Liberty, unless you hold THE BIG LOAF by the side of it . . . ." He believed that knowledge of their social rights would enable English workers to retain their

---

[71]Northern Star, March 30, 1850, p. 2 and May 18, 1850, p. 5. Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, June 16, 1850, p. 6. Leader, July 6, 1850, p. 350. Red Republican, July 13, 1850, pp. 25-26; July 20, 1850, pp. 36-37; and August 3, 1850, pp. 53-54. Disagreements existed over the number remaining, as either 60 or 80 were cited.

[72]Northern Star, July 13, 1850, p. 1.

[73]See Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 37-39.

political rights once they obtained them.[74] The problem was to educate them about the significance of this issue. Jones' sympathy with working-class sufferings enabled him to speak knowledgably to the workers about their rights. He emphathized with them against the other classes. Writing to Harney from Sussex in July 1850, he commented: "Seven parks laid under our eyes from the hill on the common--gorgeous country seats, a few rich farmhouses, and not one labourer's cottage, Good heavens! where do they live, the men who made all that rich and ornamental cultivation, but in the village are backsloughs as bad as St. Giles's under the very shadow of the great old Church."[75] Jones spent the remainder of his active Chartist days espousing social reform.

Thus, the conviction that socialism and social reform were essential to the obtainment and preservation of political rights was the ultimate result of the 1848-49 revolutions. The February Revolution in France provided the Chartists with the impetus they needed to assault the Queen's Government. That Chartist efforts failed to topple aristocratic government reflected the overwhelming strength of the authority structure, not the inherent weakness of the non-deferential working class. The internationalists had great hopes for revolution after February, but suffered the same fate as the Chartists. By mid-summer their expectations were dashed and their organizations were mangled.

Yet, the international labor movement survived. Due to the leaderhip's ideological dedication to reform the movement revived in

---

[74] Northern Star, August 10, 1850, p. 1.

[75] Ernest Jones to George Julian Harney, July 22, 1850, Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 26-28.

1849 and showed great residual strength in agitation for Hungarian independence. Their hopes soared once again as violent rhetoric, such as Harney's, met with working-class approval. The numerous well-attended meetings held across the country in the second half of 1849 encouraged them in their beliefs. 1848 had shown the English workers' dislike of actual revolution, but 1849 reflected their continued fascination with continental peoples who were striving for freedom. Perhaps, an emphasis upon the concept of social reform could also educate the English working class about its lack of real freedom. Social reform became the slogan of the internationalists.

CHAPTER III

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE REFUGEES, 1850-1853

Although the working-class internationalists at 1850 pronounced in favor of social reform, they never quite agreed upon an exact program. These heirs of Chartism faced competition in the 1850s. The jingoistic radicalism of men such as John Arthur Roebuck and the middle-class radicalism of Joseph Hume and John Bright who had formed in 1848 the "Little Charter" movement constituted two alternatives. They saw the decline of Chartism as an opportunity to redefine the reform debate under their own, not working class, leadership. Consequently, this period was one of fragmentation and confusion with many suggestions being offered for the English labor movement's future. The central issue was that of the relation of workers to the middle class. In time the question was resolved in favor of cooperation, but during the years 1850-53 the outcome hung in the balance.[1]

---

[1]Gillespie, Labor and Politics is the standard account of these and later years. She contends that by 1850 the English working classes were internationally minded, but does not measure how deeply the impact was felt. Her primary focus is on parliamentary politics, not on the international labor movement. For Gammage's account see his History of the Chartist Movement, pp. 359-402. Hovell, Chartist Movement, pp. 300-12 briefly scans the years under study here. Ward, Chartism, pp. 222-31 hardly does any more justice to this period than did Hovell. The entire working-class movement between 1848 and 1854 needs a new synthesis to bring its research up-to-date. That is not proposed here, but rather this chapter aims at illuminating part of the ". . . change in the tone and

The international labor movement also suffered confusion and fragmentation. In order to achieve their goals of social and political reform the internationalists had to define their social theories and express them in an appealing manner to the workers. They needed a unified program if they were to convince the wider working-class structure on a social level to marshall its support to achieve reform. I will argue below that this prerequisite for success eluded the movement for two reasons. First, internationalism operated in a weakened and demoralized condition in the years preceding the Crimean War. In order to sustain itself it relied upon enthusiasm generated from foreign events and from the appearance in England of prominent foreigners, both sympathetic and unsympathetic. This reliance compounded rather than resolved differences over the role of social reform because it caused the internationalists to misplace their emphasis and expend their energies on diverse and fruitless affairs instead of creating a common philosophy. Secondly, the authority structure marshalled its resources to oppose the movement. The social control of police harassment became a matter of record and accomplished its goal of disrupting the refugees and their allies. From hindsight we know that the possibility of revolution was remote after 1848. But contemporaries possessed no such knowledge and took the precaution of keeping an eye on these potential dissidents. Thus, the international labor movement floundered while waiting for another 1848.[2]

---

temper of British radicalism" after the disaster of 1848. For a recognition of this need see J. F. C. Harrison, "A Knife and Fork Question?: Some Recent Writings on the History of Social Movements," Victorian Studies, XVIII (December, 1974), 224.

[2]For internationalism during these years see Rothstein, From Chartism to Labourism, pp. 153-65 and Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 202-33.

In this period Her Majesty's Government began a regular policy of observing the refugees and their English friends. The scale of this police espionage transcended earlier spying on working-class activity and reflected the upper class's fears of the revolutionary potential of the internationalists. The bulk of this espionage was under the direction of the Detective Division of the Metropolitan Police. High-level police officers disagreed about the intention of a police force. Colonel Charles Rowan believed that the police ought to act upon the preventative principle only. His colleague Richard Mayne argued that the detection of crime was just as valid. Consequently, the Detective Division of two inspectors and six sergeants was established in 1842. In the 1850s the detectives and other regular policemen who were called upon occasionally to perform their duties in civilian dress emerged as true professionals. Previously, men who fulfilled their roles had done so in order to obtain rewards for convictions or to satisfy political demands as agents provocateurs. The lower classes disdained these men in earlier times and transferred their dislike of them to the new detectives. Since the newly formed police in London had yet to gain the working class's favor, the job of the detectives was doubly difficult.[3]

---

[3]For the establishment of the Detective Division see the correspondence in H.O. 45/724. Background information on its creation and the philosophy behind it is found in Charles Reith, British Police and the Democratic Ideal (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp. 72-112, 153-59, 233; Ibid., A New Study of Police History (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956), pp. 143-67; and Belton Cobb, The First Detectives and the Early Career of Richard Mayne, Commissioner of Police (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1957). For recent work on the English police see Robert D. Storch, "The Plague of the Blue Locusts: Police Reform and Popular Resistance in Northern England, 1840-57," International Review of Social History, XX (Part 1, 1975), 61-90 who argues that the police acted as middle class agents in working-class communities, and hence were

Surprise might justifiably be registered on the question why the police bothered to observe the internationalists at all. Had not the 1848-49 agitation failed? Yes, it had, but the authorities' fear of the social revolutionary aspect of Chartism under its new leaders prompted the observation. On this point one of the police reports is instructive. Police constables and sergeants conducted most of the actual observation. They were hardly well-informed on current social criticism. Yet, the policeman writing his report on March 13, 1850, referred to the "Red Republican Chiefs." Fear of socialist or communist inspired upheaval and a desire for social control resulted in the police practices of the 1850s. In the minds of the authorities Chartism had become a part of internationalism and the prominent exponents of the international labor movement were either democrats, socialists or communists. All were suspect of wrong-doing.[4]

The police reports offer innumerable insights about the internationalists. Most important, the first concrete evidence about the social composition of the working-class crowds that attended international meetings is found in the reports. The radical newspapers were content with statements about proletarian types or lower orders, or made

---

resented. Wilbur R. Miller, "Police Authority in London and New York City, 1830-1870," Journal of Social History, (Winter, 1975), 81-101 contends somewhat less convincingly that police power in London emanated from working class acquiescence to police authority. For a discussion of police reliance on the moral assent of the population see Alan Silver, "The Demand for Order in Civil Society: A Review of Some Themes in the History of Urban Crime, Police and Riots" in The Police, ed. by David J. Bordua (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), 1-24.

[4]Police Report--Chartists and Louis Blanc, March 13, 1850, H.O. 45/3136. For examples of the internationalists' references to themselves as "Reds" see Democratic Review, March, 1850, p. 388, April, 1850, p. 434, May, 1850, p. 462; and Northern Star, May 11, 1850, p. 8.

no comment at all. But the police defined the audiences specifically. For example, on the evening of January 14, 1850, Reynolds, McGrath and Harney harangued a Metropolitan Charter Association gathering of 1,500 mechanics with internationalist themes. These workers were skilled artisans, not down-trodden proletarians. Doubtless, other kinds of workers attended, but the mechanics were cited far more regularly in the police reports.[5]

Surprise ought not be registered about artisans forming the bulk of the internationalists' listeners. Most of the movement's agitation occurred in London where industrial proletarian development lagged behind the North of England. Secondly, the internationalists, and the Chartists for that matter, held their meetings in mechanics institutes such as the John Street Institution and the National Hall in Holborn, as well as in taverns. Naturally, the artisans, as well as middle class members, attended lectures held in their own institutions.[6]

The police reports also indicate that internationalist rhetoric justified the authorities' conduct. The very nature of government requires that it respond repressively to threats against order and stability. 1851 was the year of the Great Exhibition in London and many people in the upper and middle classes feared that disorder, perhaps even

---

[5]Chartist Meeting--Report, G. Division, January 15, 1850, Mepol. 2/59 and Police Report: Chartist Meeting, F. Division, February 1, 1850, H.O. 45/3136.

[6]For the mechanics' institutes see Richard D. Altick, The English Common Reader (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 188-212 and Edward Royle, "Mechanics' Institutes and the Working Classes, 1840-1860," Historical Journal, XIV (1971), 305-21.

rebellion, was in the offing.[7] The internationalists contributed to that feeling.

Several random examples taken from their speeches in late 1850 and early 1851 support this contention. A police report detailing a benefit meeting held for the Polish and Hungarian refugees on the evening of December 16, 1850, cited Ernest Jones as describing, before about 1,000 workers, ". . . the Exhibition of 1851 as a glorious opportunity of existing themselves--as thousands of Democrats from all parts of the world would be in London--whose sympathies they would be sure to have."[8] At a Chartist lecture to ninety people held on January 7, 1851, at 41 Turnmill Street, a Mr. Wood spoke about the influx of foreigners who were coming to the Exhibition and ". . . advised the People to advocate democracy at that time in every possible way."[9] Mr. Bertolau, a clerk at the Treasury, sent unsolicited reports to Sir Richard Mayne about the disaffected Chartists. One letter noted a meeting of "delegates" at the John Street Institution. They were determined to rebel during the Exhibition, he wrote.[10] Even O'Connor contributed to the authorities' suspicions. On January 8, 1851 at the South Chartist Hall, he claimed that the Exhibition would draw to London many democrats and their presence would inspire Englishmen to action.[11]

---

[7]See Audrey Short, "Workers Under Glass in 1851," Victorian Studies, X (December, 1966), 193-202.

[8]Police Report: Chartists and Refugees, December 17, 1850, H.O. 45/3136. The underling was in the original report.

[9]Police Report: Chartists, January 8, 1851, H.O. 45/3615.

[10]Mr. Bertolau to Mayne, April 7, 1851, Mepol. 2/62. See also Bertolau's letter of April 28, 1851, Ibid.

[11]Northern Star, January 11, 1851, p. 1.

Later, however, in the first number of Notes to the People, which appeared the week of the opening of the Exhibition, Jones called upon the Chartists to avoid disruptions at the Exhibition. Violence would harm democracy's cause; he argued:

> The middle-class are becoming democratic--but their democracy lies in their pockets: if they are the losers by the autumn--they grow more democratic; but if they are the losers through our supposed or actual instrumentality, they turn reactionary. Therefore, commit no violence!--create no fear. Don't spoil their trade, its spoiling fast enough already! Let the system run out the length of its tether, and it will break its own neck. . . .

Thirteen years later Marx, chancing upon several old copies of this paper, wrote to Engels reminding him that Marx had influenced Jones considerably at this point.[12] Jones' inference in 1851 was that violence was a viable possibility. The police reports supported that theme. Indeed, as early as November 5, 1850, Mayne had prepared a memo about the expected influx of foreigners and the problems arising from their possible acquaintance with the refugees who were in close contact with known English political agitators. He thought precautions were in order.[13]

Because of the expected arrival of unrecognizable criminals and political agitators, Grey and Mayne implemented a two-fold policy. They increased the size of the police force and accepted police agents from foreign countries to act as undercover men in providing identification for the English police. France and the Germanies sent most of the officers, although some came from Russia and New York City. Yet, the existing correspondence shows that the English authorities were as concerned

---

[12] Notes to the People, 1851-52, I, 16. See also Marx to Engels, November 4, 1864, in Marx and Engels, Correspondence, 1846-1895, p. 146.

[13] Mayne to H. Waddington, November 5, 1850, Mepol. 1/53.

to reduce their expenses regarding these men as they were to utilize them. In addition, Mayne became upset with the Prussian agents who spent most of their time carrying out "political objects" for their government instead of helping the Metropolitan Police.[14]

The added precaution and the increased provocation accorded to the refugees and their English friends in these months resulted from overreaction. The Exhibition came and went, the crowds behaved in an orderly fashion and the internationalists caused no trouble. Aside from an address from a group of Sardinian workmen who toured England to the Society of the Friends of Italy, a recently-formed middle class group, and a reply to the Italians, the authorities were in complete control.[15] Indeed, near the end of 1851 Sergeant John Sanders, the omnipresent detective who carved a career out of observing the refugees, wrote a report offering quieting news for his superiors. Under the influence of alcohol they might utter a phrase "Death to the Aristocrats" or "down with the 'President'" but they maintained no emissaries in France and were scarcely capable of providing for themselves in England. He concluded that they were merely waiting for an opportunity to return to France in the midst of another revolution.[16] From his close proximity to the refugees Sanders understood the extent of their weakness. His superiors never grasped that reality.

---

[14]For some of this correspondence see: Mayne to H. Waddington, March 31, 1851, Mepol. 1/53; Mayne to H. Waddington, May 21, 1852, Ibid.; Mayne to H. Waddington, June 11, 1851, Mepol. 2/92; and Mayne to H. Waddington, June 19, 1851, Mepol. 1/53.

[15]For the address and the SFI response see Northern Star, September 20, 1851, p. 5 and Leader, September 20, 1851, p. 888 and September 27, 1851, p. 910.

[16]Metropolitan Police Report, November 1, 1851, H.O. 45/3518.

Foreign events frequently led the British Government to intensify their actions, just as the internationalists did. One such example was the coup d'état of Louis Napoleon on Devember 2, 1851. The Home Office followed the influx of French refugees closely and Sergeant Sanders kept his superiors apprised of the situation. On December 30, 1851, he reported that about 1,500 new French refugees had arrived and that they lived in the Leicester Square area of London. They appeared respectable despite some calm discussions among them regarding Palmerston's dismissal from the Foreign Office and some disrespectful language towards President Bonaparte. He did note, however, that Pierre Leroux, the "famous Socialist," was in London and that Victor Schoelcher, a member of the Mountain in the now-dismissed French Assembly, would arrive shortly.[17] This police observation focused mainly upon the "Reds," but did not ignore other groups. A Sanders' report in January recorded the refugees' continual arrival; he stated emphatically that they were placed under police surveillance while they were in London.[18] Indeed, another of his reports informed his superiors about specific information regarding the French

---

[17]Police Report--French Refugees, December 30, 1851, Mepol. 2/43. Howard C. Payne and Henry Grosshans, "The Exiled Revolutionaries and the French Political Police in the 1850's," American Historical Review, LXVIII (July, 1963), 954-73 cite the number of socialist refugees at 1,000. They argue that French authorities were preoccupied with the "red spectre" that was kept alive by these refugees and that France made the refugee question an important issue in Franco-British relations in the 1850s. They contend that British diplomats believed that the French exaggerated the situation, but they failed to investigate the Metropolitan Police Papers for these years which indicate more than a passing interest by English officials.

[18]Police Report--Foreign Refugees, January 13, 1852, H.O. 45/4302.

refugees' attitude towards Britain's refugee policy and regarding the activities of the German refugees.[19]

Despite the increase in police activity during these months, the new French government indicated dissatisfaction. Throughout the second half of 1851 the French minister in London, M. Walewski, sent several letters and reports to the Foreign Office about French fears regarding the revolutionaries in London.[20] After the coup d'état, official pressure was exerted in Paris on the English Ambassador, Lord Normanby, in an effort to convince his government to adopt a stricter policy.[21] Although Palmerston approved of Louis Napoleon's coup, he resisted French pressures on this question. As he wrote to Sir George H. Seymour, the British representative in St. Petersburg, continental governments did not have the right to dictate British policy on this issue.[22] Thus, the police policy of increased surveillance reflected a moderate approach not to the liking of continental regimes.

Police observation remained at a high level from 1852 until 1858. They reported refugee activities, discoveries concerning refugee plans, and refugee movements within London and the provinces. Prominent

---

[19]Police Report--Foreign Refugees, February 25, 1852, H.O. 45/4302.

[20]Copy, the Prefect of Police in Paris to the Minister of Interior, June 21, 1851, H.O. 45/3518; W. Addington to H. Waddington, August 21, 1851, Ibid.; and Copy, Count Walewski to Palmerston, August 15, 1851, Ibid.

[21]Normanby to Palmerston, December 4, 1851, no 367, Public Record Office, Foreign Office 27/905 (Hereinafter referred to as F.O.); Normanby to Palmerston, December 15, 1851, no. 409, Ibid.; and Normanby to Palmerston, December 17, 1851, Ibid.

[22]Palmerston to Seymour, October 28, 1851, copy of no. 53 enclosed in W. Addington to H. Waddington, December 30, 1851, H.O. 45/3518. See also Hansard's, CXIX (3 February-22 March, 1852), pp. 244-45.

refugees, insignificant followers, organizations and the movement of refugee correspondence all warranted inclusion. The correspondence between the exiles on the island of Jersey and those in London came under scrutiny. The Hungarians appeared in the police reports as the most aggressive of the refugees. The same procedures and objectives were employed to observe the Englishmen involved with these foreigners. For his sound work, Sanders was rewarded with a gratuity of £10 as Mayne believed that Sanders performed his duties with "great discretion."[23]

The police reports also reveal the workings of the Government's practical solution for the international labor movement problem. Sanders supervised the exportation of refugees to America. The Secret Service fund at the Foreign Office paid the bills for their transportation. The Metropolitan Police, the Home Office and the Foreign Office cooperated on the project. Lt. Charles Szulczewski, the Secretary of the LAFP, often acted as an intermediary between individuals who desired free passage and the British authorities.[24] Although the evidence is too sketchy to provide complete figures, a considerable number of refugees were shipped out of England. For example, between March 4 and October 26, 1852, 613 foreigners went out at a cost of £5,525 6s 2d and from July 5, 1852, to October 29, 1853, 251 Poles left England at the Government's

---

[23]Police Report, June 11, 1852, H.O. 45/4302; Police Report--Refugees, August 10, 1852, Ibid.; Police Report--Refugee Committee, August 24, 1852, Ibid.; Police Report--Refugees, August 16, 1852, Ibid.; Police Report--Arms from America, August 17, 1852, Ibid.; Police Report, August 23, 1852, Ibid.; Police Report--Refugees, September 16, 1852, Ibid.; and see also Police Report, May 15, 1852, H.O. 45/4313 and Police Report, April 6, 1852, Ibid.

[24]For examples see Mayne to H. Waddington, May 10, 1852, Mepol. 1/46; Mayne to W. Addington, July 9, 1852, Ibid.; and Charles Szulczewski to Mayne, June 13, 1853, Mepol. 2/43.

expense. Sanders alone in 1853 spent over £600 in shipping refugees to New York City in groups of two's and three's. This heavy expenditure continued into and throughout 1854. Over £2,600 were spent on 271 Frenchmen who went to New York City.[25]

The Government's removal policy worked smoothly, although at times the refugees could be troublesome. On several occasions Sanders presented the refugees with their new clothing and their tickets some time prior to their departure only to discover that they pawned the clothes in order to drink one last time with old friends. To circumvent that problem Sanders resorted to entrusting their new clothes to them as they prepared to board ship.[26] Yet a substantial number of exiles remained in England. A police report of March 19, 1853, contained these figures: French--1,000; Italians--110; Hungarians and Germans--3,208; and Belgian--60.[27] A reservoir of potential troublemakers still resided in England.

Her Majesty's Government treated the international labor movement as if its members were subversives. The authorities failed to recognize the movement's internal weakness because several episodes during this period seemed to indicate the movement's ability to create a mass following. Neither the authorities nor the internationalists

---

[25]Account of Money advanced by Mayne to Captain Labalmondiere and disbursed by him in aid of Destitute Foreign Immigrants under the Direction of the Secretary of State, 1852, Mepol. 2/43; C. Yardly to Mayne, December 27, 1853, Ibid.; Money paid to Sanders, 1853, Ibid.; and Estimated Expenses for departure of French Political Emmigrants to New York, 1854, Ibid.

[26]Report, June 13, 1853, Mepol. 2/43 and Report, July 21, 1853, Ibid.

[27]Memo by Sir Richard Mayne, March 19, 1853, H.O. 45/4816.

realized that the international labor movement's reliance on foreigners and foreign events signified weakness rather than strength.

The first of these occasions was the appearance in September 1850 in London of Marshall Haynau, the Austrian who had brutally subdued the Hungarian revolt in 1849. His arrival brought forth a spontaneous and violent working-class demonstration. His reputation for cruelty preceded him to England. Unwisely, he ventured into a working-class neighborhood. Upon visiting Barclay and Perkin's Brewery in Southwark, their draymen recognized him, showered him with manure and chased him into the streets. After hiding for a time in a dustbin at the "George" tavern, an angry crowd forced him upstairs where a group of policemen rescued him and took him to safety.

This treatment illustrated the vehemence of English working-class feelings about continental tyrants. The draymen became instant heroes and the radical newspapers voiced their approval of what had occurred. Harney, for example, devoted a three page leader in the September 14 issue of the Red Republican to praising the wisdom of the English working class for its hatred of tyranny. He also printed a highly class-conscious jingle that came out of Southwark:

> Turn him out, turn him out, from our side of the Thames,
> Let him go to great Tories and high-titled dames.
> He may walk the West End and parade in his pride,
> But he'll not come back again near the "George" in the Bankside.[28]

Visible working-class approval of the "Austrian butcher's" punishment came in numerous public meetings. On the evening of

---

[28]Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, p. 211. See also Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, September 8, 1850, pp. 6, 10; September 15, 1850, p. 6; Northern Star, September 7, 1850, p. 5; Leader, September 7, 1850, pp. 557-58; and September 14, 1850, p. 579.

September 10 the Fraternal Democrats called a meeting at Farrington Hall; hundreds were turned away. A number of Barclay and Perkin's draymen heard Harney and Engels praise their conduct. Harney contended that men had a right to rid themselves through popular justice of the tyrants who enslaved them. Engels predicted a revolution on the continent that would result in the peoples' enemies fleeing to Russia instead of to England.[29]

The police watched these meetings closely. One such gathering convened on September 16 when about 370 Hungarians, Poles and Chartists met at the "George" in Southwark. About 280 of them paid 6d to attend and see a chair upon which Haynau had sat, a birch-broom that allegedly had been broken on his back and the dustbin that he had hid in. Brief speeches and songs dominated the festivities.[30] A more serious gathering was held at the British School Rooms, Cowper Street. Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper cited the audience at 1,800-2,000. The police report noted 1,500-1,800 in attendance. Regardless of which was correct, such numbers reflected intense working-class interest in this issue of international proportions. Much of the evening's discussion centered upon Mr. William Davis, secretary to the Refugee Fund, and Mr. Thomas Brown, on the Refugee Fund Executive--both men a part of Harney's Democratic Committee--who admonished the Chartists for their failure to support the

---

[29] Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, September 15, 1850, pp. 10-11; Northern Star, September 14, 1850, p. 1; Leader, September 14, 1850, p. 579; and Red Republican, September 21, 1850, pp. 105-106.

[30] Reynold's Weekly Newspaper, September 22, 1850, p. 10; Northern Star, September 21, 1850, p. 7; and Police Report: Poles and Hungarians, September 17, 1850, H.O. 45/3136. Reynolds gave the date as September 17 and the Northern Star gave September 16. Since the police report was dated the 17th and reported the meeting as not having broken up until after midnight, the Northern Star date must be incorrect.

refugees more fully. As the main attraction, O'Connor spoke about the attack on Haynau; he claimed that had he been there he would now be on trial for murder. Already enthusiasm for action had given way to empty words.[31]

Indeed, enthusiasm waned quickly. A police report of a meeting on September 25 at the Literary and Scientific Institute, Carlisle Street, at which Harney appeared, noted 400 working men and women in attendance. Another held at the "George" on October 6 drew only forty people.[32] Nevertheless, the general tone of working-class opinion agreed with the Leader that Haynau got his due reward rather than with the indignation of The Times and polite gentlemen.[33]

The Haynau incident had provided the internationalists with an impetus to action and the celebration meetings drew large crowds. But he returned home within the week and removed the cause of the workers' anger. Beyond hot words and a few excited meetings internationalism gained nothing except the enhancement of the authorities' view of them as troublemakers.

The arrival of Louis Kossuth, the leader of the Hungarian revolt of 1848-49, in October 1851 offered yet another example of this problem. His presence captured the entire nation's attention, especially that of the faceless masses. Again the authority structure was reminded of the

---

[31]Police Report: Lecture Barclay's Men, September 18, 1850, H.O. 45/3136; Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, September 22, 1850, p. 10; and Northern Star, September 21, 1850, p. 1.

[32]Police Report: Public Meeting, September 26, 1850, H.O. 45/3136 and Police Report: Chartists and Haynau, October 6, 1850, Ibid.

[33]Leader, September 14, 1850, p. 588.

inert though potential force of the working class. Radicals of all persuasions saw Kossuth as an ally. With the failure of the Hungarian Revolution he and his followers had fled to Turkey, where they lived as the Sultan's "Guests" under virtual house arrest at Kutayah until the Porte decided whether to give them up to the Russians and Austrians or send them to the West.[34] Throughout the late spring and summer of 1851 the radical newspapers carried numerous accounts of Kossuth in "captivity." They called upon the British Government to intervene to secure his release.[35] Lord Dudley had pressured Palmerston for some time to help Kossuth gain his freedom.[36] The expectation of his appearance in England, though, forced class antagonism to the surface. The Times and Globe abused him unmercifully. And Linton asked: if he was feted by city corporations consisting of respectable middle class and upper class people, could "honest" draymen and republicans still welcome him? Though doubting Kossuth's republican convictions, Linton decided that a working-class welcome was necessary under any circumstances.[37] The expectation of the various English groups of gaining Kossuth's allegiance preceded his departure from Turkey.

---

[34]The best study of this period of Kossuth's life is Jánossy, Great Britain and Kossuth, pp. 56-60. Phineas C. Headley, The Life of Louis Kossuth (Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1852), pp. 216-44, although old is of value. See also Ridley, Lord Palmerston, pp. 534-36 for his involvement.

[35]For examples see Leader, May 17, 1851, p. 471; Reynolds's Newspaper, May 18, 1851, p. 14, May 25, 1851, p. 8, June 8, 1851, p. 14, July 20, 1851, p. 4; and Northern Star, July 12, 1851, p. 5 and July 19, 1851, p. 1. Newspapers outside London also carried stories about Kossuth; see, for example, Glasgow Sentinel, June 14, 1851, p. 1.

[36]Hansard's, CVIII (21 January-25 February, 1850), pp. 480-518; CIX (26 February-26 March, 1850), p. 1056; and CXIV (14 February-14 March, 1851), pp. 885-86.

[37]English Republic, 1851, p. 353.

He left Constantinople on September 7, 1851. He stopped in Marseilles where he spoke before an enthusiastic crowd and issued a statement that appeared too democratic for the French Government. It refused him permission to cross France and he continued his voyage to England. English internationalists found solace in France's action. Now, they would occupy the limelight in toasting Kossuth. Napoleon's conduct also underlined the English belief that democracy flourished nowhere else in the world as it did in England.[38]

As the steamboat approached Southampton, preparations continued for welcoming the Hungarian hero. Everyone wanted to participate either through offering him a banquet or presenting him an address. Not to be outdone, a working men's committee, headed by Thornton Hunt and John Pettie, was established in London to coordinate working-class planning.[39] This Central Demonstration Committee met several times a week in order to make the necessary arrangements. It decided that a proposed meeting would be English in character. Although foreigners would be allowed to join in the procession, they were prohibited from committee membership or from making speeches at the banquet. That, it was thought, would make the greatest impact on the continent because continental despots would be more impressed by a totally English meeting than by one consisting of their own refugees. A subscription was also planned and funds were solicited

---

[38] Reynolds's Newspaper, October 12, 1851, pp. 8, 12 and Northern Star, October 11, 1851, p. 4. See also Headley, The Life of Louis Kossuth, pp. 230-31.

[39] Reynolds's Newspaper, October 12, 1851, p. 15 and October 26, 1851, p. 14.

from working-men's organizations. The West End Shoemaker's Society, for example, allocated to the Committee some of its monies.[40]

Kossuth arrived at Southampton on October 23. Although greeted by thousands of Hungarians and Englishmen of all classes at the docks, he was quickly whisked through streets thronged with well-wishers first to the American consulate and then to the Mayor's residence. There he spoke briefly about his warm reception. At the Town Hall before a "respectable" audience, he received two addresses. One came from the corporation; the other from the inhabitants at large. He responded in a serious vein. Amidst the frequent interruptions of the cheering crowd he made a statement that appeared to place himself within the ranks of the internationalists. The support of the people of England would further freedom, justice and the dignity of humanity on the continent. Internationalists of all shades had argued similarly for some half-dozen years. Was he the working men's leader? Could he unite the English internationalists? His speech raised the internationalists' hopes. But later that afternoon, after consulting with Mayor Andrews of Southampton, he declined to accept an invitation to a banquet of working men in Southampton. To do so, he said, would extend his stay too long. But he found time to return for official banquets at Winchester on Friday and at Southampton on the following Tuesday. Hardly had he set foot on English soil than he voiced one set of ideas and acted on another.[41] The internationalists failed to perceive that Kossuth's background was that of an untitled

---

[40] Northern Star, October 18, 1851, pp. 7, 8 and October 25, 1851, p. 8.

[41] Illustrated London News, November 1, 1851, pp. 544-46 and Reynolds's Newspaper, October 26, 1851, p. 12.

Magyar gentry with the credentials of an aspiring professional lawyer. Nor did they note the nationalism of his political program. Despite the English authorities' distrust of Kossuth, he had more in common with middle class respectability than he had with working-class radicalism of any creed.

On Friday morning Kossuth returned from London where he was staying to Mayor Andrew's country residence in Winchester, near Southampton. He spoke before sixty gentlemen, including Lord Dudley Stuart, Richard Cobden, Mr. Croskey, the United States Consul, and Francis Pulzsky, his agent in England since 1849. His speech elaborated upon the theme begun at Southampton. Cobden's response emphasized: ". . . that the name of Louis Kossuth is heard at the firesides of the middle classes" and defended the principle of non-intervention.[42] On that morning Hunt's committee met with Kossuth and presented him its address. The members' report indicated that Kossuth intended to advocate non-intervention to his English audiences and that he feared offending any of the classes or parties through becoming too partisan. He failed to respond either way to the committee's request for his attendance at the proposed working class banquet. In reporting these proceedings, Reynolds wondered why Hunt and his group were so slow in rescuing Kossuth from the clutches of the middle class. He suggested that the committee's inaction might imply to Kossuth the idea that the working class cared little for him, and that was a falsehood.[43]

---

[42] Illustrated London News, November 1, 1851, pp. 546, 558-59; Reynolds's Newspaper, November 2, 1851, p. 6; and Jánossy, Great Britain and Kossuth, p. 138.

[43] Reynolds's Newspaper, October 26,1851, p. 14 and November 2, 1851, p. 1.

