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Abstract:

'A Comparative Re-examination of Anglo-Irish Relations in Nineteenth-Century Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle-upon-Tyne'.

Caroline L. Scott

In attempting to reassess the nature of nineteenth-century Anglo-Irish relations in England I propose to examine the comparative economic, religious, political, cultural and residential characteristics of immigrant Irish in three northern cities which have hitherto been portrayed as the polarities of immigrant experience (Liverpool being the worst, and Newcastle the best) and the archetypal model of such (Manchester). Through exploiting a wealth of under-used primary material, I intend to explore in particular the reliability of the prevailing image of the Irish as a social and criminal problem, and, moreover contemporary belief in this portrayal; to test assumptions regarding the degree of social dispersion, and the extent of (and the prevalence of the perception of) the threat the Irish posed to the livelihood of the 'native' population; to question how consciousness of religious difference conditioned response; to assess the extent of participation in English political conventions and the nature of popular reaction to Irish nationalism; to investigate the degree to which a sense of 'Irishness' persisted, conditioned social life and generated a 'cultural distance'; to scrutinize the extent of residential 'ghettoization', through census studies, and to examine how English perceptions were influenced by racial-nationalistic stereotypes. In so doing I propose to observe chronological variation, to compare reactions to the Irish with those to other immigrant groups, and thence to test whether it was the size and type of Irish immigrant population that determined response, or the peculiar economic, social, political, religious and cultural characteristics of the cities in which they settled. Thereby I hope to demonstrate the subject to be infinitely more complex than the traditional static image of the Irish as a universally vilified and ghettoized minority.
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It is a valid reaction to query the objective of researching such a well-documented subject as nineteenth-century Irish immigrant experience in England. But there remains a great capacity for revision in this area, its traditional history being a minefield of propaganda and potent stereotypes. With perpetuation of the prevailing ideologically, sensationally and politically serviceable images, through uncritical interpretation and empirical imbalance, the line between myth and fact has become indistinct.

There is no paucity of contemporary comment regarding the Irish immigrant presence, but what rendered the contemporary loquacious should render the historian cautious, for much of this is polemic. Consequently researching immigrant settlement is not so much an operation of searching for references, but of sifting and analysing an abundance of material. Though contemporary comment is not as monochromatic as historical interpretation suggests, it is uniform in its general purposefulness (combative or defensive). Mild and casual reflection was exceptional. Furthermore, other than in the mantle of cleric, radical or nationalist, there is a virtual vacuum of Irish immigrant commentary on their communities’ characteristics and reception. There, thus, exists an empirical imbalance which the historian must consciously negotiate. It is a wonder then that this is not a more controversial area. I am not thence proposing an antithetical white-wash, and certainly not a hagiography of immigrants, but the motives of commentators must be addressed. E. P. Thompson’s dictum that, ‘It is not the friction, but the relative ease with which the Irish were absorbed into working class communities which is remarkable’,\(^1\) has been loudly criticized, but the prevailing negative interpretation too offhandedly dismisses the positive. Some moderation is over-due. The polemically attractive notion of the Irish being marginalized profoundly influences much of the available primary material, and thereby, likewise, historical interpretation. In particular the 1836 Report on the State
of the Irish Poor has been given a primacy that is inappropriate for the century as a whole, and accredited a dubious authority, given the ulterior motives of its authors and contributors. Its sentiments dominate the conclusions of such eminent names as J. H. Clapham, A. Redford, J. M. Werly, M. A. G. O'Tuathaigh, K. O'Connor and E. D. Steele, who perceive a sustained barely-below-the-surface antipathy, and, in Liverpool's case an on-going civil war, that is simply not credible theoretically or empirically.

Study of England's Irish communities has undergone considerable revision in the past thirty years. There is prevalent a desire to re-evaluate some of the more glaring misconceptions and to exploit the wealth of under-used primary materials, which have been handled with greater caution and professionalism. Why, then, is there a need for another study? The current historiographical challenge has been directed overwhelmingly through revision of the more blatantly discrepant areas, such as the experience of Irish in rural communities, small towns, in Scotland and Wales, and through investigating the progress of the intellectual and social elite. Subsequently Liverpool and Manchester, the cities that generated the oft contested stereotypes, remain bywords for sectarian division and slum degeneracy, with Irish communities subjected to what is conventionally presented as a legitimate native economic, political, cultural, racial, religious and social prejudice. Work thus remains incomplete. Studies generally comprise revisionist but synoptic overviews or meticulous but specific and uncomparative local and particular investigations. I hope by an analogical construction of the latter to contribute something of an improved validity to the former.

