

Daniel O'Connell, repeal and Chartism in the age of Atlantic revolutions

ROBERTS, Matthew <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0639-1634>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/15673/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

ROBERTS, Matthew (2018). Daniel O'Connell, repeal and Chartism in the age of Atlantic revolutions. *The Journal of Modern History*, 90 (1), 1-39. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Daniel O’Connell, Repeal and Chartism in the Age of Atlantic Revolutions*

To say that Chartists and Daniel O’Connell disliked one another would be something of an under-statement. Chartism, the popular movement for parliamentary reform, dominated British popular politics in the late 1830s and 1840s, just as O’Connell’s Repeal movement – the campaign for the repeal of the Act of Union (1800) – dominated Irish popular politics during the same period. The Leicester Chartists judged O’Connell to be “*one of the vilest of traitors and political apostates* recorded in the annals of political delinquency.”¹ The Halifax Chartists, reaching further depths of invective, compared O’Connell to “Satan amongst the Angels of Heaven,”² while the Chartists of Hull resolved that “The several portraits of O’Connell, that arch-traitor of the people, shall be publicly burnt at the rooms of the Working Men’s Association.”³ O’Connell and his loyal supporters were no less scathing of the Chartists: “miscreants,” “violent and unthinking,” “the worst enemies of Ireland,” “wretched” and “evil” were just some of the choicest of epithets O’Connell used to describe the Chartists.⁴

A range of explanations have been cited – by historians, Chartists and Repealers alike – for this mutual enmity: the rivalry between the two Irish “O’s” – O’Connell and the Chartist leader Feargus O’Connor – for the leadership of radicalism; O’Connell’s alliance with the Whigs versus the independence of Chartism; the racist and imperialist attitudes of the Chartists; the anti-democratic nationalism of the Repealers; the willingness of some Chartists to countenance physical force against O’Connell’s undeviating adherence to moral force; and

the middle-class ideology and leadership of the repeal movement versus the working-class character of Chartism.⁵ But these reasons can only be made to explain so much; they fail to explain adequately why Chartists were *so* hostile to O'Connell, and vice versa. Further, this enmity has served to blind historians to the many similarities and points of contact between the two movements, and to underestimate the radicalism of O'Connell and the Repeal movement. Many previous accounts note, in passing, that Chartists supported repeal; that O'Connell himself had been part of the discussions which had led to the drawing up of the People's Charter; that some of his followers in Britain and Ireland even signed Chartist petitions; and that all eighteen of O'Connell's parliamentary 'tail' voted in favor of the 1842 Chartist petition.⁶ Yet on the question of why this co-operation existed – and could co-exist alongside friction between the two movements – the historiography has been largely silent. It was the rivalry between the two movements that led the respective leaderships to exaggerate the differences.

The purpose here is not to suggest for one moment that Chartism and Repeal were identical or even similar in every respect (there is not space here to recount the many similarities and differences between the two movements; though Table 1 provides an overview). Neither is the intention to efface the points of conflict that undoubtedly existed between the two movements. When it came to social and economic issues, O'Connell was an individualist, which pitted him against the kinds of economic regulation that some Chartists were advocating.⁷ That O'Connell emerged as a stalwart of the Anti-Corn Law League thus surprised few Chartists. On the other hand, even when it came to issues such as protection, the rights of trades unions, and the New Poor Law, O'Connell's position was, in fact, more complex and contingent. As Alex Tyrrell and Paul Pickering have observed in relation to free trade, "O'Connell's position was complex, based on a combination of principled and tactical considerations," and he 'believed that Ireland's economic difficulties meant that the 'normal'

rules of political economy did not apply”.⁸ Doubtless this made him appear hypocritical in the eyes of English radicals. O’Connell’s radicalism was constrained by the alliance he struck with the Whigs – the so-called “Litchfield House Compact” of 1835. On several occasions O’Connell was forced to subordinate his radicalism or, even more embarrassingly, reverse his previously stated opinions, notably over factory reform (which led to accusations that he had been bribed by the millowners) and the “Tolpuddle Martyrs” to save the Whigs from defeats in the House of Commons.⁹ O’Connell was never entirely comfortable with the dictates of liberal political economy, hence his support for factory reform on occasions, his hostility to extending the poor law to Ireland, and his support for the native Irish manufacture movement.¹⁰ True, he objected to a poor law on the grounds that if the able-bodied were relieved it would sap independence and self-reliance. But this was only one of a number of objections that O’Connell raised; he was arguably more concerned about the potential of a poor law to break up families and sunder the bonds of kinship (if the elderly could be dispatched to a workhouse what was to stop sons and daughters from emigrating?) and he shared the view of the English anti-poor law protesters that the workhouse was inhumane.¹¹ As the focus of the present article is the shared democratic ideology of Chartism and Repeal, it should be borne in mind that this lens renders the two movements more similar than would a focus on social and economic ideas.

This article is a contribution to recent work which has begun to integrate British and Irish popular politics in the first half of the nineteenth century,¹² still too often studied separately. Though J. G. A. Pocock’s call for a “greater British history” was issued 30-40 years ago, historians of Chartism and even more so of Repeal, have been slow to embark on the writing of the interconnected histories of England and Ireland. In fact, we know more about the Chartist legacy in the far-flung corners of the British World than we do about Chartism in Britain’s closest colony.¹³ Historians have long been aware of the presence of

Irish migrants in English and Scottish Chartism, and some attention has been paid to Chartism in Ireland. Yet the respective historiographies fall short of realizing Pocock's vision. Here we might usefully draw on recent work on "Atlantic History" and the "British World" with its "complex balancing act" of 'constantly comparing, juxtaposing, and interweaving,'"¹⁴ in this case the two stories of Repeal and Chartism, mindful of the connections as well as the contrasts. To paraphrase Pocock on the War of the Three Kingdoms, Chartism and Repeal originated "independently if interconnectedly," and flowed "together to form a single series but not a single phenomenon". Both Chartism and Repeal, for example, had "veneration for English political norms and institutions,"¹⁵ refracted through the optic of the Atlantic revolutions of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Chartism has been compared to virtually all the movements that fed into and existed alongside it (pre-eminently the Anti-Corn Law League and Owenism) in the late 1830s and 1840s, save for the Irish Repeal movement.¹⁶ This article begins by comparing the two movements, and shows that some of the obvious differences turn out to be more apparent than real. The second section argues that there was a shared ideological commitment to democracy, even if O'Connellites proved less *outrance* and impatient than Chartists.¹⁷ While the historiography on Repeal is rich, with the most recent scholarship adding economics to the traditional focus on religion and nationalism as factors in the growth of the movement,¹⁸ the political ideas underpinning the movement remain surprisingly neglected: Repeal itself was, in part, a campaign for parliamentary reform. But to realize Pocock's vision, we must go further than simply furnishing contrasts and connections. We also need to explore how Repeal and Chartism interacted "so as to modify the conditions of one another's existence."¹⁹ To date, historians have largely limited their discussions of Chartist-Repeal relations to the vexed question of the role played by Irish migrants in the British Chartist movement.²⁰ While this article lends further weight to the view that many Irish migrants to Britain were both

Repealers and Chartists, the role of Irish migrants in British Chartism is only one part of what was a complex relationship between Chartism and Repeal. Chartists were frequently at the forefront of O'Connell's mind, and vice versa. For the Chartists, O'Connell presented a serious threat to the independence of their movement, and some of their hostility towards him was a defensive mechanism designed to repel his bids for the leadership of Chartism. Conversely, O'Connell's enmity towards the Chartists was part of a strategy of a trying to contain Chartism in Britain and prevent Irish migrants from fraternizing with the British Chartists.

Having sketched out this comparative context, the third section focuses on Chartism in Ireland in the early-to-mid 1840s, about which we still know relatively little. The extant scholarship has concerned itself largely with the events of 1848 when a group of Repealers – the Confederates – entered into an alliance with the Chartists, and so the focus here is on the pre-Famine period.²¹ Chartism was patently a much smaller movement in Ireland, but it was not, by any standards, insignificant – the word almost universally applied in previous accounts.²² By utilizing a range of sources, much wider than was as readily available to previous historians, the article provides the most comprehensive account to date of Irish Chartism in the years before 1848. By drawing on the papers of the Repeal Association and by making full use of the police reports to the Chief Secretary's Office in Dublin and the Colonial Office in London, along with the digitized Chartist and Irish press, it suggests that O'Connell had good reason to fear the rival pull of Chartism, not just in Britain but also, to a lesser extent, in Ireland where his control of popular politics was far from total.²³ Particular attention is paid to the means by which Chartism was established in Ireland, especially the role of Irish diasporic networks. The article concludes by situating the comparison of the Chartist and Repeal movements in the context of recent work on the “age of democratic revolutions” in the Atlantic world.²⁴ In doing so, it challenges the view that there was a

“democratic deficit” in Ireland in the age of O’Connell, and suggests that Repeal and Chartism were beset by similar tensions over competing definitions of liberty which had been cascading around the Atlantic World since the late eighteenth century.

I. COUNTRY AND CONSTITUTION

On the surface, Chartism and Repeal appear to be anchored in very different political contexts. The Chartists were heirs to a radical tradition that looked back to the American and French revolutions, but also to the United Irishmen of the 1790s (O’Connor’s father and uncle had been prominent United men). This illustrates, at the very outset, that Chartism was not contained within any English, or even British, radical tradition.²⁵ The Repeal movement seems to have a very different ancestry – the campaign for Catholic Emancipation waged by O’Connell in the 1810s and 1820s to remove the remaining civil disabilities that branded Catholics as second-class citizens. The legacy of this campaign, it has been argued, did much to shape the subsequent Repeal movement, which saw the narrowing of Irish nationalism to the claims of Catholic Ireland. In doing so, the O’Connellites explicitly rejected the traditions of the United Irishmen – not only their non-sectarianism but, crucially, their physical force designs revealed most dramatically in the ill-fated 1798 rebellion and the abortive uprising of 1803, led by Robert Emmet. As all of O’Connell’s biographers point out, his first-hand experience of French revolutionary violence whilst a student in France in the 1790s, and his encounter with the ideas of William Godwin, left him with a life-long aversion to mob rule and violence.²⁶ But these two traditions were far from being antithetical. Thanks to recent work on the political culture of eighteenth century Ireland, we now know that Repeal emerged from a similarly rich tradition of popular politics foregrounded by the Irish supporters of the American revolutionaries, in particular the Patriot Volunteers of the 1780s: some of their

iconography, for example, would be reactivated by O’Connell.²⁷ Though O’Connellites might publicly distance themselves from the revolutionary United Irishmen, they inherited some of their democratic ideology. Viewed from this longer-term perspective, the campaign waged by O’Connell for Catholic Emancipation in the 1820s – supported, we might note, by increasing numbers of British radicals – represented a temporary, if necessary, narrowing of Irish nationalism.

There are good grounds for situating O’Connell himself in the context of the Atlantic World. As Christine Kinealy has shown, O’Connell “championed human rights throughout the world,” including the rights of British Jews, the condition of the Indian peasantry, and the treatment of Maoris in New Zealand and Aborigines in Australia. But it was the issue of anti-slavery which engaged him most “whether in the West Indies, India or the United States,” demonstrating that “his politics transcended simply Irish, Catholic or national concerns.”²⁸ O’Connell was shaped just as much by the Enlightenment, including its more radical wing when it came to such issues as slavery and women’s rights, than he was by the “Counter-Reformation Catholicism” he encountered at the colleges of St Omer and Douai. Hence his lifelong support for religious freedom and equality, a stance that inspired liberal Catholics around the Atlantic World.²⁹ Recall the O’Connell of the 1790s who had derived great delight from reading Thomas Paine’s *Age of Reason*.³⁰ There is even some circumstantial evidence that O’Connell flirted with the Society of United Irishmen in the late 1790s before the rebellion.³¹ O’Connell might have recoiled at the violent excesses of the French Revolution, but he sympathized with the slave revolt in St. Domingo. In August 1838 at the celebrations in Haiti commemorating “Emancipation Day,” a toast was proposed to O’Connell as a “friend of liberty and universal emancipation.”³² While he had clearly left some of these youthful indiscretions behind by the 1820s, he remained a supporter of liberation and liberal movements around the globe, holding Simon Bolívar in high regard, a compliment that was

fully returned.³³ O’Connell also welcomed the revolutions of 1830 in Belgium and France, seeing in them a harbinger of repeal.³⁴ Had O’Connell been less principled and more pragmatic like some of his fellow Repealers, he would have been ideally placed to launch the Repeal movement as a genuinely Atlantic movement, but for the stumbling block of his outspoken abolitionism and commitment to racial equality, which lost him support from American-Irish defenders of slavery (of which there were many). Instead, he found himself as one of the leading figures in the transatlantic anti-slavery movement with the New York Free People of Colour hailing him as “the uncompromising advocate of universal emancipation, the friend of the oppressed Africans and their descendants, and of the unadulterated rights of man.”³⁵ For O’Connell slavery was incompatible with the eternal sacred principles of Christianity and democracy: “The spirit of democratic liberty is defiled by the continuance of negro slavery in the United States,” a quotation that supporters of the North in the American Civil War resurrected.³⁶ This was a view shared by most, though not all, Chartists: “slave-holding, liberty-talking Yankees,” was how the Dublin Chartist leader W. H. Dyott referred to supporters of slavery.³⁷ So even at the level of tradition, Chartists and O’Connellites had not trodden entirely separate paths into those movements.