By contrast, the Northern Star approved Kossuth's Winchester speech and predicted a great outpouring of working-class sympathy for him at Hunt's Copenhagen Field meeting on November 3. The leader claimed that England must identify itself with Hungarian independence because ". . . if the battle against Russia be not fought in Hungary, it will, ere long, have to be decided on our shores."[44] Yet Kossuth continued to appear before middle-class, not working-class, audiences. In the Town Hall at Southampton on October 26 he performed verbal gymnastics before some 200 notables as he balanced Hungarian revolutionary hopes with respectable middle-class ideas about liberty and Free Trade. He knew how to tell an audience that with which it agreed.[45]

He continued this stance at his official reception in the Guildhall in London on October 30. He praised the Corporation of London as the "metropolis of freedom" and as the upholder of English social order. His speech so excited the dour Corporation members that they interrupted him repeatedly. Had they known the real feelings of the lower class of people among the multitudes who lined the streets along Kossuth's procession from Eaton Place in Knightsbridge to the Guildhall they would have turned him out-of-doors.

The procession to the Guildhall marked a great outpouring of sympathy for this freedom-fighter by the English working men, middling and middle classes. A crowd of 1,000 artisans gathered before his residence prior to his departure for the Guildhall. They followed him on his

---

[44] Northern Star, November 1, 1851, p. 4.

[45] Illustrated London News, November 1, 1851, pp. 546, 548-50 and Reynolds's Newspaper, November 2, 1851, p. 7.

route into the City. The crowd's pressure frequently delayed the carriage's progress; the assemblage following him increased to 6,000 by the time it had reached Charing Cross. When the procession reached St. Paul's Cathedral and Cheapside the crowd was immense. On the return trip late in the afternoon, people were still waiting for a glimpse of Kossuth. At Charing Cross he stopped and spoke to them. Before such a group he said: "All power was with the people, and it was only for the people to make known their wishes, and all the tyrants of the earth would be put down, and universal liberty established."[46] Such, no doubt, reflected the sentiments of many who cheered Kossuth, but not of the Corporation members.

On Monday at Copenhagen Fields, he faced a working-class crowd that was unlike any he had yet seen. Kossuth refused to speak at length to a huge open-air gathering; he preferred presenting Hunt's Central Demonstration Committee a written address that someone else could read to the workers.[47] But he withdrew that stipulation and agreed to speak briefly. A procession formed at Russell Square, where O'Connor's 1848 Kennington Common crowd had originated--a fact lost on none--and proceeded to Copenhagen Field amidst great fanfare. For example, a gallows with numerous copies of The Times hung on it was borne along the route. Estimates of the crowd's size around the speaker's platform at the field ranged from the Illustrated London News and Northern Star figures of 12-15,000 to Reynolds's Newspaper's estimate of 70,000. The former

---

[46]For the above two paragraphs see Illustrated London News, November 1, 1851, p. 550, November 8, 1851, pp. 565, 567; and Reynolds's Newspaper, November 2, 1851, pp. 7, 12.

[47]Reynolds's Newspaper, November 2, 1851, p. 7.

was probably correct, but even that made it a sizeable working-class gathering.

Kossuth mouthed working-class ideas within a deferential perspective. He identified himself with the workers--his father was one--, contended he favored political emancipation and not class privilege, and recognized public opinion as the basis of all constitutional authority. Then he launched into a defense of Cobdenite Free Trade. He also denied any socialist influence in Hungary. Nor had he come to England as a political agitator because England had sufficient political freedom to achieve whatever reform it needed. Either he knew less about England than he thought or his respectability and desire to appease the British Government dictated his statements. Most likely it was the latter. A Northern Star editorial on November 8 castigated him for his Cobdenite ideas and his advocacy of non-intervention. The radical newspaper reaction to his speech was overdone because few at Copenhagen Field had heard him speak over the noise. Others had problems, too. Hunt refused O'Connor the right to speak with Kossuth in the private meeting held near the platform. Hunt contended that he acted because Kossuth said he would leave if O'Connor appeared. Although the Hungarian's secretary denied that statement, any inference that Hunt could have construed in a like manner would have reinforced his dislike for O'Connor and justified excluding him.[48]

---

[48]For the above two paragraphs see Illustrated London News, November 8, 1851, p. 570; Reynolds's Newspaper, November 9, 1851, pp. 8, 13; and Northern Star, November 8, 1851, pp. 4, 8.

That evening 800 people attended the committee's banquet. At Highbury Barn Tavern, Pettie, Massey, Hunt, O'Brien, Holyoake and Louis Blanc among others spoke. Kossuth absented himself for fear of association with the London democrats.[49] But then other democrats were not in attendance either. Neither Harney, Jones, Marx, Engels nor any of the left-wing democrats were there. They had moved too far from the "respectable" Kossuth. Although Harney, then on tour in southern Scotland, discovered that the loudest cheers came for Kossuth, he failed to seek him out.[50]

Kossuth left London the next week for Manchester and Birmingham. Again tumultuous crowds greeted him. On Monday, November 11, he toured Birmingham and the neighboring towns of Coventry, Wolverhampton, and as far as the Potteries. Given a general holiday, the working class turned out in the thousands. From the village of Yardly to the Bull Ring in Birmingham, a stretch of six miles, the route of the procession was lined with people. Half a million persons were estimated in the area to see him. After dining with local notables that evening Kossuth traveled to Manchester, where he encountered a similar demonstration. Many workers sought a holiday there too, but were denied one. Consequently, thousands took a "French leave" and appeared anyway. As one said, "Well, I saw Kossuth, at all events, which is more than I can say of the Queen." At the Free Trade Hall, within minutes after the doors opened the 8,500 seats were filled. Introduced by George Wilson, an old Anti-Corn Law

---

[49] Illustrated London News, November 8, 1851, p. 570; Reynolds's Newspaper, November 9, 1851, p. 12; and Northern Star, November 8, 1851, p. 8.

[50] See Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, p. 221.

Leaguer who had made all the arrangements for the trip, Kossuth spoke about liberty, tyranny and Free Trade. He was wildly received. With a tremendous reception behind him he returned to London on November 13 and left for America on November 20.[51]

The masses had shown their approval of Kossuth and in a sense also for a superficial brand of internationalism. Kossuth fascinated Englishmen, especially workers. The Northern Star expressed the optimism exhibited during his stay when it wrote:

> In the interval, the national mind was expanded. We are now able to see that nations are connected with, and influenced by, each other, just as individuals are in the private relations of life, and that it is impossible for any one nation to enjoy perfect liberty or secure freedom, while other nations are oppressed, tyrannized over, or robbed, by brute force, or their rights.[52]

Buoyed up by this enthusiasm, Jones wrote: "It must be evident that revolution, iron-paced is about to stride above the thrones of Europe--and that a corresponding excitement will be wrought in this country."[53] Of the sixty-five towns and city corporations that sent Kossuth addresses not one wrote unkind words. The majority of them came from the traditional radical and internationalist areas.[54]

Surface appearance, however, belied structural fractures and fissues. Within the leadership of the international labor movement in

---

[51]Illustrated London News, November 15, 1851, pp. 589-91; Northern Star, November 15, 1851, pp. 7-8; and Reynolds's Newspaper, November 15, 1851, pp. 12-13. All of Kossuth's speeches were printed in book form for distribution. See Louis Kossuth, Kossuth: His Speeches in England, with a Brief Sketch of his Life (3rd ed.; London: Charles Gilpin, 1852). For George Wilson see Norman McCord, "George Wilson: A great Manchester Man," Manchester Review, VII (Winter, 1956), 431-36.

[52]Northern Star, November 8, 1851, p. 8.

[53]Notes to the People, 1851-52, II, 581.

[54]Northern Star, November 22, 1851, p. 8 lists all of them.

England serious questions were raised about Kossuth's allegiance, but they were brought up only after he left the island. Linton was dissatisfied with him because he catered too much to the upper classes and people such as Lord Dudley Stuart. Holyoake also had differences with Kossuth. His clash focused upon personal matters within the Kossuth entourage regarding the firing of a certain Mr. Day. Although a peripheral figure in the international labor movement, Robert Owen nevertheless spoke with authority for some of those on the Left. He castigated Kossuth for his dismissal of socialism as an alternative to either aristocratic or democratic government. David Urquhart, who accomplished a considerable advancement in the mid-1850s for the cause of working-class international awareness, albeit not always without distortions, labelled Kossuth an agent of the Russian Czar. But the cruelest words came from Jones who changed his opinion about him after the tour ended. Kossuth's objection to socialism and communism placed him, in Jones' view, with the "order-mongers" and oppressors. His kind words for Free Trade associated him with the capitalists who plundered the people. He was nothing more than a bourgeois puppet.[55]

Her Majesty's Government thought otherwise. After Kossuth returned from America the authorities waited for an opportunity to expell him from England. Finally in April 1853 an effort was undertaken towards that goal. The amateurish action to expell him on the basis of questionable charges resulted in a traditional internationalist demonstration,

---

[55] English Republic, 1851, p. 375; F. W. Newman to G. J. Holyoake, November 19, 1851, No. 447, Holyoake Collection; Robert Owen to his Excellency Louis Kossuth, Ex-Governor of Hungary, November 10, 1851, No. 1, 968, Robert Owen Correspondence; David Urquhart to Louis Kossuth, February 14, 1852, Urquhart Papers, Balliol College Library, Oxford, Series I.J.3; and Notes to the People, 1851-52, II, 604-606.

and Kossuth remained in England. His English supporters expressed dismay over the invasion of his rights and voiced resentment about police espionage. Palmerston's admission that the police regularly observed the refugees failed to surprise the internationalists, but his acknowledgment that Englishmen were subject to the same treatment caused a furor.

The authorities handled the entire affair badly. The Times printed a story on April 15, 1853, which claimed that the police had searched a house owned by Kossuth two days earlier and that a quantity of arms and ammunition had been seized. The writer lodged a vicious attack upon Kossuth that drew an equally venemous response in the People's Paper.[56] That same day the parliamentary radicals questioned Her Majesty's Government about the surveillance of the refugees. On April 29 and May 5 the Radicals pressed Home Secretary Palmerston about two issues: did the police investigate at the behest of the Home Office--if so, they wanted to see the warrants--and, were the police regularly employed to watch the refugees? Palmerston admitted that the refugees were subject to whatever means the police deemed necessary to obtain information for prosecution if they were suspected of wrongdoing. The rule applied to Englishmen, too. Plain clothes policemen had been used for years to follow refugees and other persons. As for this particular case, Palmerston implied that he had not given any special instructions.[57]

Palmerston had acknowledged nothing unique. To anyone informed about current police philosophy his revelation was commonplace. Detection

---

[56]The Times (London), April 15, 1853, p. 4 and People's Paper, April 16, 1853, p. 8.

[57]Hansard's, CXXV (11 March-18 April, 1853), pp. 1209-16 and CXXVI (19 April-9 May, 1853), pp. 797-804 and 1142-67.

and the detectives were at this time an integral element of the Metropolitan Police. The Radicals believed that such conduct was un-English. In this particular case they might have reacted less vehemently had they known how flimsy the evidence against Kossuth was. The only connection between Kossuth and the "grenade factory" operated at Rotherhithe under the direction of a certain Mr. Hall and his son was an unsigned letter from Kossuth mentioning the grenades which a Major Useur had given to the police. Useur was a disaffected Hungarian whom Kossuth had left destitute in Hungary. Kossuth was not charged, but the other two men were tried under the Explosive's Act for possessing more powder on the premises than was legally allowed. The prosecutors were unable to prove that the substance found there was gunpowder and both men were freed. Palmerston, who had given out incorrect information about this substance in the earlier debate in the House of Commons, wrote a memo requesting that in the future the police exercise greater care in their reports.[58]

The incident drew a prompt response from the internationalists. Both Reynolds and Jones condemned the Government for its actions. Jones, for example, argued that the police and the army were intended for the suppression of both the working class and the middle classes because the Whigs sought the destruction of self-government just as the Tories had resisted its extension. His belief in the imminence of class warfare

---

[58]Report of Rockets Made for Kossuth, March 26, 1853, H.O. 45/4816; Report Relative to Political Refugees in this Country, April 5, 1853, Ibid.; and Palmerston Memo, April 25, 1853, Ibid. See also People's Paper, April 23, 1853, p. 5 and April 30, 1853, pp. 3, 5.

clouded his vision, yet such ideas intensified the excitement surrounding the Kossuth incident.[59]

Public meetings were called to show support for Kossuth. The "respectables" organized most of these gatherings; Sir Joshua Walmsley and Lord Dudley Stuart were prominent in the agitation.[60] The opportunity was seized to present Kossuth with a bound copy of the complete works of William Shakespeare. This Working-Man's Penny Testimonial project, which Douglas Jerrold had begun in 1852, received 9,215 pennies from working men. Before Lord Dudley, Jerrold, Cobden, Walmsley and others, Kossuth accepted the offering and praised the Parliamentary Radicals for their defense of him on May 5.[61] Jones summed up the Left's reaction to the Penny Testimonial: "These men, who hate democracy, think to get a Democratic character by sympathizing with a revolutionary movement at the other end of Europe--but not one word of Democracy at home!"[62]

His statement reflected the weakness, and by implication the jealousy, of the Left. At this opportune moment, the moderates organized the protests and the Left watched from the relative isolation of its newspaper offices. At best the Left fueled suspicions about foreign pressure being the cause of the police spying. But the statements of Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe discount that as the only motivation.

---

[59] Reynolds's Newspaper, April 24, 1853, p. 8 and People's Paper, April 30, 1853, p. 4.

[60] People's Paper, May 14, 1853, p. 2 and May 21, 1853, p. 7; and Reynolds's Newspaper, May 15, 1853, p. 9, May 29, 1853, p. 11 and June 5, 1853, p. 14.

[61] Leader, May 7, 1853, pp. 439-40.

[62] People's Paper, May 14, 1853, p. 4.

On his return to Constantinople he stopped at Paris on March 13, 1853, and dined with Louis Napoleon and the Empress. The Viscount defended the sacred right of asylum that Britain offered to all refugees and contended that existing British institutions were capable of dealing with those exiles who offended the governments with which they disagreed.[63] Neither the Left nor the parliamentary radicals would have believed such statements. For them the issue was too emotional and distrust of the Government too intense.

A number of conclusions about working-class internationalism emerge from the Kossuth incident. First, the governments on the continent and in Britain feared the refugees excessively. As Marx wrote to Engels in late February:

> While the émigrés are in reality completely bankrupt and can't say boo to a goose, their power is being trumpeted through all the government newspapers and the belief is being sown that a web of conspiracies is being woven around the good citizens of every side.[64]

Second, the movement's weakness resulted from the temporary demise of the Left. Third, police spies and detectives were essential to the authorities' control program, although their revelations were frequently unreliable. Nevertheless, the Government's policy worked. Refugees and their sympathizers lived for years in an atmosphere of constant suspicion, if not open harassment, and their enthusiasm waned. Many quit the movement, others shifted their reform interests and many gave up all hope

---

[63] Copy, Memo of Stratford de Redcliffe, March 14, 1853, sent by Clarendon to Cowley, March 18, 1853, no. 39, F.O. 146/465.

[64] Marx to Engels, February 23, 1853, in Marx and Engels, Correspondence, 1846-1895, p. 62.

and either emigrated to North America, or, in the case of the refugees, allowed the British Government to send them to New York City.[65]

The Government's motivation for monitoring the internationalists emanated from the authority structure's failure to realize that the age of revolution had passed by. The continued sympathy of a substantial number of internationalists for the social program of the February 1848 Revolution and for the few "Red Republicans" who had survived the June Days unsettled the upper classes. English working-class awareness of Louis Napoleon's undoing of the 1848 Revolution surfaced repeatedly. For example, the Fraternal Democrats religiously celebrated the 1848 Revolution and a return of Eugene Sue and six other "Red Republicans" to the Legislative Assembly resulted in a congratulatory meeting in the Literary and Scientific Institute under the auspices of the Provisional Committee of the NCA on the evening of May 7, 1850.[66] The NCA on May 28 and the Fraternal Democrats on June 3 discussed the same issue. At both the speakers emphasized the connection between social and political rights. Harney claimed that an unholy alliance existed on a world-wide basis against the working classes. Only international proletarian unity could combat this menace to their freedom. Reynolds called for continental revolution and the establishment of republics. Then, he said, republics

---

[65]For the Chartists who left England for America see Ray Boston, British Chartists in America, 1839-1900 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971). Many of them found life in the United States less inviting once they arrived there.

[66]Reynolds's Political Instructor, March 2, 1850, p. 144; Democratic Review, March, 1850, p. 388; Northern Star, March 2, 1850, May 11, 1850, p. 8; and Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, May 12, 1850, p. 1.

would be adopted in other nations, England included. In short, action elsewhere first, then in England.[67] Such ideas encouraged the Government in its policy of social control.

The outburst of working-class enthusiasm decrying Napoleon's usurpation of the Frenchman's political rights in the December 2, 1851, coup d'état enhanced the British Government's suspicions. At numerous protest meetings throughout the country workers voiced a united objection against Napoleon's action. Frequently, they called for European working-class solidarity to oppose him, although no one offered any practical means to accomplishing this goal.[68]

The internationalists discussed the coup's meaning for the English working class, but no consensus existed. Linton, speaking for the "respectables," called upon England to rescue Europe from despotism, but only after additional reform of English political institutions.[69] At a December 8 public meeting in Newcastle upon Tyne and a December 30 Fraternal Democrat tea party Harney heard numerous speakers, including James Watson, call for greater proletarian unity to oppose such despotism. The Fraternal Democrats called for a crusade against political tyrants after the capitalist tyrants in each country were defeated. Social reform still preceded political reform.[70]

---

[67] Northern Star, June 1, 1850, p. 8 and Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, June 9, 1850, p. 7.

[68] Northern Star, December 13, 1851, p. 4; Reynolds's Newspaper, December 7, 1851, p. 8; and English Republic, 1852, p. 1.

[69] English Republic, 1852, p. 1.

[70] Northern Star, January 3, 1852, p. 1 and January 24, 1852, p. 8.

Thus, a split over objectives existed in the ranks of the international labor movement. This weakness went unnoticed. What caught the authorities' eyes were statements such as Harney's that "the liberty and welfare of England was inseparably connected with that of other countries, and the great leaders of the democratic cause in Europe. . ." and calls such as that of the Fraternal Democrats effort to organize into localities in order to facilitate the dissemination of foreign affairs news to the English workers.[71] That previous attempts in that direction had fallen short apparently did not matter.

The coup d'état, nevertheless, brought forward a negative reaction from the English working class. Many agreed with W. E. Adams that it "surpassed in wickedness and horror . . . anything that has ever been recorded . . . in Western history." It sent, he wrote, a "thrill of horror" throughout the country.[72] Many Englishmen used it as an opportunity to express democratic sentiments. One such man, who had just built a house at Red Hill in Surrey called "Mazzini Villa," expressed his feelings in a political demonstration that concluded with his workers burning Napoleon in effigy.[73] Such enthusiasm contributed to the authorities' apprehensions.

But in the early 1850s the refugees suffered from a disorganization that was manifested in their destitution. The democratic Poles who had come to England in March 1850 lived in London in dire

---

[71]See Reynolds's Newspaper, December 21, 1851, p. 14, February 22, 1852, p. 13, June 13, 1852, p. 16; and Northern Star, January 24, 1852, p. 8.

[72]Adams, Social Atom, II, 342.

[73]Reynolds's Newspaper, May 16, 1852, p. 7.

straits. Davis and Brown proved incapable of controlling them, much less soliciting adequate funds. Neither O'Connor's efforts nor the Metropolitan Trades Committee's assistance to Harney's Democratic Conference solved the problem.[74] Added to the monetary situation were internal squabbles over ideology. For example, in the small group under Davis' and Brown's tutelage a disagreement arose in November and December of 1850 between the Czartoryski followers and the more democratic refugees; it resulted in the group splitting into sections and both of them competing for the few available funds.[75]

The arrival at Liverpool in March 1851 of the remainder of Kossuth's Polish Legion challenged the internationalists once again to translate their speeches and addresses into practical aid. A representative of the LAFP boarded the refugee vessel and offered the 260 odd men the British Government's free passage direct and at once to America. They were housed in Liverpool with three days to decide.[76] In case

---

[74]For example, see Northern Star, October 12, 1850, p. 1 and October 26, 1850, p. 1. For Brown's fund seeking functions see Northern Star, September 28, 1850, p. 5; Police Report: Poles Present, August 28, 1850, H.O. 45/3136; Police Report: Refugees, November 1, 1850, Ibid.; Police Report: Refugees Meeting, November 5, 1850, Ibid.; Police Report: Chartists and Foreigners, November 6, 1850, Ibid.; and Police Report: Chartist and Foreign Meeting, January 6, 1851, H.O. 45/3615. See also Northern Star, December 7, 1850, p. 8.

[75]Northern Star, November 30, 1850, p. 1; Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper, November 24, 1850, p. 10. The evolution of the split can be followed in the Northern Star for November and December of 1850.

[76]Letter by Stanislaus Worcell, February 22, 1851, English Republic, 1851, p. 98; Ibid., p. 126; Leader, March 8, 1851, p. 217; A. 20, Cowen Collection. See also Peter Brock, "Joseph Cowen and the Polish Exiles," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII (December, 1953), 52-55.

any of them did remain in England, Grey instructed Mayne to take precautions.[77]

Linton and Stanislaus Worcell met the refugees in Liverpool and shouldered the responsibility for their welfare. On Monday evening, March 10, some 2,500-3,000 Liverpoolites attended a public meeting to help them. Linton declared that the Poles had never intended going to America. The crowd overwhelmingly approved of their staying in England and a subscription of £9 10s was collected. Such a paltry sum hardly could have supported them for long. Consequently, a memorial to parliament asking for support was prepared.[78] Grey refused to budge.[79]

Thus, as Harney foresaw, the internationalists had to establish committees to aid the refugees. In Liverpool, the Polish-Hungarian Refugee Central Committee under the direction of Thomas Bott carried on the work begun on March 10.[80] The usual radical newspapers offered their columns to help raise money and men such as Hunt expounded plans calling upon English operatives to find work for the refugees. But aside from a few of them with professional skills most were manual laborers who

---

[77]W. Addington to H. Waddington, February 10, 1851, H.O. 45/3720. Grey's note on the cover sheet approved Waddington's request to pass the information along to Mayne.

[78]Leader, March 15, 1851, p. 240; Northern Star, March 15, 1851, p. 6; Friend of the People, March 22, 1851, p. 116; and English Republic, 1851, pp. 126-27. See also Worcell to Linton, February 27, 1851, in Stefan Kieniewicz, ed., "From the Polish Correspondence of William J. Linton, 1844-1854," Annali Istituto Giangiocomo Feltrinelli (Milano: Feltrinelli Editore, 1960), III, 190-91 for one of their letters.

[79]Memorial, H.O. 45/3725.

[80]Friend of the People, February 22, 1851, p. 82. Examples of their efforts are found in A. 21 and A. 22 in the Cowen Collection.

could speak no English at all. Finding places for the 230 or so refugees who remained in England proved difficult. At Bradford, where a Hungarian Committee already existed, four or five more were taken on immediately. But for the others Linton proposed that the 5,000 Chartists divide into Relief Committees of twenty each and support one refugee per committee with contributions of 6 pence a week from each Chartist. He exaggerated both Chartist membership and willingness to help.[81]

Nevertheless, they were slowly parcelled out. Leeds, Newcastle upon Tyne, Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Padeham, Glasgow, Halifax, Barehead, Paisley, Burnley, Sunderland, Leicester and other towns in the North accepted them. Linton claimed in late 1851 that only forty-five remained in Liverpool. Most of the success in finding employment for the Poles came after a working-class group, acting under the name Central Committee of the Operatives for the Relief of the Polish Refugees and directed by William L. Costine and James Spurr, was formed to coordinate working-class assistance.[82]

The entire process involved overcoming several problems. At Bradford Harney's old friend George White wrote about differences of opinion between liberal and Chartist committee members over the future of the

---

[81] Friend of the People, March 29, 1851, pp. 116-17 and April 19, 1851, p. 167; Northern Star, March 15, 1851, p. 1 and April 5, 1851, p. 1; Leader, March 29, 1851, p. 291; Reynolds's Newspaper, March 23, 1851, p. 6. For the Bradford Hungarian Committee's efforts to help the refugees who had arrived in 1850 see Leader, February 1, 1851, p. 113.

[82] Leader, July 5, 1851, p. 629, August 30, 1851, p. 829; Northern Star, May 3, 1851, p. 8; Friend of the People, March 29, 1851, p. 125; English Republic, 1851, p. 292; and The Refugee Circular, April 19, 1851, p. 1, A. 25, Cowen Collection. For one of the committee's broadsheets see A. 28, Cowen Collection. Other examples are found in Northern Star, April 12, 1851, p. 3 and Reynolds's Newspaper, April 20, 1851, p. 14.

refugees; the liberals wanted to send them to America in order to ". . . stifle the universal feeling of sympathy which the working classes cherish towards them." The refugees' cause was further hampered because some Englishmen in need of support began posing as members of the Liverpool refugee group. Linton was finally forced to publish a letter advising anyone confronted by a man claiming refugee status to send the fellow's name to himself, James Spurr or David Masson for confirmation before extending assistance to him. The authorities created additional problems. Police agents acting on behalf of the Home Office badgered some of the refugee sponsors in an effort to discourage them from helping the refugees. The Sheffield Town Council adopted a memorial to Grey requesting that he leave them alone.[83]

Grey's men met little success in that endeavor. But evidence of the authorities' heightened position surfaced in June and July of 1851 when another batch of Hungarian refugees arrived at Southampton. Ninety came in June and about 100 in July. The vast majority of them elected to continue on to America. Lord Dudley Stuart and Major Charles Szulczewski made the arrangements for their voyage. Mayor Richard Andrews of Southampton was reimbursed a total of £2,380 3s 6d from Secret Service funds for the care given them in Southampton.[84] Theoretically the internationalists disapproved of sending refugees to America. But in the summer of of 1851 they failed to object. Only later, when Kossuth visited England,

---

[83] Friend of the People, April 19, 1851, p. 167; Leader, August 30, 1851, p. 829; Refugee Circular, May 24, 1851, A. 46, Cowen Collection; and Refugee Circular, April 19, 1851, p. 1, A. 25, Ibid.

[84] See his letters, and those of town clerk Charles E. Duncan, to Grey, dated June 5, 7, 21, July 2 and 7, 1851, in H.O. 45/3720.

did they reflect back on their error in not doing for the Southampton refugees what they had done for the Liverpool group. The strain of providing for the first group, plus the continued problems they faced in maintaining other refugees dampened their enthusiasm for taking on another batch of destitute exiles. Of equal significance was the origin of the Southampton exiles. They were soldiers of Kossuth and his philosophy coincided with that of the LAFP. In the 1850s they encouraged the refugees to emigrate to America, and their representatives dealt with the Southampton men.

Internationalism between the excitements of 1848-50 and the Crimean War existed in a lull. The difficulties encountered in funding the refugees reflected the movement's weakness. The problem was recognized and the internationalists attempted to revitalize and sustain their movement through the formation of new progaganda organizations. The formation of new committees and formal pressure groups in a time of adversity exhibited an inner strength of internationalism: its leaders were men of conviction who persisted in pursuit of their goals despite sagging support from the masses. But the creation of the two new organizations, the Central European Democratic Committee in 1850 and the Society of the Friends of Italy in May 1851, also complicated an already fractured movement and resulted in increased police observation, which in turn further dampened internationalist spirits and popular participation.

The CEDC was a refugee operation.[85] No Englishman belonged to it, although its revolutionary decrees were published in the radical

[85]Alvin R. Calman, Ledru-Rollin après 1848 et les proscits francais en Angleterre (Paris: F. Reider and Company, 1921), pp. 95-105 is the only investigation of the CEDC.

newspapers. The CEDC called for the organization of the European democrats under its banner with the obstacles of individuality and theoretical dogmatism submerged to its own liberal nationalistic creed. In its peak year 1851 the DEDC published numerous addresses to various European nationalities struggling for freedom and claimed the adherence of the Committee of Young Austria, the Centralizing Committee of Germany, the Polish Democratic Committee and the Central Democratic Association of Holland.[86] But it accomplished little and withered away in 1853. Its demise was due to the proliferation of organizations, financial instability and theoretical disagreements.

The CEDC's impact on the English working-class was minimal. No English group joined it or expressed sympathy with it. Linton attempted to form a Committee of Republican Association in connection with it, but failed to find enough good republicans for the projected Central Committee who could muster fifty votes in their support.[87]

About the same time as the formation of the CEDC, Mazzini reorganized from abroad the Italian National Committee. His intention was to raise a European subscription of 10,000 francs, which the Roman Republic had authorized in 1849. His goal was to lead a war to establish a government of national sovereignty in Italy. On November 27, 1850, the CEDC claimed suzerainty over this Italian Loan, as it was called, and

---

[86] English Republic, 1851, pp 6-9 and 53. For a letter to the CEDC from the Dutch organization in Amsterdam see the Red Republican, February 1, 1851, p. 59.

[87] English Republic, 1851, pp. 54-60. The best explanation of Linton's republicanism is in Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 99-105. A briefer statement is found in Norbert J. Gossman, "Republicanism in Nineteenth Century England," International Review of Social History, VII (Part 1, 1962), 56-57.

acknowledged the adherence of the Italian National Committee to CEDC leadership.[88]

The British Government observed these activities warily. The Foreign Office kept Grey informed of Mazzini's plans as it learned them from Lord Normanby in Paris. Someone in the Foreign Office considered the situation serious enough to warrant extending the 1848 Alien Act.[89] Russell's Whig government acted on the basis of two motivations. First, the Foreign Office was under pressure from continental governments to halt these particular refugee activites.[90] In response to Austrian and French inquiries about the legality of the refugee campaigns a police investigation produced no grounds for arrests and a legal opinion from John Romilly and A. E. Cockburn, Law Officers at Lincoln's Inn, held that the simple placements of the advertisements of the Italian Loan Committee in newspapers failed to prove conclusively that the men whose names accompanied them had sanctioned either the adds or their ideas. Barring such proof no case existed. Grey and Palmerston concurred and the Foreign Secretary informed the French Chargé d'Affairs of the decision.[91]

---

[88] Leader, October 19, 1850, pp. 705-706 and English Republic, 1851, pp. 52-53.

[89] H. Waddington to W. Addington, June 10, 1850, H.O. 45/3272. See Normanby's dispatch to the Foreign Office, dated June 3, 1850, which is enclosed.

[90] Lord Alderly of Stanley to H. Waddington, November 8, 1850, H.O. 45/3263; Copy of M. de Brenier to M. de Marescalchi, January 28, 1851, H.O. 45/3720; and see Georges Bourgin, "Mazzini et le Comité Central Democratique en 1851," Revista Storica del Risorgimento Italiano, VI (1913), 353-71 for some examples from the French side in 1851.

[91] See Inspector Charles Le Guild, Report, November 12, 1850, H.O. 45/3272; Mr. Payne, Relative to the Italian Loan, February 26, 1851, Ibid.; Draft, H. Waddington to the Foreign Office, February 13, 1851, H.O. 45/3720; Law Officers' Report, March 11, 1851, H.O. 45/3263; for

On this point Palmerston has often been maligned for bowing to the pressure of foreign governments. The evidence shows, however, that in 1850 he did not. When informing the Home Office about the proposal of M. Drouyn de Lhuys, the French Foreign Minister, for an extradition policy between France and England, Palmerston stated that the "fundamental principle of such a convention is that the personal liberty of a foreigner in England should be substantially as secure as that of a British subject, . . ." His position was all the more remarkable because in these early months of 1850 he was engaged in the Don Pacifico issue and sought cooperation with France in foreign affairs. Moreover, at another time he refused to comply with a request from the government of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha that the English police interview a refugee in London for them. He answered that he had no legal power to do so. His knowledge since early February that Victoria disapproved of his Don Pacifico policy might have prompted his uncooperative stance regarding the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha request.[92]

Second, Her Majesty's Government felt compelled to investigate the Italian Loan affair because a number of Englishmen formerly prominent with the refugee committees also participated in this Mazzinian fiasco. Mazzini instructed his English collaborators to wage a propaganda campaign and to call public meetings in cities such as Manchester, Leeds and other manufacturing towns.[93] He knew that popular support had to

---

Grey's position see his memo dated November 10, 1850, Ibid.; and for an account of Palmerston's statement see W. Addington to W. Waddington, February 1, 1851, H.O. 45/3720.

[92]W. Addington to H. Waddington, January, 1850, H.O. 45/3263 and Foreign Office Draft to H. Waddington, May 4, 1850, F.O. 27/954.

[93]Richards, ed., Mazzini's Letters, I, 165-66.

come from the entire country, not just from London. But his "respectable" colleagues found newspaper agitation in London preferable to mingling with the operatives in the manufacturing districts.[94]

Their efforts to raise money were sincere, however. But few of the notes were sold either in England or France and the money that was collected was apparently wasted upon English muskets that never reached Italy.[95] The effort resulted in the Metropolitan Police investigating and secretly observing Mazzini's English sympathizers. In order to protect his good name Stansfeld finally withdrew from the Loan Committee.[96] Considering the farcical nature of the project the authorities overreacted. Neither the pressure from foreign governments nor the British Government's desire for maintaining public order justified the time spent on the Italian Loan Committee.