The question of the degree of integration is one that has brought historians into contention, implying a problematic definition and a diversity of experience, dependent on chronology and the particular circumstances of the locality, and illustrating the influence upon conclusions of the historian's ideological approach, as they have contested whether integration was a positive or a self-deprecating development. Given the non-homogeneity of the labouring populations of the rapidly
growing cosmopolitan nineteenth-century cities 'assimilation' is not measurable against any standard, but is rather perhaps best gauged in terms of the generally perceived remarkability and acceptability of the Irish presence. Indices of integration are represented by levels of inter-marriage, in common cultural, social and political participation, in residential, linguistic, economic, demographic and criminal 'normalization', and by examining native responses to Catholicism, nationalism and cultural and ethnic distance. Second and third generation English-Irish become harder to study as they are less the subject of contemporary comment. The obvious assumption is that they therefore must have been absorbed by 'English society', but, alternatively, it is unclear whether those referred to as Irish by contemporaries are Irish-born or Irish-by-descent.

Liverpool and Newcastle have been depicted as the polarities of Irish urban experience, while Manchester, the subject of fascination for a plethora of nineteenth-century philanthropic investigators, has been, and, even in the latest histories, continues to be, presented as the archetypal model of such: 'the city where most of the stereotypes originated or gained credence'. It is the intention of this thesis both to test comparatively the legitimacy of these assumptions, and to investigate the influence of the different economic structures and political inclinations of the three cities. Numbers were important in determining native response, as is emphatically evinced by the case of Liverpool, where Irish immigration at the time of the Famine resembled an invasion. While London had the largest Irish population of any area in England in the nineteenth century, significantly Liverpool retained the highest proportion of Irish to native population (see fig. 0.1-0.3).

In contrast to most studies, the chronology of this thesis is a broad one, as only transient conclusions can be derived from a short-term snapshot. The nineteenth century is a period of exceptional change, and the reactions to post-Famine...
communities are only genuinely comprehensible in the light of pre-Famine community relations, and with appreciation of the 'urban invasion' that the 1840s represented. Furthermore, this is not just a matter of numbers, for the economic and social characteristics of immigrants varied chronologically, as did their origin within Ireland. The Famine has traditionally been regarded as a turning-point in Irish history and accordingly it has been treated as a watershed in immigrant history, transforming relations and generating an overt anti-Irish prejudice. As historians are re-evaluating the importance of the Famine in Irish history, here too an examination is over-due.

This is not the place for detailed analysis of the circumstances determining the emigration decision, but an overview of the interplay of push and pull factors is vital to appreciate the attitudes and circumstances of immigrants. Before the Famine low agricultural productivity on farms in the west of Ireland and population pressure led to the establishment of the tradition of seasonal labour migration. Initially migrants travelled to the east of Ireland to help with the harvest, but, as demand began to exceed the work available and excessive subdivision effectively disinherited younger sons and daughters, as the English import of grain drew the economies closer together and demand for labour in England increased, as steam boat services were established and became cheaper, and de-industrialization began in Ireland, migrants became immigrants. Before the Famine it was possible to cross the sea for the price of an unskilled labourer's day's wages. At first they came to England (largely from Connacht, Mayo, Roscommon, Leitrim, Sligo and Donegal) as harvest workers but progressively they remained over the winter (in 1841 17,651 of the 57,651 who came as harvest workers remained) and increasingly they came from Ulster and the southern and eastern seabords to industrial centres, as Ulster industry declined and reorientated and wages in English industry increased faster than in agriculture. It is no coincidence that the areas with large-scale Irish settlement were those with high labour demand. As John Denvir noted, the Irish were generally the first to settle in areas where there was opportunity, and the first to leave when there was a downturn.