In demanding repeal the O’Connellites were seeking to alter the constitutional basis of the United Kingdom, largely – it would appear – from motives of nationalism. Chartism, strictly defined, desired no such alteration and saw itself, on the whole, as a supra-national movement that aimed to transcend the historic divisions between the three kingdoms. Yet in tacking repeal of the Act of Union onto their 1842 petition the Chartists signaled their recognition of Irish claims to self-government.³⁸ Nonetheless, as democrats, first and foremost, Chartists were always uncomfortable with appeals based on the particularistic claims of nation, race and religion – a legacy of their Jacobin heritage. This tension was aptly characterized by O’Connor when he declared that “I have, at all times, said that Ireland was

my country, the world my republic.”³⁹ The O’Connellites, by contrast, were more willing to trade in these various forms of “othering”: “Orange, Protestant, English,” was how O’Connell branded Chartists in 1841.⁴⁰ Chartists rebuked O’Connell for these crude appeals to sectarianism and racism. As an article in the *English Chartist Circular* protested, “To us it would seem...a crime against nature to sow the seeds of animosity between kindred nations.”⁴¹ The London Working Men’s Association [LWMA] was no less outraged at O’Connell’s bigotry and countered this with the assurance that “as the blood of both countries [Britain and Ireland] commingles in our veins...so, assuredly, under the benign influence of free and equal institutions would our liberties and interests be blended and identified as one united and happy people.”⁴² As the LWMA’s words suggest, the reference to blood implies that they did not regard the Irish as a separate race. Bronterre O’Brien similarly lambasted O’Connell for the blanket way he condemned all Englishmen as “Saxon.”⁴³ British Chartists seldom resorted to anti-Irishness (or indeed racism of any kind), and on the few occasions when some did it was based on a diffuse sense of cultural/ethnic difference rather than ideas of race.⁴⁴ This is not to suggest that the English working class harbored no anti-Irish sentiments, but it was never part of the formal discourse of Chartism. There is next to no evidence that British Chartists grounded their own claims to citizenship by defining themselves against the “savage Celt” in the way that some supporters of (English) working-class enfranchisement did during the 1860s, or as some of the American Irish did vis-à-vis African-Americans.⁴⁵

But if Chartists were heirs to a Jacobin international fraternity, O’Connell, as we have seen, was a child of Enlightenment which, as Bruce Nelson has observed, led O’Connell to “choose internationalism over nationalism at critical moments in his career.”⁴⁶ In the tenacity with which O’Connell supported these issues he could prove anything but pragmatic and shifting – the usual charges made against him.⁴⁷ O’Connell’s biographers have long observed

that, as a liberal nationalist he was ill at ease with the romantic and cultural nationalism of a growing number of his fellow Repealers which culminated in Young Ireland.⁴⁸ Like the American revolutionaries before him, O’Connell’s demand for repeal stemmed less from any convictions he had about Ireland’s separateness as a nation and more from his refusal to abandon what he viewed as Ireland’s rights under English common law and the British constitution.⁴⁹ It should be emphasized that O’Connell was never an incipient home ruler, much less an advocate of Irish independence. The demand for repeal was deceptively simple, defined most tersely by O’Connell in February 1833: “In short, salutary restoration without revolution, an Irish parliament, British connection, one King, two legislatures.”⁵⁰ Unlike the various future home rule schemes, the two legislatures were to be equal, and O’Connell was also willing to accept the retention of Irish MPs at Westminster “for all general purposes.”⁵¹ The important point here is the emphasis O’Connell placed on the “British connection” and his repeated declarations of fealty to the crown which entailed more than just rhetorical professions of loyalty to cover his disloyal acts.

O’Connell, like most Chartists, was a constitutionalist – not just in method but also in justification. There was more than just a hint of what Pocock terms the “Catholic Old English” of Ireland in O’Connell, who maintained that “Ireland was organically connected with the English crown but that the management of this connection lay with Irish counsellors and councils of that crown.”⁵² In other words, Ireland was subject to the English crown, but not the parliament of England. O’Connell was not only a monarchist, but as one would expect of a trained and highly effective lawyer, he was extremely well versed in English parliamentary and common law. Indeed, in his great parliamentary speech of 1834 when he moved a motion in favor of repealing the Act of Union, one of his central propositions was that the Union, and in particular the way it had been enacted, was unconstitutional. O’Connell tellingly opened his speech with reference to the American Revolution and the recent

Canadian protests, noting that all three had suffered from the unconstitutional attempts by England to assert dominion. The echoes of the American revolutionaries were plain to see: “I mean distinctly to assert, that Ireland was an independent nation, and that we ought to regard her, not as a subordinate province, but as a limb of the empire.” The long first part of O’Connell’s speech was devoted to a constitutional history of the relationship between England and Ireland, from 1172 down to the Act of Union, during which Ireland had been free to possess its own legislature, a freedom confirmed by the Act of 1782 – “the Irish Charter of Liberty,” “a compact in which the Irish people endeavoured to follow up the principles of the British Constitution.” The Irish people, O’Connell declared, “insist on their Charter being revived.” Along the way, O’Connell cast the English imposition in a distinctly Atlantic register: “The story of Spanish cruelties in South America, is mild and moderate compared with the dark catalogue of crimes, of cruelties, and atrocities, which were committed in Ireland and against Irishmen.” O’Connell also cited John Locke: “The Legislature cannot transfer (says Mr. Locke) the power of making laws into other hands (as the Act of Union did).”⁵³ Thus, Repeal, no less than Chartism, was saturated with the “constitutional idiom.”⁵⁴ This idiom drew heavily on English Protestant philosophy: an instance of what Eugenio Biagini has termed “ideological promiscuity across confessional and national boundaries.”⁵⁵ It is also noteworthy that in both O’Connell’s and the Chartists’ thinking on empire, there was the same unresolved tension between viewing the colonial system as an unwarranted usurpation of the popular rights of natives, and seeing the British Empire as a potentially positive force for spreading liberty.⁵⁶

II. PARALLEL AND RIVAL MOVEMENTS

There is no doubt that O'Connell's willingness to sacrifice the forty-shilling freeholders – the plebeian mainstay of his electoral support – as the quid pro quo for Catholic Emancipation in 1829 cast a serious blot on his reputation as a radical reformer. What made this sacrifice all the more treacherous in radical eyes was that he had avowed a few years earlier that he would never (again) bargain away their franchises: O'Connell had agreed to this sacrifice as part of the failed negotiations over a Catholic Relief Bill in 1825. Here lay the origins of the radical charge that O'Connell had betrayed the Irish laborers – and by extension the English working class – for the middle-class cause of Catholic emancipation. What difference would it make, radicals on both sides of the Irish Sea asked, to the working-class now that rich Catholics could sit in parliament?⁵⁷ In O'Connell's defense he had consented to this sacrifice with the greatest of reluctance, and almost immediately set about trying to undo it.⁵⁸ But with little support inside or outside of parliament, the campaign was stillborn: for all the noise that English radicals like Henry Hunt made in defense of the forty-shilling freeholders, O'Connell observed that Hunt had 'no following'.⁵⁹ O'Connell's tears for the forty-shilling freeholders were genuine. By the late 1820s, he had a long-established and publicly acknowledged reputation as a radical reformer. O'Connell had declared in favor of universal manhood suffrage on numerous occasions since the 1810s. He continued to do so in the 1830s and 1840s – though his attachment to it, like most things, waxed and waned as the occasion demanded and he was certainly willing to accept household suffrage.⁶⁰ Though he preferred the term "general suffrage" to universal (manhood) suffrage, with the exception of specifying a more stringent residence qualification for gaining the franchise – O'Connell stipulated six months against the Chartists' three – his definition was identical. In fact, as O'Connell spelled out at a meeting of the Repeal Association in Dublin in September 1841, the Repealers subscribed to all points of the Charter save one – annual parliaments; the Repealers were for triennial. Yet by 1842, in the interests of co-operating with Joseph Sturge's Complete

Suffrage Union – an initiative designed to build bridges between middle-class reformers and Chartists – the Repealers came out in support of annual parliaments).⁶¹

Parliamentary reform was integral to repeal: after all, the demand for repeal was not just an act of negation; it was to be the prelude to the restoration of an Irish parliament. While O’Connell might have been vague about certain aspects of repeal, he made it clear on numerous occasions that there would be no return to the *status quo ante* the Act of Union when the Irish parliament had been unrepresentative and virtually powerless vis-à-vis the Irish executive. Only radical reform would break the still formidable political power of the Ascendancy.⁶² Virtually all of the organizations that O’Connell set on foot – the General Association (1836), the Precursor Society (1838) and the Repeal Association – were all, at root, movements for parliamentary and franchise reform. The Precursor Society demanded an extension of the franchise, and not just for Ireland but to “obtain for all parts of the empire, the greatest possible extension of the suffrage that can practically be obtained.” Far from being a nominal organization, whose only purpose was to pre-empt repeal, the Precursor Society was an active body, commissioning no less than five detailed reports investigating the woefully limited and corrupt state of the Irish electoral system. Five of the Precursor Society’s nine objects were demands for parliamentary reform.⁶³ It was Lord Stanley’s electoral registration bill – which threatened to restrict the Irish franchise even further – that prompted O’Connell to relaunch the Repeal movement in 1840.⁶⁴ O’Connell was only too aware that his own electoral support was built on shifting and contracting sands, dramatically underlined when he was unseated for Dublin following an election petition in 1836 (on the grounds that some of his voters had forfeited their franchises due to being in arrears with their tax payments). Further, by 1840 the electoral register was now very old, and the generous terms on which freeholders and householders – the mainstay of O’Connell’s support - had been enfranchised in 1832 on eight year certificates was due to expire, and there was no guarantee

that the new terms would be as generous.⁶⁵ O'Connell thus had personal as well as ideological motives for demanding democratic reform: a more popular franchise, protected by the ballot, and the abolition of the property qualification (he had to resort to all sorts of financial transactions prior to elections to ensure that he and his kinsmen met the stiff property qualifications) and a clamp down on the unreformed Dublin Corporation's creation of 'fictitious and improper' freemen,⁶⁶ all promised to solidify his electoral base. During the Repeal agitation, O'Connell continued to single out the state of the franchise and representative system as a major grievance, claiming that while one in five men could vote in England only one in twenty could so in Ireland.⁶⁷ This was compounded by the under-representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament: 'Ireland, with more than two-thirds of the population of England, has but 105 members' while England had over 500 MPs. On the basis of population and the Irish contribution to exports, imports and revenue O'Connell claimed that Ireland was entitled to 178 MPs.⁶⁸ O'Connell was explicit that the representative basis of any future Irish parliament had to be population.⁶⁹

In light of these ideological affinities along with the many other similarities between the two movements it is not surprising that there existed a significant minority of Irish immigrants in Britain who supported both movements, evidence that Irish migrants were not blindly and exclusively O'Connellite in their political loyalties. As early as July 1839 there was a contingent of Manchester Irish within the local Chartist movement who were of a sufficient critical mass to be issuing their own addresses.⁷⁰ Instances such as these are a reminder that this was just the tip of the iceberg: we will never know the full extent of Irish involvement in Chartism in Britain because of the faceless members of the crowd, whose Irishness was not so conspicuously on display.⁷¹ The Young Ireland newspaper the *Nation* claimed that there were 100,000 Irish in Manchester in 1842 if the immediate descendants of Irish-born were included in the calculation, a figure that puts into perspective the 15,000

members of the town's Repeal associations.⁷² The highpoint of Chartist-Repeal contact seems to have been in the years 1841-3 – in both Britain and Ireland (before 1848). Not coincidentally, it was during this period that the British Chartist movement paid most attention to Ireland and the Irish, even more so after the setbacks of 1842 when the second petition was rejected by parliament, followed by the climb down after the failure of the strike waves of the summer to deliver the Charter. Unprecedented column inches were devoted in the *Northern Star* to the Repeal movement; to Chartism in Ireland; to Irish Chartists; to Irish history and the iniquities of British rule in Ireland.⁷³ These overtures were not without effect. The Manchester Repeal Association, for example, was far from being implacably opposed to the Chartists; not only did some of their members sign the Chartist petition of 1842 but others signed the petition for the liberation of John Frost, imprisoned for his part in the Newport rising of 1839.⁷⁴

Behind the scenes, though, relations between the two local movements were more strained. The secretary of the Salford Repeal Association complained to Dublin headquarters that “some renegade Irishmen” attended Chartist meetings, which took place in the same building, in the room above, where they met.⁷⁵ The Birmingham Repeal Association complained that Chartists attended their meetings – some of whom were Irish, and – underlined in the letter – “they have already made overtures to some Catholics to come into their local meetings” with the result that some Irishmen have declared themselves “Catholics and Chartists.”⁷⁶ The report in the *Northern Star*, by contrast, suggested that these fraternizations were entirely cordial, at least until Dublin headquarters ruled in September 1841 that no Chartist could be enrolled in the Repeal association.⁷⁷ Indeed, it appears that this injunction was born out of a real fear that Repealers would defect to “Feargus and Repeal.” Another loyal Repealer who had been in attendance at the Birmingham meetings implored headquarters “to do something in time, for I found a great deal of wavering in some of my

countrymen.”⁷⁸ A Repealer from Glasgow relayed to Dublin that the local attempts by the Chartists to win over the resident Irish to their cause “will have some effect for some time.”⁷⁹ The decision of a few Irish Repealers in Port-Glasgow to sign the 1842 Chartist petition “caused great dissension among the other Repealers who have not signed it.”⁸⁰ From the very inception of Chartism there had been a contingent of resident Irish in Glasgow who were supportive, and publicly so by announcing their presence as a corporate body in the processions that accompanied mass meetings just as they did elsewhere.⁸¹ The resident Irish Chartists of Campsie, for example, had their own banner.⁸²

The result of the injunction from Dublin to expel Chartists caused dissension in repeal ranks – even to the point of splitting some local repeal associations into rival bodies who were pro- and anti-Chartist (e.g. in Leeds).⁸³ L. T. Clancy, a Chartist-Repealer of some years standing, wrote as a Repeal warden from London in the hope that this injunction was nothing more than “humbug.”⁸⁴ And in Barnsley the Repeal Association seems to have been little more than a Chartist body.⁸⁵ At Bolton the injunction similarly had little effect where Chartists and Repealers continued to fraternize.⁸⁶ And as late as 1846 a group of 50 Irish Repealers resident in Bradford were members of the Chartist Land Plan.⁸⁷ While most repeal associations seem to have towed the official line, as David Goodway has observed of the London Irish, “There must have been many other Irish who considered themselves Chartists as well as Repealers, even if most – on account of loyalty to Erin or of the anger of the Liberator – effectively were Repealers only.”⁸⁸ We may tentatively conclude, then, that what changed after the injunctions of the Repeal leadership was not that all Repealers ceased to be Chartists; but that they now kept quiet about their dual loyalty.