Mazzini returned to England in February of 1851. He and his friends created on May 15 the SFI. Although similar to the LAFP and the PIL in its social membership, it differed from them in its intended activist philosophy. It lingered on until March of 1855.[97] Included on the

---

[94]See, for example, Leader, October 26, 1850, p. 729, November 2, 1850, p. 753, November 16, 1850, pp. 800-801, and December 7, 1850, p. 872.

[95]Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII, 234, footnote 12.

[96]See the memo of Richard Mayne, February 10, 1851, H.O. 45/3720; Report--Mazzini Loan, 1851, Ibid.; Report, February 12, 1851, Ibid.; and Hammond and Hammond, James Stansfeld, p. 28.

[97]The historiography of the SFI is short. Harry W. Rudman, Italian Nationalism and English Letters (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), pp. 97-126 covers it in passing. Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII, 233-35 offers the best available

SFI council were nearly all the leading "respectable" internationalists: both Ashursts; Cowen; Duncombe; J. A. Froude; Holyoake; Hunt; Walter Savage Landor; Linton; David Masson (Secretary); Richard Moore; Professor Francis Newman; William Scholefield, M. P. for Birmingham; Shaen; Stansfeld; Lord Dudley Stuart; P. A. Taylor (Treasurer); and Arthur Trevelyan. Thirty-six of the original 100 resided in greater London and the remainder were scattered across west Yorkshire, Lancashire and such places as Newcastle upon Tyne, Belfast, Dublin, Plasgwynant, Pudlicott, Edinburgh and Glasgow. Socially, they were drawn from the middle and middling classes.[98]

The Society's objectives were to promote through public meetings, lectures and pamphlets a "correct" understanding in England of the Italian Question, to do the same in Parliament and generally to aid the cause of Italian religious and political liberty. In particular it objected to Britain's principle of non-intervention that allowed the French to continue their occupation of Rome. By September 1851 the Society had a number of credits to its name: a "Monthly Record," an address to the public, a tract on non-intervention and an address to Italian patriots. A projected tract on terrorism in Rome had yet to appear.[99] The SFI

---

introduction to it. Otherwise, the following books give the Society only brief mention: Hammond and Hammond, James Stansfeld, p. 28 and Margaret J. Shaen, ed., William Shaen. A Brief Sketch (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912), p. 13.

[98]Society of the Friends of Italy, Address of the Society of the Friends of Italy. Fifty Thousand (London: At the Offices of the Society, 1851), p. 2.

[99]English Republic, 1851, p. 287; Leader, July 26, 1851, pp. 696-97; Northern Star, July 26, 1851, p. 5 and September 20, 1851, p. 7.

never acted as vigorously as its founders had intended it to act. Its focus upon the conversion of the influential people of society precluded it from playing a significant part in the working-class agitation, although as individuals and as participants in other societies some of its members were involved with working-men movements.

In the year following the December 2 coup the SFI achieved its peak activities. Its well-attended conversaziones attracted large numbers of middle class and influential people, who heard some of Mazzini's best expositions in favor of a democratic Europe. He called upon the English for moral support through the gathering and disseminating of information about Italy and upon the Queen's Government to encourage other governments to also practice non-intervention.[100] Indeed, much of the SFI's propaganda aimed at exposing the fallacies of non-intervention.[101] Professor Francis Newman stated the issue more eloquently than most in his address on "The Place and Duty of England in Europe." He called upon his countrymen to support European nationalities in their quest for freedom.[102]

The SFI's impact upon the Government's policy was marginal. Mazzini published a major article in George Eliot's Westminster Review in April 1852 in which he argued against British compliance with the continental governments' request that the refugees be sent to America. The

---

[100] Leader, February 14, 1852, pp. 146-48; English Republic, 1852, pp. 45-51; Northern Star, February 14, 1852, p. 14; and Guiseppe Mazzini, M. Mazzini's Lecture, Delivered at the First Conversazione of the Friends of Italy, "No. IV of the Tracts of the Society of the Friends of Italy," (London: n.p., 1852).

[101] Leader, April 24, 1852, p. 395 and English Republic, 1852, pp. 53-55.

[102] Leader, May 1, 1852, pp. 408-409 and May 8, 1852, pp. 434-35.

article's publication coincided with a period of inquiry in Parliament about the influence of foreign governments on British policy, but a direct connection between Mazzini's treatise and the inquiry is indiscernible.[103] An SFI petition prepared on November 10, 1852, for presentation to the House of Commons protested the French and Austrian occupation of Rome and called upon Britain to rescue Italy, but aside from the document's publication in the radical newspapers it reached few of the people for whom it was intended.[104]

Within the international labor movement the SFI suffered from its middle class bias. Differences within the ranks over the question of middle class cooperation and about the correct brand of socialism precluded any semblance of a unified front. It made the authorities' social control policy much easier.

The Shilling Subscription for European Freedom illustrates the first of these problems. This project was developed under the auspices of Thomas Cooper, Joseph Cowen, Jr., George Dawson, W. J. Linton, James Watson, James Stansfeld and others. They asked Englishmen to contribute one shilling a year to the joint credit of Mazzini and Kossuth.[105]

---

[103]For the article see Mazzini, Life and Writings, VI, 215-65. For the following debate see Hansard's, CXX (23 March-29 April, 1852), pp. 28-30, 477-526 and 659-82.

[104]Star of Freedom, November 13, 1852, pp. 219-20 and Reynolds's Newspaper, November 14, 1852, p. 11. For a reprinting of the petition see Star of Freedom, November 27, 1852, p. 251 and Reynolds's Newspaper, December 5, 1852, p. 12. See also Joseph Mazzini to G. Julian Harney, [1852], Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, p. 55 and Frederick W. Hoeing, "Letters of Mazzini to W. J. Linton," Journal of Modern History, V (March, 1933), 60-61.

[105]Friend of the People, April 10, 1852, p. 75 and Leader, February 28, 1852, pp. 197-98.

Holyoake assisted them and collected some £450; others raised another £50, so that £500 were gathered before the subscription closed in February 1853.[106] An immediate result of the Shilling Subscription was that the police spied upon Mazzini and Stansfeld, and probably others, again and continued their vigil some seven weeks after Mazzini had gone to Milan to stage another unsuccessful uprising.[107]

The Shilling Subscription revealed the differences between the Left and the "respectables." Linton accused Holyoake and his group of gravitating too close to the middle-class politicians. Harney denied Holyoake space in the Star of Freedom to defend himself and then inserted a letter of his own explaining the differences between himself and Holyoake's friend, Thornton Hunt, on such issues as refugee treatment, republicanism and politics in general.[108] Although both sides agreed upon the importance of making the Shilling Subscription drive a working-class endeavor, Mazzini's June 12, 1852, letter of approval also included disparaging remarks about the French socialists. Furthermore, in his Westminster Review article Mazzini had offered a weak parry at the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels.[109] Such bickering was inherent to

---

[106]Holyoake, Sixty Years, I, 266; Rudman, Italian Nationalism, p. 101; and Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII, 244.

[107]Police Report--Mazzini, March 23, 1853, H.O. 45/4816.

[108]Holyoake, Sixty Years, I, 267; George Julian Harney to George Jacob Holyoake, September 30, 1852, No. 526, Holyoake Collection; and Star of Freedom, October 2, 1852, p. 117.

[109]Guiseppe Mazzini, Letter from Signor Mazzini to Mr. G. J. Holyoake [An Appeal for Shilling Subscriptions in Aid of Italian Freedom] (London: n.p. 1852). It is reprinted in McCabe, Life and Letters, I, 237-39. For the earlier letters see Reynolds's Newspaper, March 28,

the differences between the "respectables" and the socialists. The men whom Mazzini had attacked responded in kind to defend themselves. Louis Blanc, Pierre Leroux and others listed in Mazzini's letters were members of the Jersey branch of the Commune révolutionnaire, which Félix Pyat, Marc Caussidière and J. B. Boichot founded in London in 1852. They advocated La Republic democratique et sociale universal.[110]

Such ideological rifts detracted from the Shilling Subscription's success. Harney and his followers ignored it and launched a fund drive of their own. They formed the Democratic Refugee Committee on May 9, 1852, and sought monetary aid, employment assistance and refugee education. Harney, Gerald Massey and Hunt, with whom Harney now cooperated, issued an address recalling the days of Milton and Cromwell when Englishmen feared no despot and challenging their countrymen to "convince the world that we still retain a remnant of the spirit of the men of the Commonwealth, . . ."[111] They managed to procure employment for a few refugees. But the Committee dissolved itself on March 30, 1853, after collecting only £69 11s. The Committee divided its money according to a formula that gave three-eighths to the French, two-eighths to the Germans, two-eighths to the Poles and Hungarians and one-eighth to operating expenses.[112]

1852, p. 7 and April 4, 1852, p. 13. The attack upon Marx and Engels is in Mazzini, Life and Writings, VI, 227-29.

[110]Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 204-12.

[111]Star of Freedom, May 15, 1852, p. 5; Reynolds's Newspaper, May 16, 1852, p. 12; and Star of Freedom, May 22, 1852, p. 5.

[112]For the quarterly reports see Star of Freedom, August 14, 1852, p. 11 and November 20, 1852, p. 236. See Reynolds's Newspaper

Numbers rather than need determined the division because the Poles and Hungarians were in greater need than either the French or Germans, yet they received less money. Official estimates placed the refugee figures at 4,380 in 1853. Of these, 2,500 were Poles, 260 were German and 1,000 were Frenchmen.[113] The method for the money's division only indicated the growing influence of the French socialists on Harney. Unfortunately, the two fund drives competed simultaneously for money from a dwindling group of supporters and sympathizers.

This inability to cooperate characterized refugee relationships also. The 1851 celebrations of the 1848 French Revolution reflected this diversity. One gathering at the John Street Institution drew about 600 "gentlemen" to a banquet before the public was admitted to hear Harney, Reynolds, Caussidière, Ledru-Rollin and others. About 1,000 attended a banquet at Highbury Barn Tavern the same evening, February 24. In a hall decorated with republican flags and streamers exhibiting the names of reformers and martyrs, the audience heard letters of approval from Martin Naduad, a representative of the French people soon to be exiled, from the democrats of the twelfth arrondissement in Paris and from the exiled Poles in Paris. Schapper, Harney, Pettie and Blanc spoke.[114]

The celebrations underlined the movement's lack of unity. Although the turnouts were large--a similar banquet of German refugees

---

May 8, 1853, p. 9 for the Committee's last statement. Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII made no reference to this group.

[113]Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859, International Review for Social History, III, 201.

[114]Reynolds's Newspaper, March 2, 1851, p. 14.

held on March 13 drew about 600 people[115]--everyone realized their predicament. Harney tried to straddle the fence in claiming that two meetings were held because of ideological differences but praised the English democrats who attended both meetings.[116] Nevertheless, the Fraternal Democrats printed a different address for each assembly.[117]

In this period the international labor movement divided over the question of socialism's role in it. The issue of middle-class cooperation proved insurmountable. Although Jones too would not remain Marx's disciple beyond the late 1850s, he used his People's Paper, founded in May, 1852, to expound Marxian social reform ideas as the key to a reconstruction of Chartism. Marx frequently contributed articles and aided Jones with his editorial duties during the paper's early days.[118] Jones believed in the necessity of state ownership of the essential means of production and emphasized the nationalization of land and credit as the key to obtaining social rights. The self-employed laborer, he argued, would end capitalism. This agrarian communism reflected O'Connor's earlier influence on Jones, but Jones' insistence on class conflict in obtaining social rights revealed Marx's ascendancy in his current thought.[119]

---

[115] Northern Star, March 15, 1851, p. 5.

[116] Friend of the People, March 8, 1851, p. 98.

[117] See the Friend of the People, March 8, 1851, p. 98, for both addresses.

[118] Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 50-51, footnote 1, lists all of Marx's articles in the People's Paper.

[119] People's Paper, May 8, 1852, p. 4, December 25, 1852, p. 4, and January 1, 1853, p. 4. See also Fr. de J., "An Open Letter from Ernest Jones to Weydemeyer," Bulletin of the International Institute of

The doctrine of class struggle enabled Jones to argue that an affinity existed between English workers and continental refugees, because neither had political or social rights. Jones sought lessons for the English worker in the experiences of the refugees. For example, he claimed that universal suffrage had failed in France because the working class had voted for middle class representatives rather than members of their own class. He warned English workers about trusting the men of the Manchester School and advised them to elect working men after they obtained the vote. He also discussed the question of what European democracy could expect from England. He called for reform first in England, then help for others. ". . . Tyranny abroad trembled before Cromwell and the Commonwealth--we tell him [Kossuth] that it would do more than tremble before the Charter and Social Rights in England--it would fall!"[120]

Other socialists differed on the question of where reform ought to come first. Harney believed that violent revolution in Europe was preferable to an agitation in England. Harney's approach to internationalism was cosmopolitan. He opened the columns of his newspapers to all refugees and men or all creeds. For example, in November 1850 the first English translation of the Communist Manifesto appeared in his Red Republican.[121] But he also mixed with all three of the discernible factions

---

Social History, VII (1952), 181-89. An excellent discussion of Jones' communism is found in G. D. H. Cole, Socialist Thought, Vol. I: The Forerunners, 1789-1850 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1953), pp. 151-52.

[120] People's Paper, May 29, 1852, p. 4 and November 6, 1852, p. 4.

[121] Red Republican, November 9, 1850, pp. 161-62, November 16, 1850, pp. 170-72, November 23, 1850, pp. 181-83, and November 30, 1850, pp. 189-90.

of French socialist refugees in London: Blanc's utopians, Ledru-Rollin's Société Révolution and Pyat's Blanquist group. He also publicized the efforts of the bourgeois CEDC. Marx and Engels broke with Harney over his collaboration with these other refugees. A seven year breach (January 25, 1851-January 14, 1858) in the correspondence between Engels and Harney reflected the intensity of the theoreticians' position. The Harney-Marx/Engels disagreement ultimately led to a rupture between Harney and Jones.[122] Harney remained closer to the older refugees such as Schapper and to Louis Blanc and the utopians.[123] Harney's value to the movement emanated from his efforts to bridge the transition period between internationalism's pre-modern romantic revolutionary period and its later modern, scientific associational stage. His failure to completely accept the transformation does not demean his contributions.

In 1853 the international labor movement experienced profound changes. First, the Fraternal Democrats dissolved. In their last address of November 16 they called for a crusading war against despotic Russia.[124] Although more rhetorical than anything else, they did represent the first serious attempt at an international working man's movement. They had survived for six years, an accomplishment in itself. As a result of their existence numerous other international organizations had been formed, thousands of workers and their sympathizers had achieved an awareness of the possibilities of an international identity and social

---

[122]See Cadogan, "Harney and Engels," International Review of Social History, X, 74-75 and Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 212-14.

[123]See Blanc's letters to Harney in 1852 in Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 6-10.

[124]Beacon, November 16, 1853, p. 64.

reform ideas had reached the working-class movement in England. The Fraternal Democrats' conviction about the sacredness of working-class internationalism and their persistent espousal of this belief occupied a central place in their accomplishments. Their fondest hopes remained unachieved, but they bequeathed optimism to their successors.

The second change was the Left's expulsion of Harney, who had decided that past techniques of agitation were no longer viable and considered a middle class alliance as an option. The break between Jones and Harney came in 1852 when Jones spoke against Chartist involvement with trade unions and the cooperative movement for fear that they would subvert independent working-class political and social programs into an extension of middle-class ideals. Harney saw the achievement of working-class political survival in a cooperation with these organizations, although his belief that the opposition of the propertied classes would force these economic groups back into politics was wrong. He argued his case in a succession of new papers. His Star of Freedom folded in November 1852. He then fielded the Vanguard from January to March 1853 and the Beacon from October 26, 1853, to January 9, 1854. None of them restored his position.[125] On November 28, 1853, at a meeting in the National Hall in Holborn to celebrate the Polish Revolution of 1830 a group of Jones' followers under James Finlen's leadership prohibited Harney from occuping the chair. They claimed that Harney had betrayed the cause of democracy. An altercation ensued between the two groups that required a policeman to restore order. After defending himself in

---

[125]Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 220-23. For the Beacon's connection to Harney see Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, p. 39, footnote 1.

the Beacon, Harney departed within a month for Newcastle upon Tyne where he accepted a position on the Northern Tribune of Joseph Cowen, Jr. Jones became the dominant spokesman for working-class internationalism in London.[126] To the detriment of Jones' integrity he, too, called for a Chartist-trades alliance in 1853.

The international labor movement lacked a common approach to achieving social and political reform. Reliance upon non-English inspiration and police harassment prevented both unity and success. Disagreements over ideology fractured the movement and continued to do so for years. That problem corresponded to similar issues in both the English labor movement and in international socialist circles. The paramount divisive question was middle-class cooperation. Despite its weakness in the early 1850s, working-class internationalism's resilience was soon demonstrated in the Crimean War agitation.

---

[126] Reynolds's Newspaper, December 4, 1853, p. 6; People's Paper, December 3, 1853, p. 7; and Beacon, December 7, 1853, pp. 101-102, 112. See also Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 230-31; Ward, Chartism, p. 231; and Polish and other exiles to G. Julian Harney, [1853], in Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 68-71.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNATIONALISM AND THE CRIMEAN WAR, 1854-1857

In England the Crimean War brought the expectation that social and political reform issues would be shelved while aristocrats led England to victory. Instead, the war demonstrated the ineptness of aristocratic society. Consequently, the middle class subjected the closed structure of elite government to criticism. This criticism resulted in a heightened sense of middle-class consciousness that emerged from that class's attitude that it could have conducted the war better than did the aristocracy. Olive Anderson has argued this thesis at length. She noted briefly, and apologized for not pursuing further, that radical concern for the national struggles of the Poles, Hungarians and Italians helped keep radicalism alive during the war. Other historians have observed this phenomenon too, but none have attempted to explain why the Crimean War only kept radicalism alive and did not enable the reformers to achieve their goals.[1] In this chapter I argue that the internationalists

---

[1] Olive Anderson, A Liberal State at War: English Politics and Economics during the Crimean War (London: Macmillan, 1967), pp. 97-182. For additional evaluations of working-class concerns about foreign affairs in the 1850s see Simon MacCoby, English Radicalism, 1853-1886 (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1938), p. 33; Asa Briggs, The Making of Modern England, 1783-1867 (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), pp. 430-31; and Briggs, "The Crimean Centenary," Virginia Quarterly Review, XXX (1955), 542-55.

overemphasized the importance of defeating Russia before reform could be obtained in Europe and England. To succeed a movement must be willing to take calculated risks. The internationalists opted instead for half-way measures. In part they can be defended because the previous eight years of experience had given them little positive reinforcement. Moreover, in the immediate period of the war circumstantial problems precluded their overcoming the internal shortcomings of their embryonic movement.

One such issue was the inability of the internationalists to create or foster a level of working-class consciousness comparable to that of the middle class. This failure resulted from the social constitution of the working-class leadership. For some time the international labor movement had grappled with the question of a middle-class alignment, just as Chartism had. Gradually the movement gained more "respectable" leaders than it retained from the "proletarians" and the refugees. The exodus of refugees to American accounted partially for this situation, but more important was the emerging respectability of labor itself. Supposedly, the "New Model" unions of this period were the product of labor leaders who accepted the existing economic system and worked within it to alleviate the worst of its abuses. Although unions in this period had not abandoned revolutionary ideas completely, they were careful to avoid extremism.[2] Thus, amidst the growing prosperity of the 1850s radical

---

[2]Sidney Webb and Beatrice Webb, The History of Trade Unionism (rev. ed.; London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1920), p. 180 argue the acceptance case. Asa Briggs, Victorian People (New York: Harper and Row, 1955), pp. 169, 196 disagrees with the Webbs. Henry Pelling, A History of British Trade Unionism (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), pp. 50-51 allows the unions their "New Model" classification but draws attention to their similarities with earlier craft unions. G. D. H. Cole, "British Trade Unions in the Third Quarter of the Nineteenth Century," International Review for Social History, III (1937) in Eleanora M. Carus-Wilson, ed.,

reformists declined and the numbers of moderates rose. The international labor movement underwent a similar experience. In both movements the leadership came either from a middle-class background or accepted and strove for middle-class respectability. Under these circumstances working-class consciousness was submerged beneath the overwhelming superiority of the middle-class entrepreneurial ideal of self improvement within the capitalist system.[3]

Thus, the English working class reduced the vehemency of its attack upon the capitalist system and opted for jingoism combined with expectations of future reform in England after changes were achieved in Europe. As Frances Gillespie wrote:

> The whole structure of political reform was soon swamped in the excitement of the Crimean War. The working classes considered this war as in a large measure their own. They forgot their own political exclusion for a time in their all-absorbing interest in the struggle against oppression. Or perhaps they sensed the impetus their own cause would receive through the triumph of liberty abroad. When next the question of reform came into the forefront of English politics, it persisted until it received a fairly satisfactory solution.[4]

Within the international labor movement the recurring problem of whether to emphasize reform at home or revolution abroad surfaced again. Jones'

Essays in Economic History (London: Edward Arnold, 1962), III, 202-21 believes the unions were more radical than the Webbs would admit and that the new unions retained a considerable revolutionary character. For a discussion of the "New Model" thesis that sides against the Marxists see A. E. Musson, British Trade Unions, 1800-1875 (London: Macmillan, 1972), pp. 49-58.

[3]See Trygve R. Tholfsen, "The Intellectual Origins of Mid-Victorian Stability," Political Science Quarterly, LXXXVI (March, 1971), 67. Unlike Tholfsen, Perkin, Modern English Society, pp. 271-73 ignores continued working-class skepticism and argues for the defeat of the working-class ideal and the victory of the middle-class ideal.

[4]Gillespie, Labor and Politics, p. 109.

argument for social reform in England to precede all other reform programs whether in England or on the continent had carried its opposition by 1854. During the Crimean War he altered his position slightly; he continued to advocate social reform but sought a closer connection with political revolution. Marx and Engels agreed with him. He was not alone as numerous internationalists worked diligently to achieve their ends during the Crimean War. Consequently, Gillespie's generalization should be viewed with care because she merely notes the working class's de-emphasis of reform questions and presents no evidence. Except for a few general statements she skips the war years and takes up her analysis at the war's conclusion. The lack of reform interest that she writes about refers to the parliamentary radicals but not to the internationalists. These men, who were close to the politically conscious workers, continued to advocate reform, although among them the "proletarians" were more vociferous. Their agitation during the Crimean War spawned the International Association which was the last truly working-class international organization before the First International. They also ushered in the last phase of revolutionary internationalism before middle-class domination of their movement.

The international labor movement revived under the stimulus of the Eastern Question. The possibility of a war against despotic Russia quickened the foreign affairs awareness of many Russophobic Englishmen. Polish independence became a central issue of the agitation as the internationalists urged Her Majesty's Government to adopt a moral position. These enthusiasts anticipated marshalling working-class support for various reform projects as they took up the challenge of educating both

workers and the Government on the proper conduction of foreign affairs.

In the fall of 1853 gatherings of 1,000-1,500 were common, especially in the trade centers of Lancashire and west Yorkshire.[5] In London, the radical newspaper editors gave increasing amounts of space to the Eastern Question. Their major concern was not for the future of the Ottoman Empire but for the opportunities its demise offered for the East European nationalities to achieve their national identities. Everyone assumed that war would come. Jones' People's Paper led the way in both volume and enthusiasm.

Three themes pervaded internationalist thought at this time. First, the European rulers were verbally abused. Nicholas the "miscreant" was portrayed as the man responsible for Europe's lack of freedom. They castigated Louis Napoleon for retarding the spread of democracy. And Victoria was reprimanded for her German ties, which by implication placed her in the Czar's influence. Secondly, they repeatedly raised the question of England's goals in the coming conflict. Few of them expected England to pursue her "rightful" objectives of leading Europe's nationalities unless the English people pressed their Government into action. No one foresaw, either, England purposely instigating continental revolution. Rather, they believed that England would create the proper conditions for such rebellions through administering a sound defeat to the Czar. Then the nationalities would escape despotism under their own power and revolution would sweep westward. Thus, the third theme of their

---

[5]See, for example, People's Paper, September 24, 1853, p. 7.

campaign stressed the necessity of England aiding the nationalities so that the coming war would be a "just war."[6]

War fever reached a high level among the remaining internationalists. Despite the differences in their ranks, they agreed that the coming conflict would escalate beyond a simple war of kings. In the last issue of Harney's Beacon he stated the internationalists' position as succinctly as anyone. War against Russia would unleash an insurrection in Italy, Hungary and Poland that would spread to France and then to England. ". . . From this War, from the fierce ordeal of the Coming Struggle, may possibly spring even England's regeneration."[7]

The internationalists envisioned the defeat of Russia preceding either political and social change in Europe or accompanying reforms in England. The Left opted for the latter; the moderates for the former. The Left's position offered the English labor movement a greater chance of immediate achievement of reform because if they had pursued it to its logical end the Government would have been required to wage a war and conduct a rearguard defense against serious reformers. It would have meant wide-spread worker agitation rather than Cabinet discussion of such projects as Lord Russell's franchise reform proposal that never saw the

---

[6]For some of the best, though by no means all, examples of this rhetoric see People's Paper, February 5, 1853, p. 1, March 26, 1853, p. 1, June 18, 1853, p. 4, June 25, 1853, p. 4, July 2, 1853, p. 4, July 23, 1853, p. 5, August 20, 1853, p. 4, September 24, 1853, p. 5, October 1, 1853, p. 4, November 5, 1853, p. 5, November 19, 1853, p. 4, November 26, 1853, p. 5, December 17, 1853, p. 4, December 24, 1853, p. 4, January 14, 1854, p. 4, February 25, 1854, p. 1, March 4, 1854, p. 4, March 11, 1854, p. 4, and April 1, 1854, p. 4; Reynolds's Newspaper, February 27, 1853, p. 8, July 10, 1853, p. 1, October 9, 1853, p. 8, October 23, 1853, p. 1, October 30, 1853, p. 8, and March 5, 1854, p. 1; and English Republic, 1853, pp. 325-27, 345-48 and 389.

[7]Beacon, January 9, 1854, p. 171.

floor of the Commons. The Left's risk would have been great, but then it could have suffered no less than it ultimately did anyway from its half-way approach. Although the Left might be castigated for not grasping the opportunity, it would have faced a formidable task in over-taking the moderates whose position lay directly in the mainstream of the mid-Victorian labor scene. Furthermore, no assurance existed that the workers would have supported such an adventure. Conversely, the moderates played into the hands of the anti-reformers in Parliament when they insisted on defeating Russia before seeking reform at home. Revolution on the Dneiper, Danube or the Vistula had historically never led to revolution or reform in western Europe; rather, for centuries innovative change and progress had spread from west to east. The moderates placed their hopes in the wrong geographical region. Their emphasis should have been on English reform within the context of the international labor philosophy, not on Polish independence, or at least on some scheme that assured simultaneous efforts.

Rather, they began an agitation predicated upon past experience. They thought that individual and group propaganda would pressure Lord Aberdeen's Coalition Government to fight the Russians to re-establish Poland. Foremost in this philosophy were the Polish refugees. The Polish Democratic Society planned a ". . . showy anniversary, required by the close connection of the Turkish war with the cause of Poland" on November 29, 1853.[8] With Worcell in the chair, Linton delivered a dynamic

---

[8]S. Worcell to William J. Linton, November 1, 1853, in Kieniewicz, ed., "Polish Correspondence," Annali Istituto Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, III, 202.

speech calling for an English declaration of war on Russia as a preliminary to a general European liberation war. To the approval of ... the crowd of refugees and Englishmen he claimed that English working men unanimously favored such a war. Linton later called this meeting the "first open recognition of English republicanism in accord with European, . . . [the first proclamation] on English soil [of] the necessity of a new campaign against the unholy Alliance of Kings." But he said nothing of the practical problems involved in such a project beyond the wishful expectation that public opinion would force Aberdeen's government to a similar conclusion. He failed to mention the difficulties of achieving that goal, even though he had been an internationalist long enough to know better.[9]

Taking his cue from Worcell, Linton argued that the Turkish Empire was insignificant and that English protection of the East European nationalities as a bulwark against Russia was the real question.[10] Not long after the English declaration of war against Russia, Linton sensed the futility of his cause when he wrote: "And the peoples have not yet learned to do more than 'sympathize.'"[11] Little did he realize that his patriotic encouragement of the dropping of English reform questions for the duration of the war was as much the cause of the workers' malaise that he abhorred as a cure for their lack of political and social freedom.[12]

---

[9] People's Paper, December 3, 1853, p. 7; English Republic, 1854, pp. 23-39; and Linton, Memories, pp. 141-42.

[10] English Republic, 1853, pp. 345-48 and 1854, pp. 212-16.

[11] Northern Tribune, 1854, p. 181. The entire article was reprinted as W. J. Linton, Help for Poland (London, Brantwood, n.p., 1854).

[12] For one of his patriotic statements see Northern Tribune, 1854, pp. 249-50.

Nor did other "respectables" recognize the disadvantage their program did them. P. A. Taylor, junior, for example, attempted unsuccessfully in January 1854 to change the almost defunct Society of the Friends of Italy into an English Foreign Affairs Society. Its intended goal was to educate workers about their responsibility toward the European nationalities. Taylor was a typical "respectable." His biographer wrote that he ". . . would have been after gentle Lucy Hutchinson's own republican heart," if only he had lived in the days of the Long Parliament. He was a member of the middle class and his family was a partner in a silk manufacturing firm. His father had participated in the Anti-Corn Law agitation and the family numbered among its closest friends John Stuart Mill, Mazzini, Colonel Perronet Thompson and Ebenezer Elliot, the corn-law rhymer. The younger Taylor belonged to the PIL in the late 1840s and later sat as an M.P. for Leicester. Although motivated by the injustice done to the Poles, Italians and Hungarians and to English workers, his paternalistic approach to both sets of wrongs offered little immediate hope of rectification.[13] A good Taylor family friend was W. J. Fox, the Unitarian minister, who was a Liberal M.P. for Oldham. He too called for the creation of a Polish nation; he believed that Poland was the barrier between civilized Europe and barbarian Russia. He wrote a weekly piece for the Weekly Dispatch under the signature "Publicola" to spread his views.[14] Another member of this group was the poet

---

[13]P. A. Taylor, [Junior] to George Jacob Holyoake, January 1854, No. 635, Holyoake Collection. For the Taylor family see John M. Davidson, Eminent English Liberals in and out of Parliament (Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, [1880]), pp. 25-35.

[14]Richard Garnett, Life of W. J. Fox (London: John Lane Co., 1910), pp. 325-26.

Walter Savage Landor. He was a casual participant in "respectable" internationalism. His solution for the troubles in the East was to assassinate the Czar. That such simplistic ideas were impractical even the editors of the Leader recognized.[15] But his proposal reflected the lack of reality that characterized this group.

Not only did they dream of impractical schemes, but they insured the movement's weakness through ideological wrangling. Worcell labelled David Urquhart "an enemy of Democracy" and Linton assisted Mazzini's friend George Dawson in countering the Urquhart movement.[16] This internal bickering had crippled the internationalists from their inception. No group rose above these petty quarrels that took their viciousness from personality conflicts as well as from legitimate ideological differences.

The Tory-Russophobe Urquhart competed with the internationalists for the workers' allegiance. Therein lay their dislike for him. A deeper cause for international objection to him was that his radicalism was national not international. He called for a renewed emphasis on local government institutions and for the resuscitation of the ancient rights of petitioning the Crown and impeachment, but not for universal manhood suffrage. He idealized the England of Queen Anne, not the new England of political and social equality. Yet his National Movement with its well-organized local committees came nearer to creating a mass

---

[15] Leader, October 28, 1854, p. 1019.