This study aims to evaluate whether context or immigrant characteristics most
influenced their reception. Cooter's research on the north-east emphasizes the former, as, generally, do studies of Liverpool.\textsuperscript{10} However this thesis contends that reception was determined by the origin and previous experience, as much as, if not more than, by the society in which immigrants arrived. While the Liverpool Irish overwhelmingly came direct from Leinster, Down and Mayo,\textsuperscript{11} an unusually large proportion of those entering Newcastle came from largely Protestant and more industrial and urbanized Ulster, and Connacht, with very few from Leinster (contrarily Cooter supposed that they generally came from the most depressed western counties), sailing from Belfast to Whitehaven and (to a lesser extent) Glasgow (as is evinced by the number with Scottish spouses, and, or, children),\textsuperscript{12} and so had both the means and determination to undertake substantial travel to Newcastle and, consequently, previous experience of residence within England upon arrival in the town, in contrast with the 'raw' immigrants who entered Liverpool (see fig. 0.4 and 0.5). Moreover, remoteness from ports meant that while immigrants in Manchester and Newcastle tended to remain for some time, and therefore acclimatized to urban ways (arguably this was more important than assimilation to 'English' mores), the Irish population of Liverpool was substantially transient.
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1. The Irish as a Social Problem

One of the most recurrent themes of nineteenth-century commentary on Irish settlement, and of the standard history, is its imposition of a distinct, exceptional and on-going 'social disease'. England regarded the Irish influx as economically necessary but distasteful. 'On landing here, he is cast into prison as an idle vagabond', Irish Confederate George Smyth emotively complained, 'free trade England wants not him but the produce of his toil'. Immigrants were commonly depicted as a threat to health and peace, introducing dirt and disease, and their accompanying characteristic vices of lawlessness, indolence, improvidence and immorality. However the purpose and chronological validity of contemporary accounts and statistics require re-evaluation.

In spite of the disparity of their propagandizing and moralizing designs, J. P. Kay, Carlyle, Engels, Mayhew and A. B. Reach all concurred in their ideological utilization of the Irish, as scapegoats and potent emblems, in examining the emergence of the industrial 'urban jungles' with their social and moral dislocation. Immigration coincided with developing realization of the draw-backs of industrialization, and served as a convenient scapegoat for urban authorities. Polemic expediency necessitated that the worst extremes of the immigrant experience should be sensationaly presented as general standards, and subsequently they were uniformly cloned as social saboteurs, deviants and misfits. This is not to say that the Irish did not cause problems (or, rather, magnify and exacerbate existing problems), but extremes are disproportionately and anachronistically publicized. Graham Davis and Mervyn Busteed illustrate how influential the writings of Dr. J. P. Kay were in particular. Kay's *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes employed in the cotton manufacture in Manchester* (1832), seeking to dissociate urban distress from industrialization and stir the authorities into action, identified Irish immigration directly with public health problems and, in emotive prose, sought to demonstrate their negative influence on the industrial populace. Queries about how
genuine Kay's descriptions and emphases were voiced at the time. In 1835 Francis Place said of Kay,

> his picture is a very deplorable one...his narration relates almost wholly to the state of the Irish, but...the condition of a vast number of the people was as bad some years ago, as he believes the worst portion of them to be now.

But the work quickly became a source book for Victorian sociologists and philanthropists, and with it studyably compact Little Ireland became the choice destination of anthropological tourism. Thus while the area's existence was short-lived it endured as a potent symbol in the 'Condition of England' debate. Given that contemporary portrayal in monochromatic, and little is accordingly known of the crowds of Irish who diffused away from their more polemically invigorating countrymen, the historiography is equally biased. Moreover the image of the ghettoized Irish has served well modern polemists' discourses on England's exploitation of the Irish.