The injunction from Dublin to expel Chartists from Repeal Associations was born of a genuine anxiety that the boundaries between the two movements were becoming blurred at the grassroots level. In fact, this was the latest in a series of moves by O’Connell to distance

himself and his followers from the Chartists, dating back to the period when Chartism had first emerged as a mass movement in 1838. Why did O'Connell attack the Chartists? As we have seen, he and many of his followers were in broad agreement with the principles of Chartism, and the mild rebuking argument that Repealers should focus only on their own immediate goal and avoid mixing up their campaign with other issues was not an option given O'Connell's public and active support for the anti-slavery movement and Anti-Corn Law League. Indeed, just like O'Connor conjuring up the red herring of the "New Move" – the tendency by the early 1840s for Chartists to splinter and pursue parallel, possibly rival, strategies and tactics, all of which O'Connor claimed detracted from the goal of securing the People's Charter – O'Connell likewise may have been concerned about a similar drift. And certainly by 1842-3, fraternization between Chartists and Repealers was only one of a series of fires that O'Connell was trying to put out; the most controversial and pressing for him was what to do with pro-slavery American Repealers. Thus, from O'Connell's point of view, the only option was to go on the offensive and attack the Chartists.

In declaring himself an enemy of Chartism, O'Connell's motives were fourfold. First, to underline his own affinity with the Whigs by accusing those who rejected his pragmatic willingness to work with them as playing into the hands of the Tories. One of the fundamental differences between O'Connell and the Chartists concerned their respective stances towards English party politics: while the O'Connellites were willing to enter into alliances with the Whigs, there were many Chartists willing to strike strategic and tactical alliances with Tories – notably the factory reformer Richard Oastler. The Repealers could not understand how any reformer could act in a way that might benefit the Tories – the historic and continuing enemies of Ireland. The Chartists could not understand how any reformer could enter into an alliance with the Whigs – the betrayers of the radical cause. O'Connell was clearly worried about the rise of what he derisively dubbed the "Tory-Radicals," the label he used to lump

together Oastler, the Reverend Joseph Rayner Stephens and Feargus O'Connor, a powerful and popular alliance in the north of England in the mid-1830s. The resurgence of Toryism in England in the late 1830s posed a real threat to O'Connell's parliamentary alliance with the Whigs, the continued existence of which was the only bulwark against the Orange faction in Ireland. Second, by whitewashing all Chartists with the incendiary rhetoric of Oastler, Rayner Stephens and O'Connor, O'Connell used this trio as scapegoats to justify his own desertion of Chartism, a crucial smoke screen to cover his retreat, given the prominent part he had played in the birth of Chartism. Third, by speaking out against physical force, O'Connell underlined the constitutional and peaceful *modus operandi* of his own extra-parliamentary movement. In this respect, O'Connell was facing an incipient challenge of truly Atlantic proportions. It is perhaps no coincidence that O'Connell became most exercised about the threat of Chartism in Ireland at the same moment when he was in conflict with those Irish-Americans who not only supported slavery, but those who – like the Young Irelanders – were coming to the view that physical force would be a necessity, a view long-held by United Irish emigres.⁸⁹ The injunction from Dublin to expel Chartists coincided with the drive to collect signatures for an address to the Irish American community condemning slavery, organized by the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society, to which O'Connell lent his signature.⁹⁰ It is also suggestive that the pro-Chartist broadside "Chartism: Legal and Other Opinions," which circulated widely in England and Ireland, also made its way across the Atlantic to the Irish community in Boston (a significant number of broadsides, mostly relating to the Repeal movement, were dispatched from Ireland to the USA in the 1830s and 1840s).⁹¹ It seems fair to assume that just as some Repealers in Ireland were supportive of Chartism, so too were Irish Americans – perhaps those who had United Irish antecedents. An edition of Carlyle's diatribe *Chartism* was also published in Boston, which suggests that there may have been some Bostonians who needed disabusing of their democratic leanings (subsequently, there were New York editions as

well).⁹² In short, O'Connell was now fighting wars on several fronts. Linked to this – and arguably uppermost in O'Connell's mind by the early 1840s – was the need to contain Chartism within Britain. The Chartists reasoned that repeal would never be conceded by a House of Commons that had not been democratized. The Chartists hoped, therefore, to envelop the Repeal campaign, hence their repeated overtures to the Repealers in the early 1840s.⁹³ But such a strategy posed a threat to the independence of the Repeal movement, and thus to O'Connell's power, a reality he had appreciated as early as September 1838.⁹⁴ Fourth, and – far more dangerously to the Chartists – as a means to re-build a popular, cross-class alliance of moderate reformers in Britain, preferably under O'Connell's own leadership, which would accept “instalments” such as household suffrage.⁹⁵ As O'Connell confessed to his henchman P. V. Fitzpatrick just prior to the 1841 general election: “A new party must be found, more radical than the Whigs, less radical than the Chartists.”⁹⁶

During this period (1838-1842) O'Connell made no secret of the fact that he wished for the destruction of Chartism.⁹⁷ Once Chartism had formally established itself as a movement, O'Connell soon added to his catalogue of betrayals of the working-class radical cause. O'Connell came out in support of the resignations of the Birmingham delegates from the first Chartist Convention, who were overwhelmingly middle class: indeed, their resignations were construed as playing into the hands of O'Connell and the Whigs.⁹⁸ A further act of betrayal came when O'Connell swung his support behind the Anti-Corn Law League.⁹⁹ And yet O'Connell was at once inspirational, influential and thus potentially dangerous to the unity of Chartism. After all, he not only spoke with the authority of a successful extra-parliamentary agitation behind him, he also personified a new kind of popular politics which had won Catholic emancipation against tremendous odds. Even O'Connor could be generous on this account. O'Connor, nonetheless, clearly perceived O'Connell as a threat to his leadership, especially in those periods when he felt most vulnerable.¹⁰⁰ What made O'Connell

so dangerous, at least in the eyes of those like O'Connor who believed that Chartism should be an independent, working-class movement, was that there were suspect elements within Chartism who might be persuaded by O'Connell's alternative strategy. These groups included middle-class radicals such as Thomas Attwood (a personal friend of O'Connell's from the Reform Bill days), the Reverend Patrick Brewster (who had been censured by the Scottish Church for his appearance on a public platform with O'Connell when the latter had visited Scotland in 1835), Joseph Sturge (a friend from the anti-slavery movement) and various middle-class reform organizations such as the Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association.¹⁰¹

It might also include the LWMA whom, it should be remembered, had invited O'Connell to play a part in the birth of the People's Charter. In a letter to the Chartist Julian Harney, O'Connell wrote of the LWMA "I have seldom if at all met with more intelligent, clear sighted or honestly disposed men."¹⁰² As late as December 1840, John Cleave, a founding member of the LWMA and who had long been on friendly terms with O'Connell, sent a plan of the National Charter Association to ask O'Connell's advice about its legality.¹⁰³ While the ultra-radical enemies of the LWMA, notably O'Connor and Harney, accused that body of being tools of O'Connell (a view that has been taken up by some modern accounts),¹⁰⁴ in fact the LWMA had been wary of O'Connell from the very beginning. True, like a number of so-called "friends of reform," O'Connell had been nominated as an honorary member on February 27, 1837, but it was withdrawn a week later.¹⁰⁵ Relations soured further on June 7, 1837 when O'Connell tried to hijack proceedings and propose the formation of a new society to campaign for parliamentary reform (one that, while desirous of universal manhood suffrage, would accept instalments), but this was killed by Lovett.¹⁰⁶ In any case, as a reading of Henry Hetherington's *London Dispatch* – the mouthpiece of the LWMA – makes clear, the artisans of the LWMA had been critical of O'Connell since at least September 1836.¹⁰⁷ In this respect they were moving in the same direction, though perhaps not with the

same speed, as the northern radicals with whom O'Connell had become very unpopular due to his treachery over factory reform and his equivocation over the New Poor Law. The LWMA took the strategic decision that, for all his faults, O'Connell was a useful parliamentary ally. It was only when it became clear that he was hostile to trades unionism in February 1838 that the LWMA set their face firmly against him. This repudiation of O'Connell was motivated not only by outraged principle but also by a tactical decision to put distance between themselves and O'Connell. This was in response to O'Connor's taunts that the LWMA had initially supported O'Connell's proposal for a parliamentary enquiry into trades unionism (though as it soon transpired for very different motives).¹⁰⁸ So despite what their enemies alleged, the LWMA had, at best, a chequered history with O'Connell. Even the Birmingham Political Union, for all its adulation for O'Connell from Reform Bill days, contained elements who were critical of his alliance with the Whigs.¹⁰⁹

O'Connell made repeated overtures to what he termed the "rational and sober-thinking portion of the Chartists" in May 1839, April 1840, March 1841, and on several occasions in 1842.¹¹⁰ In making these overtures, O'Connell urged Chartists to cast aside O'Connor.¹¹¹ O'Connell, however, failed in this strategy of trying to draw out the moderate elements, who largely rallied around O'Connor. O'Connell, it has to be said, must bear a large part of the responsibility for the failure of his strategy. His approach had not, for the most part, been one of enticement and persuasion but one of vituperative attack by accusing all Chartists of being guilty of the crimes of their leaders. This was a charge that Lovett for one found deeply objectionable as he made clear in an open letter to O'Connell in 1843.¹¹² When O'Connell did engage in constructive debate and tried to extend the olive branch, it was judged to be too little, too late; and in any case, the Chartists suspected his motives, as the overtures appeared to coincide with periods when O'Connell's power was diminished.¹¹³ Thus, by alienating those Chartists like Lovett who were more willing to work with other reformers, O'Connell

seriously undermined his own strategy. As the *Charter* protested, “Mr O’Connell knows well that the Chartists, who are now sitting in Convention, have evinced and do still evince the utmost anxiety to abstain from any thing extravagant or violent.”¹¹⁴ It was thus O’Connell who did more than most in the early years of Chartism to cement the discordant elements within the movement: loathing of O’Connell was one of the few issues on which O’Connor and William Lovett, inveterate enemies in so many other respects, were agreed, though this did not stop O’Connor on occasions when he felt his leadership was being challenged from accusing other Chartist leaders of being in league with O’Connell. For example, this was one of the poison darts that O’Connor used to defeat the “New Move”. Historians of Chartism have not appreciated just how much O’Connor bound up the “New Move” with O’Connell and the part that this played in torpedoing the various schemes.¹¹⁵ O’Connor had effectively made hatred of O’Connell a test of fidelity to Chartism. Some of those associated with the “New Move” were forced on to the defensive: even John Cleave, who had at one time counted O’Connell as a friend, felt sufficiently backed into a corner that he told O’Connell at a public meeting that his treatment of O’Connor had been “cowardly.”¹¹⁶

Thus, O’Connell posed a serious threat to Chartism in 1838-39, and he remained a potential threat at least until the Whig government came to an end in 1841, at which point O’Connell sought to revive mass political agitation in Ireland. But it was only when this campaign had been firmly established (not until the end of 1842),¹¹⁷ that he ceased to play any role in British popular politics. By the end of 1841, after the general election of that year had seen the Whigs routed and the Tories returned to power, and with the gravity shifting back to the theatre of popular politics, the battle would now be for the support of the Irish in Ireland and the Irish immigrants in Britain. The problem for O’Connell was that he was not the only one who had set his sights on conquering the world of Irish popular politics.