[16] S. Worcell to W. J. Linton, November 8, 1853, in Kieniewicz, ed., "Polish Correspondence," Annali Istituto Giagiacomo Feltrinelli, III, 118.

following than did any international organization. They envied his success.[17]

David Urquhart is usually remembered for his Russophobia. As an official at the British Embassy in Constantinople he developed a deep love for the Turks. When Palmerston discovered Urquhart's attempt to engineer a war between Russia and Turkey, the Foreign Minister recalled him to London. This act convinced Urquhart that Palmerston was a Russian agent; he called for Pam's impeachment. He saw Russian influence everywhere and began an agitation to expose it. At first Urquhart sought middle-class support but achieving only moderate success he turned to the working class in 1839. His method was to establish "Committees for the Study of Diplomatic Documents," but when Palmerston left office in 1841 and the Eastern Question receded into memory his movement lapsed into inactivity. During his Chartist flirtation he claimed he had discovered Russian infiltration in their ranks and contended, unjustly, that he had alerted the authorities about the Chartist uprisings in 1839-40. An eccentric and unbalanced man, Urquhart made little inroad into working-class politics before the 1850s.[18]

Chartist reaction against Urquhart emanated from their fear that his foreign affairs emphasis would distract from their own agitation for the Charter. O'Connor held that view.[19] In the mid-1850s the

---

[17]Anderson, Liberal State, pp. 139-52 presents a succinct analysis of Urquhart's ideas.

[18]The only biography, desperately in need of revision, is Gertrude Robinson, David Urquhart (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920). An excellent, recent analysis of Urquhart's movement as a pressure group is Richard Shannon, "David Urquhart and the Foreign Affairs Committees" in Patricia Hollis, ed., Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England (London: Edward Arnold, 1974), pp. 239-61.

[19]Gammage, Chartist Movement, p. 189.

internationalists believed that he threatened their own foreign affairs schemes. When Urquhart went on a speaking tour in November of 1853, the People's Paper warned "Democrats" to be wary of his movement, which it perversely labelled the "Russian Move."[20] Yet, he revived his "Foreign Affairs Committees," which numbered at their high point about 150 with 2-3,000 working-class members. Although a strong cell existed in Newcastle, Urquhart's movement centered in the west Midlands. The skilled craftsmen of this area, who were neither attracted to Chartism nor organized by the "New Model" unions, were drawn to Urquhart.[21]

A particularly active unit existed at Sheffield. Sheffield's cutlery and steel trades profited during the Crimean War. The war transformed the city from a manufacturing to a large-scale industrial economy.[22] Urquhart's appeal drew its strength from the traditional radicalism of such local leaders as Isaac Ironside and from the social composition of these particular workers. As early as 1851 Ironside had organized "wardmotes" in Sheffield which dealt with foreign affairs almost from the time of their origin. Over the years middle-class activists withdrew their support; consequently, the "wardmotes" metamorphosis into Foreign Affairs Committees left them with a thorough working-class composition.[23] The

---

[20] People's Paper, November 12, 1853, p. 1.

[21] Anderson, Liberal State, pp. 146-47 and Asa Briggs, "David Urquhart and the West Riding Foreign Affairs Committee," Bradford Antiquary, n.s., Part XXXIX (April, 1858), 197-207.

[22] W. H. G. Armytage, "Sheffield and the Crimean War: Politics and Industry, 1852-1857," History Today, V (July, 1955), 479.

[23] John Salt, "Local Manifestation of the Urquhartite Movement," International Review of Social History, XIII (Part 3, 1968), 356-59. For Ironside see Joyce M. Bellamy and John Saville, eds., Dictionary of Labour Biography (2 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1972), II, 201-207.

war began the proletarianization of Sheffield's working class. In the process, working-class interest in foreign affairs evolved beyond a simple anti-Russian expression into a genuine spirit of international consciousness.

That awareness of the place of Sheffield in the international community had existed for some time. The condition of foreign trade was recognized as an important element in the local "bread and butter question."[24] In 1851 several members of Kossuth's Polish Legion had gone to Sheffield in search of work. Although it is impossible to determine how many remained in the city, their presence must have expanded local working-class awareness of international issues because the refugees usually expressed their beliefs at every opportunity whether it be at rallies, coffee houses, taverns or one-on-one encounters. Also, in 1851 Sheffield radicals had sent a deputation to Southampton to greet Kossuth. The city provided fertile ground for internationalist agitators.

As owner of the Sheffield Free Press, Ironside opened its columns to Urquhart's propaganda before the latter established his own Free Press in London in October 1855. The Free Press cost two pence; C. D. Collett edited it and Holyoake printed it. This emphasis on newspaper propaganda was characteristic of other English radical movements and led to an unlikely association with Marx. Urquhart and Marx shared one trait: both suffered from Russophobia. After the two met in February 1854 Marx began contributing occasional lengthy and weighty articles to the Sheffield Free Press. Although his barrages of unassimilated information led

---

[24]Salt, "Local Manifestation," International Review of Social History, XIII, 352.

to a disagreement with Ironside who felt his paper "emtombed" by them, Marx reluctantly continued writing for the Free Press. Most of his efforts were reprints of articles written for him by Engels but published under his name in the New York Tribune. Marx's relationship with Urquhart survived on an uneasy basis. Financial needs provided his prime motivation. As he wrote to Engels following a letter of commendation from the Sheffield Foreign Affairs Committee for his four part piece on the Kars Blue Book papers in the People's Paper, which was reprinted in the Free Press in summary form: "It would have been much better if the chaps had sent me the money they made by reprinting (as a pamphlet) under the title Story of the Life, etc. my article on Palmerston." The praise was all the more exceptional, wrote Marx, because ". . . there is war to the death between the People's Paper and the Free Press, and in general between Chartism and Urquhartism."[25]

In an earlier letter to Engels Marx noted ". . . a bitter controversy between the Chartists and the Urquhartists at Newcastle upon Tyne, London, Birmingham, and several other places."[26] He wrote of Chartists but meant all those to the left of center. The Urquhart competition for working-class support caused the internationalists great concern. At Newcastle one of the first Foreign Affairs Committees was

---

[25]Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels, May 8, 1856, in Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, p. 240. For Marx and Urquhart see Armytage, "Sheffield and the Crimean War," History Today, V, 475-76; Salt, "Local Manifestation," International Review of Social History, XIII, 353-54; Shannon, "David Urquhart" in Hollis, ed., Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England, pp. 239, 252; and G. Allen Hutt, "David Urquhart: A Forgotten Friend of Marx," Plebs, XV (February, 1923), 68-71.

[26]Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels, April 10, 1856, in Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, p. 239.

established. By early February 1856 Richard Hart, one of Urquhart's chief organizers, wrote to his mentor that "The Chartists have come over in a body and have made up their minds to go for impeachment and agitate the Country."[27] Although he overstated his success, the Urquhart threat was sufficient enough to elicit from Jones and Finlen, who were then attempting to reorganize Chartism, disclaimers of any connection with Urquhart and charges against him of being a Tory plotting to give the Crown more not less power.[28] The working-class attack on Urquhart contributed less to his movement's failure than did its own illusive nature Urquhart doted on the past and once the enthusiasm of the Crimean War ended his mass appeal receded into pockets of isolated though dedicated followers.

In Newcastle Joseph Cowen, junior organized an agitation that paralleled Urquhart's, but which also fell within the mainstream of the English labor movement. Although Cowen sponsored Urquhart's speech in Newcastle on October 23, 1854, he never joined the Russophobe's movement.[29] Too republican for the National Movement, Cowen pursued independently his objective of pressuring the Government into assisting the Poles gain their freedom. The cause of the democratic émigrés permeated Cowen's radical activities throughout the 1850s and early 1860s. The Cowen

---

[27]Richard Hart to David Urquhart, February 8, 1856, I.G. 15, Urquhart Papers.

[28]People's Paper, March 1, 1856, p. 4; March 8, 1856, p. 5; and March 29, 1856, p. 5.

[29]Broadsheet, October 18, 1854, A.239, Cowen Collection; Leader, November 4, 1854, p. 1037; Northern Tribune, 1854, pp. 389-92; and Newcastle Journal, October 28, 1854, A.245, Cowen Collection.

family lived in Blaydon near Newcastle where they operated a brick factory. They marketed their product throughout Europe, a practice that enabled the younger Cowen to transport refugees and their communications secretly into Europe. The 1844 Mazzini letter-opening incident had inspired Cowen, while still a student at Edinburgh, to enter into an acquaintance with Mazzini and Linton. His friendship with Linton lasted twenty years despite Linton's constant badgering for financial assistance. He lent support to a group of twelve Polish Legion exiles who came to Newcastle on March 4, 1851, and assisted in collections for Linton's Shilling Subscription in 1852. He retired from active involvement in international causes after the Polish rebellion of 1863 failed and sat in the House of Commons from 1873 to 1886. An enlightened employer, he emphasized his Tyneside provincialism in the House and succumbed to Boer War imperialistic jingoism by the time of his death in 1900. Cowen exemplified the coming international agitator: radical in his politics, parternalistically sympathetic to working-class woes and thoroughly middle class. Urquhart's opposition Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee had a more working-class membership than did Cowen's group. His sympathy for the Polish cause came not from ideology but from compassion, a universal humanistic trait. In 1879 when asked why he championed the Poles, he said: "Because they seemed the most forlorn."[30]

---

[30]Davidson, Eminent English Liberals, pp. 51-63 is an excellent sketch of Cowen's life. Among the unsatisfactory studies are: Evan Rowland Jones, The Life and Speeches of Joseph Cowen, M.P. (London: Sampson Low, 1885); William Duncan, Life of Joseph Cowen (London: The Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd., 1904); and Hinton, English Radical Leaders, pp. 77-85. For his relations with Mazzini see Rudman, Italian Nationalism, p. 97 and passim; for his friendship with Linton see Smith,

Peter Brock has chronicled Cowen's Polish activities.[31] The Newcastle upon Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee was formed under the leadership of Cowen and Charles Attwood, an ironmaster and brother of Thomas Attwood,on November 16, 1854. It drew most of its support from the middle class and from some workers. After eighteen months of feverish bluster it lapsed into inactivity. Shortly after the 1854 celebration in St. Martin's Hall in London of the Polish Revolution of 1830 an Anglo-Polish Committee was created under P. A. Taylor's direction and offered to assist the Newcastle group gain a wider English audience. Similar to earlier "respectable" international groups, it emphasized petitions and public meetings to win over the Government to Poland's cause.[32]

The Newcastle Committee staged two impressive public celebrations before its demise. On the 29 of November in 1854 and on the 29 of January in 1855 it convened gatherings in commemoration of the Polish Revolution of 1830.[33] The first resulted in an address that attacked the British Government for not encouraging a Polish insurrection and for not calling for the establishment of a Polish nation with its ancient frontiers.

Radical Artisan, pp. 58-59 and passim; and for his fleeting acquaintance with Alexander Herzen see Monica Patridge, "Alexander Herzen and the Younger Joseph Cowen M.P., Some Unpublished Material," Slavonic and East European Review, XLI (December, 1962), 50-63.

[31]"Joseph Cowen and the Polish Exiles," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII, 52-69.

[32]English Republic, 1855, pp. 27-29; Anglo-Polish Committee Handbill, A.268, Cowen Collection; P. A. Taylor [junior] to Joseph Cowen, junior, December 27, 1854, A.276, Ibid.; Broadsheet of Anglo-Polish Committee, January 6, 1855, A.290, Ibid.

[33]For brief accounts see the Northern Tribune, March 3, 1855, pp. 64-65.

Such a policy would lead to a war against Prussia and Austria, but England would be assisted against them by internationally inspired popular uprisings.[34] Although unrealistic, this hope permeated internationalist dreams. It also found willing adherents among the Polish exiles. General Mieroslawski, who was an important figure in the émigrés in Paris, wrote to Cowen offering to raise a 5,000 man Polish Legion which he suggested England supply and arm.[35] Responding for the Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee, Harney informed the General that they accepted his plan and were willing to advance it in memorial form to the Government. But he warned Mieroslawski, ". . . I should be but deceiving you were I to encourage the hope that the British people would by popular subscription furnish the means to arm and equip a Polish Legion."[36] His experience as a "Red Republican" had taught Harney the futility of seeking popular support for international adventures. By 1855 he had turned irretrievably from socialist working-class agitation and moved into middle-class respectability with its innocuous petitions and parliamentary questions. Just as he had been among the first to advocate proletarian action, now he was among the vanguard of the movement's deserters, although not without cause.

Regardless, the quest for the Polish Legion continued. Mieroslawski wrote a memorial which the Newcastle Foreign Affairs

---

[34]Brock, "Joseph Cowen and the Polish Exiles," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII, 58.

[35]General Louis Mieroslawski to Joseph Cowen, junior, January 1, 1855, Northern Tribune, March 3, 1855, p. 61.

[36]Newcastle upon Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee to General Mieroslawksi, February 20, 1855, in Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 58-59.

Committee published under the title Poland, Russia, and the Western Powers, A Memorial, Historical and Political, Addressed to the British and French Nations.[37] Their hopes were frustrated, although two regiments of Polish Cossacks appeared under the Sultan's banner, without English support, and fought against Russia.[38]

Exasperation with public indifference to the Polish cause led Cowen and Harney to form the Republican Brotherhood.[39] Two letters from Harney to Holyoake indicate that the Republican Brotherhood founders took their endeavor lightly. Harney offered to make Holyoake a member and jokingly acquiesced to Holyoake's amusing comments in the Reasoner about the Brotherhood. Cowen enrolled his Secularist friend and wrote at the end of Harney's first letter "Done at the Republican Palace, Blaydon, first day of the week and in the Year of the Republic I." Even in their humorous moments the internationalists encountered the shadow of the French Revolution. The Brotherhood published one issue in January of a paper, the Republican Brotherhood, but with the organization confined to Cowen's Newcastle friends it became defunct early in 1855 without any achievements except one local banquet.[40]

---

[37]See "Copy of the Petition for the Restoration of Poland," March 28, 1855, A.237, Cowen Collection. A favorable review of Mieroslawski's memorial is found in the London Investigator, August, 1855, pp. 68-69. Holyoake published the memorial as a pamphlet.

[38]Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, Report of the Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London: C. Detkens, 1855), pp. 3-6.

[39]Brock, "Joseph Cowen and the Polish Exiles," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII, 59.

[40]G. Julian Harney to George Jacob Holyoake, January 21, 1855?, No. 728, Holyoake Collection; G. Julian Harney to George Jacob Holyoake, February 15, 1855, No. 737, Ibid.; for Holyoake's membership card see

In the spring of 1855 internationalism experienced trauma in Newcastle. Cowen divested himself of the Northern Tribune, which was incorporated into the Reasoner. And with the contest for working-class support at a pitch Attwood deserted Cowen and joined Urquhart's rival Committee for Watching the War. Furthermore, in the summer Harney departed for Jersey where he edited the Jersey Independent.[41] Almost inexplicably internationalism ebbed in Newcastle at the height of the Crimean War; Urquhart's group accomplished little more than did Cowen's.

The nature of the international labor movement accounts for this rapid decline. At its peak in Newcastle, it relied upon foreign impetus for inspiration. The Crimean War resulted from diplomatic issues; it was fought at a distant location on the edge of the Black Sea. If the English worker had an economic interest that involved the grain trade and his food supply, no one bothered to tell him.[42] Instead, the internationalists appealed to the worker either on Urquhart's moral, metaphysical level or on an amoral political level. In the former workers were advised to read Blue Books and seek out traitors. In the latter they were told to follow their betters and marshall themselves behind the illusive advice of political refugees.

The ultimate cause of the movement's failure in Newcastle was its reliance upon refugee extravaganzas and the concommitant belief that

---

No. 738, Ibid. For a report of the Brotherhood's philosophy see the Northern Tribune, March 3, 1855, pp. 105-106.

[41]Holyoake, Sixty Years, I, 295; Brock, "Joseph Cowen and the Polish Exiles," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII, 62; and Schoyen, The Chartist Challenge, pp. 241-48.

[42]For this interesting and much-maligned thesis see Vernon J. Puryear, England, Russia, and the Straits Question, 1844-1856 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1931).

public pressure of that sort would influence the Government's policy. This tendency appeared in the agitation before the declaration of war. In March 1854 Guiseppe Garibaldi arrived in London, where he consulted with Mazzini, Kossuth, Ledru-Rollin, Herzen, Worcell and other refugees. Mazzini also introduced him to several of his English friends, including James Stansfeld.[43] In order to benefit from the expected enthusiasm that a visit from Garibaldi could generate, Cowen invited him to Newcastle. The General accepted and arrived on April 11 in the American registered vessel the Commonwealth, which was manned by Italian refugees and bound for Genoa. To his host's dismay Garibaldi humbly declined to attend a popular demonstration.[44] But he did accept on board his ship an address of sympathy and an inscribed sword and telescope that were purchased with a working-men's penny subscription. The address contained a succinct statement that revealed the extent of the Newcastle group's commitment to the European nationalities; it was ". . . the never-ceasing duty of at least encouraging by sympathetic words, if we can not help by deeds, all who, like yourself and your compatriots, are nobly engaged in the struggle for the Right."[45] Words not deeds exemplified the middle-class involvement in the international labor movement. Its history can be traced back through the SFI and the LAFP and is found in practically every parliamentary pronouncement of the radicals who had taken up the cause after the Polish Revolution of 1830.

---

[43]Anthony P. Campanella, "Joseph Cowen, Garibaldi e Mazzini," Estratto da Nouva Revista Storica, Anno L, Fasc. I-II (1966), 202.

[44]G. Garibaldi to Joseph Cowen, junior, March 8, 1854, in Campanella, "Joseph Cowen, Garibaldi e Mazzini," Nouva Revista Storica, Anno L, 201.

[45]Northern Tribune, 1854, pp. 173-75.

Similar results emerged from Cowen's courting of Kossuth. In December 1854 the Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee commended Kossuth for his oratorical support of the Polish cause. In his reply Kossuth promised to cooperate with the Committee in furthering their goals.[46] The Eastern Question had drawn Kossuth from his self-imposed quiet and he now spoke to numerous English audiences for the next two years. He appeared before respectable international groups in London, before middle-class gatherings in the northern industrial areas and before Scottish audiences. He urged his listeners to force the Government to define its war purposes and he told them that Austria was an unsafe ally that had more in common with Russia than with Great Britain. He informed his audiences that the only real solution for the Eastern Question was the independence of Hungary, Poland and Italy. Except among the internationalists he convinced few.[47] Throughout the war Cowen and Kossuth maintained a correspondence about the secret trips of revolutionary agents who used Cowen's business as a cover.[48] Finally, Kossuth visited Newcastle in May 1856, after the disappointing conclusion of the Crimean War. On May 19, 20, and 21 he spoke to crowds in Newcastle and Blaydon, receiving at the latter an honorary membership from the Mechanic's Institute. But events

---

[46]Newcastle upon Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee to Louis Kossuth, [1854] in Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, p. 57 and Louis Kossuth to G. Julian Harney, December 21, 1854, in Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[47]For an example containing all the above themes plus an editorial in support of the government's policy see the Glasgow Examiner, July 8, 1854, pp. 3-4. See also S. Worcell to W. J. Linton, June 23, 1854, in Kieniewicz, ed., "Polish Correspondence," Annali Istituto Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, III, 221-22.

[48]See, for example, Louis Kossuth to Joseh Cowen, [1855] in Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 29-30.

had passed by this kind of agitation and his appearance failed to revive the lagging foreign affairs interest in Newcastle. His visit saddled Cowen with a £36 deficit and the Committee temporarily became inactive.[49]

The Eastern Question also revived the "proletarian" internationalists. Jones dominated them at this point, but he squandered his gains as easily as he garnered them. His efforts to maintain the Chartist organization devolved into numerous bitter conflicts for control of the executive. The March 1854, July 1855 and January 1856 elections drew few voters, but Jones and his flunky James Finlen became virtual dictators. Instead of creating a mass proletarian following, his interminable squabbles drove away many of the remaining faithful. Gammage, who had long disliked Jones, concluded: "Jones was not the man to lead a great movement; he had intellect and energy, but he was ambitious and mercenary. He must command the movement or he would reduce it to nothing." Marx concurred with Gammage on this observation.[50]

Jones spent considerable energy in late 1853 and early 1854 organizing his Labor Parliament project. On September 15 the operatives at Preston went out on strike for higher wages; they were then locked out until finally forced back to work in May 1854. Jones publicized their strike in the People's Paper and assisted in collecting funds for them. The great support in the country for the operatives led Jones to the premature conclusion that he could turn the strike into a mass movement

---

[49] Gateshead Observer, May 24, 1856, A.457, Cowen Collection, and Cashbook and Financial Statement of Kossuth's Visit to Newcastle, May 1856, A.459, Ibid.

[50] Ward, Chartism, pp. 232-34; Gammage, Chartist Movement, pp. 394-400; and Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels, April 10, 1856, in Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, p. 239.

under his leadership. He proposed a Labor Parliament containing working-class members as a show of unity and as a focal point of a national movement. But the program he advocated was utopian in that it was based on cooperative enterprises in agriculture and industry.[51]

The Labor Parliament met in Manchester from March 6 to 18, 1854. It did little to advance the international labor movement. Aside from Marx, who wrote it a laudatory but guarded letter, Blanc and Martin Nadaud--all of whom were honorary members--the internationalists had no input.[52] The Labor Parliament dealt entirely with domestic questions and made no determined effort to engage refugee participation. Its program looked to the past rather than the future. Previously Jones had argued that social and political reform were synonymous; now he claimed that a cooperative scheme would bring social changes from which political reform would emanate. He drew heavily on O'Connor's Land Plan. Gammage saw this plan as emblematic of Jones' trickery. Why? Writing to Engels somewhat later Marx contended: ". . . Jones spoils everything by his urge for publicity, his tactless fumbling after pretexts for agitation and restless desire to move faster than the times." Jones further harmed his cause through his failure to court the trade unions during this episode. Buchanan concluded that the unions' lukewarm reaction to the Labor Parliament confirmed ". . . the general trade union

---

[51]Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 53-55 and R. A. Buchanan, "Trade Unions and Public Opinion, 1850-75" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1957), pp. 41-63.

[52]Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, Appendix IV, "The Program of the Labour Parliament, 1854," pp. 272-73 and Appendix V, "Karl Marx: Letter to the Labour Parliament," 9 March 1854, pp. 274-75.

antipathy towards political action in the 1850s," although he believes that to argue that the trade unions were only interested in industrial questions is incorrect.[53]

Because of his megalomania Jones had muffed an opportunity to draw the trade unions into closer cooperation with the Chartists, and, perhaps, the internationalists. In the late 1860s Robert Applegarth claimed he had learned his radicalism from the People's Paper, among others.[54] As a prominent advocate of "New Model" unions, he would have been a significant recruit for Jones in 1854. Doubtless, there were other union men in a similar position. None of them supported the Labor Parliament, or became involved in the international labor movement until the early 1860s when the movement's nature and objectives were quite different. Jones missed another opportunity to create the mass movement that was necessary for the achievement of the international labor movement's goals.

Jones' best effort at creating a mass agitation came in the fall of 1854 when Louis Napoleon pardoned Armand Barbés, a former companion of Blanqui. Jones seized the occasion to invite Barbés to a working-class reception in London. He feared the illustrious revolutionary would fall into the hands of "sham democrats and charlatans," as had Kossuth in 1851. A Welcome Committee was established, but it was broadened at the Committee's next meeting to become a Welcome and Protest Committee in

---

[53]Gammage, Chartist Movement, pp. 394-95; Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels, February 13, 1855, in Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 238-39; and Buchanan, "Trade Unions and Public Opinion, 1850-75," pp. 228-29.

[54]Briggs, Victorian People, p. 172.

order to also protest the coming state visit of Louis Napoleon. On the Committee were Jones, Finlen and several others of Chartist and internationalist background such as George Harrison, William Slocombe and J. B. Leno.[55] The Committee met twice weekly throughout November. Although Barbès declined to attend the celebration due to ill health, two positive actions were undertaken. Support from areas outside London trickled in from Newcastle, Barnley and Nottingham.[56] Second, at the November 26 Committee meeting a deputation of French exiles acting for M. Schoelcher attended and sought to join the Committee. Jones declined their offer because he wanted a genuine British expression. They acquiesced but still offered to help. George Harrison's response revealed the basic internationalist inclination of this group:

> The sooner we sink nationalities, the sooner we will be free. We are the oppressed of England, but the soldiers of all. Our creed is: Universal Democracy--the world a republic, and everyman a brother.[57]

International philosophy, refugee sympathy and a desire for mass public support were essential to the Committee's success. Shortly, they pursued all three.

They announced their public meeting for December 4 in the Hall of Science, Holborn. It was chosen to commemorate Napoleon's December 4, 1851, massacre following the coup d'état. Resolutions against the alliance with France and in favor of English alliances with the Poles,

---

[55] People's Paper, October 21, 1854, p. 4 and October 28, 1854, p. 4.

[56] Ibid., November 4, 1854, p. 1 and November 11, 1854, p. 4.

[57] Ibid., December 2, 1854, p. 4.

Hungarians and Italians were approved. An amendment supporting the French alliance failed for lack of a second. Jones made an excellent speech in which he challenged Englishmen to support the nationalities because ". . . they who bartered the liberty of others will never be recipients of their own."[58] The Welcome and Protest Committee had achieved its immediate goal of a public meeting despite police harassment. The police had ripped down its placards and pressured tavern owners into refusing them meeting space.[59] Police observation of potential revolutionaries remained a consistent policy.

Fresh from this success, the Committee decided to become permanent. After considerable squabbling, two organizations were created. Since Jones hoped to use the agitation to revive Chartism, a London Organization Committee was set up to act as the London branch of the NCA. Finlen broke ranks with Jones when Jones forced upon the LOC a European republican emphasis. Jones argued that Chartism needed to seek democracy at home and an alliance with democracy abroad. He thought new life could be infused into Chartism by reorganizing under the Charter the social program of the Convention of 1851 and of the Labor Parliament of 1854 and the universal goals of the democratic republic. In this Jones prevailed.[60] Insular Chartism had come far since 1839. Theoretically, Jones pointed to the future, but the internal differences of recent years made the LOC moribund. Within a few months it gracefully disappeared.

---

[58] People's Paper, December 9, 1854, p. 1.

[59] Ibid., October 14, 1854, p. 6 and December 9, 1854, p. 4.

[60] Ibid., February 10, 1855, pp. 4-5.

The second offspring of the Barbés venture offered greater hope. The International Committee emerged from a January 21, 1855, subcommittee meeting of Finlen, Jones, Slocombe, R. V. Wood, John Chapman, Searle and Brewster with five French refugees, who were led by Alfred Talandier.[61] It became the International Association in 1856 and lasted until 1859. In organization, philosophy and objectives it was the successor of the Fraternal Democrats and the precursor of the First International of 1864. Its history has been written in great detail elsewhere and will not be reiterated here.[62] Rather, this analysis accounts for its failure to assist the international labor movement achieve its goals.

The International Committee was formally established at a public meeting in St. Martin's Hall on February 27, 1855. An international socialist emphasis predominated. Jones chaired the gathering and gave a powerful speech in which he urged the working classes of Europe to cooperate. Beneath a large red flag, bordered in white and inscribed with the words "THE ALLIANCE OF THE PEOPLE" Jones called for protests against alliances with tyrants, for help for the nationalities and for the rights of labor. He connected the latter two objectives in a concise summation that smacked of Marxian class consciousness:

> Thus much for our alliances. Our further duty is to restore the oppressed nations to independence. But what independence? I

---

[61] People's Paper, January 27, 1855, p. 4.

[62] Rothstein, From Chartism to Labourism, pp. 166-81 presents a simplistic version of it; Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 212-36 is detailed and accurate, and he reprints a number of scarce documents; Braunthal, History of the International, I, 74-83 fits it into the preliminaries of the First International; and Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 56-59 discusses Jones' role in its formation, but does not pursue it further.

> say "internal" as well as "external." Independence from the aristocrat and usurer within, as well as from the Czar or Emperor without. Better no Poland than a royalist or oligarchic one. Better break the sceptre of the nation on the graves of its buried freemen than place it in any other than the sovereign people's hands. The oppressed and crushed nations have not bled and suffered for this--to be made a catspaw of middle class liberals--an English election cry--and then be left to perish. Yes! be free Poland! be free Italy! be free Hungarians! but you are not the only oppressed nationalities. We take a nobler and wider view. For us, nation is "nothing," man is "all." For us the oppressed nationalities form but one: the universal poor of every land--that struggle for life against the nation of the rich--that mighty race of which every man gives health, labour, life unto society, and receives starvation, disease, and hostilities in return. Let none misunderstand the tenor of this meeting: we begin tonight no mere crusade against an aristocracy. We are not here to pull one tyranny down only that another may live stronger. We are against the tyranny of capital as well. The human race is divided between slaves and masters. The producers are the slaves--the idlers are the monsters; and the idlers take to themselves what the slaves produce. We say, then, that to be free, the workman must be able to produce for himself. Work is bread--bread is life; to free life you must free labour that gives bread. Liberty is the right to live by your own labour, and to enjoy what your own labour yields, without leave asked of any. If capital . . . is necessary for labour, the labourer has a right to the necessary capital; and until labour commands capital, instead of capital commanding labour. I care not what political laws you make, what Republic or Monarchy you own--"man is a slave."[63]

Jones thrust the social question to the forefront. He foresaw a class oriented struggle aimed at restructuring society throughout Europe. In short order the French, Polish and English internationalists sent delegates to sit on the Committee under Jones' Presidency. Instead of living up to its promises, the International Committee followed the precedent of earlier organizations and confined itself to issuing addresses and staging public meetings. Due to an illness Jones retired from the Committee and his difficult work fell to men of lesser ability.[64]

---

[63] People's Paper, March 3, 1855, p. 4.

[64] Ibid., March 24, 1855, p. 5; May 19, 1855, p. 5; July 21, 1855, p. 6; and September 29, 1855, p. 6. See also Brock,

George Harrison, William Slocombe, R. Workman, J. B. Leno and Mr. Nash were incapable of expounding Jones' vision to the English workers. They were poor imitations of Jones and Harney and, although granted ample space in the People's Paper, they failed to inspire many. To gain action from a working class that basked in moderate prosperity and gloried in war-time jingoism required skill as well as dedication.

Furthermore, the interminable wrangling among the refugees hampered class unity. The refugees constituted a more significant element in the movement than they had at any time since the 1851 arrival of Kossuth, but they could not cooperate. For example, in September 1855 Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin and Kossuth issued a manifesto calling for all republicans to unite under their banner.[65] In a polemical pamphlet Louis Blanc responded; he informed the three republicans that they could not justly claim the allegiance of a majority of the republicans as long as they opposed the socialists.[66]

The proper method of achieving their objectives was not only debated between individual refugees but was approached from opposite ends by the existing organizations. The LAFP agitated for Polish freedom with total disregard for the International Committee. The LAFP sent lecturers

---

"The Polish Revolutionary Commune in London," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXV, 118.

[65][Louis] Kossuth, [Guiseppe] Mazzini, and [Alexander] Ledru-Rollin, Manifesto of the Republican Party (London: Holyoake and Co., 1855). For additional statements by Mazzini at about the same time see Guiseppe Mazzini, Two Letters to the People of England on the War (London: n.p., 1855).

[66]Louis Blanc, Observations on the Recent Manifesto of Kossuth, Ledru Rollin, and Mazzini (London: Holyoake and Co., 1855). Parts of the pamphlet were printed in the People's Paper, October 27, 1855, p. 1 and Reynolds's Newspaper, October 14, 1855, p. 4.

throughout the country and petitions to Parliament. Its thirteen petitions with 17,823 signatures in 1854 and twenty-nine petitions with 5,585 names up to May 1855 failed to convince the British government to put a Polish Legion in the field against Russia. LAFP member Edmund Beales, a London Radical, claimed the same importance of Polish independence for European civilization as did the International Committee. He argued within the narrow confines of politics and made no mention of the wider area of social reform. But then the LAFP had never gone that far.[67]

The international movement had suffered from the beginning from these internal differences. In the midst of the Crimean War, which offered the movement its best chance of success since 1848, ideological problems continued to plague it. Equally as bad, the advance guard on the Left was largely ignored by its major competitors. Either the moderates had written off any real threat of working-class agitation or the Left was simply too weak to warrant the kind of opposition that the Fraternal Democrats had received.

More likely the Left's weakness was the cause of its isolation, although it managed to conduct a viable propaganda campaign. Blanc's castigation of the triumvirate for their preference for verbal action over physical action could just as easily have described the Left. The International Committee was intimately connected with the French Commune révolutionnaire, which was one of the most violent of the refugee groups. An incident caused by members of this group presented the International Committee with a chance to marshall working-class support for its program.

---

[67]Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, Report of the Twenty-third Annual Meeting, pp. 17, 37, 44-55.

The middle class was presented its opportunity for a similar attack on aristocratic government in January 1855 when J. A. Roebuck called for an inquiry into the condition of the army at Sebastopol. That action led directly to a change in governments, a general questioning of aristocratic superiority and a heightened sense of middle-class consciousness.[68] That the working-class spokesmen failed to do the same with their incident reflected their weaknesses and showed that the strength of aristocratic government could still be applied against a working-class agitation outside parliament if not against middle-class attacks within Westminster.