A striking feature of contemporary comment is the fundamental lack of interest in why the Irish constituted a problem, indicative of the fact that they were convenient scapegoats. Lack of mutual empathy, reflected Bogue, rendered the Irish in English eyes 'nothing better than rogues, vagabonds and liars'. The Irish contribution to urban social problems is generally glibly attributed to a national character beyond redemption and an inferior level of 'civilization'. Immigrants were victims of the vogue among social commentators for decrying living standards in rural Ireland as symptomatic of the barbarity of the race. Liverpool frequently appealed for its 'riff-raff' Irish to go home, but one wonders what Liverpudlians would have had to talk about had this ever happened? Furthermore such recurrent characterization of the Irish as uncultivated savages advanced the dominant intellectual ethic that the Irish were unfit to govern themselves. Consequently Irish circumstances are not regarded as an element of general urban English social problems, but as a different issue, requiring a separate solution. Even when the propagandizing objectives of the observer require the manipulation of Irish social problems as symptomatic of a broader evil, such as industrial capitalism or
urbanization, they are seldom represented as its victims, but, rather, generally, the sinister, albeit unwitting, conspirators in its perpetration. Acknowledgement of cultural, economic or educational determinants is rare. The professional pseudo-scientific thoroughness of Sir George Cornewall Lewis's 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor* with its exploration of the 'Causes of deterioration' ('1. Removal from home', '2. Change from country to town', '3. Change from low to high wages', '4. Poor laws, charities and police'), is therefore evident.

The conclusions of the investigations of the 1830s and 1840s have been presented as valid for the whole century. However the empirical imbalance is in itself portentous. During the Famine period the Irish refugees genuinely did represent an unprecedented problem, especially in the principal debarkation port of Liverpool, confirming already formulated stereotypes, as they strained limited welfare resources and native sympathy. James Harvey complained:

> the savage, dirty, demoralized, idle Irish...flood Manchester and Liverpool with dirt, faction, superstition, typhus fever and beggary.

First-generation immigrants suffered the worst of circumstances, but, as they were generally the focus of comment, the community as a whole is represented unduly and anachronistically harshly. But this is not entirely a misconception of historians, as the fact that the Irish were thought to constitute a social problem, was more influential to contemporary relations than that they actually did. J. A. Jackson asserts that the identification of the Irish as a 'social problem' was confined to the period 1800-60. S. Gilley concurs, observing that thereafter 'consciousness of the Irish as a special problem requiring a special solution quietly dies away'. Although the social improvement of settled individuals was offset by the arrival of new immigrants, it is progressively true that their poverty in general became less extreme, the Catholic clergy strove to make them 'respectable', to suppress drinking, wildness, improvidence and suspicion-arousing secret societies, slum areas formerly associated with the Irish were cleared and, with slowing immigration, the easing dislocation of the Famine generation and the adaptation to an urban existence and English cultural
norms, communities became less distinct, and, thereby, serviceable as scapegoats.

Given that contemporary criticism is overwhelmingly of external 'respectable' origin, its value as regards immediate interaction is questionable. Often observers had little familiarity with working class life in general, meaning that reflections on Irish circumstances are inappropriately sensational. The social context into which the Irish moved did not represent such a clear contrast as is implied by the habitual highlighting of the Irish as a problem. Indeed the deficit of recorded working class opinion necessitates the deduction of popular reaction via comparative examination of the 'facts' of immigrant social problems and the context within which such occurred. The scarcity of evident working class reaction to this aspect of immigration (compared to the extent of interest in their religious, economic, political and cultural characteristics) is itself significant. Where the Irish did integrate it was generally into working class society, which in middle class eyes represented no redemption. This subject is a monopoly of middle class documentation, as it was a monopoly of middle class interest, generated not merely by ethnicity but class prejudice too, in revolt at the 'low Mick'. Indeed the fact that the Irish were fairly socially monochromatic, with few middle-class champions, made them an especially vulnerable target. The social status of Irish immigrants was not just determined by their economic circumstances, but was coloured by stereotypes and prejudice. The Irish are unfailingly listed with the criminal and profligate, the non-respectables.

Interestingly the derogatory focus concentrates overwhelmingly on the Catholic Irish. Moreover their religiosity was directly identified by some as responsible for their physical condition. Frank Neal cites the Liverpool Mail:

One of the many obnoxious vices of popery is that where it prevails, it generates hosts of filthy and importunate mendicants - the vermin of the human race.