III. IRISH CHARTISM

When John Leach, the president of the National Charter Association, toured Ireland in summer 1843 he informed the readers of the *Northern Star* that “There are more Chartists in Ireland than the English Chartists are aware of” – and this some six months after Chartism had suffered its second major setback in Britain.¹¹⁸ Clearly, Chartism was not a mass movement in Ireland due to the rival pull of Repeal and the hostility of O’Connell. To this may be added the countervailing forces of sectarianism, popular loyalism, popular liberalism and the persistence of traditional forms of protest, each of which militated against any sense of class solidarity with English workers. These factors were a powerful deterrent to Chartism in Ulster where, one might have expected, a stronger Chartist presence, especially in Belfast but also throughout the province given the numbers of textile workers (a mainstay of Chartist support in Britain). While the movement put down some roots there – thanks, in part, to the proselytizing of the Isle of Wight artist Philip Brannon, then resident in Belfast,¹¹⁹ Chartism’s association with Repeal may have repelled some of the Protestant artisans. The influential sway of the County Down radical William Sharman Crawford – who, though supportive of universal manhood suffrage, worked hard to foster cross-class alliances and rival initiatives such as the Ulster Constitutional Association – also narrowed the space available for any Chartist challenge.¹²⁰ (The Irish Universal Suffrage Association [IUSA] offered the presidency of their association to Sharman Crawford, but he declined.)¹²¹ Further, as Allan Blackstock has shown, for all their apparent “proletarian” similarities with English textile workers, the Ulster weavers continued to express their grievances via a blend of traditional and novel forms of protest. While this protest could on occasion link up with radical politics, the cross-class tradition of an enduring moral economy lent itself more to popular liberalism or popular loyalism.¹²² Finally, as Kerby Miller has demonstrated, the relative quiescence of the Ulster proletariat can be attributed to the imposition of a “Protestant Way of Life:” a

“hegemonic framework of shared political, social, and cultural assumptions that had been forged, disseminated, and at times quite harshly imposed by Ulster’s Protestant elites in the early 1800s.” This framework left little space for the articulation of a class-based popular political culture.¹²³ This was also facilitated by the marked decline of Presbyterian radicalism, which had been so strong in Ulster in the 1790s and a mainstay of United Irish leadership and support. Due to exile, hanging, transportation and emigration, a disproportionate number of Ulster Presbyterians, especially in the linen areas, left Ireland for North America taking their radicalism with them.¹²⁴

Despite these difficulties, Chartism did establish an organizational presence in Ireland. Taking Ireland as a whole, groups of Chartists existed across the four provinces in some thirty locations: in Connaught at Loughrea, Roscommon (Mohill, Roosky and Tarmonbarry), and Sligo; in Leinster at Athboy, Balbriggan, Baldoyle, Ballyragett, Chapelizod, Donabate, Drogheda, Dublin, Dunboyne, Kells, Lucan, Mountmellick, Navan, Newton Mount Kennedy, Roundtown (Rathfarnham, Co. Dublin), and Wicklow; in Munster at Cashel, Cork, Leitrim (Co. Cork), and Waterford; and in Ulster at Antrim, Armagh, Belfast, Camlin (Co. Donegal), Newry, and Newtonards.¹²⁵ While these groups may have been informal in character and little more than a few individuals, not all were.¹²⁶ On one occasion, Henry Clark, a Connaught man resident in Dublin, received a request for membership of the IUSA from 240 of his fellow Connaught men.¹²⁷ Though the IUSA was ultimately a small body with a peak membership of 1,200 (of which 300 were allegedly card-carrying members of the Repeal Association),¹²⁸ there were clearly many more supporters of Chartism in Ireland. The small town of Drogheda had at least three Chartist clubs by October 1841 and supplied 600 signatures to the 1842 Chartist petition (small wonder that the local Repeal Association had issued a public address to the “Working Classes of Ireland” imploring them to reject Chartist overtures).¹²⁹ Dublin furnished 3,000 signatures, while Belfast alone, 2,200 signatures for the 1842 Chartist

petition, and in nearby Newtonards “hundreds volunteered to sign that petition.”¹³⁰ And if we add to this the places and homes where the *Northern Star* circulated, the figures would be much higher. Bernard M’Donnell, the Chartist organizer in Loughrea, informed the *Northern Star* that the newspaper was circulating in Galway, Ballinasloe, Eyrecourt, and Portumna (all in Co. Galway).¹³¹ There were also letters requesting copies of, and letters thanking British Chartists for sending, the *Northern Star* from Ballaghaderreen (Co. Mayo), Donegal, Cashel (requests from eight separate individuals on one occasion), Kilkeen, Rock (Co. Tyrone), and Thurlas.¹³² The occasional notice of a “Chartist” baptism also expands the geographical reach: at Carrickfergus (Co. Antrim) on August 14, 1842, “Arthur O’Connor Feargus M’Kinney.”¹³³ Likewise the list of names who sent remittances in response to the various Chartist subscription drives.¹³⁴

Also testament to the meteoric rise of Chartism in Ireland in 1841-2 was the notice that was taken by both the Repeal Association and the authorities.¹³⁵ “Great care should be taken to watch their proceedings” was the comment entered by one of the clerks in the Chief Secretary’s Office in response to a communication that the Chartists were “appearing in Drogheda.”¹³⁶ As early as August 1839 when L. T. Clancy, aided by Chartist missionaries from Britain, was trying to establish a Chartist body in Dublin, the O’Connellites were worried enough to send one of their henchmen and a band of followers to scotch the attempt. Brow-beating, ridicule, physical intimidation, religious prejudice (Chartism was, allegedly, an Orange, Tory, socialist and infidel plot) and all manner of underhand tactics were resorted to such as spreading rumors that membership of a Chartist body was a transportable offence.¹³⁷ When there was a concerted effort to establish Chartism in Ireland in 1841-2, Irish Chartists found the public sphere closed-off to them. O’Higgins, the Dublin Chartist leader, was forced to hold meetings of the IUSA in his own home for much of 1841-2 on account of the disturbances caused by the presence of Repealers at public meetings. A similar fate befell the

Chartists of Belfast.¹³⁸ It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Irish Chartism assumed the form of a cottage-based religion, and in more ways than one: not only did meetings take place in the homes of the faithful, but the standard pattern of the meetings consisted largely of communal reading of the *Northern Star*. But even meeting in the private sphere was no guarantee of immunity. When a landlord discovered that the Belfast Chartists met in the home of one of his tenants, he forbade any future meetings with the result that the tenant, Robert M'Glesham, was compelled to move.¹³⁹ A Chartist from Lisburn likewise cited landlord tyranny (the Marquis of Hartford) as the greatest obstacle in preventing the formation of a Chartist association.¹⁴⁰ In another case, from Antrim, the local Chartist agitator, Francis Mellon, was told that unless he desisted his mother's pension would be stopped, which she received as compensation from the local squire for the death of her husband (on hearing of Mellon's plight, a group of London Chartist shoemakers sent him no less than 10 shillings).¹⁴¹

Another tactic was to publicly vilify and persecute any man known to be a Chartist, a fate that befell Peter Brophy (one time secretary of the IUSA), who, as a Protestant, fell victim to O'Connell's castigation of him as an "Orangeman," which became so bad that he eventually fled Ireland. This may explain why few openly declared themselves Chartists.¹⁴² The *Northern Whig* lent its assistance to the already powerful anti-Chartist cause in Belfast by entering into a character assassination of the Chartist lecturer Philip Brannon: "This fellow calls himself an 'artist.' From his appearance, however...he would only pass current here for one of those ingenious workers in metals known as travelling tinkers. He is a tall and shabby-looking man, in a fustian frock."¹⁴³ So worried was O'Connell when he got wind of a Chartist challenge in Newry that he published a long letter in which he attempted to dissuade the operatives from embracing Chartism, citing no less than thirteen reasons.¹⁴⁴ By September 1841 there is some evidence to suggest that the spread of Chartism was beginning to contribute to a diminution in the Repeal Rent in some places.¹⁴⁵ The view presented in the

O'Connellite Irish press, which often included letters from Repeal associations in Britain, gives a misleading picture: only those letters which conveyed an impression of Chartist weakness were published.¹⁴⁶

Chartism was spread in Ireland via three main conduits: missionaries dispatched from Britain (Peter Hoey, an Irishman resident in Barnsley, for example, was active in Drogheda for several weeks in the summer of 1841)¹⁴⁷; through the circulation of the Chartist press, many copies of which were posted gratis from Britain; and through migration between Britain and Ireland – in both directions. Migration, for example, was the basis of Chartism being “imported into Newry” in the words of the *Newry Telegraph*. Its progenitor, Joseph M'Donald, a Catholic shoemaker native to Newry had migrated to Britain – when is unclear – but on his return had set up a Chartist association.¹⁴⁹ A Sub-Inspector of the Police for King's County reported to Dublin Castle that a Chartist delegate from Scotland, a stonemason by the name of McShea, had tried to form a society at Shannon Harbor (King's County). The presence of a Scotsman in central Ireland seems, at first glance, odd; until, that is, we note that Shannon Harbour was a trans-shipping hub on the Grand Canal which flowed, via the River Shannon, to the port of Limerick. The Harbor was famous for its stone buildings, and so the presence of a mason is unsurprising. It appears that McShea's other purpose in being there was to make arrangements for other migrant masons from Scotland to work on the harbor.¹⁵⁰ Chartists in both Britain and Ireland were alive to the importance of such movements. A Chartist from Bradford wrote to the *Northern Star* to inform them of a resolution he had succeeded in passing in his local organization. Aware that many Irish migrants would be passing through Bradford en route to the agricultural districts to help gather the harvest, the local Chartists were to collect as many copies of the *Northern Star* and distribute them freely to the Irish as they passed through the streets.¹⁵¹ What impact this had is, obviously, unclear, though with some 35,000 to 40,000 Irish seasonal migrants crossing to and from Britain every

year by the mid-1830s (and 60,000 by 1841), this was clearly an important group for Chartists to target.¹⁵² As we have just seen, we know that exposure to Chartism in Britain converted some Irishmen to the cause. One of the police reports of the activities of the Dublin Chartists also stated that a small number of the members of the IUSA were Englishmen and Scotsmen who had migrated to Ireland.¹⁵³

Diasporic networks were also important. The setting up of a Chartist group in Balbriggan, for example, was the work of Charles Campbell, who was the brother of John Campbell, the first secretary of the National Charter Association.¹⁵⁴ How, and how much, the Campbell brothers remained in contact with one another is unclear, though it seems likely that correspondence played some part. Patrick Ryan, the parish priest of Donabate, had been converted to Chartism whilst he was a priest in Barnsley. On hearing of Ryan's continuing support for Chartism in Ireland, a letter of appreciation was sent to Ryan from his old Barnsley "Irish Catholic Chartists," signed by over 100 such individuals. Relevant here is that this letter played a part in encouraging some of Ryan's new parishioners to declare their support for Chartism.¹⁵⁵ It may also be significant that the areas of Chartist strength in Ireland were often those with the highest levels of emigration to Britain: the eastern and southern counties.¹⁵⁶ Conversely, it is not surprising that it was the Liverpool Chartists who went to the greatest lengths to furnish Chartists in Ireland with copies of the *Northern Star*, even forming a dedicated committee to undertake the organization.¹⁵⁷ This volunteer effort was crucial as it was virtually impossible to purchase the *Northern Star* from a newsagent in Ireland.¹⁵⁸ Correspondence between friends was also another means of spreading Chartism, facilitated from 1840 by the introduction of the uniform penny post. It seems that it was the friendship between a Mr Hines, then resident in London, and John Conroy in Mountmellick (King's County) – where Hines originated – that was the spur to the setting up of a Chartist group at Mountmellick. It is clear from one of the letters that Hines had published in the *Northern Star*

that the two men regularly corresponded. Conroy was particularly proud of the fact that he had managed to organize a class of Chartists which included Catholics and Protestants.¹⁵⁹ An Irishman named Dennis Sheehan, a shovel maker from Strawberry Banks in Gloucestershire, was in correspondence with Peter Brophy when the latter was in Ireland.¹⁶⁰ The Irish born L. T. Clancy corresponded with Irish Chartists after he migrated to London.¹⁶¹

It would be incorrect to assume that Chartism was only an “import” from Britain; we know that an indigenous popular radicalism existed in a number of the larger Irish urban centers. Foremost here was Dublin with its large numbers of artisans and petty tradesmen. It was at the invitation of the Dublin Chartist Association that the Convention dispatched Robert Lowery as a missionary in the summer of 1839. Perhaps un-coincidentally, it was only when the O’Connellites got wind of the presence of a missionary from Britain that they moved against the Dublin Chartists. As Lowery relayed to the Convention, “The Whigs are in astonishment at our having got a footing here; it has occupied the attention of the Castle.”¹⁶² Once the IUSA had been established on a sound footing it too acted as a Chartist hub: there were moves to send missionaries into the country districts, though with what success remains unclear.¹⁶³ It also distributed Chartist propaganda, and in this they were fortunate that one of their leaders, W. H. Dyott, was a printer. Dyott printed 5,000 copies of the tract “What is a Chartist?” and had them distributed to various barbers shops in the city and posted to various places elsewhere in Ireland. The IUSA also employed the wife of one of its leaders, Mrs Dempsey, to travel around Ireland distributing tracts, and we may infer that she enjoyed some success as parish priests were entreated to warn their congregations to have nothing to do with her.¹⁶⁴ Why Dempsey’s wife, and why a woman, was chosen for this task is unclear, this being the only explicit reference to the active involvement of a woman in Irish Chartism.