On September 22, 1855, the Commune révolutionnaire celebrated the September 1793 French Revolution at the John Street Institute. The Commune révolutionnaire had been created following the December 2, 1851, coup d'état. Félix Pyat, G. Jourdain, Marc Caussidière, J. B. Boichot, Alexander Besson and Alfred Talandier and other left-wing Blanquists and socialists were its leading members. It communicated with various revolutionary societies in France and published L'Homme in Jersey; it left both the French and English authorities with an uneasy feeling.[69] At the John Street meeting Pyat read a letter addressed to Queen Victoria. He summarily noted the refugees' appreciation for the refuge they received in England and castigated the Queen for her recent state visit

---

[68] Briggs, Victorian People, pp. 52-86.

[69] For the Commune révolutionnaire see Payne and Grosshans, "Exiled Revolutionaries," American Historical Review, LXVIII, 964-65; Braunthal, History of the International, I, 79; and Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 204-12.

to France; he charged that the meeting with Napoleon denigrated Victoria's honor, that Napoleon was little better than a criminal and that England was allied with a usurper. Pyat published the letter in L'Homme on October 10 and The Times led a public outrage that resulted, according to earlier historians, in the Jersey exiles being forced off the island.[70]

The Jersey expulsion was not a simple case of a precipitant reaction to an unfortunate letter. Rather, it was the culmination of nearly a decade of police harassment. In Jersey there resided about 120 French, Italian, German and Polish refugees. Beginning in the summer of 1853 Sanders periodically traveled to Jersey and filed numerous reports concerning refugee activities. He returned to the island many times over the next three years, as the Lt. Governor, Major General Frederick Love, pleaded with the Home Office for his intelligence services.[71]

Sanders noted throughout the fall of 1853 a corresponding heightening of activity in Jersey as the Eastern Question intensified. He kept a close watch over the Comité révolutionnaire, the island's branch of the Commune révolutionnaire, and identified its chiefs as Victor Hugo and his two sons, Pierre Leroux and Charles Ribeyrolles, who had been in England since November 1851.[72] Although most of his reports

---

[70]People's Paper, September 29, 1855, p. 6; L'Homme, October 10, 1855; Rothstein, From Chartism to Labourism, pp. 174-75; and Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 215-16.

[71]Lt. Governor [Major General Frederick Love] to H. Waddington, September 15/17, 1853, H.O. 45/4816; Lt. Governor of Jersey to Henry Fitzroy, September 24/27, 1853, Ibid.; Lt. Governor of Jersey to Henry Fitzroy, 3/6 [no month] 1853, Ibid.; Lt. Governor to Henry Fitzroy, December 6/9, 1853, Ibid. For a history of Jersey see Alban E. Raggs, A Popular History of Jersey (Jersey: Walter E. Guiton, 1895), pp. 136-53.

[72]Enclosure, Report, July 1, 1853, H.O. 45/4816; Report,

reflected his serious attitude, occasionally Sanders revealed his susceptibility to that ever-present temptation of the undercover agent: over-dramatization. For example, he noted that the more affluent refugees, such as Hugo and his friends, frequently rented horses and met for discussions in open ground at isolated places. Major General Love believed these meetings showed the sinister intentions of these men who publicized the doctrines of socialism and communism. Love duly noted the appearance of the refugee journal, L'Homme, on November 30, 1853, and mentioned its propaganda potential.[73]

But the approach of trouble in Turkey and the reopening of the question of the nationalities in Eastern Europe were the issues that caused the authorities their greatest concerns in late 1853. A small group of Utopian Socialist Poles lived in Jersey. Zeno Swietoslawski and Colonel Telecki led them. Their 1853 celebration of the 1830 Polish Revolution drew the attendance of Hugo, Leroux and Ribeyrolles. It also caught Major General Love's attention, as did a November 29 gathering of 250 refugees and their sympathizers who discussed the Eastern Question.[74]

By 1855 Jersey had become the most serious center of left-wing refugee agitation. The Commune révolutionnaire maintained relations with

---

September 13, 1853, Ibid.; Proceedings of the French and Hungarian Political Refugees in Jersey, October 10, 1853, Ibid.; Report, November 8/10, 1853, Ibid.; and Report, November 19, 1853, Ibid.

[73]Report, October 15, 1853, H.O. 45/4816 and Lt. Governor of Jersey to Henry Fitzroy, October 19/22, 1853, Ibid.

[74]Lt. Governor of Jersey to Henry Fitzroy, December 3/6, 1853, H.O. 45/4816 and Lt. Governor of Jersey to H. Waddington, December 10/13, 1853, Ibid. See also, Brock, "Zeno Swietoslawski," American Slavic and East European Review, XIII, 566-87.

the International Committee and its national societies, Deutsche Arbeiterbildingsverein, the NCA and Lud Polski. L'Homme, which Ribeyrolles edited and which operated under the ownership of Count Pianciani, had become the primary non-English outlet for the refugees. It and the refugees were a constant irritant to Napoleon. Sergeant Sanders had spent a considerable part of 1854 and 1855 on the island watching these men.[75]

The authorities in London became more reactionary than in earlier periods. Palmerston was appointed Prime Minister on February 4, 1855, following the successful Roebuck motion. Palmerston's earlier moderate attitude toward refugee activities changed once he occupied his new office. He discovered that taking on the leadership of the country in the depths of the Crimean debacle required that he act with strength. His Home Secretary, Grey, had never sympathized with the refugees and the Earl of Clarendon, who stayed at the Foreign Office, was susceptible to foreign pressure regarding the refugees. In addition to these circumstances, Love's accounts of events in Jersey proved instrumental. He reported to the Home Office that the refugees held secret meetings to plan the assassination of the Emperor and that they smuggled books and pamphlets into France. He called them dangerous people.[76] Then the brother of the

---

[75]Lt. Governor of Jersey to Henry Fitzroy, M.P., April 15, 1854, H.O. 45/5180; Lt. Governor Love to H. Waddington, January 10, 1855, H.O. 45/6188; Lt. Governor Love to Henry Fitzroy, March 2/6, 1855, Ibid.; and Lt. Governor Love to H. Waddington, September 28/October 2, 1855, Ibid. For two of Sanders 1854 reports see Police Report: Political Refugees in Jersey, J. Sanders, April 26, 1854, H.O. 45/5180 and Police Report: Political Refugees, J. Sanders, May 15, 1854, Ibid.

[76]Lt. Gov. Love to H. Waddington, March 31/April 3, 1855, H.O. 45/6188.

Pianori tried and failed to kill Napoleon. The English authorities believed that he had fled to Jersey; Sanders was sent there in the late summer of 1855 under direct orders from Grey, as transmitted through Mayne, to investigate. Although he could not locate the man, tensions remained high.[77]

The decisive communication in the crisis came from Love. He wrote to Grey on August 4 that:

> The conduct of the Refugees has already had a very serious effect in demoralizing the youth of the Island, many of whom have become Red Republicans. It is the decided opinion of most of the respectable inhabitants of the Island, as well as my own, and which I have before in my correspondence expressed, that the residence of the Refugees . . . will be of incalcuable mischief to the inhabitants of the Island and end in alienating the Jersey generation from England and the Government.[78]

Upon the strength of the refugees' threat to the moral fibre and political reliability of the island's inhabitants the Government prepared to act. Palmerston wrote:

> I think these French exiles ought to be sent away from the Channel Islands where they are doing far more mischief to France and England than they could accomplish in London. The best way would be to send them off gradually. The most violent first. The rest by installments.[79]

The decision to remove the Jersey exiles was reached in August not in October, as was so long thought. The open letter to the Queen merely allowed the policy's fulfillment.

---

[77]W. Hammond to H. Waddington, July 31, 1855, H.O. 45/6188; Sanders to Sir Richard Mayne, August 4, 1855, Ibid.; Lt. Gov. Love to Sir George Grey, August 7, 1855, Ibid.; Report, Sanders, August 9, 1855, Ibid.; and Memo, Sanders, August 12, 1855, Ibid.

[78]Lt. Gov. Love to Sir George Grey, August 4, 1855, H.O. 45/6188.

[79]Memo, Palmerston, August 14, 1855, H.O. 45/6188.

Sanders reappeared in Jersey in late September and returned reports to his superiors confirming the inflammatory and dangerous nature of the refugees. He reinforced previous depreciatory views of them in noting that they frequented the "low beer shops" of workers in order to gain the lower class's allegiance. Furthermore, he noted the existence of a regular correspondence between Jersey, France, London, Belgium and the United States and that the Jersey refugees claimed an alliance with the Chartists. Sanders labelled the refugees' conduct "infamous" and feared a disturbance might occur between them and the local population which disliked them.[80] His reports were ordinarily accurate and he was less inclined to exaggerate or create situations than his predecessors in the spying business, although he certainly give his superiors information that conformed to their predispositions. His prediction came true when following the October 10th printing of the letter to Victoria a crowd of 2,000 locals demonstrated against the continuance of the refugees on the island. Love exercised the permission Grey had granted him on that same day to expell the troublemakers and sent Ribeyrolles, Pianciani and Thomas, L'Homme's printer, to Guernsey.[81] That action resulted in thirty-five refugees signing a placard protesting the expulsion. In an act of deliberate provocation, it was printed in L'Homme and distributed throughout Jersey. Included in this group were Victor Hugo and his two sons. Palmerston made the decision to expell them.

---

[80] Report, Sanders, October 5, 1855, H.O. 45/6188.

[81] Sanders to Capt. Labalmondiere (Commissioner of Police, Jersey), October 14, 1855, H.O. 45/6188; H. Waddington to Lt. Gov. Love, October 10, 1855, Ibid.; and Lt. Gov. Love to H. Waddington, October 18, 1855, Ibid. For an account of the Jersey inhabitants' meeting see Jersey Independent, October 20, 1855, p. 3.

Love suppressed L'Homme and sent the last of this group to Guernsey on November 3. The entire project proceeded peaceably, although one refugee had the last word when he shouted from the boat as it pulled away, "Vive La Republique Universalle et social."[82] Before departing the island Sanders informed his superiors that quiet prevailed again. He claimed that a small number of Jersey residents had provoked the refugees' placard declaration through their persistent efforts to incite the foreigners. His concluding remark foretold difficult times for the authorities in London:

> I am further informed that Reynolds, Ernest Jones, Mazzini, Ledru Rollin, Kossuth and many other Refugees are not strangers to the disturbances in London, and that their object is to keep up the excitement; their only object is to push the people to violence.[83]

The internationalists failed to fulfill Sanders' prediction, although they pressed their case before the English worker. An agitation commenced immediately. Jones and the International Committee dominated it. Pianciani set the tone of these meetings in a letter to the People's Paper in which he charged that the letter to the Queen had provided but

---

[82]For the placard see "Declaration," H.O. 45/6188; it was also printed in L'Homme, October 24, 1855, and People's Paper, November 11, 1855, pp. 1, 6. For Hugo see Kenneth Ward Hooker, The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 105-42. Brief accounts of the expulsion are in Raggs, A Popular History of Jersey, pp. 143-44 and Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review for Social History, III, 215-16. For the relevant correspondence see Lord Palmerston to Sir George Grey, October 23, 1855, H.O. 45/6188; Lt. Gov. of Jersey to H. Waddington, October 25, 1855, Ibid.; Lt. Gov. Love to H. Waddington, October 27, 1855, Ibid.; Lt. Gov. Love to H. Waddington, October 31, 1855, Ibid.; and Lt. Gov. Love to H. Waddington, November 3, 1855, Ibid.

[83]Police Report: Jersey Exiles, Sanders, November 20, 1855, H.O. 45/6188.

the excuse to expell them and that the police had persecuted them.[84] Throughout November the incident received sympathetic coverage in several newspapers. Besides Jones' paper, the Morning Advertiser, Reynolds's Newspaper, and the Reasoner presented London readers with numerous stories. In the provinces the Newcastle Guardian, Glasgow Sentinel, the Bristol Mercury, the Manchester Examiner, the Birmingham Journal, the Gateshead Observer, the Devenport and Plymouth Telegraph, the Leeds Freeman and others followed the London papers' lead.[85]

As in the past, public protest meetings were held. In London four demonstrations were convened to express sympathy with the refugees. Several of the refugees attended the gathering held on New Years' Eve and Jones spoke at two others. All were peaceful. Although the internationalists recognized the Jersey expulsion as a real threat, they were unable to marshall a great popular outburst of support. The intensity and emotion of earlier agitations under similar circumstances were missing from their speeches and addresses. The movement in London was moribund. Its vitality was sapped due to years of disappointments, internal squabbles and failures.[86] In the provinces protest meetings were conducted at Glasgow, Paisley and Newcastle. At Paisley an audience listened to James Finlen and drew up a traditional resolution of protest, but at Glasgow a stormy meeting was held. Under the chairmanship of

---

[84] People's Paper, October 20, 1855, p. 5 and October 27, 1855, p. 5.

[85] See Hooker, Victor Hugo, p. 120.

[86] For these meetings see the People's Paper, November 17, 1855, p. 1; November 24, 1855, p. 5; January 5, 1856, p. 5; and Hooker, Victor Hugo, p. 130.

James Moir, an old Fraternal Democrat now a city councillor, Finlen and Edward Masson, editor of the radical Scottish Daily News, levied charges of French interference and launched a vicious diatribe against Napoleon, the English aristocracy and the Queen's government. That was too much and the crowd hissed them down.[87] The temper of Scottish internationalism had cooled; in the days of Fraternal Democrat agitation and Harney's fall 1851 travels through Scotland such demonstrations had been received sympathetically. The middle-class ideal had triumphed.

Although the agitation failed, the "old" internationalist Harney occupied a central position in it. On November 12 Cowen's Newcastle Foreign Affairs Committee met to protest the Jersey expulsion. The Committee passed two resolutions: one charged the government with an arbitrary action that was contrary to the spirit of the constitution; the other labelled the expulsion an "act of criminality" and called upon Englishmen to resist any government effort to reimpose an Alien Act on the refugees. Copies were sent to Palmerston, Grey, Clarendon, Love, Hugo, Pianciani, Herzen, Worcell, Ledru-Rollin, Kossuth, Ribeyrolles, Pyat and the Committee of Polish Exiles.[88] Harney had moved to Jersey in the summer of 1855. Although he played no part in the letter affair itself, he acted as Cowen's intermediary and delivered the Newcastle

---

[87]Hooker, Victor Hugo, p. 130 and People's Paper, December 8, 1855, p. 1.

[88]"Notes on a speech at a public meeting of the Newcastle on Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee on the expulsion of the Jersey Exiles, [Joseph Cowen, junior], November 17, 1855, A.398, Cowen Collection; Cutting, Reynolds's Newspaper, November 17, 1855, A.416, Ibid.; and Jos. Cowen, jun. to Sir George Grey, November 20, 1855, and Jos. Cowen, jun. to Victor Hugo, November 19, 1855, A.420, Ibid.

group's letter containing the resolutions to Hugo.[89] Harney's stature remained high among Hugo's circle. Hugo's son, Francois, and Pianciani maintained a correspondence with him. They asked for his aid and good offices to gain access to English internationalists, such as Cowen, and to sympathetic newspapers, and sought his advice about the publication of an English translation of a pamphlet that Victor Hugo wrote to present his version of the expulsion.[90] In addition, Harney wrote a series of articles for the Reasoner. Although he produced no proof then or years later in a reminiscence, he believed that Bonapartist spies and agents were responsible for the expulsion.[91] Nothing came of his efforts.

The Jersey Expulsion Committee achieved little more. Its efforts to raise a subscription for the exiles proved futile. On November 19 it had £4 12s 6d on hand; a week later its accounts had dipped to £1 14s 4d.[92] No additional reports were printed. This collection drive fell short of any previous effort. Internationalism could generate neither monetary support nor class enthusiasm in the midst of its last chance to achieve its goals through revolutionary means. After the New Years' Eve meeting no further agitation was mounted to help the exiles.

---

[89] Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, p. 114, footnote 6; for an elementary discourse by a Jersey stonemason and communist see Norman Le Brocq, "George Julien [sic] Harney in Jersey," Marxism Today, XV (December, 1971), 366-68.

[90] For the letters of Francois Victor Hugo and Luigi Pianciani to Harney see Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, pp. 113-17, 137-39.

[91] Reasoner, December 16, 1855, p. 301, December 23, 1855, p. 309, January 6, 1856, p. 5, and January 20, 1856, p. 21 and George Julien [sic], Harney, "Victor Hugo in Jersey," Athenaeum, June 20, 1885, p. 791.

[92] People's Paper, December 8, 1855, p. 4.

The year 1855 marked the high point of "proletarian" internationalism. Proletarian disillusionment surfaced in 1855. Jones sought cooperation with the middle-class Administrative Reform Association, which had invited Chartist cooperation. He discovered that the City men sympathized little with working men and told English workers that the middle class was no better than the aristocracy.[93] He then advocated cooperation with the middle-class State Reform Association; it also failed. O'Brien and Reynolds opposed any dealings with the middle class. Consequently, Jones announced at the end of 1855 that "We have found middle class reformers powerless, . . ."[94] In May 1856 he wrote to Holyoake rejecting a working class and middle class alignment.[95] At this juncture Jones' thoughts were confused.

The "respectables" emerged from the Crimean War victorious. The international labor movement fell to their leadership. The "proletarians'" demise came rapidly. Tensions within the Chartists and internationalists regarding the question of cooperation with the middle-class reformers contributed to the international labor movement's failure to achieve its objectives. The end of the Crimean War brought additional disillusionment because the East European nationalities were ignored in the treaty that closed the war. Many of the "proletarians" who had risen to another challenge declined to continue. Furthermore, the ties between

---

[93] People's Paper, May 5, 1855, pp. 1, 4, May 12, 1855, p. 1, and May 19, 1855, p. 1.

[94] People's Paper, December 29, 1855, p. 1.

[95] "Fr. de J," "Ernest Jones and Chartism circa 1856," Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History, V (1950), 103-104.

the refugees and the English internationalists weakened. For example, on August 10, 1856, the International Committee became the International Association. Although the Chartists were still one of its four societies, no prominent Englishman of the earlier period participated in this proletarian, socialist revolutionary organization--and no new Englishmen of similar stature replaced them. The International Association, unlike the Fraternal Democrats, was predominantly a refugee group. Its manifestoes were distributed within a small coterie of international exiles who read a few foreign revolutionary newspapers. Relatively little news about this group reached English workers, or for that matter, those who remained of the English internationalists.[96] Sergeant Sanders advanced this breakdown in communication between the refugees and the English. Between July and November he spent £402 5s 12d to send refugees to New York City. In 1856 he dispersed £881 1s 5d for the same business.[97]

In another area the triumph of respectability is evident. Ernest Jones was still a prominent leader in the labor movement, but on the question of reform his views had changed. By 1860 he had retired from active participation and moved to Manchester where he took up his legal practice, although he was active in Lancashire working-class politics until his death in 1869. W. E Adams described Jones' appearance at about this time:

---

[96]Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859," International Review of Social History, III, 222-36 and Braunthal, History of the International, I, 79-83.

[97]Account of Expenses for the Departure of French Political Refugees to New York, 1855, Mepol. 2/43 and Draft of Emigration Expenses for 1856, Ibid.

> Ernest Jones kept the old flag flying till he almost starved into surrender. When near its last gasp, he was in the habit of addressing open-air assemblages on Sunday mornings in Copenhagen Fields, now the site of Smithfield Cattle Market. I walked from a distant part of London, through miles of streets, to hear him. It was during the Indian Mutiny. The old fervour and the old eloquence were still to be noted. But the pinched face and the threadbare garments told of trial and suffering. A shabby coat buttoned close up round the throat seemed to conceal the poverty to which a too faithful adherence to a lost cause had reduced him.[98]

Jones' condition worsened until he was forced to sell the People's Paper to J. Baxter Langley; by then he was reduced to begging friends such as Robert Owen for money.[99]

Jones began organizing the last Chartist conference in April 1857. It finally convened on February 8, 1858. His proposal that certain middle-class reformers align with the Chartists underlined his belated conversion to cooperation, but split the few remaining Chartist faithful. He called upon the middle class to adopt manhood suffrage and the abolition of property qualifications for sitting in Parliament. The parliamentary radicals had already reopened the reform question. Under the leadership of Roebuck they had formed a Parliamentary Reform Committee in June of 1857 to include all those who had formerly belonged to Hume's "Little Charter" movement, the Parliamentary and Financial Reform Association of 1849-55, and the Administrative Reform Association of 1855. The new group's objective was a rate-paying suffrage, not manhood suffrage, and Bright was to lead outside the Commons in the country.

---

[98] Adams, Social Atom, I, 230.

[99] See Ernest Jones to Robert Owen, May 31, 1858, No. 2,959A, Robert Owen Correspondence; Ernest Jones to Robert Owen, June 2, 1858, No. 2,959B, Ibid.; and Ernest Jones to Robert Owen, June 3, 1858, No. 2,959C, Ibid.

Bright sat for Birmingham after August 1857. His campaign in 1858-59 for household suffrage for the boroughs, which he subsequently reduced to a three-pound rating, a ten-pound suffrage for the counties, redistribution and the ballot achieved little success outside the industrial cities.[100] Bright never introduced his bill and once again working-class hopes were dashed.

Yet, that was Jones' goal at the last Chartist Conference. On the fourth day of it various middle-class reformers met with the Chartists. Several London trade unions were also represented. William Allan and William Newton of the Engineers were the most prominent of them. A small deputation from the Parliamentary Reform Association attended briefly, but withdrew. But no parliamentary radical of any stature appeared and none were included in the Political Reform League, the new association that emerged to act for the Conference in London. Jones was satisfied with the Conference's results. He was now firmly committed to cooperation with other reform groups, although he argued for the retention of independent action for workers.[101]

The internationalists played no role in this reform agitation. Neither the middle-class groups nor Jones' Political Reform League, which ended in late 1858, paid any attention to the international labor movement. The Crimean War had dissillusioned Jones and he, too, downplayed international issues. The columns of the People's Paper carried

---

[100] Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 63-64; Gillespie, Labor and Politics, pp. 147-53; and Briggs, Victorian People, pp. 220-22.

[101] People's Paper, February 13, 1858, pp. 1, 4, 5, February 20, 1858, p. 1, and February 27, 1858, p. 1. See also Cabinet Newspaper, November 27, 1858, p. 1.

considerably less foreign affairs news in 1857-58. The Indian Mutiny, for example, received but passing mention. Five years earlier such an event would have dominated news in his paper. Rather, Jones focused on domestic affairs. His de-emphasis of internationalism was evident in a series of political soirees that he offered between October 7, 1856, and January 27, 1857. Only one of the five speeches dealt with foreign affairs, and it was a lackluster analysis.[102]

To counter Jones' Political Reform League several London Chartists created the National Political Union on February 24, 1858. They disapproved of Jones' middle-class cooperation and received support from Reynolds's Newspaper. The provisional executive of this group included T. M. Wheeler, William Slocombe, William Taylor and J. B. Leno.[103] All of these men were long-standing internationalists and all had recently cooperated with Jones on the Welcome and Protest Committee and the International Committee. Their emphasis on the Charter reflected the closer connection between internationalism and independent working-class reform than Jones was now willing to accept.

Jones' new reform ideas antagonized Marx and Engels. In November 1857 Marx wrote to Engels:

> . . . Jones is behaving stupidly. You know that long before the crisis--with no definite aim except to find some pretext for agitation in this likewarm time--he had arranged for a Chartist Conference, to which bouregois radicals . . . were also to be invited.

---

[102]For these speeches see People's Paper, October 11, 1856, pp. 1, 4, November 8, 1856, pp. 1, 4, November 29, 1856, pp. 1, 4, 5, December 6, 1856, pp. 1, 4, December 27, 1856, p. 1, January 3, 1857, p. 1, January 10, 1857, p. 1, January 31, 1857, p. 1, and February 7, 1857, pp. 1, 4.

[103]See Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, pp. 69-70.

> The ass should first form a party, for which he must go to the factory districts. Then the radical bourgeoisie will come and ask him for compromises.[104]

In January 1858 Marx noted that both Reynolds and O'Brien opposed any compromise with the middle class and accused Jones of becoming a middle-class dupe. Adding injury to insult, Marx bemoaned Jones' discontinuation of asking his advice.[105] Engels found cause for greater dispair:

> This business with Jones is very disgusting. . . . For the rest, it seems to me that Jones' new move, taken in conjunction with the former more or less successful attempts at such an alliance, is really bound up with the fact that the English proletariat is becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat as well as a bourgeoisie.[106]

Working-class internationalism during the Crimean War years maintained radical reform expectations, but failed to accomplish its own goals or those of the middle class radicals. This period witnessed a proliferation of internationalist organizations, but they were all limited to a narrow segment of confirmed agitators and their allied refugees. Aside from Urquhart's movement, no international organization gained a mass following, and the 3,000 Urquhartites hardly swept the country with their program. But the Bright-led movement to redefine political reform, which developed out of the middle-class reform organizations of the Crimean period and which persisted in several forms between 1858 and 1867, did affect a considerable impact on the English labor

---

[104] Marx to Engels, November 24, 1857, Marx and Engels, Correspondence, 1846-1895, pp. 100-101.

[105] Marx to Engels, January 14, 1858, Marx and Engels, Correspondence 1846-1895, p. 102.

[106] Engels to Marx, October 7, 1858, Marx and Engels, Correspondence, 1846-1895, p. 115.

movement. Out of it grew a class cooperation that contributed to the success of the reform agitation leading up to the Reform Bill of 1867. The internationalists' contribution to the English labor movement came in their intellectual input in furthering socialistic ideas among some English working-class leaders. Gauged in these terms working-class internationalism paled into insignificance beside middle-class radicalism.

The internationalists' failure to achieve their goals emanated from two circumstances. First, the authorities' steadfast resilience confronted them at every point. The call for English assistance to the East European nationalities to gain their freedom was ignored or suppressed, whatever its inspiration. Second, the internationalists squandered what strength they possessed through their inability to define their priorities regarding the nature of reform, its relation to internationalism, and where it ought to come first. Jones' fleeting cooperation with middle-class reformers near the end of this period only confused further the movement's ideological content. Consequently, the Government acted towards the international labor movement as if it were becoming powerless--which it was.

CHAPTER V

RESPECTABLE INTERNATIONALISM, 1858-1864

After the Crimean War the middle-class radicals led the quest for political reform in England. MacCoby contends that Palmerston forestalled these reform efforts and that foreign affairs distracted the working class from seeking reform. Gillespie and Leventhal believe that the issues of Italian freedom, American slavery and Polish revolution furthered the working-class cause through bringing its leaders into closer cooperation with the radicals and demonstrating labor's respectability and patriotism.[1] In these years an alliance was forged that enabled middle-class spokesmen to influence the labor movement. The working class accepted middle class leadership and ideology; in short, it became respectable.[2] That acceptance, when coupled with the growth of the not-so-new "New Model" unions and their transformation after the 1850s into a respectable pressure group pursuing piecemeal economic legislation, dealt the international labor movement its deathblow.[3]

---

[1]MacCoby, English Radicalism, 1853-1886, pp. 51-83; Gillespie, Labor and Politics, pp. 110-11, 213-22; and F. M. Leventhal, Respectable Radical: George Howell and Victorian Working Class Politics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 47-53.

[2]See Trygve R. Tholfsen, "The Transition to Democracy in Victorian England," International Review of Social History, VI (1961), 226-48.

[3]Pelling, British Trade Unionism, pp. 50-86 and W. Hamish Fraser, Trade Unions and Society (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974).

Respectability permeated the international labor movement after the Crimean War, but neutralized rather than spurred the movement's pursuit of its social and political goals. Brian Harrison and Patricia Hollis argue that the labor historians err in their "wrong-turning theory" about cooperation with the middle class.[4] Yet, the evidence of 1832, of Lord Russell's reform schemes of the early 1850s and of the bills brought forward between 1857 and 1864 indicates that the middle class no less than the upper class had not accepted labor's rightful place in society and politics. Nor did William E. Gladstone's manipulations preceding Benjamin Disraeli's "Leap in the Dark" reflect much change in that attitude. Neither Liberal politicans nor middle-class radicals envisaged wholesale social and political changes. Since the working class leadership now accepted their superior's hegemony and guidance, the best the English labor movement could expect was piecemeal parliamentary reform. Working-class internationalism had no place in that program. I will argue in the pages below that during the agitations about Italy, American slavery and Poland the same respectability that brought about closer class cooperation penetrated working-class internationalism to such an extent that it rendered it incapable of pursuing its reform objectives, much less of achieving them.

On January 14, 1858, an attempt to assassinate Louis Napoleon III as he arrived at the Paris Opera failed. The would-be assassins, Felice Orsini and his four Italian refugee compatriots, sought to

---

[4]Brian Harrison and Patricia Hollis, "Chartism, Liberalism and the Life of Robert Lowery," English Historical Review, LXXXII (July, 1967), 504.

encourage the Emperor to assist in the creation of an Italian state. Luckily he lived and, although his motives differed from theirs, he did aid the Kingdom of Sardinia in its quest for an Italian national state. The investigation into Orsini's plot established a connection between the five men and the internationalists in England that strained English-French relations. In order to appease the Emperor, Palmerston, then Prime Minister, proposed a Conspiracy to Murder Bill. The working-class response to this entire incident illustrated the extent of "respectable" permeation of the international labor movement.

The official correspondence between Lord Clarendon at the Foreign Office and Lord Cowley, the Ambassador at Paris, indicates that they deplored such irrational violence yet fought to restrain the French outburst against English laws. Cowley described the situation in Paris with candor. Following a concise narrative of events, Cowley sent his superior on January 17 a private dispatch in which he warned of an expected French protest against the protection given the refugees in England.[5] Count Walewski, the French Foreign Minister, asked Cowley several hard questions. For example, he charged that the conspirators had hatched the plot in England and that one of them, a man named Pierre, had traveled to Birmingham where the bombs were made. Cowley was also pressed for statistics about the number of refugees living in England. Walewski informed him that the governments of Europe were hostile towards England because of the refugee problem and stated that Belgium and Sardinia had agreed to do France's bidding. Of course, the aggressive,

---

[4]Cowley to Clarendon, January 15, 1858, no. 62, F.O. 27/1241 and Cowley to Clarendon, January 17, 1858, no. 64, Ibid.

Anglophobic letters that some army officers were publishing in Le Moniteur made an impression on Cowley.[6]

He did his best to blunt the French demands which he thought were instigated due to the actions of certain Frenchmen who sought to exaggerate the seriousness of the situation. He warned Walewski that too much pressure on Palmerston's Government might backfire because public opinion would react adversely against such blatant intervention in English affairs.[7] Throughout, Clarendon approved of Cowley's actions.[8]

Acting from London Clarendon tried to appear conciliatory yet firm towards the French demands in the hope of appeasing Louis Napoleon but not raising Parliament's ire. He warned the French several times of the need for moving quietly in dealing with the refugees. The experience of previous international demonstrations weighed heavily in his reasoning.[9] To counter the French charges about the Italian refugees in England, Clarendon hinted that he was not above admitting publicly that the French had deported many of them to England.[10]

---

[6]Lord Cowley, The Paris Embassy during the Second Empire, ed. by F. A. Wellesley (London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1928), pp. 145-47, 153. See also Cowley to Clarendon, January 21, 1858, no. 90, F.O. 27/1242; Cowley to Clarendon, January 29, 1858, no. 119, Ibid.; Cowley to Clarendon, January 29, 1858, no. 121, Ibid.; and Cowley to Clarendon, February 1, 1858, no. 134, Ibid. As for the improbability of Austria joining France in pressing for the expulsion of all the refugees from England see F.O. to Cowley, February 2, 1858, Draft no. 163, F.O. 27/1234.

[7]Cowley to Clarendon, January 17, 1858, no. 67, F.O. 27/1241 and Cowley to Clarendon, January 29, 1858, no. 119, Ibid.

[8]See F.O. to Cowley, January 19, 1858, Draft no. 99, F.O. 27/1233 and F.O. to Cowley, January 30, 1858, Draft no. 151, Ibid.

[9]See F.O. to Cowley, January 16, 1858, Draft no. 84, F.O. 27/1233 and F.O. to Cowley, January 21, 1858, Draft no. 116, Ibid.

[10]Lord Cowley, Paris Embassy, p. 148.

But his willingness to assist the French investigation exceeded his fear of popular dissension in England. He offered English aid on January 16, before a request was received. Without direct French pressure he sent a police agent to Birmingham to check the Orsini and Pierre connections there and he offered to send to Paris a Frenchman in the pay of the Metropolitan Police who knew the refugees.[11] The Birmingham investigation yielded a number of papers that were sent to Cowley for the French prosecutors; also sent were seven documents that Pierre requested for his defense.[12] In response to Cowley's January telegraphic query about the number of refugees in England, Clarendon informed his ambassador that 2,210 refugees were in London. About 400 of them were Frenchmen, 460 were Germans, 250 were Hungarians, 50 were Italians and 150 were Spanish. Presumably, the majority of the remaining 900 were Poles, although that is not explicit in the dispatch. The LAFP listed 769 Polish refugees in England as of May 3, 1858. Since the Society ignored the Polish socialists, the figure derived from the Foreign Office dispatch is probably correct. The Foreign Secretary also noted that the Government had paid passage to New York for 960 men, 305 women and 33 children. Although no inclusive dates were cited, previous evidence indicates that most of these émigrés were sent out after 1848.[13] These figures are the only composite

---

[11] F.O. to Cowley, January 16, 1858, Draft no. 84, F.O. 27/1233; F.O. to Cowley, January 18, 1858, Draft no. 91, Ibid.; and F.O. to Cowley, January 18, 1858, Draft no. 92, Ibid.

[12] Mayne to H. Waddington, February 26, 1858, Mepol. 1/46. For a French request for certain items and a prosecution witness to appear at Orsini's trial see Cowley to Clarendon, February 4, 1858, no. 148, F.O. 27/1242.

[13] F.O. to Cowley, January 21, 1858, Draft no. 117, F.O. 27/1233. See also Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, Report of

statistics available for the refugees for this period. The ease with which they were supplied to Cowley reflects the effectiveness of the Metropolitan Police control over these people. Although the 2,210 figure represents less than one half of the number that had resided in England at the beginning of the decade, London still contained a considerable group of potential dissidents. Although maintaining observation over them strained the existing police facilities, Sanders and the detectives managed sufficiently.

Two related issues reflected Clarendon's conciliatory attitude. Despite Clarendon's reminder that the Channel island refugees had been neutralized in 1855, the French government remained convinced that a connection existed between them and the assassins. Consequently, the French government insisted that Great Britain tighten the procedures for obtaining passports in Jersey. Clarendon remonstrated but acquiesced. He then published a notice in the London Gazette and several daily newspapers informing his countrymen that French officials would not allow anyone to land without a passport.[14] A second acquiescence involved the Conspiracy to Murder Bill. M. de Persigny, the French Ambassador to St. James, informed Walewski, who told Crowley, that Clarendon had indicated that Her Majesty's Government intended to appease

---

the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London: Geo. H. Nichols, 1859), p. 7.

[14]F.O. to Cowley, January 18, 1858, Draft no. 92, F.O. 27/1233; F.O. to Cowley, February 13, 1858, Draft no. 210, F.O. 27/1234; and F.O. to Cowley, February 18, 1858, Draft no. 242, Ibid. The latter contains a copy of the notice. For an explanation of the Government's practice of placing official notices in the London Gazette see E. P. Thompson, "The Crime of Anonymity," in Douglas Hay, et al., Albion's Fatal Tree (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975), pp. 255-57.

French public opinion with a bill that would enable English authorities to deport foreigners who conspired against foreign monarchs or who upset tranquility abroad. On this issue Cowley advised Walewski to avoid publicity and warned him not to expect too much. Walewski thought a "moral effect" was all that was necessary. Cowley suggested that the French ought to respond to such a bill with a promise to end the practice of sending undesirables to England. In the future, Walewski said, such people would be sent to America.[15] In response to Roebuck's question about this pressure, Palmerston admitted that the measures being suggested were encouraged by France, but contended that the British Government would do the same if the attack had been made on the Queen's life.[16]

Regarding the refugees, in 1858 France secretly paid the transportation cost for those that Louis Napoleon wanted removed from England. Lord Cowley informed Walewski that no refugee could be sent out of England against his will, "but that measures could be taken to let it be known that we are disposed to send applicants. . . ." The "measures" were, no doubt, police pressure. Lord Malmesbury, then Foreign Secretary, declined to send more than 300, but the Under Secretary at the Foreign Office, Mr. Hammond, doubted the existence of that many "dangerous men who would wish to emigrate."[17] The French provided two lists of French and Italian refugees; the lists included the names

---

[15]Cowley to Clarendon, January 22, 1858, no. 98, F.O. 27/1242.

[16]Hansard's, CXLVIII (30 December 1857-22 February 1858), pp. 762-63, 766-68.

[17]Hammond to Mayne, April 24, 1858, Mepol. 2/43.

of Jourdain, Ledru-Rollin, Pyat, Ribeyrolles, Mazzini, Pianciani, Simon Bernard and seventy-five lesser-known men. Between April 30 and August 28, 194 exiles were sent off at a cost of £2,032 4s 4d.[18]

The refugee exodus received a boost when on August 16, 1858, Louis Napoleon offered a full amnesty to nearly everyone convicted of political offenses. Most of them had returned to France by the early 1860s.[19] At approximately the same time, the English authorities began to avoid refugee problems. When towards the end of 1858 a legal question arose regarding the return to Jersey of some of the refugees expelled in 1855, the Home Office offered advice but allowed Lieutenant Governor Numby to make the final choice.[20] By then no one considered refugees a serious problem.

I conclude from this evidence that the governments of France and Great Britain agreed on a general policy towards political refugees. Their desire was to suppress refugee activity in order to forestall democratic or socialistic political and social reform. That many of these exiles were on the political left only intensified the power structure's dislike of them. For the international labor community in England

---

[18] Francais que de Gouvernement de l'emperour verrait avec plaisir s'éloijver de Londres et gagner les Estates Unis, and Refugiés deserteurs avant quitté Gèneve ou devant le quitter encore pour l'intener ou s'éloigner de la Suisse, Fevrier-Juin, 1858, Mepol. 2/43 and Accounts for Departing French and Italian Political Refugees to New York, 1858, Ibid.

[19] Payne and Grosshans, "The Exiled Revolutionaries," American Historical Review, LXVIII, 970-71. Jones assumed that every refugee who returned home would seek vengeance thereafter from within France rather than from England; see Cabinet Newspaper, August 27, 1859, p. 4.

[20] Lt. Gov. Major General Numby to H. Waddington, October 13, 1859, H.O. 45/6333; H. Waddington to Lt. Gov. Numby, October 22, 1859, Ibid.; Lt. Gov. Numby to Grey, October 14, 1859, Ibid.; and Robert Marett (Advocate General) to Lt. Gov. Numby, November 2, 1859, Ibid.

this incident created an opportunity for agitation. This time effective action resulted but it came from middle-class reformers who had only marginal interests in internationalism.

Parliamentary and working-class reaction to Palmerston's proposed bill was vociferous. In the Commons the Radicals, led by Roebuck, W. J. Fox, Duncombe, Richard Monckton Milnes, Thomas Milner-Gibson and Bright stood fast against the Government. They decried it as an attack on English liberties. On the first reading on February 9, the bill passed 299 to 99, largely due to the support of Disraeli and the Conservatives. But in the next ten days public opinion outside Parliament stiffened and Disraeli seized the opportunity to align his 146 followers with 80 Liberals and Radicals to defeat Palmerston on the bill's second reading 234 noes to 215 ayes.[21] Palmerston resigned and Lord Derby and Disraeli formed their brief government. The internationalists' long-hoped-for fall of Palmerston was achieved. Of course, as Reynolds predicted,[22] the Conservatives were no more amenable to the internationalists than was Palmerston.

What was the role of international working-class agitation in this change of governments? Thomas Frost wrote:

> The attempt to make Parliament a machine for registering the decrees of the French Emperor roused a spirit all over the country which Palmerston must have supposed to be extinct. The

---

[21] Hansard's, CXLVIII (30 December 1857-22 February 1858), pp. 933-57, 980-1081 and 1741-1847. See also Ridley, Lord Palmerston, pp. 647-68 and Robert Blake, Disraeli (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1966), p. 363.

[22] Reynolds's Newspaper, February 28, 1858, p. 1.

> masses of the metropolis swarmed into Hyde Park again, and demonstrations against the bill were made Sunday after Sunday, at which stronger language was used than I had heard since 1848.[23]

Yet divisiveness prevailed. The LAFP presented Louis Napoleon with an address from fifty-six refugees congratulating him on his escape from death. The Polish Revolutionary Commune issued a statement declaring that address unrepresentative of the Polish exiles.[24] The thirty-nine members of a conservative Italian Constitutional Party, which advocated the creation of an Italian Confederation modelled on the German Confederation, issued a statement deploring the assassination attempt.[25] But Reynolds and Jones claimed that "assassins" such as Napoleon had to expect attempts on their lives.[26] The internationalists feared the introduction of a new Alien Bill which they believed would be an attack on their liberties and issued calls for protest meetings throughout the country.[27] The incident also elicited expressions of Francophobia.[28] This feeling was buttressed with an element of class resentment. Samuel Kydd combined them:

---

[23]Frost, Forty Years' Recollections, p. 270.

[24]Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, Report of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London: Geo. H. Nichols, 1858), p. 12 and People's Paper, February 20, 1858, p. 4.

[25]People's Paper, March 6, 1858, p. 3, March 13, 1858, p. 6; and Leader, March 13, 1858, p. 254.

[26]Reynolds's Newspaper, January 17, 1858, p. 9 and People's Paper, January 23, 1858, p. 4.

[27]See People's Paper, January 23, 1858, p. 4, February 6, 1858, p. 6; Reynolds's Newspaper, February 21, 1858, p. 1; and Leader, February 6, 1858, p. 137.

[28]People's Paper, February 20, 1858, p. 4 and Reynolds's Newspaper, January 31, 1858, p. 8 and February 14, 1858, p. 1.

> . . . We cannot afford him [Louis Napoleon] to dictate from Paris what English law should be, as he does through his organ at "Albert-gate." . . . For Queen Victoria! to do duty in a police force, under orders from Louis Napoleon, and commanded in person by M. [de] Persigny, and threatened by military opinion, is rather more than even John Bull, in the excess of his loyalty, ought to sanction with his approval.[29]

These opinions had little effect on the policymakers, although they indicated the internationalist opposition to any additional curtailment of refugee privileges.

But a pivotal middle-class public meeting held in London on February 15 impressed the authorities and strengthened the Radical's position. The gathering at the Freemason's Hall in Great Queen Street drew 4,000 people.[30] Although the People's Paper may have padded the figure, some credence may be given to the meeting's importance because the authorities deemed it significant enough to observe it. In the Metropolitan Police files is a 168-page carefully hand-written account of its proceedings. Only the Fraternal Democrats had received such careful scrutiny. Several M.P.s sent their regrets, but all denounced the proposed bill. Included among them were Fox, Bright, Sir De Lacy Evans, William Scholefield, Charles Gilpin and James White. Alfred Bate Richards, dramatist, former editor of the Daily Telegraph and later editor of the Morning Advertiser from 1870 to 1876, and the chief promoter of the volunteer movement in 1859, was in the chair.[31] The speakers were Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Sexton, Ernest Jones, Washington Wilkes,

---

[29]Samuel Kydd to editor, February 1, 1858, Reynolds's Newspaper, February 7, 1858, p. 7.

[30]People's Paper, February 20, 1858, p. 6.

[31]Stephen and Lee, eds., Dictionary of National Biography, XVI, 1096-97.

Mr. Macintosh, George Leverson, John Cunningham and Mr. McGilchrist. Except for Jones and Wilkes none of these men had ever spoken at an international working-class meeting. This gathering was convened under middle-class direction, but the speakers pursued a goal of the international labor movement. The speeches and resolutions echoed the fears put forward in the internationalist and radical presses.[32]

The Freemason's Hall meeting called for a public meeting in Hyde Park on Sunday February 21 at 3:00. The Committee of the Hyde Park Demonstration, whose prominent members were Holyoake and J. Baxter Langley, planned an assembly with no speeches, a vote of hands to show approval of the Freemason's resolutions and the presentation of a new memorial to the Queen. After the vote, the Committee requested that everyone leave the park in a quiet and orderly manner. They recognized the potential for a disturbance and predicted that spies and "hostile persons" would be responsible. This desire for a peaceful show of public opinion was their paramount concern and permeated their plans. It reflected the order-conscious middle-class bias of respectable internationalism. In the tradition of middle-class Radicalism, they, through Holyoake, asked Lord John Russell to present a petition to the Commons; Holyoake received an affirmative reply. When the bill failed in the Commons on February 19 the Committee cancelled the demonstration. But the members feared two days was an insufficient time to inform the public and sent a deputation to Sir Richard Mayne's office in Scotland Yard to request police advice on how to accomplish their aim without

---

[32]Proceedings convened for the Purpose of taking into Consideration Lord Palmerston's Conspiracy Bill held at the Freemason's Hall, Great Queen Street, February 15, 1858, Mepol. 2/68.

inconveniencing the public.[33] Such timidity rankled Reynolds, who called the proposed demonstration a "dumb show" and compared it to a Quaker meeting.[34]

Despite their efforts, a large number of persons assembled at Hyde Park. The Leader, which then barely counted as an internationalist organ, labelled these people "roughs" and castigated the "idle and disreputable" fellows who came out for mischief. What occurred was a classic example of class feeling in which police, foreigners and upper-class people were pelted with dirt and rocks. Several of the ruffians received jail sentences for their fun. But the Leader cautioned against future Sunday park gatherings which, it contended, served only to concentrate London trouble-makers in one area.[35]

The London working class, however, remained in an unsettled frame of mind for three months. Three prosecutions were the cause. The first of these cases involved Dr. Simon Bernard, who was accused of playing a central role in the assassination conspiracy. He was arrested on February 14 while Palmerston was still in and examined at Bow Street before being remanded for trial, but was tried after Derby became Prime Minister.[36] In the second case the radical bookseller and publisher Edward Truelove was arrested the week after Bernard and charged with

---

[33]Notes, George Jacob Holyoake, February 16, 1858, No. 1001, Holyoake Collection; MSS of "A London Revolution," [1858], No. 1002, Ibid.; Handbill, Demonstration in Hyde Park, [1858], No. 1003, Ibid.; and George Russell to George Jacob Holyoake, February 16, 1858, No. 1004, Ibid.

[34]Reynolds's Newspaper, February 21, 1858, p. 8.

[35]Leader, February 27, 1858, p. 197.

[36]For the arrest and examination see People's Paper, February 20, 1858, p. 3, February 27, 1858, p. 4; and Leader, February 20, 1858, p. 170.

seditious libel against Louis Napoleon for distributing the anonymous pamphlet entitled Tyrannicide: Is It Justifiable? The author was W. E. Adams who left a vivid account of the Metropolitan Police's harassment and of the intensity of the Home Office's investigation.[37] The third prosecution involved a Polish bookseller, Stanislas Tchorzewski, who was arrested on March 23 for selling a pamphlet written by Felix Pyat, Alexander Besson and Alfred Talandier. He was tried along with Truelove.[38]

The working class interpreted the prosecutions as evidence of the Government's acquiescence to Louis Napoleon and as an attack on the freedom of the press. On both counts they were correct. During Bernard's appearances before Mr. Jardine at Bow Street, the two governments cooperated in exchanging evidence relevant to Orsini's and Bernard's cases. Although Derby allowed the prosecution of Bernard to proceed, his Government did so reluctantly and resisted a French request for another bill similar to Palmerston's. Lord Malmesbury informed M. de Persigny that the question of the insufficiency of English laws depended on the outcome of the Bernard and Truelove trials.[39]

All three men were acquitted. Reynolds declared Bernard's successful defense an English defeat of French influence and claimed a

---

[37] People's Paper, February 27, 1858, p. 4 and Adams, Social Atom, II, 357-61. For another account of the arrest see James Rigby to Robert Owen, February 26, 1858, No. 2,869, Robert Owen Correspondence.

[38] People's Paper, March 27, 1858, p. 7 and Adams, Social Atom, II, 363. For the Metropolitan Police's intention to arrest him see Mayne to Hammond, March 18, 1858, Mepol. 1/46.

[39] F.O. to Cowley, February 23, 1858, Draft no. 257, F.O. 27/1234 and F.O. to Cowley, March 3, 1858, Draft no. 26, Ibid.

victory for trial by jury.[40] According to the London News, a translation of Mr. Edwin James' defense speech was distributed to French workers who paid subscriptions for it.[41] The June trials of Truelove and Tchorzewski hinged upon the issue of freedom of the press. The Truelove Defense Fund Committee, which evolved into the Press Prosecution Defense Committee, aided both men in paying for their defenses. Although these assistance committees reflected an older international labor tradition, middle-class men dominated their membership. James Watson was treasurer and P. A. Taylor played a significant part in collecting the paltry sums available. Both of the charged men received a verdict of not guilty in return for expressing their regrets to the court and promising to discontinue such activities.[42]

Working-class internationalism gained nothing from these trials despite the obvious interconnection between the individuals, their ideas and the general philosophy of the international labor movement. Although these were insignificant men, in the past men equally as nondescript had aroused serious agitation through the publication of their causes. In this instance, Bernard, who was saddled with an £850 defense debt, became a popular lecturer, but only for a few months. Once his notoriety wore off, his dreary lectures drew sparse crowds.[43]

---

[40] Reynolds's Newspaper, April 25, 1858, p. 8. For accounts of the trial see People's Paper, April 17, 1858, p. 3; April 24, 1858, p. 4; and MacDonell, ed., Reports of State Trials, VIII, 887-1063 and 1901-96.

[41] London News, June 5, 1858, p. 1.

[42] Reynold's Newspaper, June 20, 1858, p. 1, June 27, 1858, p. 1; and Adams, Social Atom, II, 362-72. For the defense funds see People's Paper, March 20, 1858, p. 4, March 27, 1858, p. 4, April 10, 1858, p. 6, and May 1, 1858, p. 1.

[43] For some examples of his lectures and speeches see Reynolds's

Although the internationalist press had disclaimed anything other than sympathy with assassination, the evidence indicates a philosophical predisposition towards violence. Two examples will suffice. Holyoake, who was hardly a man caught up in violence, had in 1856 taken two bombs concealed in a black brief bag along with him to Sheffield where he lectured to a working-class audience. At Sheffield he tested one of the bombs in a rock quarry. These were a preliminary model of the Birmingham bombs that were used against Louis Napoleon. He did this task for Mazzini, who claimed they were to be used in Italy; Holyoake denied that either of them had any knowledge of the bombs' future use in Paris.[44] Secondly, there is the involvement of Thomas Allsop in the assassination plot. Orsini used his passport to travel to Belgium and then to Paris. Allsop defended his participation in the conspiracy because he ". . . was against the Emperor's killing innocent people on the 2nd of december [sic]."[45] Allsop was a London stockbroker who included among his friends O'Connor, O'Brien and Owen.[46]

Newspaper, May 2, 1858, p. 6, March 13, 1859, p. 9; London News, June 5, 1858, p. 1, July 17, 1858, p. 1; Broadsheet: Lecture by Dr. Bernard, June 8, 1858, A.610, Cowen Collection; and Cutting, Daily Express, June 16, 1858, A.611, Ibid.

[44]Holyoake, Sixty Years, II, 19-25 and McCabe, Holyoake, I, 248-50.

[45]Anne Allsop to Robert Owen, March 25, 1858, No. 2,879. Robert Owen Correspondence. The police originally thought Allsop had made the trip across the Channel and pursued him doggedly until he left the country for New York. A reward of £200 was offered for him until July 1858. After the reward offer was dropped he returned to England. Mayne to Hammond, March 6, 1858, Mepol. 1/46 and London News, July 17, 1858, p. 1.

[46]Ray Faherty, "The Memoirs of Thomas Martin Wheeler, Owenite and Chartist," Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, no. 30 (Spring, 1975), 11-13 contains biographical information about Allsop.

Despite sympathy for terrorist actions even within the "respectables," a popular demonstration other than under middle-class direction eluded the weakened international labor community. The best it could muster was a spy mania. In a series of letters to the press the refugees complained about the stepped-up harassment from foreign and English "spies." Sanders and the other detectives who sought evidence for the various trials were identified as the English culprits.[47] The internationalists especially resented the Metropolitan Police practice of employing foreigners who were assigned to assist English policemen in cases involving the refugees. An example was constable Ticcini (or Tinnicci) of Italian descent who accompanied detective Frederick Williamson in the arrest of Dr. Bernard.[48] From the authorities' position such men were necessary for the police to function properly.

The existence in England of a corp of foreign spies is more difficult to establish, but not incomprehensible. The wild claim of Gerald Massey that French spies were in Newcastle excited public opinion, but was grounded in hysteria not fact.[49] The change that _agents provocateurs_ dogged the footsteps of certain refugees in hopes of encouraging them to compromise themselves was true, however. In 1858 two

---

[47]For two refugee letters see _Reynolds's Newspaper_, January 31, 1858, p. 1 and for the refugee reaction to the increased police surveillance see the _People's Paper_, February 13, 1858, p. 3 and February 20, 1858, p. 6.

[48]_Reynolds's Newspaper_, January 31, 1858, p. 8; _People's Paper_, February 20, 1858, p. 4; and _Leader_, February 20, 1858, p. 170.

[49]Cutting, _Manchester Examiner_, February 25, 1858, A.553, _Cowen Collection_ and _People's Paper_, March 6, 1858, p. 1.

such men arrived in England. One focused upon the Italian refugee leaders and the other directed himself at Ledru-Rollin.[50] These were isolated instances and working-class suspicions of a counter-conspiracy were unfounded. The police contributed to this misunderstanding through their efforts to avoid having to disclose their use of detectives. At Bernard's trial cross examination revealed that John Rogers, who had gathered much of the evidence against the refugee, was a detective.[51] The manner in which he was exposed compounded the police error because it strengthened the working-class belief that spies populated London and that police in general were a threat to English liberty.

Englishmen who were concerned about their liberty tried during the Italian unification wars of 1859-62 to revive English interest in the Italian cause. The old international labor movement concept of a connection between reform on the continent and in England found no place in this agitation. Such ideas were now viewed as a distraction from home politics. With a few exceptions, politicians and their allies dominated this effort.

Interest in Italian freedom recurred periodically after the Crimean War. An address from a group of working men in Genoa to the working men of England, dated September 11, 1856, caused a number of middle-class men, some of them previous members of the SFI, to start up a subscription to purchase 10,000 muskets for Italian revolutionaries.

---

[50] Calman, Ledru-Rollin après 1848, pp. 174-75. Holyoake knew personally two agents provocateurs. Such men, he wrote, always advised "'speaking out.'" See Holyoake, Sixty Years, II, 3-9.

[51] MacDonell, ed., Reports of State Trials, VIII, 928, 932-39 and Reynolds's Newspaper, April 18, 1858, p. 8.

The Newcastle-upon-Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee had a public meeting with a Mr. Gregson, a watchmaker, in the chair on September 29 to receive the address and start the subscription. The Committee sent an address to the workers of Genoa claiming overwhelming English working-class support for their cause and pledging to support them both morally and materially.[52]

These Italian workers were Mazzinian political agitators. They were mouthpieces for Mazzini, who was in Genoa.[53] The publications of the Italian National Committee bore the imprint of Mazzinian philosophy as he prepared for yet another uprising.[54] The Emancipation of Italy Subscription's English sponsors included Jerrold, Cowen, P. A. Taylor, W. H. Ashurst, Edmund Beales, William Shaen, Stansfeld and George Dawson among other gentlemen. The men who contributed to the fund in 1856 were from the middle and intellectual classes. J. B. Baines collected funds from faculty members at University College, London. Professor Francis W. Newman was among the contributors.[55]

---

[52]The Working-Men of Genoa to the Working-Men of England, September 11, 1856, A.464, Cowen Collection; Broadsheet, Details of a Meeting in Newcastle on September 29, 1856, in aid of Emancipation of Italy Fund, A.468, Ibid.; and Newcastle on Tyne Foreign Affairs Committee to the Working Men of Genoa in Joseph Cowen, junior to Felice Casaccia, October 8, 1856, A.479, Ibid. See also People's Paper, September 27, 1856, p. 1; October 4, 1856, p. 1; Leader, September 20, 1856, p. 890; and October 4, 1856, p. 939.

[53]Mazzini to Emilie Ashurst, September 12, 1856, in Richards, ed., Mazzini's Letters, II, 54-55.

[54]See Printed Circular with Correspondence from the working men of Genoa on the Emancipation of Italy Fund, September [23], 1856, A.469, Cowen Collection and Leader, October 25, 1856, p. 1010.

[55]Address of the Emancipation of Italy Fund Committee, September 1856, A.478, Cowen Collection. For lists of contributors see Leader,

The Committee's objectives were similar to earlier "respectable" efforts. Its members called on the Italians to take the initiative, but promised material aid. Otherwise, it diffused information in hopes of bringing public opinion pressure on Parliament.[56] Together with what was collected for Garibaldi in 1860 the Committee raised £10,420. That made it the most successful of the popular subscriptions.[57] But the funds collected were wasted when the May 1857 Mazzinian uprising in Genoa failed and Mazzini returned to England empty-handed once again.[58]

The Committee lapsed into inactivity for four years. In the spring of 1859 the ominous threat of a French and Sardinian war against Austria raised international and Liberal hopes for Italian freedom. Unlike earlier foreign incidents that had resulted in popular demonstrations under working-class leadership, the coming Franco-Austrian War caused few workers to become politically active. Only Kossuth ventured out of London in the spring of 1859 to generate support for his cause. But he spoke to middle-class audiences, only, at the London Tavern on

---

October 18, 1856, p. 986, November 15, 1856, p. 1089, and December 20, 1856, p. 1204.

[56] Leader, September 27, 1856, p. 915 and December 13, 1856, pp. 1180-81.

[57] Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic Quarterly, 244. In Newcastle £55 14s 1d was collected but after deducting expenses only £13 17s 2d was sent to the London collection center. If these figures are indicative of other areas then the local organizations spent far more money than they turned in. Gossman does not clarify whether he is reporting a figure before or after expenses were deducted. For Newcastle see Financial Statement with particulars of the Emancipation of Italy Fund from September 29, 1856, January 3, 1857, A.487, Cowen Collection.

[58] Hammond and Hammond, James Stansfeld, pp. 32-34.

May 20, at the Free Trade Hall in Manchester on May 24, at Bradford on May 25 and at Glasgow on May 27.[59]

The circumstances of the carefully-staged speech in the Free Trade Hall illustrate the extent of the "respectables'" permeation of the international labor movement. George Wilson chaired the meeting. The former chairman of the Anti-Corn Law League was now chairman of the middle-class Lancashire Reform League. He later became Director of the Manchester and Leeds Railway and finally chairman of the Lancashire and York Railway.[60] Kossuth's close friend Francis Pulzsky communicated with Wilson in making the arrangements for the visit. Pulzsky suggested appropriate resolutions and requested the sequence of events from his reception through the conclusion of his stay. He wanted Wilson to arrange "some marked expression of sympathy" for Kossuth and argued for the placement of a notice in the papers to read that Kossuth was "invited by a large number of influential men in Manchester."[61] This concern for presenting a respectable image to the authorities was symbolic of Kossuth throughout his career. He spoke before a packed house at the Free Trade Hall, but the 1 shilling admission price precluded workers from attending. Although non-intervention was announced as the meeting's theme, Kossuth's speech was anti-Austrian.[62]

---

[59]Louis Kossuth, Memories of my Exile, trans. by Ferencz Jausz (London: Cassell, Petter, Gilpin and Co., 1880), pp. 191, 218, 241 and 258-59.

[60]McCord, "George Wilson," Manchester Review, VII, 431-36.

[61]Francis Pulzsky to George Wilson, May 15, 1859, George Wilson Papers, Manchester Public Library; the underlining is Pulzsky's. See also Francis Pulzsky to George Wilson, May 21, 1859, Ibid.

[62]Reynolds's Newspaper, May 29, 1859, p. 14.

This tour came in the midst of a General Election. The key issue in the election was Italian unification. Derby's Conservatives supported Austrian interests, although they did so unenthusiastically. The new alliance of Gladstone and Palmerston, who favored the Italian cause, won the election. Kossuth's speeches placed him and his applauding middle-class "respectables" in the Liberal camp. From the point-of-view of the working-class leadership the Italian question was bound up with the reform question.[63] But the international newspapers in London expressed a fear that the Italian issue would divert people's attention from home reform.[64] Jones, who stood for Nottingham in the 1858 election, had expressed this fear numerous times in 1858 and 1859.[65]

Gillespie's analysis of this election errs on two counts. She overemphasized the importance of the Italian question for working-class politics because she confused the middle-class Radicals, who were pro-Italian, with working-class leaders, who were slightly less pro-Italian. Secondly, she does not present any direct citations showing widespread working-class interest in Italian freedom during the election weeks, but analyzes the election within the context of a working-class desire for manhood suffrage. That is incongruous with her thesis.[66] The previous thirteen years' experience would indicate that working-class sympathy

---

[63]George Howell, Labour Legislation, Labour Movements and Labour Leaders (London, 1902), p. 140 cited in Gillespie, Labor and Politics, p. 145.

[64]See Reynolds's Newspaper, May 1, 1859, p. 1.

[65]London News, May 30, 1858, p. 1; Cabinet Newspaper, January 8, 1859, p. 4, January 15, 1859, p. 4, February 12, 1858, p. 4, and April 30, 1859, p. 4.

[66]Gillespie, Labor and Politics, pp. 181-86.

existed. But in April, May and June of 1859 I find only one working-class demonstration in favor of the Italian cause. It occurred in Hyde Park on May 9 when 5,000 persons disrupted a Radical meeting held to show English approval of Louis Napoleon's intervention. The crowd's reaction was more anti-Napoleon than it was pro-Italian.[67]

The one man who might have marshalled middle-class opinion on the Italian question and perhaps involved the working class was John Bright. But he would not take the chance. He even dropped his proposed reform bill during the campaign. Yet, the "respectables" sought his allegiance. Pulzsky had suggested him as chairman for Kussuth's Free Trade Hall meeting. Bright refused because he stood for neutrality not for helping the anti-Austrian Kossuth.[68]

In the spring of 1859 Frederic Harrison's efforts to enlist Bright's aid also failed.[69] Harrison and Edward S. Beesly were English Positivists who pursued a spirit of free inquiry based upon Auguste Comte's sociological teachings. They believed that organized public opinion could solve social and intellectual problems. Their quest for

---

[67] Reynolds's Newspaper, May 15, 1859, p. 6.

[68] John Bright to George Wilson, May 18, 1859, George Wilson Papers.

[69] Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers, British Library of Political and Economic Science, London School of Economics and Political Science. See also Frederic Harrison, Autobiographic Memoirs (2 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911), I, 187-88. Unfortunately the original letters in the Frederic Harrison Papers were undated. When they were assembled they were given dates, but it proved impossible to come closer than the year. Since none of them were numbered the citations that follow in this study are confusing. The only way to locate particular letters is to pull all those dated either [1858] or [1859] in Box 1, Section A and read them. H. L. Beales wrote a two page report that is available in the file folder index key to the contents of each box.

reform led them to advocate union militancy in the 1860s. Harrison was a lawyer and Victorian writer-to-the-reviews and Beesly taught history at University College, London.[70]

Their correspondence in 1858 and 1859 illuminates both Liberal and working-class opinion about Bright. It also reveals the nature of the evolving international labor movement. In 1858 Harrison called Bright the "only great public man we have." The next year, probably before the election, he compared Bright to Palmerston and Derby and concluded that the old Free Trader was thoroughly democratic. But he also noted Bright's impotence:

> Bright seems to me right and sound. I only wish he had shown some trace of the truth beneath--that the nations of Europe are so bound up they must act together. The public have a strong instinct of solidarity of peoples.

Harrison's intellectual perception of the people's solidarity exceeded the "proletarians'" expectations of eight or ten years previous. Perhaps the enthusiasm of youth caused him to confuse hopes with reality. Regardless, he did perceive that Bright lacked an international orientation:

> Bright is too sanquin. He has alienated the rich and has not gained the poor. Besides, being without a foreign policy he is hampered. There is a dull feeling that he is inferior to Lord Palmerston and Lord John because he only talks about "reform" and knows nothing of the "state of Europe."[71]

---

[70]Royden Harrison, "Professor Beesly and the Working-Class Movement," in Briggs and Saville, eds., Essays in Labour History, pp. 205-41. See also Austin Harrison, Frederic Harrison--Thoughts and Memoires (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1926); Davidson, Eminent English Liberals, pp. 204-16; Royden Harrison, "E. S. Beesly and Karl Marx," International Review of Social History, IV (Part 1, 1959), 22-58; Ibid., (Part 2, 1959), 208-38; and Bellamy and Saville, eds., Dictionary of Labour Biography, II, 162-74.