Virtually all of the attempts to set up Chartist bodies were in the years 1841-2. Indeed, with the exception of Dublin, Chartism seems to have been virtually absent in Ireland before

1841.¹⁶⁵ Conversely, little by way of organization, with the exception of the IUSA, appears to have survived much beyond 1843. Chartism thus began to grow in Ireland at precisely the same moment when O'Connell was planning to renew the campaign for repeal in earnest. With the exception of a small number of outposts (in Cork, Galway, Roscommon, Sligo and Waterford), the majority of these places are clustered around Dublin and, to a much lesser extent, Belfast – and the majority in the eastern counties. By contrast, Chartism had little presence to the west of a vertical line drawn from Sligo in the north to Cork in the south – i.e. in the most rural, the most remote and, at least in Munster, the most O'Connellite areas. Areas of Chartist strength were exactly the sorts of places where O'Connell's influence was weaker. O'Connell had good reason to fear the rival pull of Chartism in these places, especially in Dublin where some of the trades – already of divided political loyalties due, in part, to sectarian rivalries amongst the artisans – came out in support of Chartism. This was a group that O'Connell had alienated on account of his perceived hostility to trades unions and his backsliding over repeal. The Dublin Plasterers, for example, wrote to the London Working Men's Association informing them that they had resolved to petition for the Charter and that they had formed a Mechanics' Institute which had 600 members. Soon afterwards, a Working Men's Association was established in Dublin.¹⁶⁶ The Chartists were clearly aware of O'Connell's vulnerability in Dublin, and this, no doubt, allied to its status as the capital (with a population of some 238,000 by 1841) and its concentration of artisans, explains why they concentrated their initial missionary work there.¹⁶⁷ O'Higgins attributed O'Connell's loss of his Dublin seat in the 1841 general election to his refusal to pledge himself to the Charter. O'Connell's refusal, he alleged, had alienated some of the artisans and petty traders, at least some of whom qualified for the franchise as freemen – a not altogether outrageous claim given that O'Connell lost by a mere 147 votes.¹⁶⁸

The IUSA, established in August 1841, was a cause of genuine anxiety for O'Connell and the Repeal leadership when it first appeared, not least because – as a police report relayed – it spread rapidly in Dublin.¹⁶⁹ Soon similar bodies existed in Athboy, Belfast, Newry, Drogheda and Loughrea.¹⁷⁰ By the summer of 1841 the IUSA was clearly operating akin to the National Charter Association in Britain, as the national organizational body of Chartism in Ireland. For example, many of the free copies of the *Northern Star* were sent to Dublin, and then posted to various locations in Ireland, and the reports of police informers listed Chartists from other locations in Ireland present at meetings of the IUSA.¹⁷¹ A regular feature of the meetings in Dublin was the reading of letters from groups of people resident in various parts of Ireland and Britain (a further instance of the role played by correspondence in sustaining Irish Chartism) requesting membership of the IUSA.¹⁷² The Repeal leadership was concerned enough to dispatch spies to the meetings of the IUSA.¹⁷³ Similarly, we may also infer that O'Connell was sufficiently worried about the influence of O'Higgins to engage in lengthy public rebuttals of various charges levelled against him by Higgins (of which there were many going back years).¹⁷⁴ It is testimony to the firm roots put down by the IUSA that it survived the collapse of Chartism in Britain after the failures of 1842. It appears to have been in good health throughout 1843, when it, no doubt, benefited indirectly from the revival of the repeal agitation – after all, its stated goal was also repeal, and O'Connell had declared 1843 to be the “Repeal Year.” It is conceivable that Irish Chartism also gained some traction for the same economic reasons as the Repeal movement: the economic distress of 1842, consequent on falling agricultural prices.¹⁷⁵ Irish Chartism did not survive the collapse of the popular repeal agitation following O'Connell's imprisonment for seditious conspiracy in May 1844. Indeed, its weakened state was already visible by November 1843 when the IUSA held out the olive branch to O'Connell and the Repeal Association, though its members still refused to sacrifice the Charter.¹⁷⁷ These overtures were rebuffed and the IUSA was suspended shortly

afterwards, as a token – it was claimed – of respect to O’Connell, but also, one suspects, because its numbers had dwindled. It would not be revived until 1848.¹⁷⁸

What was particularly worrying for the O’Connellites was that Chartism was a potentially dangerous rival to the Repeal movement. Not only were Irish Chartists just as ardent in their desire for repeal of the Act of Union, but its very existence belied the O’Connellite assumption that no one in Britain was desirous of securing justice for Ireland. A further cause of concern for O’Connell may have been that Young Ireland, as represented by their newspaper *The Nation* were adopting a less combative stance towards the Chartists in some of their editorials and articles.¹⁷⁹ O’Connell, though powerful and immensely popular in Ireland, was not invulnerable as the recurrent apathetical responses to repeal, the persistence of clandestine agrarian violence, and the existence of Chartism all testify. Recent work has underlined the “ambiguous character of O’Connellism” as a shorthand term to describe Irish popular politics in the 1830s and 1840s. As Fintan Lane concludes his study of the Cork radical James Sheahan, the Repeal movement “was larger than O’Connell and...commentators were mistaken in presuming that the “Liberator” led an unreflective mob.”¹⁸⁰ As late as March 1843 – the eve of the monster meetings in the designated “Repeal Year” – Repeal wardens were still writing to headquarters listing reasons why the popular response had been sluggish: fear of landlord reprisals and the poverty of the peasantry being the most important reasons.¹⁸¹ A correspondent from Loughrea in August 1841 warned that while Chartism was growing in his locality the Repealers were “either dead or sleeping.”¹⁸²

We may wonder why, if Chartism was so weak in Ireland and “the vast majority” of Irish immigrants to Britain “obeyed with undeviating fidelity”¹⁸³ the strictures of O’Connell to shun the Chartists, O’Connellites felt the need to go to such extraordinary lengths to vilify the Chartists? As late as May 1843 Dublin headquarters ordered all Repeal wardens to return the subscriptions from any members associated with Chartism. Why were some Catholic

priests in Ireland denouncing Chartism from their altars and warning their congregations that any Chartists “would be hung and transported, as they were in the year ninety-eight”¹⁸⁴ Similarly, if some loyal Catholic priests in Britain were going to the lengths of declaring to their Irish parishioners that no Catholic who was a Chartist “could receive the sacraments,”¹⁸⁵ and there were other instances of priests invoking spiritual sanctions against Catholic Chartists,¹⁸⁶ then it seems reasonable to conclude that more than a few Irish immigrants were in error. Likewise the ruling from Dublin headquarters that all Chartists must be expelled from the Repeal Association, which surely speaks volumes for the strength not the weakness of Irish immigrant support for Chartism. And the same argument can be made of the authorities in Ireland. Why did the Belfast magistrates send a policeman, incognito, to the meetings of the Chartists?¹⁸⁷ Why did the Dublin police build up a dossier on Chartist activities, which not only made their way to the Castle but also to the Colonial Office in London?¹⁸⁸ Clearly, it is impossible to even estimate the number of Chartists in Ireland; though it seems reasonable to conclude that it was of a similar size to the Repeal movement *in Britain*.

IV. TRICOLOURED ATLANTIC

What does a comparison of Chartism and Repeal tell us about the various “re-imaginings of democracy in the age of revolutions,” to paraphrase the title of a recent collection of essays, edited by Joanna Innes and Mark Philp? One of the key conclusions of the chapters dealing with Ireland in this collection, especially the essay by S. J. Connolly, bears a striking resemblance to one of the lesser known essays of Dorothy Thompson, entitled ‘seceding from the Seceders: The Decline of the Jacobin Tradition in Ireland, 1790-1845.’¹⁸⁹ In this essay Thompson argued that the weakness of Chartism in Ireland, and the anti-democratic nature of

Irish nationalism, stemmed from the decline of the Jacobin tradition, established all too briefly by the United Irishmen in the 1790s. The assumption here, and in the collection by Innes and Philp, is that there was a “democratic deficit” in Ireland. This assumption has been further reinforced by the swathe of historiographical revisionism on eighteenth-century Irish history: few would now share Thompson’s view that the United Irishmen were Jacobins, who are now presented as reluctant democrats at best.¹⁹⁰ The fact that Chartism was a larger movement in Ireland than has been recognized, and given the many similarities between the Repeal and Chartist movements – including a shared commitment to democracy – suggests that the notion of a democratic deficit has been pushed much too far in recent historiography. Chartism in Ireland, and Repeal, emerged from a rich, if partly submerged, tradition of popular politics dating back to the 1780s and 1790s: in addition to the political content of some Ribbonism, there were attempts to set up co-operative societies and communities in the early 1830s (though little seems to have come of these ventures); trades unionism expanded in the 1830s and as we have seen in relation to Dublin there was some support for radical reform amongst trades unionists; and a number of radical newspapers were established in the early 1830s - the *Dublin Comet*, the *Carlow Post* and *The Tribune* – the latter owned by none other than Patrick O’Higgins, the future leader of Irish Chartism. Interestingly, the motto of the *Tribune* was “1798: Do not dare to lay your hands on the Constitution.” And there was, of course, the more radical side of the embryonic Repeal movement as represented by the young Feargus O’Connor whose campaigns in Cork anticipated the ideology of Chartism.¹⁹¹ It was this groundswell of radical opinion that Cobbett was able to tap when he finally visited Ireland in 1834 – one of his last acts.¹⁹²

Lurking beneath the assumption of democratic deficit is the shadow of the teleological “modernization thesis” which historians of English popular politics once invoked to account for the decline of “pre-industrial,” “pre-political” and irrational protest and its canalization

into the disciplined, rational movement for political reform.¹⁹³ For all the persistence of agrarian disturbances in Ireland into the 1840s and beyond (and recent work has, in any case, shown that agrarian outrages were far from being devoid of political content), we should note the unprecedented success of O’Connell and the Irish Chartists in politicizing popular discontent. In that respect, both were heirs to the “members unlimited” traditions of the United Irishmen. It bears repeating that Chartism was no more successful in achieving its immediate goals in Britain, even with its allegedly richer democratic tradition. Perhaps one of the reasons why Chartism was not a stronger movement in Ireland was because a Chartist movement of sorts already existed in the shape of the Repeal movement. Irish Chartism, like its British counterpart, merely represented a more impatient and uncompromising desire for democracy. Finally, the notion of an Irish “democratic deficit” is rendered even more problematic when we widen the lens to the Irish diaspora, especially to North America. As David Lloyd has argued, it was, *inter alia*, the techniques of political mobilization pioneered by O’Connell in Ireland that enabled the Irish to participate so effectively in American democracy.¹⁹⁴

These sorts of contrasts and connections, similarities as well as differences, between British and Irish popular politics in the 1830s and 1840s are destined to remain obscured while ever historians persist in their attachment, however unwittingly and implicitly, to the categories of English, Irish or even British as exclusive sites. When we cast aside the obscuring lens of nationalist historiography it becomes clear that at the very moment when O’Connell was attacking the Chartists he came to preside over an extra-parliamentary movement that was strikingly similar to Chartism in terms of ideology, strategy and tactics. As a tool for recovering and analyzing these connections, the concepts of “Atlantic History” and the “British World” can be incredibly valuable. An Atlantic and British World lens also forces us to reconsider the nature of Irish Chartism, and in particular the means by which it

was cultivated, disseminated and even transformed in Ireland. As we have seen, an undue focus on the English “metropole” can lead to the erroneous assumption that Chartism was an English import and that the traffic of peoples and ideas was one-way. While there now exists a critical mass of scholarship on the Chartist legacy in various parts of the British World the field remains fragmented,¹⁹⁵ especially when compared to the rich comparative and integrated historiography on the Irish diaspora. The example of letter writing explored briefly in this article is a potentially fruitful line of enquiry to begin recreating the networks along with the local and global connections that existed amongst radicals in the British and Atlantic worlds.¹⁹⁷ There is no shortage of published letters from emigrants to friends and family back in the metropole, and vice versa – an archive that is increasingly accessible thanks to digitization of the press. There are good grounds then for approaching Chartism and Repeal from a transnational perspective. We have seen how Chartism and Repeal functioned not as isolated but as connected movements across national borders (England, Ireland, the United States), not least by communicating across those borders – facilitated by the press, post and movement of peoples. We have also begun to see how these connections transformed both movements – neither could afford to ignore the other in a relationship that was both antagonistic and cooperative.¹⁹⁸ Further work is needed on how the Chartists, especially those in Britain, envisaged Ireland and the Irish, and on how those visions were transformed by the many points of contact, overlap and co-operation, as well as through competition, between British and Ireland workers. Likewise for Repealers and Irish Chartists with regards to Britain.¹⁹⁹

The concept of the “Atlantic World,” as theorists of it have rightly cautioned, “must not exaggerate either the connections or the contrasts”.²⁰⁰ This article has deliberately placed greatest emphasis on similarity and connections as a corrective to the two separate national historiographies which have, with few exceptions, largely ignored one another. The result, it

has been argued here, is a “series of sharp dichotomies” (a term used by John Elliott in relation to early forays in Atlantic History)²⁰¹: Britain versus Ireland; Irish versus English; Chartism versus Repeal; O’Connell versus O’Connor etc., which fail to capture the connections as well as contrasts. Yet even some recent work in the field of Atlantic History has perpetuated such sharp dichotomies. Michel Ducharme’s *The Idea of Liberty* comes to mind, in which he argues that two models of liberty circulated around the Atlantic World in the Age of Revolutions.²⁰² The first is the republican model, grounded in classical understandings of civic virtue and an agrarian ideal, with a Jacobin emphasis on “popular sovereignty, political participation, and the omnipotence of the legislative branch.” In short: “a subversive and revolutionary form of liberty,”²⁰³ which reached its apogee in the American and especially French revolutions. The second he terms “modern liberty”, associated with the first generation of Enlightenment thinkers (pre-eminently Locke), which emphasized individual rights (“liberty, property, security”) over equality, a strong executive as a bulwark of liberty, and promoted commerce and wealth accumulation, and “not inconsistent with empire.” In short: “a non-subversive form of liberty”²⁰⁴ which came to be associated above all with the British constitution established in 1688. It should be noted here that Ducharme argues that the Canadian Rebellions of 1837-8 marked the end to the cycle of revolutions that began in the 1770s. Yet Malcolm Chase has recently suggested that “One way of interpreting Chartism is that it constituted a coda to that cycle,” though he fails to spell out where Chartism should be situated in this schema.²⁰⁵

At first glance, Chartism appears to conform to the republican model; O’Connell the modern one. A closer look, however, reveals considerable blurring. Both the Chartists and O’Connell were self-confessed constitutionalists at least in their rhetoric if not always in their practice, and O’Connell was not alone in setting his face against Jacobin excess though some Chartists certainly idolized the Jacobins. Both cherished civil liberties and viewed political

freedom as a guarantor of individual rights. Both voiced few objections to commerce and the accumulation of wealth, with the important caveat that wealth should not be used in ways that enslaved others (Old Corruption and capitalism in Britain; Old Corruption and absentee landlords in Ireland). And both, as we have seen, were at best ambivalent about empire. All of which places both movements in the modern liberty camp. On the other hand, O’Connell’s vision of a post-repeal Ireland was certainly based on an agrarian ideal just as it was for the many Chartists who looked to the land as a means of salvation. O’Connell’s lifelong quest for the restoration of the Irish parliament – and the assumption that its restoration would be a panacea for the nation’s ills – was legislative omnipotence with a vengeance, just as the Chartist veneration of a parliament elected on the basis of the six points was.