[71]For Harrison's comments of above see Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1858], Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers;

The "respectables'" approach to leading a genuine international labor movement is difficult to comprehend. On two points they differed from working-class opinion. This quest for Bright's adherence makes no sense, especially since Harrison knew in early 1859 from a man with trade union connections that the working men of London disliked Bright for his previous opposition to manhood suffrage and to the Ten Hours bill and that they "fear Bright's class."[72] If the workers feared Bright's class, they also distrusted Liberals such as Harrison and Beesly, despite Harrison's claim that he disliked plutocracy. Moreover, Harrison admired Louis Napoleon to the extent of considering him a masterful statesman; he regretted the suspicious attitude that Englishmen, particularly the working men, harbored towards the Emperor. After the French invasion in May, 1859 in aid of Sardinia, Harrison tried to establish a committee to counter English Francophobia but discovered that the Italian Mazzinians and their British allies, including P. A. Taylor and the "ultra-democrats," would not participate in any venture that aided the man of December 2.[73] Taylor's position came closer to working-class opinion about Napoleon than did Harrison's.

Only one conclusion is possible. The Positivists sought to submerge what remained of "proletarian" internationalism to "respectable" middle-class ideals. They wanted to blunt proletarian independence and

---

Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Ibid.; and Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Ibid.

[72]Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers.

[73]Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1858], Box 1, Section A, Ibid.; and Harrison, Autobiographical Memoirs, I, 188-89.

continue deferential politics within a social system under middle-class rather than aristocratic domination. Seen within the context of middle-class consciousness that emerged from the Crimean War Harrison's efforts at influencing the international labor movement are understandable.

His writings substantiate this theory. In 1858 he advocated artisan suffrage not manhood suffrage. His position reflected a cynicism common to the middle-class: "I want to give the artisan a vote not because I think it is right but because I think he will get some good indirectly by having it." Hence, Harrison's dislike for ". . . Ernest Jones and his lot [who] are hostile to Bright." His suspicion that Jones represented the London workers belied his fears of the proletariat.[74]

The interjection of the Italian question complicated but ultimately solved his problem. With a war about to break out and a General Election forthcoming he speculated: "I should not wonder if a European war of freedom ending in the independence of Italy, and the fall of L.N. [Louis Napoleon] were to be . . . followed by a radical move at home in fact /30 followed by /32."[75] He feared a repeat of the agitation prior to the Reform Bill of 1832. Whether that might actually have occurred is beside the point, although it seems unlikely, because he began an immediate campaign to flood the press, especially the cheap and Saturday papers, with articles arguing his case. He proposed that ten or twelve men write letters and pamphlets and organize public meetings to encourage ". . . peace--non-intervention--respectful watchfulness of

---

[74]Extract of a letter, Frederic Harrison, undated, Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers.

[75]Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Ibid.

Napoleon--reasonable precautions as to defense. . . --hostility to all coalitions, Holy Alliances, Treaties of Vienna, Balance of Power, any support of the Austrian or existing state-system."[76] In a letter, which was written after the Battle of Solferino, he emphasized two points. His writers were to focus on the cheap weekly and provincial presses which were friendly to foreign freedom but were too "ignorant" to accomplish much without quality articles provided them. Their enormous circulation offered the best opportunity to reach the masses. Among the papers he suggested were the Dispatch and the Sunday Times, although he sent his letters to the Daily News. He also suggested sending personal addresses to Jones and Holyoake to encourage them to adopt more respectable stances. Secondly, the entire project was intended to marshall public opinion to influence aristocratic government against involving England in a war to defend the Austrian Empire. Pulzsky approved of this program.[77]

The likelihood of England engaging in the war was nonexistent after Palmerston took office in June. Although favoring Italy's cause Palmerston and Russell made their position clear; it was for strict neutrality. Harrison concentrated on public opinion manipulation. Therein lay his search for Bright's cooperation on the one hand and for admittance of the artisans to the franchise on the other hand. Of necessity, he strove to encourage respectability in the international labor movement. The immediate accomplishment of his goal was squelched

---

[76]Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers.

[77]Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [1859], Box 1, Section A, Ibid.

when Napoleon signed the Peace of Villafranca and dropped out of the war. With his task incomplete, Harrison's praise for Napoleon turned to disappointment as he accused the Emperor of betraying Italy. Napoleon's failure to unify Italy made Harrison's position "unpleasant." He also had second thoughts about Bright: "How clear his position is, he needs no defense or explanation. Were we wrong to leave him?"[78]

Meanwhile, the internationalist press expressed its disappointment at the war's conclusion. Both Reynolds and Jones concluded that Louis Napoleon had cheated the Italians out of their freedom.[79] Jones speculated on a Garibaldian-led insurrection to gain what Napoleon had withheld.[80] In May 1860 Garibaldi began his campaign against the Kingdom of Naples. His success prompted Sardinia to move south and join his forces in uniting all of Italy except Rome and Venetia.

Garibaldi's exploits intensified English interest in Italy. He fascinated the working class, but the various schemes for aiding him were conducted under middle-class patronage and aimed at middle-class audiences. Internationalist expression in favor of Garibaldi took several forms. Reynolds reminded his readers that Francis II, the King of Naples, was married to a German princess who was related to Prince Albert.[81] Working-class internationalists had always believed that European aristocrats

---

[78]Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, [July 20, 1859], Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers.

[79]Reynolds's Newspaper, July 10, 1859, p. 1, July 24, 1859, p. 1; Cabinet Newspaper, July 16, 1859, p. 4, and July 23, 1859, p. 4.

[80]See, for example, Cabinet Newspaper, August 13, 1859, p. 4 and November 12, 1859, p. 1.

[81]Reynolds's Newspaper, May 27, 1860, p. 8.

felt more sympathy with one another than with their native populations.[82] In part, this was a xenophobic response. It also revealed a genuine sense of class awareness. The reaction to Albert fell in the first category and the concerns about the Italian situation fitted the latter.

Secondly, several committees collected money for the insurgents. The Emancipation of Italy Subscription was revived and various other new Garibaldi Funds were established throughout England and Scotland.[83] More important, an effort commenced to send British volunteers to help Garibaldi. Such a demonstration of enthusiasm was exactly what Harrison and Beesly had worked to forestall. Had they known how colossal a mismanaged affair it would become they might have breathed easier. In order to avoid legal prosecution under the Foreign Enlistment Act (Act 59th Geo. III, cap. 69) the Garibaldi Legion recruited "excusionists." Armed volunteers where sought, especially those who could pay for their own transportation, and about 550 were sent to Naples in mid-October of 1860. They arrived in time to fight in one engagement before the insurrection ended and Garibaldi withdrew to his farm at Caprera. About half of them returned to England and attempted to claim the wages promised to them but never paid. Many of the English manufacturing firms that had advanced materials on the promise of future payment also failed to collect. Apparently, some of the officers had embezzled part of the funds.[84]

---

[82]See Weisser, Working-Class Movements, pp. 89-90.

[83]Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII, 237, 244 and Newspaper Cuttings, Landor Praed [George Jacob Holyoake], Letter to Daily News, October 14, [1860], Holyoake Collection, Bishopsgate Institute, London and Newspaper Cutting, Landon Praed [George Jacob Holyoake], Letter to Daily News, October 29, [1860], Ibid.

[84]For the Garibaldi Legion see McCabe, Holyoake, I, 308-25 and

Such were the results of the romantic effort to aid in the establishment of an Italian state. It was not an indication of working-class internationalism. The men behind these projects were middle class. W. H. Ashurst, junior, Mr. Crawford, M.P., Mr. William Coningham, M.P., and Holyoake played the prominent roles. Concern for how society perceived the Garibaldi Legion ranked high among its promoter's priorities. Reverend H. N. Barnett informed a public meeting in the Literary Institute at Deptford that the men who fought for Garibaldi were not "rag-tag" but young patriotic gentlemen.[85]

After the Legion's failure attempts were made to collect money to pay off its debts and to maintain English awareness of the Italian question. For example, P. A. Taylor created the Garibaldi Italian Unity Committee along the lines of the SFI.[86] This group accomplished little except the publication of a pamphlet containing two lectures and two reprinted House of Commons speeches of James Stansfeld and the collection of some £2,000.[87] The monetary aid was extended in 1862 when

---

and Holyoake's own amusing but inaccurate account in his Bygones Worth Remembering, I, 243-58. See also Holyoake's letters written to the Daily News under the pseudonym Landor Praed between October 5 and December 26, 1860: Newspaper Cuttings, Holyoake Collection, Bishopsgate. The Legion's progress was followed in Reynolds's Newspaper, August 19, 1860, p. 10, August 26, 1860, p. 10, September 23, 1860, p. 14, November 25, 1860, p. 12, and December 23, 1860, p. 16.

[85] Reynolds's Newspaper, September 23, 1860, p. 6.

[86] Reynolds's Newspaper, January 20, 1861, p. 9, April 13, 1862, p. 4; P. A. Taylor to Joseph Cowen, junior, April 4, 1861, A.683, Cowen Collection; Address of the Garibaldi Italian Unity Committee, August 1861, A.690, Ibid.; Circular of the Garibaldian Italian Unity Committee, September 1861, A.692, Ibid.; and Newspaper Cutting, Daily News, April 21, 1861, No. 1,316, Holyoake Collection.

[87] James Stansfeld, The Italian Movement and the Italian Parties (London: James Ridgway, 1862) and Gossman, "British Aid," South Atlantic

Garibaldi unsuccessfully tried to take Rome and was defeated at Aspromonte.

This insurrection brought trade union influence to the forefront of working-class internationalism. An address to the workers of London from the General Neapolitan Society of Working Men of the Sections of Mutual Help, dated December 7, 1861, was published in Reynolds's Newspaper on January 5, 1862.[88] This society, which was probably a cooperative union, called upon English workers for sympathy. Its plea came at an appropriate time. The trade union movement had emerged much strengthened from the London builders' strike of 1859-60 over the nine-hour day. The builders' strike precipitated the emergence of the London Trades Council, or "Junta," which was designed to direct and guide London unionism. Robert Applegarth of the Carpenters, William Allan of the Engineers, Daniel Guile of the Ironfounders, Edwin Coulson of the Bricklayers and George Odger of the West-End Ladies' Shoemakers' Society dominated it in the 1860s. These unionists believed in a policy of conciliation with the bourgois economic world and pursued a strategy of commitment to improvement, self-help, moderation regarding strikes and respectability. They supported the "right" causes in order to prove themselves to middle-class Liberals. Italian unification was one of these causes and Harrison and Beesly were among the Liberals who

---

Quarterly, LXVIII, 237-38, 244. I arrived at this 1862 figure through computations based on Gossman's citation of £3,972 as the total amount collected in 1862 and 1864. He indicates that £1,972 of that sum was collected in 1864. In part his figures are taken from Rudman, Italian Nationalism, p. 326.

[88] Reynolds's Newspaper, January 5, 1862, p. 5.

exercised influence over the trade unionists.[89] The Webbs exaggerated the unity within the London trades unions. Odger, although a LTC member, Robert Hartwell, an ex-Chartist and later editor of the Bee-Hive, and George Potter, a joiner who was manager, editor and proprietor of the Bee-Hive, led the discontent against the larger amalgamated unions.[90] They were prominent in marshalling trade union support for Garibaldi in 1862 and 1864. The Bee-Hive was the most important trade union paper of the 1860s and through its pages international news reached the London working-class reader.

The actions of a middle-class organization calling itself the Working Men's Garibaldian Fund Committee preceded the unionists' active involvement in international issues. It called for a public meeting in Hyde Park on September 28, 1862, to express sympathy with the Italians and to protest French occupation of Rome. Unfortunately, when the fifty Garibaldians, led by the Secularist Charles Bradlaugh, arrived to harange the 20,000 assembled artisans, they encountered about 500 Irish laborers who pelted them with stones and bludgeons. The police finally cleared the grounds before a downpour sent everyone home. The English anti-Papal agitation of the past three years regarding Rome's exclusion from the Italian nation created this outburst of Irish nationalism and religiosity. The following Sunday a larger demonstration occurred; it

---

[89] Fraser, Trade Unions and Society, pp. 47-48, 59, 147. For the 1859-60 strike see Webb and Webb, The History of Trade Unionism, pp. 228-42.

[90] For Odger see Hinton, English Radical Leaders, pp. 328-39 and for Potter's and Hartwell's conflict with the "Junta" see Stephen Coltham, "George Potter, the Junta, and the Bee-Hive I," International Review of Social History, IX (Part 3, 1964), 391-432 and "George Potter, the Junta, and the Bee-Hive II," International Review of Social History, X (Part 1, 1965), 23-65.

resulted in pitched battles throughout the West End that lasted into the week.[91]

The Garibaldi riots were not confined to London. A serious disturbance broke out at Birkenhead across the Mersey from Liverpool. On the evening of October 15 a large group of "lower orders" Roman Catholics, mostly Irish, under the leadership of a priest attempted to prevent the British Parliamentary Debating Society from discussing Garibaldi's merits. Three hundred members of the Orange Society from Liverpool provoked the Catholics into a riot against property, which the local authorities put down with considerable difficulty. Attesting to the seriousness of the situation 82 members of the Cheshire constabulary and 1,000 special constabules assisted Birkenhead's 60 man police force. In addition, 150 soldiers from the 49th Regiment of Foot were brought in and quartered in several large buildings near the railway station in the vicinity of the debate. Although they were not required, the necessity for military reinforcement of the local authorities, despite the police reforms of 1856, was reminiscent of the early Chartist days. The soldiers remained in the area, although another expected riot failed to materialize. Similar outbursts occurred at Tralee, Drogheda and Newry. Eighteen rioters were held in Chester Castle under the guard of a detachment of troops until the Chester Winter Assizes began on December 11. Seventeen of them were convicted of rioting.[92]

---

[91] Reynolds's Newspaper, October 5, 1862, pp. 3, 4; Bee-Hive, October 4, 1862, p. 1; October 11, 1862, p. 1; and Sheridan Gilley, "The Garibaldi Riots of 1862," Historical Journal, XVI (December, 1973), 697-732.

[92] Chairman of Bench of Magistrates to Home Secretary, October 16, 1862, H.O. 45/7326; Enclosure, Daily Post, October 16, 1862, in J. K.

Thus, a simple pro-Garibaldi demonstration in Hyde Park sparked a riot and preceded a series of other similar disturbances. The disorders unsettled the authorities and were to have a profound impact upon official reaction to Garibaldi's 1864 visit to England. For the international labor movement these affairs were immediately significant. The Hyde Park assembly represented the first attempt at staging a huge rally since 1858. Although the meeting's results were distressing, such efforts at mass participation in internationalist activity were both reminiscent of earlier days and indicative of the future.

The international labor movement came under the direction of trade unionists who were capable of staging mass rallies. Following the Hyde Park debacle a new committee emerged in response to rumors that Garibaldi would visit England. The Trades Garibaldian Demonstration Committee sought a working-class welcome for the Italian patriot. On its executive were Odgers, Potter, Hartwell, William Randal Cremer, a joiner, R. W. Grey, a mason, and W. Tremlett, a joiner. In an address to Garibaldi, they claimed to represent 100,000 London artisans who sympathized with "their Italian brethren."[93] The Committee cooperated with a middle-class City of London Demonstration Committee of which John Richardson was secretary.[94]

Deardess to Grey, October 16, 1862, Ibid.; Sir Edward Cust to Grey, October 20, 1862, Ibid.; Grey to Sir Edward Cust, October 20, 1862, Ibid.; John Trevor to War Department Secretary, October 20, 1862, Ibid.; Horse Guards to Mr. Clive, October 21 and October 23, 1862, Ibid.; and Messrs. Walu and Bell to Grey, April 14, 1863, Ibid.

[93] Bee-Hive, October 25, 1862, p. 1, November 1, 1862, p. 1; and Reynolds's Newspaper, November 2, 1862, p. 3. For Cremer see Sir Howard Evans, Sir Randal Cremer: His Life and Work (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1909).

[94] Bee-Hive, November 8, 1862, p. 1, January 10, 1863, p. 5, and February 14, 1863, p. 1

Garibaldi's long-expected visit to England came in April 1864. The enthusiasm he generated exceeded that of Kossuth's arrival in 1851. Aristocrats, politicians, women, shopkeepers and workers responded to his appearance in England. Both the Trades Garibaldian Demonstration Committee and Richardson's City Committee revived and collaborated to stage a London welcome for their hero. The trade union group tried to retain its working-class character, but cooperated with the City Committee because both pursued a peaceful welcome. The trade union group appointed a subcommittee to accomplish its goals. The subcommittee consisted of Odgers, Coulson, Applegarth, Butler, a tin plate worker, Caysier, a joiner, Shaw, a painter, Cremer, J. R. Taylor, Mr. Davis, Potter and Hartwell. The latter two maintained relations with Richardson's group. Edmund Beales, who was prominent in the LAFP, was a member of the City Committee.[95]

Divisiveness, however, characterized the extended welcome. P. A. Taylor urged Cowen to see Garibaldi when the General landed at Southampton in order to encourage the patriot to travel directly to "Newcastle, Glasgow--Birmingham and other great places." Taylor feared that Garibaldi might fall into "harmful hands and surroundings in London."[96] Cowen did his best, but Garibaldi elected to spend his first days at the Isle of Wight under the influence of Mr. Charles Seely, Liberal M. P. for the Isle of Wight and W. E. Forster, a Liberal M. P. for Bradford. The latter openly courted working-class leaders, but focused

---

[95] Bee-Hive, March 26, 1864, p. 1.

[96] P. A. Taylor to Joseph Cowen, junior, March 22, 1864, A.730, Cowen Collection.

on the elite workers in an effort to prevent unified working-class agitation.[97] Holyoake also dreaded Garibaldi's falling into the wrong hands in London. Holyoake was himself nearly thrown off the special train that brought the General to the Nine Elms station of the South Western Railway in London. The secularist's presence was alarming to the "respectables" because they did not want to jeopardize Garibaldi's visit with a Mazzinian association. Although Holyoake managed to stay aboard, he did so on his own powers through promising to remain in the background. Forster refused to intercede for him. Holyoake's own "respectability" wore thin when placed beside the Liberals who were infiltrating labor's higher echelons.[98]

The London demonstration was meticulously planned. Its emphasis was upon order and at the request of Sir Richard Mayne banners and placards alluding to political and religious questions were prohibited.[99] The 1,500 police who monitored the procession route encountered the calmest monster street demonstration of the mid-Victorian period. Although Palmerston refused official sanction to a request to allow Volunteer Rifle Corps to line the streets, some, such as the 10th Tower Hamlets Volunteers, marched anyway.[100] At the railway station the General received addresses from the two committees and then 50,000 trade,

---

[97] Fraser, Trade Unions and Society, pp. 152-53.

[98] McCabe, Holyoake, I, 326-28 and Holyoake, Sixty Years, II, 119-25.

[99] Bee-Hive, April 9, 1864, p. 1.

[100] Reynolds's Newspaper, April 10, 1864, p. 4.

temperance and friendly society artisans, organized under J. Baxter Landley's direction, marched past him. Included in the procession were Italian, Polish and Hungarian refugees. The crowds along the five mile route from Nine Elms to the Duke of Sutherland's Stafford House, where Garibaldi would stay, dwarfed the trades demonstration. The Bee-Hive and Reynolds's Newspaper estimated that about one million people lined the streets in hopes of a glimpse of the Italian. The Times cited a figure of 5-6,000 marchers. Whichever was true, it represented a significant expression of international awareness.[101]

During the next few days Garibaldi saw various tourist sites throughout London and the immediate area, received invitations to visit nearly every important city in Britain, met with distinguished Englishmen and conversed with the political exiles. He spoke with Karl Blind, Ledru-Rollin, Louis Blanc and Alexander Herzen, in addition to many Italians. On Sunday April 17 he attended a luncheon at Herzen's Toddington address and made a speech praising Mazzini for his love of Italy and his devotion to liberty.[102] That same evening Gladstone saw Garibaldi at Stafford House and the next day the Queen was informed that Garibaldi would leave for Italy without touring the provincial towns.

The official reason for the departure was ill-health. Accusations and recriminations flooded working-class, radical and parliamentary circles. On May 10 Gladstone declared to a delegation from the City and

---

[101] Bee-Hive, April 16, 1864, p. 1; Reynolds's Newspaper, April 17, 1864, pp. 1, 6, 8; The Times, April 12, 1864, p. 12. See also Christopher Hibbert, Garibaldi and his Enemies (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965), pp. 341-42.

[102] Bee-Hive, April 23, 1864, p. 1.

Working Men's Garibaldi Committee that he had informed the General in Italian of a Dr. Fergusson's medical report which included a warning that if he went on the provincial tour his health might be impaired. Gladstone denied any political pressure and disclaimed responsibility for the General's impressions that Her Majesty's Government wished him to leave England. The deputation of Beales, J. R. Taylor, Shaen, Langley, Odger and Hartwell was unconvinced.[103] Their distrust emanated from a much paraphrased account of an interview about his meeting with Gladstone that Garibaldi had had with Cowen on April 19. Cowen's account, which was given to the City Committee on April 20, and Shaen's and P. A. Taylor's versions of the interview varied. Cowen later informed Holyoake that he had not spoken to Shaen at all and that the Reynolds's Newspaper copy of an explanation that he had sent to Hartwell was inaccurate.[104]

Despite the confusion, popular opinion held Gladstone guilty; he probably was. Harrison wrote to Beesly: "Gladstone is certainly a brazen liar."[105] Circumstantial evidence indicates that the authorities were uneasy about the effects of Garibaldi's visit on the lower classes and hence they were likely to encourage his early departure. Victoria

---

[103] Reynolds's Newspaper, May 15, 1864, p. 3.

[104] Bee-Hive, April 23, 1864, p. 1 and Reynolds's Newspaper, May 15, 1864, p. 3. For the explanatory letter see Reynolds's Newspaper, May 29, 1864, p. 8 and Bee-Hive, May 28, 1864, p. 1. For Cowen's clarification of that letter see Joseph Cowen, junior to George Jacob Holyoake, May 31, 1864, No. 1,543, Holyoake Collection. Much of the confusion arose from P. A. Taylor's attempt to involve Cowen in a literary exposé, which never appeared, of Gladstone's and the Earl of Shaftesbury's part in Garibaldi's leaving; see P. A. Taylor to Joseph Cowen, junior, April 25, 1864, A.810, Cowen Collection and P. A. Taylor to Joseph Cowen, junior, June 11, 1864, A.839, Ibid.

[105] Frederic Harrison to E. S. Beesly, March 1864, Box 1, Section A, Frederic Harrison Papers.

disliked him because of his association with democrats and refugees.[106] Although Palmerston dined with Garibaldi, the Prime Minister was suspicious of the Garibaldian demonstrations because they upset the Austrian and French governments and because he believed they were likely to arouse renewed democratic agitation in England.[107] Palmerston's fears were justified because the disgruntled Garibaldi committees turned a Working Men's Shakespeare Tercentenary Committee meeting on April 23 at Primrose Hill park into a protest meeting. The police dispersed the gathering under a standing order established after the 1862 Hyde Park disturbances.[108] Apprehension of another Garibaldi riot determined these official actions. Even the organizers of the April 11 procession expressed relief when Irish Catholic workers failed to appear and a ruckus was avoided.[109] Concern over riots was justified. But anxiety about a popular demonstration effecting governmental policy was exaggerated. As Holyoake said:

> . . . he [Garibaldi] must distinguish between popular sympathy and popular power. He might find himself the subject of the generous enthusiasm of the streets, but he must take it as the voice of the people, not the voice of the Government.[110]

The internationalists had long recognized the distinction. But whereas the "proletarians" had failed to integrate people and government, the "respectables" had worked to preclude such an agreement. After the

---

[106] Hibbert, Garibaldi and his Enemies, pp. 344-46.

[107] Ridley, Lord Palmerston, p. 771.

[108] Bee-Hive, April 30, 1864, pp. 1, 4, May 5, 1864, p. 1; and Reynolds's Newspaper, May 1, 1864, p. 8.

[109] Bee-Hive, April 16, 1864, p. 1.

[110] Holyoake, Bygones Worth Remembering, I, 232.

Primrose Hill affair some sixty men from both the middle class and working class, including Beales, Shaen, Beesly, Harrison and George Howell, a bricklayer, reconvened at another location. Howell made a proposal that led to the creation in 1865 of the Reform League which, although a working-class organization, included middle-class representatives. It played a central role in the agitation preceding the Reform Bill of 1867.[111] Palmerston, of course, missed all that.

Leventhal pinpointed the significance of the Garibaldi visit. It allowed a ". . . more inclusive blending of middle-class Radicals and trade unionists than the domestic reform effort had been able to achieve alone."[112] Garibaldi's short-term impact on the internationalists was negligible. The Reform League was the demonstration's only tangible result. But the reforms that it sought bore scarce resemblance to those of the international labor movement.

This blending of classes was furthered in two additional agitations. Since both of these have received ample analysis, a detailed account here is unnecessary. Rather, they are discussed as examples of class cooperation on the bureaucratic level that marked these years.

First, the American Civil War provided the Positivists an opportunity to cement their alliance with the trade unionists and with Bright. Beesly fostered this development. He organized a huge meeting at St. James' Hall, London, on March 26, 1863, in which he amassed on the

---

[111] Leventhal, Respectable Radical, pp. 48-49 and Gillespie, Labor and Politics, pp. 250-51.

[112] Leventhal, Respectable Radical, p. 50; see also Fraser, Trade Unions and Society, p. 125.

same platform the major London trade unionists under Bright's chairmanship. Bright's presence drew him into closer cooperation with these working-class elements as on the other questions of Italian and Polish nationalism he remained committed to non-intervention and hence somewhat removed from both the Positivists and the trade unionists.[113] This pro-North gathering was the source of the myth that English workers sympathized entirely with the North and that they did so rather than start an agitation which might endanger freedom in the United States. Bright nurtured the myth in order to present English workers to the rest of society as a mature element deserving political representation. Two historians have demonstrated that thesis invalid. Roydon Harrison shows that within the context of worker sympathy for the North a number of labor and radical newspapers favored the South.[114] In her recent local study of Lancashire workers and the American Civil War, Dr. Ellison reveals the extent to which the cotton district operatives were pro-South, although not pro-slavery. These workers believed that Britain's

---

[113] Bee-Hive, March 28, 1863, pp. 5-6.

[114] Royden Harrison, "British Labor and the Confederacy," International Review of Social History, II (Part 1, 1957), 78-105; "British Labor and American Slavery," Science and Society, XXV (December, 1961), 291-319; "'The Free Inheritance of Us All': Beesly's Speech in St. James' Hall, London, March 28, 1863," Science and Society, XXVII (Fall, 1963), 465-73. For two earlier views see Richard Greenleaf, "History, Marxism and Henry Adams," Science and Society, XV (Summer, 1951), 193-208 and "British Labor against American Slavery," Science and Society, XVII (Winter, 1953), 42-58; and Joseph H. Park, "The English Workingmen and the American Civil War," Political Science Quarterly, XXXIX (September, 1924), 432-57. For a discussion of the radical newspapers' positions regarding slavery see G. D. Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom. The Impact of American Democracy upon Great Britain, 1830-1870 (n.p.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955).

recognition of the South would result in the lifting of the blockade and prosperity's return.[115]

The cutting-edge of working-class internationalism was the new Positivist alliance. The old "proletarian" internationalists favored the North without qualifications. Jones, who was in Manchester, did so, as did Harney who resigned as editor of the Jersey Independent after six years because its owner objected to his strong pro-North bias.[116] Neither of them had a significant impact on working-class opinion regarding this issue. Time and affairs had passed them by. Consequently, the emerging, though short-lived, trade union/Bright cooperation and its impact on internationalism had no effect on Jones or Harney, neither of whom represented working-class internationalism anyway.

The second foreign incident that contributed to this new alliance was the Polish insurrection of 1863-64. English working-class support generated during this agitation for Poland led to the creation of the International Working Men's Association, or First International. The last, feeble demonstration of the old international labor movement occurred in this period. Linton resuscitated himself long enough to establish the Central Committee of the Friends of Poland on February 27, 1863. It was a moderate organization that was soon outbid for working-class support. The better organized campaigns of Urquhart and the triumvirate of Beales, Harrison and Beesly with the Bee-Hive, won more

---

[115]Mary Ellison, Support for Secession: Lancashire and the American Civil War (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972).

[116]Saville, Ernest Jones: Chartist, p. 77; Jersey Independent, November 29, 1862, [p. 2]; and Black and Black, eds., The Harney Papers, footnote 3, p. 98.

followers. Beales worked closely with Count Ladislaus Zamoyski's London Bureau propaganda machine. Thus, when Beales' National League for the Independence of Poland replaced the defunct CCFP in August 1863 the organized internationalist agitation in England became allied with the aristocratic Prince Czartoryski Polish exiles. The NLIP sought Polish independence through the formal assistance of the British government. Although a middle-class group, it appealed to the working class for support.[117]

The Polish agitation failed to achieve its goal. But it did bring English and French workers into contact with each other. Frederic Harrison argued for English-French cooperation as a preliminary to Poland gaining its independence. He believed that English influence in the days of Elizabeth I, Cromwell and William III had been instrumental in European affairs and could be so again without war. His was a somewhat jaundiced view of English history.[118]

In 1862, 1863 and 1864 representatives of the French and English workers met and exchanged addresses. On August 5, 1862, a group of seventy French artisans, who were in London to attend the International

---

[117] Smith, Radical Artisan, pp. 138-40. The best analyses of this period are John F. Kutolowski, "English Radicals and the Polish Insurrection of 1863-64," Polish Review, XI (Summer, 1966), 3-28 and "Mid-Victorian Public Opinion, Polish Propaganda, and the Uprising of 1863," Journal of British Studies, VIII (May, 1969), 86-110. An earlier, and somewhat elementary, study is J. H. Harly, "Great Britain and the Polish Insurrection of 1863 I," Slavonic and East European Review, XVI (July, 1937-38), 155-67 and "Great Britain and the Polish Insurrection of 1863 II," Slavonic and East European Review, XVI (January, 1937-38, 425-38. For Marx's involvement see Adam Ciołkosz, "Karl Marx and the Polish Insurrection of 1863," Polish Review, X (Autumn, 1965), 8-51.

[118] Harrison, Autobiographical Memoirs, I, 288-89. For an example of his propaganda see Bee-Hive, June 27, 1863, p. 4.

Exhibition, were entertained by a committee of English workers. An address to all French workers was issued which called for "cooperation amongst the working classes . . . of different nationalities."[119] On the evening of April 28, 1863, at St. James' Hall, Beesly called for British and French cooperation to aid Poland and a delegation including Beesly, Odger, Coulson, Applegarth, Cremer and others was appointed to meet with Palmerston to press him on the question. Stansfeld introduced them on May 18 but Palmerston made no promises.[120] Then on July 22, 1863, another gathering convened at St. James' Hall to further the Polish cause. Liberal M. P.s, Positivists and trade union men were on the platform. A delegation of French workers representing the Paris Working Men's Committee, including S. Fribourg and Henri Tolain, attended. The next day a reception was held for them at the Bell Inn, Old Bailey. An address to all French workers was issued. It emphasized the fraternity of peoples and called for a gathering of representatives of workers from France, Italy, Germany, Poland, England and other countries to initiate cooperation between these peoples. Odger wrote the address; Cremer, Thomas Grant Facey, a painter, C. Goddard, a bookbinder, and John Eglington, a carpenter, signed it. It was published December 5, 1863.[121] In response another group of French workers visited London in April 1864

---

[119] Reynolds's Newspaper, August 10, 1862, p. 4.

[120] Bee-Hive, May 2, 1863, pp. 5-6 and May 23, 1863, p. 4.

[121] Bee-Hive, July 25, 1863, pp. 5-6 and December 5, 1863, p. 1.

during the Garibaldi demonstrations and proposed a "congress of continental and English workmen. . . ."[122]

The meeting was held at St. Martin's Hall on September 28, 1864.[123] Out of it the First International emerged. Beesly chaired the meeting and he rather than Marx was the guiding spirit behind the International's formation.[124] A General Committee of thirty-four men was elected. Twenty-seven of them were English workers. Later Odger was elected the first President and Cremer the first Secretary. The International linked together English trade unionists, French Proudhonists, Mazzinians and Germans from the Arbeiterbildungsverein. No Englishman associated with the international labor movement of the 1840s and 1850s belonged to it. But their slogan "All Men are Brethren" was adopted by the new respectable though weak union international organization. The international labor movement's fulfillment remained unachieved and the pursuit of immediate political and social reform within an international creed quietly died. The "proletarians" were absent or biding their time, as in the case of Marx. The "respectables" emerged triumphant.

---

[122]Henry Collins and Chimen Abransky, Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1965), p. 26.

[123]Bee-Hive, October 1, 1864, p. 1.

[124]Royden Harrison, "E. S. Beesly and Karl Marx," International Review of Social History, IV (Part 1, 1959), 31. See also Henry Collins, "Karl Marx, The International and the British Trade Union Movement," Science and Society, XXVI (Fall, 1962), 400-402.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The holders of political power and social prestige never relinquish their position without pressure from those who want a share, write the authors of a recent statistical study of collective violence in modern France, Germany and Italy.[1] Between 1846 and 1864 some members of the English labor movement sought the creation of an international proletarian identity through an interaction with European political refugees in order to establish a democratic government in England and to foster national self-determination in Europe. The international labor movement wanted political and social reform of the existing governments. In return it received official opposition and failed. At this point, a summation of the movement's nature and an explanation of its failure are in order.

First, I offer a synopsis of my discoveries. I have categorized the internationalists into "proletarians" and "respectables." The former included socialists and democrats, and others on the left; the latter group comprised republicans and traditional middle class radicals. The "proletarians" pitched their appeal to the working class and gained most

---

[1]Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly, The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), p. 280.

of their support from Chartists and from workers in the traditional radical centers in Britain: London, west Yorkshire, Lancashire, the Northeast and the industrial areas of Scotland. The "respectables" found most of their support among the middling class of people, especially from professionals and intellectuals. Working-class support for the "proletarians" was more extensive than was the support accorded to the "respectables," but the latter's adherents were more influential in English society. There is little doubt that the internationalists' immediate impact was superficial. The English working class made no firm commitment to either side. Thus, in the short-term the international labor movement's impact on the English labor movement was minimal beyond its contribution of keeping radicalism alive during a transition period. In the long-run, the "proletarians" assisted others, such as O'Brien, infuse socialist ideas into the English labor movement. Jones' and Harney's introduction, for example, of Marxian ideas was instrumental in this process. This intellectual input was internationalism's most significant accomplishment.

I offer as an explanation of the movement's failure its inability to transcend its intellectual status in order to combine the appropriate independent working-class elements to obtain its goals. The refugees were of central importance. They sought reform in Europe, but among the various exile groups those favoring a social reform program gradually overwhelmed those whose program was more purely political. Their first interest was in European not English reform. Hence, they appealed for support primarily to the English workers, who, of course, had no political power. But that appeal further unsettled the middle and upper

classes who still held out against the working class obtaining its rightful place in society.

The "respectables" argued for reform in Europe to precede reform in England. Their problem was a weakly defined reform program that favored only limited kinds of political reform in England, coupled with the creation of independent national states in Europe, but devoid of social reform. Furthermore, they distrusted independent working-class politics and called for middle-class leadership against aristocratic government. That blunted their appeal to the working class until quite late in this period; it also set them at odds with the upper class.

By comparison, the "proletarians" advocated reform in both Europe and England. Although they could not always agree on the timing of this reform, they at least thought to pursue their goals in an international context. They connected political and social reform in the belief that one accomplished little without the other. But aside from general theories and vague programs, they never formulated an appealing ideology. Thus, their efforts to enlist broad working-class support failed and their international revolutionary character won them the undying opposition of the middle and upper classes.

The last of the groups in this four-way struggle was the trade unions. The unions expressed little interest in reform in England, except for advances in their legal status, and no interest in the European situation till the mid-1860s. The trade unions slighted political reform and emphasized the amelioration of economic conditions. Due to this objective they were growing in popularity in working-class circles, especially among the artisans and better-off laborers, and represented

the best opportunity for marshalling mass support. Furthermore, the upper classes were gradually recognizing the trade unions as a stabilizing force in class relations and were slowly extending legal acceptance to them. Clearly, if working-class internationalism was to become a political force rather than an intellectual vacuum, it had to capture the trade union's leadership.

Why it did not becomes apparent from the following explanation of the relations among the four groups and from an elucidation of official continental and English governmental sympathy and repression towards each group. First, the refugees experienced a positive relationship with the "proletarians." Each depended on the other for moral support and ideological strength and the refugees relied on the "proletarians" for monetary assistance, meagre though it was. But the relations between the refugees and the "respectables" were less than harmonious. The refugees' social reform orientation distressed the "respectables" who favored political reform only and the "respectables'" advice to the refugees to wait patiently or emigrate upset their revolutionary hopes. In addition, the "respectables" hardly agreed with the "proletarians," who were the refugees' strongest supporters, because of ideological differences. The fourth group, the trade unions, were well received in "respectable" ranks, as witnessed in the Positivists' episode, but the "proletarians" only half-heartedly pursued the trade unions. To a great extent this latter omission resulted from the internal squabbles among the "proletarians." I find no connection between the refugees and the trade unions. Thus, the refugees and "proletarians" reinforced one another on the left, and the "respectables" on the right and the trade

unions in the center also cooperated. But neither side could work with the other. Divisiveness among the four groups and within each group plagued the international labor movement. That basic 1850s' issue of the direction the English labor movement was to adopt permeated all labor relations of the period. Middle-class cooperation or independent working-class politics proved an insurmountable obstacle for the internationalists.

But another reason for the movement's failure exists in addition to this ideological divisiveness. It was the reaction of the established governments to internationalism. The refugees, who had fled their homelands to escape various forms of oppression, faced continued repression in England. The source of this repression was two-fold. First, whenever possible continental governments acted to insure that the refugees passed on to the United States, as in their encouragement of the "respectables" to assist this exodus or as in Napoleon's direct payment of money to the British Government for expediting refugee passage out of Britain. Second, continental governments persistently pressured the various British Governments to clamp down on the refugees' activities. These efforts received mixed reactions from the Queen's Governments, but little doubt exists that the refugees received anything but repressive measures from the same authorities who offered them asylum. In short, the Government said to the refugees you may live in England, but continued political activity is not acceptable. But the influence of European monarchs on the Queen's Government is easily over-estimated. The key here was the Government's treatment accorded to the "proletarians." These refugee allies were hounded and harassed for years. Why? Because

they were social as well as political reformers and because they were democrats, socialists and communists. Their ideological commitments required a repressive response from the authority structure, which was as yet unprepared to share power even with lower class respectable elements much less with left-wing radicals who talked of reorganizing both the political and social structures of England.

As demonstrated above, this repression succeeded. An already divided movement faced an additional barrier: official opposition. By contrast, the "respectables" received positive sympathy from the Government, but, of course, never enough to allow the accomplishment of their political reform goals. Yet it was enough to preclude the "respectables" from being driven under the "proletarians'" ideological leadership. Similarly, the Government dealt the trade unions a kind of negative sympathy that held out future additional legal recognition and protection for a movement whose aims were primarily economic. As the Government realized, the pursuit of economic goals or political goals alone was not as dangerous as the pursuit of combined social/political objectives. For any chance of success the "proletarians" had to capture, or at least occupy substantial positions of influence in, the trade unions, because they had access to the masses, and also the "respectables," because they possessed the only sympathetic line of communication with the Government. The Government's policy of repression prevented the international labor movement from any such unity.

Finally, a third reason for the movement's failure emerges. These middle decades of the nineteenth century were everywhere a period of nationalism. As Hobsbawm recently wrote:

> The alternative to a "national" political consciousness was not, in practice, "working-class internationalism" but a sub-political consciousness which still operated on a scale much smaller than, or irrelevant to, that of the nation-state.[2]

A spirit of nationalism overshadowed internationalism. The international labor movement sought nationalistic objectives of reform in England and the establishment of independent nations in Europe within a vague international philosophy. Such a policy was incongruous.

I began this study with an example of Lord Palmerston's demeaning attitude towards the refugees. Yet, he approved a policy of repression in order to prevent the internationalists from achieving their goals. How ironic it was that Sir Richard Mayne, unbeknownst to Palmerston, directed a plain-clothes constable in 1864 to follow the Prime Minister on his walk home after late night sessions in the House of Commons--the same treatment that Palmerston had dealt the internationalists.[3]

---

[2]E. J. Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital, 1848-1875 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), p. 93.

[3]Mayne to Grey, February 4, 1864, Mepol. 1/47.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Cowen Collection. Newcastle upon Tyne Central Library. Newcastle upon Tyne.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Foreign Office 27. General Correspondence: France, 1781-1905.

_____. Public Record Office. Foreign Office 146. Embassy and Consular Archives: Correspondence, 1814-1915.

_____. Public Record Office. Home Office 40. Correspondence and Papers, Disturbances.

_____. Public Record Office. Home Office 44. Correspondence and Papers, Domestic and General.

_____. Public Record Office. Home Office 45. Correspondence and Papers, Domestic and General. "Registered Papers."

_____. Public Record Office. Metropolitan Police Offices 1. Office of the Commissioner. Letter Books.

_____. Public Record Office. Metropolitan Police Offices 2. Office of the Commissioner. Correspondence and Papers.

_____. Public Record Office. Treasury Solicitor 11. Treasury Solicitor and King's (Queen's) Proctor.

Frederic Harrison Papers. British Library of Political and Economic Science. London School of Economics and Political Science.

Holyoake Collection. Bishopsgate Institute. London.

Holyoake Collection. Holyoake House. Cooperative Union Library. Manchester.

Howell Collection. Bishopsgate. London.

"Jones's Diary," 1844-47. Manchester Public Library. Manchester.

Robert Owen Correspondence. Holyoake House. Cooperative Union Library. Manchester.

Urquhart Papers. Balliol College Library. Oxford.

George Wilson Papers. Manchester Public Library. Manchester.

Printed

Adams, W. E. Memoirs of a Social Atom. 2 vols. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1967.

Black, Frank Gees, and Black, Renée Métiver, eds. The Harney Papers. Assen: Van Gorcum and Co., 1969.

Blanc, Louis. Observations on the Recent Manifesto of Kossuth, Ledru-Rollin, and Mazzini. London: Holyoake and Co., 1855.

Cowley, Lord. The Paris Embassy during the Second Empire. Edited by F. A. Wellesley. London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd., 1928.

Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration. The Seizure of Cracow. The Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration to the people of Great Britain and Ireland. London: n.p., 1846.

_____. Sixteenth Anniversary of the Revolution of November 29th, 1830. London: n.p., 1846.

Democratic Friends of All Nations. An Address to the Friends of humanity and justice among all nations by the Democratic Friends of All Nations. London: J. Cleave, 1845.

Fraternal Democrats. Address of the Fraternal Democrats Assembling in London to the Members of the National Diet of Switzerland. London: n.p., 1847.

Frost, Thomas. Forty Years' Recollections. London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1880.

Great Britain. Parliament. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. LXXXV (24 March-1 May 1846); Vol. LXXXVII (4 June-24 July 1846); Vol. LXXXVIII (27 July-28 August 1846); Vol. XC (16 March-26 April 1847); Vol. XCIII (2 June-6 July 1847); Vol. CVIII (21 January-25 February 1850); Vol. CIX (26 February-26 March 1850); Vol. CXIX (3 February-22 March 1852); Vol. CXX (23 March-29 April 1852); Vol. CXXV (11 March-18 April 1853); Vol. CXXVI (19 April-9 May 1853); Vol. CXLVIII (3 December-22 February 1858).

Great Britain. Parliament. Parliamentary Papers (House of Commons and Command), 1847-48, Vol. VI (Bills, vol. 6). "An Act to authorize for One Year, and to the End of the next Session of Parliament, the Removal of Aliens from the Realm," 11 & 12 Vict., ch. 20.

Guest, Lady Charlotte. Extracts from her Journal, 1833-52. Edited by Earl of Besborough. London: John Murray, 1950.

Harrison, Frederic. Autobiographic Memoirs. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911.

Holyoake, George Jacob. Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life. 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1892.

_____. Bygones Worth Remembering. 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1905.

Kossuth, Louis. Kossuth: His Speeches in England, with a Brief Sketch of His Life. 3rd ed. London: Charles Gilpin, 1852.

_____. Memories of my Exile. Translated by Ferencz Jausz. London: Cassell, Petter, Gilpin and Co., 1880.

_____; Mazzini [Guiseppe]; and Ledru-Rollin, [Alexander]. Manifesto of the Republican Party. London: Holyoake and Co., 1855.

Leno, John Bedford. The Aftermath. London: Reeves and Turner, 1892.

Linton, William James. Help for Poland. London, Brantwood: n.p., 1854.

_____. Memories. London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1895.

Literary Association of the Friends of Poland. Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the People of Great Britain and Ireland. London: E. Detkens, 1846.

_____. Report of the Twenty-Third (Twenty-Sixth, Twenty-Seventh) Annual Meeting. London: Geo. H. Nichols, 1855-59.

Lovett, William. Life and Struggles of William Lovett. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1867.

MacDonell, John, ed. Reports of State Trials. New Series. 8 vols. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1888-98.

Marx, Karl. The Revolutions of 1848. Vol. I of Political Writings. Edited by David Fernbach. 3 vols. New York: Vintage Books, 1973-74.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. Correspondence, 1846-1895. Translated and Edited by Donna Torr. London: Martin Lawrence, Ltd., 1934.

Mazzini, Guiseppe. Letter from Signor Mazzini to Mr. G. J. Holyoake [An Appeal for Shilling Subscriptions in Aid of Italian Freedom]. London: n.p., 1852.

_____. M. Mazzini's Lecture, Delivered at the First Conversatione of the Friends of Italy. London: n.p., 1852.

_____. Two Letters to the People of England on the War. London: n.p., 1855.

_____. Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini, 1846-70. 6 vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1864-70.

National Association for Promoting the Political and Social Welfare of the People. Address of the National Association for Promoting the Political and Social Welfare of the People to the Working Classes of France on the Subject of War. London: C. H. Elt, [1844].

Polish Democrats. Sixteenth Anniversary of the Revolution of November 29, 1830. London: n.p., 1846.

Richards, E. F., ed. Mazzini's Letters to an English Family [the Ashursts], 1844-1872. 3 vols. London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1920-22.

Society of the Friends of Italy. Address of the Society of the Friends of Italy. Fifty Thousand. London: At the Office of the Society, 1851.

Stansfeld. The Italian Movement and the Italian Parties. London: James Ridgway, 1862.

Newspapers

Beacon

Bee-Hive

Cabinet Newspaper

Democratic Review of British and Foreign Politics, History and Literature

English Republic

Friend of the People

Glasgow Examiner

Glasgow Sentinel

L'Homme

Illustrated London News

Jersey Independent

Leader

London Investigator

London News

Northern Star

Northern Tribune

Notes to the People

People's and Howitt's Journal

People's Journal

People's Paper

People's Press and Monthly Historical Newspaper

Reasoner

Red Republican

Reynolds's Political Instructor

Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper

Reynolds's Newspaper

Star of Freedom

The Times (London)

Utilitarian Record

Unpublished Sources

Theses

Buchanan, R. A. "Trade Unions and Public Opinion, 1850-75." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1957.

Weisser, Henry G. "The British Working Class and European Affairs, 1815-1848." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.

Secondary Sources

Books

Altick, Richard D. The English Common Reader. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Anderson, Olive. A Liberal State at War: English Politics and Economics During the Crimean War. London: Macmillan, 1967.

Baker, Ambrose G. Henry Hetherington, 1792-1849. London: The Pioneer Press, n.d.

Bellamy, Joyce M., and Saville, John. Dictionary of Labour Biography. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1972-74.

Blake, Robert. Disraeli. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1966.

Boston, Ray. British Chartists in America, 1839-1900. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971.

Braunthal, Julius. History of the International. 2 vols. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Briggs, Asa. Victorian People. New York: Harper and Row, 1955.

_____., ed. Chartist Studies. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1959.

_____. The Making of Modern England, 1783-1867. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Calman, Alvin R. Ledru-Rollin après 1848 et les proscits francais en Angleterre. Paris: F. Rieder and Co., 1921.

Checkland, S. G. The Rise of Industrial Society in England, 1815-1885. London: Longman, 1964.

Cobb, Belton. The First Detectives and the Early Career of Richard Mayne, Commissioner of Police. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1957.

Cole, G. D. H. Chartist Portraits. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1941.

_____. Socialist Thought. Vol. I: The Forerunners, 1789-1850. London: Macmillan and Co., 1953.

Collins, Henry, and Abransky, Chimen. Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1965.

Conklin, R. J. Thomas Cooper the Chartist. Manila: University of the Philippines Press, 1935.

Creighton, Mandell. Memoir of Sir George Grey, Bart., G.C.B. Newcastle upon Tyne: Privately Printed, 1884.

[Crosley, James]. Ernest Jones. Who is he? What has he done? Manchester: A. Heywood and Sons and Reform League, [1868].

Dahrendorf, Ralf. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

Davidson, John Morrison. Eminent English Liberals in and out of Parliament. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.

Davies, David P. A Short Sketch of the Life and Labours of Ernest Jones. Liverpool: The "Journal of Commerce," 1897.

Duncan, William. Life of Joseph Cowen. London: The Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd., 1904.

Duveau, Georges. 1848: The Making of a Revolution. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Ellison, Mary. Support for Secession: Lancashire and the American Civil War. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Evans, Sir Howard. Sir Randal Cremer: His Life and Work. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1909.

Fraser, W. Hamish. Trade Unions and Society. London: Allen and Unwin, 1974.

Gammage, R. G. The History of the Chartist Movement, 1837-1854. London: Merlin Press, 1969.

Garnett, Richard. Life of W. J. Fox. London: John Lane Co., 1910.

Gash, Norman. Sir Robert Peel. The Life of Sir Robert Peel after 1830. London: Longman, 1972.

Gillespie, Frances. Labor and Politics in England, 1850-1867. Durham: Duke University Press, 1927.

Gleason, John H. The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Grugel, Lee E. George Jacob Holyoake. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, Inc., 1975.

Halévy, Elie. Victorian Years, 1841-1895. Translated by E. I. Watkin. London: Ernest Benn, Limited, 1951.

Hammond, J. L., and Hammond, Barbara. James Stansfeld. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932.

Harrison, Austin. Frederic Harrison--Thoughts and Memories. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1926.

Harrison, John F. C. Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

Headley, Phineas C. The Life of Louis Kossuth. Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1852.

Hibbert, Christopher. Garibaldi and His Enemies. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965.

Hinton, Richard J. English Radical Leaders. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1875.

Hobsbawm, E. J. Primitive Rebels. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1959.

_____. Industry and Empire. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968.

_____. The Age of Capital, 1848-1875. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.

Holyoake, George Jacob. The Life and Character of Henry Hetherington. London: J. Watson, 1849.

Hooker, Kenneth Ward. The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Hovell, Mark. The Chartist Movement. Edited by T. F. Tout. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1918.

Howell, George. A History of the Working Men's Association from 1836 to 1850. Newcastle upon Tyne: Frank Graham, n.d.

Jànossy, Dénes A. Great Britain and Kossuth. Budapest: Archivum Europae Centro-Orientales, 1937.

Jones, David. Chartism and the Chartists. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Jones, Evan Rowland. The Life and Speeches of Joseph Cowen, M.P. London: Sampson Low, 1885.

Kitson Clark, George. The Making of Victorian England. New York: Atheneum, 1962.

Langer, William L. Political and Social Upheaval, 1832-1852. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Leary, Frederick. The Life of Ernest Jones. London: Democrat Publishing Office, 1887.

Leventhal, F. M. Respectable Radical: George Howell and Victorian Working Class Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Lichtheim, George. A Short History of Socialism. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Lillibridge, G. C. Beacon of Freedom. The Impact of American Democracy upon Great Britain, 1830-1870. n.p.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.

Linton, W. J. James Watson: A Memoir. Manchester: Abel Heywood and Son, 1880.

_____. European Republicans. London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1893.

Lorwin, Lewis L. Labor and Internationalism. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.

MacCoby, Simon. English Radicalism, 1832-1852. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1935.

_____. English Radicalism, 1853-1886. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1938.

Mather, F. C. Public Order in the Age of the Chartists. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.

McCabe, Joseph. Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake. 2 vols. London: Watts and Co., 1908.

McLellan, David. Karl Marx. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Musson, A. E. British Trade Unions, 1800-1875. London: Macmillan, 1972.

Namier, Lewis. 1848: The Revolutions of the Intellectuals. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1946.

Pelling, Henry. A History of British Trade Unionism. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963.

Perkin, Harold. The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Plummer, Alfred. A Political Biography of Bronterre O'Brien, 1804-1864. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.

Puryear, Vernon J. England, Russia, and the Straits Question, 1844-1856. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1931.

Ragg, Alban E. A Popular History of Jersey. Jersey: Walter E. Guiton, 1895.

Read, Donald, and Glasglow, Eric. Feargus O'Connor: Irishman and Chartist. London: Edward Arnold, 1961.

Reith, Charles. British Police and the Democratic Ideal. London: Oxford University Press, 1943.

_____. A New Study of Police History. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.

Ridley, Jasper. Lord Palmerston. London: Constable and Company, 1970.

Robinson, Gertrude. David Urquhart. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920.

Rothstein, Fedor A. From Chartism to Labourism. London: M. Lawrence, 1929.

Rudman, Harry W. Italian Nationalism and English Letters. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Saville, John. Ernest Jones: Chartist. London: Lawrence and Wishart, Ltd., 1952.

Schoyen, A. R. The Chartist Challenge. London: Heinemann, 1958.

Shaen, Margaret J., ed. William Shaen. A Brief Sketch. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.

Smith, F. B. Radical Artisan: William James Linton, 1812-97. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973.

Stephen, Leslie, and Lee, Sidney, eds. Dictionary of National Biography. 22 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1959-60.

Talmon, J. L. Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960.

Taylor, A. J. P. The Troublemakers. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958.

Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Tilly, Charles; Tilly, Louise; and Tilly, Richard. The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Ward, J. T. Chartism. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1973.

Webb, Sidney, and Webb, Beatrice. The History of Trade Unionism. Revised edition. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1920.

Weisser, Henry. British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815-1848. Manchester University Press, 1975.

West, Julius. A History of the Chartist Movement. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

Wilson, Alexander. The Chartist Movement in Scotland. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970.

Wittke, Carl. The Utopian Communist. A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1950.

Woodring, Carl Ray. Victorian Samplers: William and Mary Howitt. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1952.

Young, G. M. Victorian England, Portrait of an Age. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Articles

Armytage, W. H. G. "Sheffield and the Crimean War: Politics and Industry, 1852-1857." History Today, V (July, 1955), 473-82.

Bourgin, Georges. "Mazzini et le Comité Central Démocratique en 1851." Revista Storica del Risorgimento Italiano, VI (1913), 353-71.

Briggs, Asa. "The Crimean Centenary." Virginia Quarterly, XXX (1955), 542-55.

_____. "David Urquhart and the West Riding Foreign Affairs Committees." Bradford Antiquary, n.s., Part XXXIX (April, 1958), 197-207.

Brock, Peter. "Polish Democrats and English Radicals, 1832-1862." Journal of Modern History, XXV (June, 1953), 139-56.

_____. "The Birth of Polish Socialism." Journal of Central European Affairs, XIII (October, 1953), 213-31.

_____. "Joseph Cowen and the Polish Exiles." Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII (December, 1953), 52-69.

_____. "Zeno Swietoslawski, a Forerunner of the Russian Narodniki." American Slavic and East European Review, XIII (1954), 566-87.

_____. "The Polish Revolutionary Commune in London." Slavonic and East European Review, XXXV (1956), 116-28.

_____. "The Socialists of the Polish Great Migration" in Essays in Labor History. Edited by Asa Briggs and John Saville. London: Macmillan, 1960, pp. 140-73.

_____. "Polish Socialists in Early Victorian England: Three Documents." Polish Review, VI (1961), 33-52.

Cadogan, Peter. "Harney and Engels." International Review of Social History, X (Part 1, 1965), 66-104.

Campanella, Anthony P. "Joseph Cowen, Garibaldi e Mazzini." Estratto da Nuova Revista Storica, Anno L, Fasc. I-II (1966), 201-18.

Ciołkosz, Adam. "Karl Marx and the Polish Insurrection of 1863." Polish Review, X (Autumn, 1965), 8-51.

Cole, G. D. H. "British Trade Unions in the Third Quarter of the Nineteenth Century." International Review for Social History, III (1937) in Essays in Economic History. Edited by Eleanora M. Carus-Wilson. London: Edward Arnold, 1962, III, 202-21.

Collins, Henry. "Karl Marx, The International and the British Trade Union Movement." Science and Society, XXVI (Fall, 1962), 400-21.

Coltham, Stephen. "George Potter, the Junta, and the Bee-Hive I." International Review of Social History, IX (Part 3, 1964), 391-432.

_____. "George Potter, the Junta, and the Bee-Hive II." International Review of Social History, X (Part 1, 1965), 23-65.

Davis, Mary. "The Forerunners of the First International--The Fraternal Democrats." Marxism Today, XV (February, 1971), 50-60.

Dutt, Salme A. "Chartism and the Fight for Peace." Labour Monthly, XXI (June, 1939), 367-74.

Faherty, Ray. "The Memoirs of Thomas Martin Wheeler, Owenite and Chartist." Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, no. 30 (Spring, 1975), 11-13.

Gilley, Sheridan. "The Garibaldi Riots of 1862." Historical Journal, XVI (December, 1973), 697-732.

Gossman, Norbert J. "Republicanism in Nineteenth Century England." International Review of Social History, VII (Part 1, 1962), 47-60.

_____. "British Aid to Polish, Italian and Hungarian Exiles, 1830-1870." South Atlantic Quarterly, LXVIII (Spring, 1969), 231-45.

Greenleaf, Richard. "History, Marxism and Henry Adams." Science and Society, XV (Summer, 1951), 193-208.

_____. "British Labor against American Slavery." Science and Society, XVII (Winter, 1953), 42-58.

Grzebienowski, Tadeusz. "The Polish Cause in England a Century Ago." Slavonic Review (July, 1932), 81-87.

Haenisch, Walter. "Karl Marx and the Democratic Association of 1847." Science and Society, II (Winter, 1937), 83-102.

Harley, J. H. "Great Britain and the Polish Insurrection of 1863 (I)." Slavonic and East European Review, XVI (July, 1937-38), 155-67.

_____. "Great Britain and the Polish Insurrection of 1863 (II)." Slavonic and East European Review, XVI (January, 1937-38), 425-38.

Harney, George Julien [sic]. "Victor Hugo in Jersey." Athenaeum, June 20, 1885, p. 791.

Harrison, Brian, and Hollis, Patricia. "Chartism, Liberalism and the Life of Robert Lowery." English Historical Review, LXXXII (July, 1967), 503-35.

Harrison, John F. C. "A Knife and Fork Question?: Some Recent Writings on the History of Social Movements." Victorian Studies, XVIII (December, 1974), 219-24.

Harrison, Royden. "British Labor and the Confederacy." International Review of Social History, II (Part 1, 1957), 78-105.

_____. "E. S. Beesly and Karl Marx." International Review of Social History, IV (Part 1, 1959), 22-58.

_____. "E. S. Beesly and Karl Marx." International Review of Social History, IV (Part 2, 1959), 208-38.

_____. "Professor Beesly and the Working Class Movement" in Essays in Labor History. Edited by Asa Briggs and John Saville. London: Macmillan, 1960, pp. 205-41.

_____. "British Labor and American Slavery." Science and Society, XXV (December, 1961), 291-319.

_____. "'The Free Inheritance of Us All': Beesly's Speech in St. James' Hall, London, March 28, 1863." Science and Society, XXVII (Fall, 1963), 465-73.

Hoeing, Frederick W. "Letters of Mazzini to W. J. Linton." Journal of Modern History, V (March, 1933), 55-68.

Horvàth, Eugene. "Kossuth and Palmerston, 1848-1849." Slavonic and East European Review, IX (March, 1931), 612-31.

Hutt, G. Allen. "David Urquhart: A Forgotten Friend of Marx." Plebs, XV (February, 1923), 68-71.

Ivany, B. G. "The Working Classes of Britain and the Eastern European Revolution (1848)." Slavonic and East European Review, XXVI (November, 1947), 107-25.

Fr. de J. "Ernest Jones and Chartism circa 1856." Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History, V (1950), 99-105.

_____. "An Open Letter from Ernest Jones to Weydemeyer." Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History, VII (1952), 181-89.

Kabdebo, Thomas G. "Lord Dudley Stuart and the Hungarian Refugees of 1849." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XLIV (November, 1971), 258-69.

Kieniewicz, Stefan, ed. "From the Polish Correspondence of William J. Linton, 1844-1854." Annali Istituto Giangiacomo Feltrinelli. Milano: Feltrinelli Editore, vol. III, 1960, pp. 172-225.

Kutolowski, John F. "English Radicals and the Polish Insurrection of 1863-64." Polish Review, XI (Summer, 1966), 3-28.

Kutolowski, John F. "Mid-Victorian Public Opinion, Polish Propaganda, and the Uprising of 1863." Journal of British Studies, VIII (May, 1969), 86-110.

Le Brocq, Norman. "George Julien [sic] Harney in Jersey." Marxism Today, XV (December, 1971), 366-68.

Lehning, A. Müller. "The International Association, 1855-1859." International Review for Social History, III (1938), 185-286.

Maehl, William H., Jr. "A. H. Beaumont: Anglo-American Radical (1798-1838)." International Review of Social History, XIV (Part 2, 1969), 237-50.

_____, "'Jerusalem Deferred': Recent Writing in the History of the British Labor Movement." Journal of Modern History, XXXXI (September, 1969), 335-67.

Mainwaring, W. H. "Ernest Jones: Chartist." Plebs, XI (March, 1919), 21-23.

McCord, Norman. "George Wilson: a great Manchester Man." Manchester Review, VII (Winter, 1956), 431-36.

Miller, Wilbur R. "Police Authority in London and New York City, 1830-1870." Journal of Social History, (Winter, 1975), 81-101.

Neale, R. S. "Class and Class-Consciousness in Early Victorian England: Three Classes or Five?" Victorian Studies, XII (September, 1968), 5-32.

Park, Joseph H. "The English Workingmen and the American Civil War." Political Science Quarterly, XXXIX (September, 1924), 432-57.

Patridge, Monica. "Alexander Herzen and the Younger Joseph Cowen M.P., Some Unpublished Material." Slavonic and East European Review, XLI (December, 1962), 50-63.

Payne, Howard C. and Grosshans, Henry. "The Exiled Revolutionaries and the French Political Police in the 1850s." American Historical Review, LXVIII (July, 1963), 954-73.

Plummer, Alfred. "The Place of Bronterre O'Brien in the Working Class Movement." Economic History Review, II (January, 1929), 61-80.

Price, Richard N. "The Other Face of Respectability: Violence in the Manchester Brick-Making Trade, 1859-1870." Past and Present, no. 66, (February, 1975), 110-32.

Rowe, D. J. "The Failure of London Chartism." Historical Journal, XI (1968), 472-87.

Royle, Edward. "Mechanics Institutes and the Working Classes, 1840-1860." Historical Journal, XIV (1971), 305-21.

Salt, John. "Local Manifestation of the Urquhartite Movement." International Review of Social History, XIII (Part 3, 1968), 350-65.

Saville, John. "Chartism in the Year of Revolution (1848)." Modern Quarterly, VIII (Winter, 1952-53), 23-33.

Shannon, Richard. "David Urquhart and the Foreign Affairs Committees" in Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England. Edited by Patricia Hollis. London: Edward Arnold, 1974, pp. 239-61.

Short, Audrey. "Workers Under Glass in 1851." Victorian Studies, X (December, 1966), 193-202.

Silver, Alan. "The Demand for Order in Civil Society: A Review of Some Themes in the History of Urban Crime, Police and Riots" in The Police. Edited by David J. Bordua. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967, pp. 1-24.

Storch, Robert D. "The Plague of the Blue Locusts: Police Reform and Popular Resistance in Northern England, 1840-1857." International Review of Social History, XX (Part 1, 1975), 61-90.

Tholfsen, Trygve R. "The Transition to Democracy in Victorian England." International Review of Social History, VI (1961), 226-48.

_____. "The Intellectual Origins of Mid-Victorian Stability." Political Science Quarterly, LXXXVI (March, 1971), 57-91.

Thompson, Dorothy. "Chartism as a Historical Subject." Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, no. 20 (Spring, 1970), 10-13.

Thompson, E. P. "The Crime of Anonymity" in Albion's Fatal Tree. Douglas Hay; Peter Linebaugh; John G. Rule; E. P. Thompson; and Cal Winslow. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975, pp. 255-308.

Weisser, Henry. "Polonophilism and the British Working Class, 1830-1845." Polish Review, XII (Spring, 1967), 78-96.

_____. "The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846." Polish Review, XIII (Winter, 1968), 3-19.

_____. "The Role of Feargus O'Connor in Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848." Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal, VI (April, 1969), 82-90.

_____. "Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848." Historical Journal, XIV (March, 1971), 49-66.