The republican liberty elements of O’Connell’s ideology suggests that we need to take O’Connell’s radicalism seriously, and not just in Ireland but also in Britain. O’Connell was not an incipient liberal; the tendency to read back the liberalism of the Victorian period distorts the radical elements in O’Connell’s politics.²⁰⁶ Some of O’Connell’s biographers have long recognized that he was far more than just a leader of Irish Catholics, he was also a British politician (to say nothing of his international reputation), straddling the very different worlds of Westminster and Irish politics.²⁰⁷ O’Connell was himself an Atlanticist, though his conception of the Atlantic was arguably more red (bottom-up) than green (Irish nationalist), though clearly a good deal paler than the red Atlantic depicted by Linebaugh and Rediker.²⁰⁸ A few have acknowledged his radicalism, notably his friendship with Jeremy Bentham,²⁰⁹ but most of these accounts have concluded that O’Connell’s radicalism was “inconsistent, unreliable and opportunistic.”²¹⁰ O’Connell was certainly all of these things, but mainly in relation to strategy and tactics, not ideology. None of O’Connell’s previous biographers have given due recognition to his status as a British *popular* radical. As this article has shown, not only did O’Connell share their ideological commitment to democracy, however much he may

have been prepared to accept instalments, but he also on numerous occasions tried to position himself as a popular radical leader, reaching out as we have seen to the Chartists on several occasions. The British face of O'Connell's popular political persona is clearly an area that merits further research, especially before relations between him and the British radicals began to sour from the mid-1830s. Clearly, this raises the question of how representative he was of the wider Repeal movement: we know that on some issues he was more advanced than some of his followers (slavery), democracy not excepted. The Young Ireland group were certainly less ideologically committed to democracy as demonstrated by their proclaiming that suffrage extension be an open question.²¹¹ Yet from the vantage point of 1848 this appears to have been a temporary retreat from the democratic thrust of repeal politics. Seen from this perspective, the events of 1848 – when the Confederates entered into an alliance with the Chartists – appear less exceptional and had been long in the making. That alliance was not the result of a sudden, atypical and paper-thin conversion to democracy, but a rediscovery of a strand that had been present since the Repeal movement began. The Repeal movement for strategic reasons went to great lengths to distance itself from the traditions of the United Irishmen, but it owed more to that tradition than it cared to admit. Irish nationalism also had its 'democratic idiom',²¹² however submerged or subordinate it may have been at various junctures in Irish history. The democratic strains in Irish Repeal and Irish Chartism, then, need to be situated in the rich tradition of Irish participation in, and/or support for, transatlantic radical and protest movements from the American Revolution, the men of '98, the Nore and Spithead mutinies, the liberation movements in Latin America, the Canadian Rebellion of 1837-8, to the Eureka Stockade in 1854 and the Maori uprisings in New Zealand.²¹³

Where Ducharme's model of liberty is more helpful, perhaps, is as an explanation for why Chartism and Repeal failed, and for making sense of the legacy. Both Chartism and

Repeal were beset by ideological contradictions between the republican and modern conceptions of liberty, a contradiction which blunted their ideological challenge to the British state. In Britain the defeat of Chartism consecrated the defeat of the republican model of liberty; in Ireland the failure of the Repeal movement, the 1848 rising and the subsequent failure of the Fenian movement similarly marked the decline – though certainly not the disappearance – of republican liberty. The mid-Victorian years would see the continued rise of modern liberty, promoted by reformers from above and radicals from below (Gladstonian Liberals and Irish Home Rulers). Here England and Ireland were in step with developments across the British and Atlantic worlds: while citizenship was expanded to include many working class individuals as voters, the price of enfranchisement was the redefining of citizenship as the preserve of white, propertied (however expansively defined) men, and in the case of England, the Irish also found themselves as the “internal other” against which English working men were defined.²¹⁴ With the failure of Chartism and Repeal, the age of transatlantic revolutions came to a close, and with it the world citizenship espoused by O’Connell and the Chartists would be firmly subordinated to the nation, a consequence, in part, of the rise of new conceptions of nationality and race epitomized by Young Ireland.²¹⁵ For the most part, the next generation of reformers articulated their claims to citizenship in distinctly British and Irish idioms: the tricoloured and red Atlantics supplanted by blue and green. With the death of O’Connell and the failure of the 1848 uprising in Ireland, English radicalism and Irish nationalism went their separate ways in the mid-Victorian decades as demonstrated by the stillborn alliance between the Fenians and the Reform League in the 1860s, which even in its conception had never been anything more than tentative.²¹⁶ It was not until the late-Victorian era that a “union of the two democracies” (Irish nationalists and British Liberals) re-emerged, comparable to the shared ideological affinities and points of contact that had existed between Chartists and Repealers in the 1840s.²¹⁷

* I acknowledge the financial support of the Institute of Historical Research for a Scouloudi Research Award which funded several trips to Ireland. I would also like to thank conveners and audiences at: ‘Chartism Day’ conferences held at the National University of Ireland, Galway, and University of Chester; the ‘Politics before Democracy’ conference at the University of East Anglia; and the University of Cambridge Modern British History Seminar series.

¹ *Chartist*, February 2, 1839.

² *Northern Star* [NS], January 5, 1839.

³ NS, January 12, 1839.

⁴ *Charter*, September 9, 1839; *Freeman’s Journal*, September 14, 1841.

⁵ Dorothy Thompson: “Ireland and the Irish in English Radicalism before 1850,” in *The Chartist Experience*, ed. Dorothy Thompson and James Epstein (London, 1982), 134-37; idem, “Seceding from the Seceders: The Decline of the Jacobin Tradition in Ireland, 1790-1845,” in Dorothy Thompson, *Outsiders: Class, Gender, and Nation* (London, 1993), 134-164.

⁶ NS, May 29, 1841; Paul A. Pickering, *Chartism and the Chartists in Manchester and Salford* (Basingstoke, 1995), 251, n.45.

⁷ Joseph Lee, “The Social and Economic Ideas of O’Connell,” in *Daniel O’Connell: Portrait of a Radical*, ed. Kevin B. Nowlan and Maurice R. O’Connell (Belfast, 1984), 79-83.

⁸ Paul A. Pickering and Alex Tyrrell, *The People’s Bread: A History of the Anti-Corn Law League* (Leicester, 2000), 82.

⁹ Thomas Ainge Devyr, *The Odd Book* (New York, 1882), 71.

¹⁰ *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*, 15:392 (House of Commons, February 8, 1833), 48:1070-73 (House of Commons, July 1, 1839); Paul A. Pickering “‘Irish First’: Daniel O’Connell, the Native Manufacture Campaign, and Economic Nationalism, 1840-44,” *Albion*, 32 (2000), 611.

¹¹ *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*, 40:947-65 (House of Commons, February 9, 1838).

¹² Timothy Keane, “Making the Irish ‘English’: William Cobbett’s A History of the Protestant ‘Reformation’ in England and Ireland,” in *The Representation of Ireland/s: Images from Outside and from Within*, ed. R. Gonzalez (Barcelona, 2003), 89-100; Michael Huggins, “Captain Rock, Captain Swing: ‘Primitive’ Rebels and Radical Politics in Britain and Ireland, 1790-1845,” in *The Human Tradition in Modern Britain*, ed. C.

-
- Litzenberger and E. Lyon (Lanham, MD, 2006), 63-80; Allan Blackstock, *Loyalism in Ireland, 1789-1829* (Woodbridge, 2007); Malcolm Chase, *1820: Disorder and Stability in the United Kingdom* (Manchester, 2013).
- ¹³ J. G. A. Pocock, "British History: A Plea for a New Subject," *Journal of Modern History*, 4 (1975), 601-24; idem, "The Limits and Divisions of British History: In Search of the Unknown Subject," *American Historical Review*, 87 (1982), 311-36. For Chartism in Australia and New Zealand see Paul A. Pickering, "A Wider Field in a New Country: Chartism in Colonial Australia," in *Elections: Full, Free and Fair*, ed. M. Sawyer (Annandale, 2001), 28-44; J. Griffiths and V. Evans, "The Chartist Legacy in the British World: Evidence from New Zealand's Southern Settlements, 1840s-1870s," *History*, 99 (2014), 797-818.
- ¹⁴ Philip D. Morgan and Jack P. Greene, "The Present State of Atlantic History," in *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford, 2009), 10.
- ¹⁵ J. G. A. Pocock, *The Discovery of Islands: Essays in British History* (Cambridge, 2005), 28.
- ¹⁶ Lucy Brown, "The Chartists and the Anti-Corn Law League," in *Chartists Studies*, ed. Asa Briggs (London, 1959), 342-71; Eileen Yeo, "Culture and Constraint in Working-Class Movements, 1830-1855," in *Popular Culture and Class Conflict 1590-1914*, ed. Stephen Yeo and Eileen Yeo (Brighton, 1981), 155-86; Edward Royle, "Chartists and Owenites – Many Parts but One Body," *Labour History Review*, 65 (2000), 2-21; Peter Gurney, *Wanting and Having: Popular Politics and Liberal Consumers in England, 1830-1870* (Manchester, 2015), ch. 2.
- ¹⁷ For Chartist attitudes towards democracy see Peter J. Gurney, "The Democratic Idiom: Languages of Democracy in the Chartist Movement," *Journal of Modern History*, 86 (2014): 566-602.
- ¹⁸ Kevin B. Nowlan, *The Politics of Repeal: A Study in the Relations between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-1850* (London, 1965); Lawrence J. McCaffrey, *Daniel O'Connell and the Repeal Year* (Lexington, KY, 1966); Richard Davis, *The Young Ireland Movement* (Dublin, 1987); Charles Read, "The 'Repeal Year' in Ireland: An Economic Reassessment," *Historical Journal*, 58 (2015), 111-35.
- ¹⁹ Pocock, "Limits and Divisions," 317.
- ²⁰ For the view that there was very little Irish influence before 1848 see Leslie Wright, *Scottish Chartism* (Edinburgh, 1953), 18-20; J. H. Treble, "O'Connor, O'Connell and the Attitudes of Irish Immigrants towards Chartism in the North of England 1838-48," in *The Victorians and Social Protest*, ed. J. Butt and I. F. Clarke (Newton Abbot, 1973), 33-70; Graham Davis, *The Irish in Britain 1815-1914* (Dublin, 1991), 174-6. For the view that there was a "very considerable Irish presence" in the words of Dorothy Thompson, see her "Ireland and the Irish," 123; Rachel O'Higgins, "The Irish Influence in the Chartist Movement," *Past and Present*, 20

(1961), 82-96; John Belchem, "English Working-Class Radicalism and the Irish, 1815-50," in *The Irish in the Victorian City*, ed. Roger Swift and Sheridan Gilley (London, 1985), 85-97.

²¹ Michael Huggins, "'Mere Matters of Arrangement and Detail': John Mitchell and Irish Chartism," in *Politics and Power in Victorian Ireland*, ed. Roger Swift and Christine Kinealy (Dublin, 2006), 96-108; Christine Kinealy, "'Brethren in Bondage': Chartists, O'Connellites, Young Irelanders and the 1848 Uprising," in *Politics and the Irish Working Class, 1830-1945*, ed. Fintan Lane and Donal Ó'Driscóil (Basingstoke, 2005), 87-112. For Chartism in Ireland before 1847-8 see the brief studies of Bernard Reaney, "Irish Chartists in Britain and Ireland: Rescuing the Rank and File," *Saothar*, 10 (1984): 94-103; Takashi Koseki, "Patrick O'Higgins and Irish Chartism," *Hosei Ireland-Japan Papers*, No. 2 (1990). The only extant study to consider Irish Chartism in any detail is the unpublished PhD of Rachel O'Higgins, but even this account is far from exhaustive. Rachel O'Higgins, "Ireland and Chartism: A Study of the Influence of Irishmen and the Irish Question on the Chartist Movement" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity College, Dublin, 1959).

²² O'Higgins, "The Irish Influence," 89; Koseki, "O'Higgins," 28.

²³ Maura Cronin, "'Of One Mind': O'Connellite Crowds in the 1830s and 1840s," in *Crowds in Ireland, c.1720-1920*, ed. Peter Jupp and Eoin Magennis (Basingstoke, 2000), 139-72; Fintan Lane, *In Search of Thomas Sheahan: Radical Politics in Cork, 1824-1836* (Dublin 2001), 60.

²⁴ Joanna Innes and Mark Philp, eds., *Re-Imagining Democracy in the Age of Revolutions: America, France, Britain, Ireland 1750-1850* (Oxford, 2013).

²⁵ Matthew Roberts, "Chartism, Commemoration, and the Cult of the Radical Hero, c.1770-c.1840," *Labour History Review*, 78 (2013), 3-32.

²⁶ Oliver MacDonagh, *O'Connell: The Life of Daniel O'Connell 1775-1847* (London, 1991), 26; Fergus O'Ferrall, *Daniel O'Connell* (Dublin, 1981), 9-10.

²⁷ Padhraig Higgins, *A Nation of Politicians: Gender, Patriotism, and Political Culture in Late Eighteenth Century Ireland* (Madison, 2010), 238-9.

²⁸ Christine Kinealy, *Daniel O'Connell and the Anti-Slavery Movement* (London, 2011), viii, 1-2.

²⁹ MacDonagh, *O'Connell*, 21; Victor Conzemius, "The Place of Daniel O'Connell in the Liberal Catholic Movements of the Nineteenth Century," in *The World of Daniel O'Connell*, ed. Donal McCartney (Dublin, 1980), 150-62; Sean McGraw and Kevin Whelan, "Daniel O'Connell in Comparative Perspective, 1800-50," *Éire-Ireland*, 40 (2005): 60-89.

-
- ³⁰ Daniel O’Connell, *A Journal for the Years 1795-1796-1797-1798 and 1799*, copy in National Library of Ireland [NLI], Dublin, O’Connell Papers, Ms 13638 (1), f.40.
- ³¹ C. J. Woods, “Was O’Connell a United Irishman?” *Irish Historical Studies*, 35 (2006), 173-83.
- ³² Patrick M. Geoghegan, *King Dan: The Rise of Daniel O’Connell 1775-1829* (Dublin, 2008), 30; Kinealy, *O’Connell and Anti-Slavery*, 63.
- ³³ MacDonagh, *O’Connell*, 169-71; Geoghegan, *King Dan*, 175, 206-7, 220. Chartists, too, occasionally invoked, quoted and commemorated Bolívar. E.g., *Western Vindicator*, June 1, 1839.
- ³⁴ O’Connell to Michael Staunton, October 11, 1830, in *The Correspondence of Daniel O’Connell*, ed. Maurice R. O’Connell, 8 vols. (Tallaght, 1972-80), 4:213-4.
- ³⁵ Quoted in Kinealy, *O’Connell and Anti-Slavery*, 47.
- ³⁶ *Daniel O’Connell on Democracy*, broadside in Boston Public Library, (MA, USA), CAB.24.24.1 v.2.
- ³⁷ *NS*, June 25, 1842; Michael J. Turner, “Chartism, Bronterre O’Brien and ‘The Luminous Political Example of America,’” *History*, 97 (2012), 43-69.
- ³⁸ *English Chartist Circular*, No. 120, 269.
- ³⁹ *NS*, March 2, 1839, February 1, 1840, May 1, 1841.
- ⁴⁰ *NS*, August 21, 1841.
- ⁴¹ *English Chartist Circular*, No. 31, 122.
- ⁴² William Lovett, *Life and Struggles of William Lovett* (1967 [1876]), 151.
- ⁴³ *Poor Man’s Guardian and Repealer’s Friend*, No. 1.
- ⁴⁴ Malcolm Chase, *Chartism: A New History* (Manchester, 2007), 306; D. G. Paz, “Anti-Catholicism, Anti-Irish Stereotyping, and Anti-Celtic Racism in Mid-Victorian Working-Class Periodicals,” *Albion*, 18 (1986), 601-16, 615.
- ⁴⁵ Catherine Hall, Keith McClelland and Jane Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender and the Reform Act of 1867* (Cambridge, 2000), ch. 4; Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (London, 1995).
- ⁴⁶ Bruce Nelson, “‘Come out of Such a Land, You Irishmen:’ Daniel O’Connell, American Slavery, and the Making of the ‘Irish Race,’” *Eire-Ireland*, 42 (2009): 58-81, 63.
- ⁴⁷ Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, ch. 1; Christine Kinealy, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester, 2009), 46.
- ⁴⁸ MacDonagh, *O’Connell*, 11.

-
- ⁴⁹ Eliga H. Gould, "Revolution and Counter-Revolution," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (Basingstoke, 2002), 209.
- ⁵⁰ O'Connell to P. V. FitzPatrick, 21 February 1833, *O'Connell Correspondence*, 5:11.
- ⁵¹ O'Connell to P. V. FitzPatrick, 22 March 1833, *O'Connell Correspondence*, 5:21; H. C. G. Matthew, 'Gladstone, O'Connell and Home Rule', in *National Questions: Reflections on Daniel O'Connell and Contemporary Ireland*, ed. R. V. Comerford and E. Delaney (Dublin 2000), 11-29.
- ⁵² Pocock, *Discovery of Islands*, 96.
- ⁵³ *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 22:1092-1117, 1109 (House of Commons, April 22, 1834).
- ⁵⁴ This is not to suggest that Chartism, or Repeal for that matter, eschewed a "democratic idiom;" rather, that many Chartists understood the English constitution to be grounded in common law, which could easily be read as justification for democracy. The forthcoming work of Josh Gibson, University of Cambridge, promises to shed a great deal of light on this aspect of Chartist ideology, and in particular how Chartists anchored themselves in the tradition of the American Revolution (itself grounded in English common law). John Gibson, "Chartism and the Age of Democratic Revolutions," paper presented at Chartism Day, Chester University, June 11, 2016.
- ⁵⁵ Eugenio F. Biagini, "Liberty and Nationalism in Ireland, 1798-1922," *Historical Journal*, 51 (2008), 793-809, 796. For the centrality of Locke in Irish nationalism see Richard English, *Irish Freedom: The History of Nationalism in Ireland* (London, 2006), ch. 2.
- ⁵⁶ Pauline Collombier-Lakeman, "Daniel O'Connell and India," *Etudes Irlandaises*, 38 (2013): 41-54; Gregory Vargo, "'Outworks of the Citadel of Corruption': The Chartist Press Reports the Empire", *Victorian Studies*, 54 (2012): 227-53.
- ⁵⁷ John Belchem, "*Orator Hunt:*" *Henry Hunt and English Working-Class Radicalism* (London, 2012 [1985]), 141-2; George Spater, *William Cobbett: The Poor Man's Friend* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1982), 2:464, 467-71.
- ⁵⁸ O'Connell to his wife, 3 and 9 March 1829, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 4:16, 25.
- ⁵⁹ O'Connell to Edward Dwyer, 11 March, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 4:27.
- ⁶⁰ *Dublin Monitor*, January 31, 1839; Fergus D'Arcy, "O'Connell and the English Radicals," in *The World of Daniel O'Connell*, 57, 61-2; *Dublin Evening Post*, September 7, 1841; *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 49:260 (House of Commons, July 12, 1839); *Poor Man's Guardian, and Repealer*, No. 5, 19.
- ⁶¹ *Freeman's Journal*, September 14, 1841; *British Statesman*, August 20, 1842.
- ⁶² E.g., William Fagan, *The Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell*, 2 vols. (Cork, 1847-48), 1:116; NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms. 13,623 (2), Resolutions passed at meeting, December 19, 1839.

-
- ⁶³ NLI, O'Connell Papers, Precursor Society, Ms 3191, "The role of the Precursor Society;" Edward Bullen, *Five Reports on the Committee of the Precursor Association [on] the Parliamentary Franchises in the United Kingdom* (Dublin, 1839), copy in NLI, Joly Collection 746.
- ⁶⁴ J. O'Connell, *Recollections and Experiences during a Parliamentary Career from 1833 to 1848* (2 vols, London, 1849), 1: 307.
- ⁶⁵ John Prest, *Politics in the Age of Cobden* (London, 1977), 54-71.
- ⁶⁶ O'Connell to Arthur French, February 7, 1837, *O'Connell Correspondence*, 6:13.
- ⁶⁷ *Address of the National Association of Ireland* (Dublin, 1840), NLI P 382 (8).
- ⁶⁸ *Report of the Committee of the National Association of Ireland on the Number of Representatives to which Ireland is Entitled* (Dublin, 1840), broadside in Boston Public Library, (MA, USA), CAB.24.24.1 v.2.
- ⁶⁹ *English Chartist Circular*, No. 135, 331.
- ⁷⁰ *NS*, July 13, 1839, May 29, 1841, May 26, 1838.
- ⁷¹ Thompson, "Ireland and the Irish," 122.
- ⁷² *Nation*, December 10, 1842.
- ⁷³ O'Higgins, "Ireland and Chartism," 376-81.
- ⁷⁴ *NS*, May 29, 1841.
- ⁷⁵ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13622 (14), James Fuller to T. M. Ray, August 24, 1841.
- ⁷⁶ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13622 (20), Mr Gately to Ray, August 31, 1841.
- ⁷⁷ *NS*, August 14, 21 August, and September 18, 1841.
- ⁷⁸ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13622 (30), James O'Connell to Ray, September 7, 1841.
- ⁷⁹ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13623 (28), Daniel Porter to Ray, October 10, 1841.
- ⁸⁰ *Freeman's Journal*, February 22, 1842.
- ⁸¹ Martin J. Mitchell, *The Irish in the West of Scotland 1797-1848* (Edinburgh, 1998), 189-90. *NS*, November 13, 1841 (O'Connor's visit to Dumfries).
- ⁸² *NS*, July 30, 1842. For the Repeal movement in Britain see Huston Gilmore, "Radicalism, Romanticism and Repeal: The Repeal Movement in the context of Irish Nationalist Culture between Catholic Emancipation and the 1848 Rising" (Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 2009), ch. 4.
- ⁸³ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13624 (60), Michael Kelly to Ray, April 5, 1843; Ms 13625 (1), Kelly to Ray, April 27, 1843. For evidence of dissension in repeal ranks vis-à-vis Chartism see: NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13623 (28), James McAuley, October 18, 1841

⁸⁴ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13622 (41), Clancy to Ray, September 21, 1841. Clancy, now resident in London, had been secretary of the Dublin Chartist Association in 1839. See his letter in *NS*, August 3, 1839.

⁸⁵ *NS*, June 3, 1843.

⁸⁶ *Freeman's Journal*, July 4, 1843.

⁸⁷ *NS*, August 8, 1846.

⁸⁸ David Goodway, *London Chartism 1838-1848* (Cambridge, 1982), 64.

⁸⁹ David A. Wilson, *United Irishmen, United States: Immigrant Radicals in the Early Republic* (Dublin and Portland, OR, 1998), 10, 169.

⁹⁰ Angela F. Murphy, *American Slavery, Irish Freedom: Abolition, Immigrant Citizenship, and the Transatlantic Movement for Irish Repeal* (Baton Rouge, LA, 2010), 50-1.

⁹¹ Broadside in Boston Public Library, (MA, USA), CAB.24.24.1 v.2.

⁹² Thomas Carlyle, *Chartism* (Boston, 1840).

⁹³ Chase, *Chartism*, 202.

⁹⁴ O'Connell to Frederick W. Conway, September 6, 1838, and O'Connell to David R. Pigot, September 30, 1838, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 6: 176, 185.

⁹⁵ *NS*, 25 May, 1839, June 8, 1839; *Charter*, June 9, 1839.

⁹⁶ O'Connell to P. V. Fitzpatrick, May 19, 1841, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 7:62-3.

⁹⁷ O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, January 17, 1840, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 6:296-97.

⁹⁸ *NS*, April 4 and 13, 1839; Thomas Milton Kemnitz, "The Chartist Convention of 1839," *Albion*, 10 (1978), 152-70: 161-64, 169.

⁹⁹ On the links between O'Connell and the League see Paul A. Pickering and Alex Tyrrell, *The People's Bread: A History of the Anti-Corn Law League* (London, 2000), ch. 4.

¹⁰⁰ *NS*, January 16, 1841.

¹⁰¹ *NS*, April 24, 1841; David J. Moss, *Thomas Attwood: The Biography of a Radical* (Montreal & Kingston, 1990), 276; Chase, *Chartism*, 47, 50, 173-5.

¹⁰² O'Connell to Harney, December 24, 1837, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 6:117.

¹⁰³ Cleave to O'Connell, December 16, 1840, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 6: 396.

¹⁰⁴ A. R. Schoyen, *The Chartist Challenge: A Portrait of George Julian Harney* (London, 1958), 23-26.

¹⁰⁵ British Library, London [BL], Add MS 37,773, Working Men's Association Minutes, Vol. 1, 1836-1839, 27 Feb. and 7 March 1837, f. 38.

-
- ¹⁰⁶ George Howell, *A History of the Working Men's Association from 1836 to 1850* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1970 [1900]), 76-8.
- ¹⁰⁷ *London Dispatch*, October 1, 1836; *Champion*, January 1, 1837.
- ¹⁰⁸ *NS*, February 10, 1838.
- ¹⁰⁹ P. H. Muntz to O'Connell, January 1, 1838, in *O'Connell Correspondence*, 6:120-1
- ¹¹⁰ *Freeman's Journal*, June 5, 1839, March 12, 1841, May 11, August 16 and 30, 1842; *Manchester Times*, April 25, 1840.
- ¹¹¹ *Charter*, June 9, 1839.
- ¹¹² William Lovett, *A Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Esq., MP, in Reply to the Calumnies He Put Forth in the Corn Exchange, August 8th, in Answer to the Address of the National Association to the People of Ireland* (1843), reproduced in *The Chartist Movement in Britain, 1838-1850*, ed. Gregory Claeys, 6 vols. (London, 2001), 3:195-200.
- ¹¹³ E.g., letter by 'Republican' in *NS*, December 5, 1840; and L. T. Clancy's letter in *NS*, October 1, 1842.
- ¹¹⁴ *Charter*, February 17, 1839.
- ¹¹⁵ *NS*, April 17 and 24, May 1, 1841. For similar attacks on the resignations of the Birmingham delegates from the Convention see Schoyen, *Chartist Challenge*, 40; and in relation to Complete Suffrage see *NS*, April 30, May 21, June 4, 1842.
- ¹¹⁶ *NS*, May 22, 1841.
- ¹¹⁷ Angus Macintyre, *The Liberator: Daniel O'Connell and the Irish Party, 1830-1847* (London, 1965), 266.
- ¹¹⁸ *NS*, July 8, 1843.
- ¹¹⁹ *NS*, December 24, 1841.
- ¹²⁰ *Belfast Newsletter*, December 22, 1840. For the Ulster Constitutional Association see John Bew, *The Glory of Being Britons: Civic Unionism in Nineteenth-Century Belfast* (Dublin, 2009), ch. 3.
- ¹²¹ The National Archives, Kew [TNA], Colonial Office [CO], 904/8, October 13, 1841, f. 375.
- ¹²² Allan Blackstock, "Tommy Downshire's Boys: Popular Protest, Social Change and Political Manipulation in Mid-Ulster 1829-1847," *Past & Present*, 196 (2007): 125-72.
- ¹²³ Kerby A. Miller, *Ireland and Irish America: Culture, Class, and Transatlantic Migration* (Dublin 2008), ch. 8.

¹²⁴ Kevin Whelan, “The Green Atlantic: Radical Reciprocities between Ireland and America in the Long Eighteenth Century,” in *A New Imperial History: Culture Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660-1840*, ed. Kathleen Wilson (Cambridge, 2004), 230-1.

¹²⁵ TNA, CO 904/8, October 2, 1841, f. 355 verso, October 13, 1841, f. 375; *NS*, December 5, 1840, April 17, 1840, July 24, 1840, Aug 21, 1840, September 4 and 18, 1840, July, 24, 1841; October 9, 23 and 30, 1841; February 26, March, 12, 1842, April 9 and 30, 1842, July 30, 1842, November 19, 1842, December 3, 1842; *Freeman’s Journal*, August 18, 1841, September 10, 1841; *Galway Vindicator*, March 5, 1842; *Kerry Examiner*, March 4, 1842; *Dublin Weekly Register*, March 5, 1842; *Poor Man’s Guardian, and Repealer’s Friend*, No. 6, 45, No. 9, 69.

¹²⁶ O’Higgins, “Ireland and Chartism, 111. I have defined “groups” as places where explicit reference is made to a number of individuals, e.g. when a group from an Irish locality wrote to the IUSA requesting membership. Such requests from single individuals – of which there were many – have been discounted for this purpose. This almost certainly under-estimates the number and location of Chartists in Ireland, not least because the letters to the IUSA had become so voluminous by October 1841 – some of which were from Chartist groups in Ireland – that many of them were no longer read at the weekly meetings of the IUSA. TNA, CO 904/8, October 26, 1841, f. 379.

¹²⁷ *NS*, June 25, 1842.

¹²⁸ *NS*, January 22, 1842, August 6, 1842, September 10 1842.

¹²⁹ *NS*, 21 August, 1841, October 9, 1841.

¹³⁰ *NS*, March 5 and 26, 1842, and May 21, 1842; *Freeman’s Journal*, August 13, 1841, September 7, 1841.

¹³¹ *NS*, August 21, 1841.

¹³² *NS*, January 9, 1841, November 20 and 27, 1841, December 11, 1841, June 25, 1842

¹³³ *NS*, September 10, 1842.

¹³⁴ *NS*, November 26, 1842.

¹³⁵ National Archives of Ireland [NAI], Chief Secretary’s Office [CSO], Registered Papers/Outrage Papers, 1841: 15/399-499 (report of Chartist delegate at Shannon Harbour), 9/9445 (Dublin), 1/13323 (Belfast), 29/14093 (Waterford), 16/14825 (Mohill, Co. Leitrim), 16/14919 (Roscommon), 11/15869 (Loughrea), 18661-3 (Leitrim), ; 1842: 1/979 (Belfast), 1/2219 (Belfast), 8/5439 (Newtonards), 1/7203 (Belfast). For the concerns of the Repeal Association about Chartist activity in Ireland see: NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13622 (30), letter from Cork, September 12, 1841; Ms 13622 (45), letter from Dublin, August 2, 1841.

-
- ¹³⁶ NAI, CSO, Registered Papers, 1841: 20/11551, August 6.
- ¹³⁷ *Freeman's Journal*, August 10 and 21, 1839, April 6, 1841; *NS*, December 17, 1842; *NS*, April 30, 1842, August 6, 1842.
- ¹³⁸ NAI, CSO Outrage Papers, 1841: 1/18237, December 10.
- ¹³⁹ *Belfast Commercial Chronicle*, September 4, 1841.
- ¹⁴⁰ *NS*, May 8, 1841.
- ¹⁴¹ *NS*, December 5, 1840, May 22, 1841.
- ¹⁴² *Freeman's Journal*, August 24, 1841.
- ¹⁴³ *Northern Whig*, December 11, 1841.
- ¹⁴⁴ *NS*, April 24, 1841.
- ¹⁴⁵ *NS*, November 27, 1841 (Drogheda)
- ¹⁴⁶ It is noteworthy that J. H. Treble, who concluded that few ordinary Irishmen participated in Chartism before 1848, based this conclusion on a study of the repeal press not the letters coming into the repeal association. Treble, "Attitudes of Irish Immigrants," 220-9.
- ¹⁴⁷ TNA, CO 904/8, August 13, 1841, f. 291.
- ¹⁴⁹ *Newry Telegraph* quoted in *Northern Whig*, April 3 1841. For another example see *Belfast Vindicator*, October 13, 1841.
- ¹⁵⁰ NAI, CSO, Outrage Papers, 15/399-449, January 21, 1841.
- ¹⁵¹ *NS*, July 16, 1842.
- ¹⁵² Cormac Ó Gráda, "Seasonal Migration and post-Famine Adjustment in the West of Ireland," *Studia Hibernica*, 13 (1973): 48-76, 51-2.
- ¹⁵³ TNA, CO 904/8, October 26, 1841, f. 379.
- ¹⁵⁴ *NS*, September 18, 1841.
- ¹⁵⁵ *NS*, October 30, 1841, September 11, 1841 (letter of John Conroy).
- ¹⁵⁶ Donald M. MacRaild, *The Irish Diaspora in Britain, 1750-1939* (Basingstoke, 2011), 11.
- ¹⁵⁷ *NS*, January 9, 1841.
- ¹⁵⁸ *NS*, August 7, 1841.
- ¹⁵⁹ *NS*, September 11, 1841.
- ¹⁶⁰ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13,623 (61), no name, Strawberry Banks, dated December 8, 1841.
- ¹⁶¹ *NS*, October 1, 1842 (Clancy to Patrick Rafter of the IUSA – the first of a series of letters).

¹⁶² BL, Add MS 34245, General Convention of the Industrious Classes, Vol. B, Lowery to Smart, August 13, 1839, f.131.

¹⁶³ TNA, CO 904/8, August 30, 1841, f. 298.

¹⁶⁴ TNA, CO 904/8, October 26, 1841, f. 379, November 18, 1841, f. 392 verso.

¹⁶⁵ Notwithstanding the setback suffered in summer 1839, a Chartist association appears to have been re-established in the autumn of 1840. *NS*, October 17, 1840, December 5, 1840. Clearly, the *Northern Star* circulated more widely before 1841-2 and beyond Dublin. As early as February 1839 there was agent in Coleraine (listed, incidentally as *the* agent for the whole of Ireland, which is surely indicative of just how weak Irish Chartism was at this stage). *NS*, February 9, 1839.

¹⁶⁶ BL, Add MS 37,773, Working Men's Association Minutes, Vol. 1, 1836-1839, October 24 and November 27, 1838, ff. 128, 132. See also Fergus D'Arcy, "The Artisans of Dublin and Daniel O'Connell, 1830-47: An Unquiet Liaison," *Irish Historical Studies*, 27 (1970): 221-43.

¹⁶⁷ Brian Harrison and Patricia Hollis, eds., *Robert Lowery: Radical and Chartist* (London, 1979), 144.

¹⁶⁸ *NS*, September 11, 1841.

¹⁶⁹ NAI, CSO, Outrage Reports, 1841: 9/9445, June 5, 1841.

¹⁷⁰ TNA, CO 904/8, October 2, 1841, f. 355 verso.

¹⁷¹ TNA, CO 904/8, August 30, 1841, fos. 297, 340.

¹⁷² *NS*, October 9, 1841 (letter read from Athboy), March 5, 1842 (letter read from Tredennick tenants).

¹⁷³ NLI, Repeal Association Papers, Ms 13622 (45) report from Michael Reynolds, n.d.

¹⁷⁴ *NS*, April 16, 1842.

¹⁷⁵ Read, "The 'Repeal Year.'"

¹⁷⁷ *NS*, November 18, 1843.

¹⁷⁸ *NS*, May 3, 1845.

¹⁷⁹ *English Chartist Circular*, No. 126, p. 293. This newspaper was regularly reprinting extracts from the *Nation* by 1843: No. 127, p. 297, No. 134, p. 325, No. 141, p. 353.

¹⁸⁰ Lane, *Thomas Sheahan*, 60.

¹⁸¹ NLI, Repeal Papers, Ms 13624 (22), John M. Loughlin, March 1, 1843.

¹⁸² *Tuam Herald*, August 28, 1841.

¹⁸³ Treble, "Attitudes of Irish Immigrants," 42.

¹⁸⁴ *NS*, October 30, 1841.

¹⁸⁵ *Liverpool Mercury*, June 28, 1839.

¹⁸⁶ Treble, "Attitudes of Irish Immigrants," 49.

¹⁸⁷ NAI, Outrage Papers, 1841: 1/13323, September 1.

¹⁸⁸ TNA, CO 904/8.

¹⁸⁹ Ultán Gillen, "Constructing Democratic Thought in Ireland in the Age of Democratic Revolution, 1775-1800"; Laurent Colantonio, "'Democracy' and the Irish People, 1830-48"; S. J. Connolly, "The Limits of Democracy: Ireland 1778-1848," in *Re-Imagining Democracy*, 149-88; Thompson, *Outsiders*, 130-63.

¹⁹⁰ S. J. Connolly, ed. *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000). Important exceptions, however, are Blackstock, *Loyalism*, and Higgins, *A Nation of Politicians*, which do much to reassert the democratic impulse in late eighteenth century Irish popular politics.

¹⁹¹ Paul. A. Pickering, *Feargus O'Connor: A Political Life* (Monmouth, 2008), ch. 3.

¹⁹² O'Higgins, "Ireland and Chartism," 84-101.

¹⁹³ For this interpretation see Belchem, "Orator Hunt:", introduction; *The Early Chartists*, ed. Dorothy Thompson (London, 1971), 12-13.

¹⁹⁴ David Lloyd, "Black Irish, Irish Whiteness and Atlantic State Formation," in *The Black and Green Atlantic: Cross-Currents of the African and Irish Diasporas*, ed. Peter D. O'Neill and David Lloyd (Basingstoke, 2009), 3-19: 16.

¹⁹⁵ In addition to the works cited in note 11, see R. Boston, *British Chartists in America 1839-1900* (Manchester, 1971); J. Bronstein, *Land Reform and the Working Class Experience in Britain and the United States 1800-1862* (Stanford, 1999); A. Heath, "'The Producers on the One Side, and the Capitalists on the Other:': Labor Reform, Slavery, and the Career of a Transatlantic Radical, 1838-1873", *American Nineteenth-Century History* 13 (2012), 1-29.

¹⁹⁷ For the rich potentials of this approach see Mary Stewart, "Expanding the Archive: The Role of Family History in Exploring Connections within a Settler's World," in *People and their Pasts: Public History Today*, ed. P. Ashton and H. Kean (Basingstoke, 2009), 240-259.

¹⁹⁸ For an overview of transnational Irish labor history see Kyle Hughes and Donald M. MacRaild, "Irish Politics and Labour: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives," in *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History*, ed. Niall Whelehan (London, 2015), 45-68.

¹⁹⁹ Gregory Vargo has also noted that the "mass of writing on Irish issues" by Chartists "means the topic merits its own detailed study." Vargo, "'Outworks of the Citadel of Corruption,'" 249, n.3.

-
- ²⁰⁰ Morgan and Greene, “The Present State of Atlantic History,” 10.
- ²⁰¹ J. H. Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492-1830* (New Haven, 2006), xvi.
- ²⁰² Michel Ducharme, *The Idea of Liberty in Canada during the Age of Atlantic Revolutions, 1776-1838*, trans. Peter Feldstein (Montreal, 2014).
- ²⁰³ Ducharme, *Liberty*, 5, 35.
- ²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁰⁵ Malcolm Chase, *The Chartists: Perspectives & Legacies* (London, 2015), 43.
- ²⁰⁶ K. Theodore Hoppen, “Riding a Tiger: Daniel O’Connell, Reform, and Popular Politics in Ireland, 1800-1847,” in *Reform in Great Britain and Germany*, ed. T. C. W. Blanning and Peter Wende (Oxford, 1999), 121-44; Biagini, “Liberty,” 798.
- ²⁰⁷ Macintyre, *The Liberator; A Union of Multiple Identities: The British Isles, c.1750-c.1850*, ed. Laurence Brockliss and David Eastwood (Manchester, 1997).
- ²⁰⁸ For this typology see Whelan, “The Green Atlantic,” 216.
- ²⁰⁹ James E. Crimmins, “Jeremy Bentham and Daniel O’Connell: Their Correspondence and Radical Alliance, 1828-31,” *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), 359-87: 367.
- ²¹⁰ D’Arcy, “O’Connell and the English Radicals,” 63.
- ²¹¹ T. Davis to W. S. O’Brien, [1844], William Smith O’Brien Papers, NLI MS 432; Irish Confederation Minute Book, Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, MS 23/H/44.
- ²¹² Gurney, “The Democratic Idiom.”
- ²¹³ Miller, *Ireland and Irish America*, 383.
- ²¹⁴ Hall, McClelland Jane Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation; Ignatiev, How the Irish Became White*; John Belchem, “Nationalism, Republicanism and Exile: Irish Emigrants and the Revolutions of 1848,” *Past & Present*, 146 (1995), 103-35.
- ²¹⁵ Murphy, *American Slavery*, 18-20.
- ²¹⁶ John Newsinger, “Old Chartists, Fenians, and New Socialists,” *Éire-Ireland*, 17 (1982), 19-45; Anthony Daly, “‘The true remedy for Irish grievances is to be found in good political institutions’: English Radicals and Irish Nationalism, 1847-74,” *Historical Research*, 86 (2013), 53-75.
- ²¹⁷ Eugenio. F. Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism, 1876-1906* (Cambridge, 2007), chs. 3, 6.