Even the usually tolerant Liverpool Mercury declared, in the wake of the 1848 rising, that the Protestant Irish were of a superior moral character. The Liverpool Herald was more direct and virulent in its commentary on the Vauxhall Road area:

All these things would lead the spectator to suppose he was in a land of savages where God was unknown and man uncared for. And who are these wretches? Not English but Irish papists.
Contrasts with the socially-acceptable Protestants, however, derive more from their overwhelmingly urbanized, industrialized northern origin than from a religiously-determined differentiation in comparative ‘civilization’, and evidence suggests that contrasts are, furthermore, considerably less distinct than has hitherto been assumed.20

The social problems highlighted by Irish immigration are the social problems afflicting the working class in general, but the easy ethnic identification of the Irish rendered them polemically useful. A. B. Forwood was a typical, if especially explicit, example of Tory exploitation of Irish social failings. In 1893 he proclaimed:

The influx of Irish into Liverpool brought poverty, disease, dirt and misery; drunkenness and crime, in addition to a disturbance of the labour market, the cost to ratepayers of an enormous sum of money.21

In spite of the social orientation and polemic that explain the propagation of the identification of the Irish as a social problem, the prejudices this generated undeniably did contribute to the downwards pervading negative characterization of the Irish immigrant.

I

'Squalor...bulked large in the English image of Ireland', writes L. P. Curtis, 'There is scarcely a description of Ireland in the Victorian era without its set passage on the dirt, misery and primitiveness'.22 Such preconceptions coloured perceptions of immigrant settlement, leaving historians overwhelmingly inclined to regard the Irish as "ghetto-proned".23 In an image typical of social commentators of the time Hippolyte Taine described the Irish quarter of Liverpool in the 1850s as ‘the lowest circle of Hell’.24 Liverpool’s first Medical Officer, W. H. Duncan lamented that the Irish cellars of Liverpool presented ‘a picture in miniature of the Black Hole of Calcutta’.25 Classifying Manchester’s Little Ireland as ‘the most horrible spot’ of this ‘Hell upon Earth’,26 Engels reflected:

The worst quarters of all the large towns are inhabited by Irishmen. Whenever a district is distinguished for especial filth and especial ruinousness, the explorer may safely count upon meeting those Celtic faces.27
He lamented that in 1844 circumstances were no better in Little Ireland than in 1831. Six years later E. Baines dubbed the area 'the reproach of Manchester'. In 1871 'A Great Briton' began a correspondence with Porcupine, complaining about 'that plague-spot in our great cities known as the 'Irish quarter', - that is the quarter where riot, drunkenness, dirt, and disease abound'. As Kay, Gaskell, Culverwell, Reach, Duncan, the Newcastle Chronicle inquirer (1850), and numerous witnesses before parliamentary commissions agreed, Irish degeneracy was manifest in the slums they inhabited, contributing to urban public health problems and the degeneration of their neighbours.

Acknowledging that the Irish were elsewhere chastised for aggravating public health problems, Cooter challenges that this did not apply in Newcastle. However there is ample contrary evidence that they occasioned proportional criticism. The Newcastle Chronicle inquirer for example insisted that, 'the influx of Irish into our large towns has had the most deteriorating influence both upon themselves and the native population with which they have come in contact'. In 1854 the Report of the Commission...on Cholera reiterated, 'among the lower and lowest classes there do appear to be some of the most utterly and recklessly filthy beings that it is possible to conceive, - an affliction considerably aggravated, if not occasioned, by the irruption of Irish on the failure of the potato crop in 1846 and subsequently'.

The Irish generally 'inhabited the cellars and those portions of the towns which, to the casual observer, would appear totally uninhabitable', or, as the Liverpool Mercury more bluntly put it, 'located themselves in dog kennels'. Upon arriving in Liverpool in 1847 an estimated 30,000 Irish immigrants descended on court and cellar dwellings which in 1842 had been declared unfit for human habitation. With no alternative shelter the police found it impossible to evict them. Irish through-traffic also fostered a particularly insalubrious character of cheap lodging house. Manchester Sanitary Association reports describe Irish dwellings as 'dilapidated' and 'ruins', while a census of St Luke's parish, Chorlton, recorded Catholics in many instances to have been the last tenants in condemned properties.
Engels reviled at the filth of Little Ireland’s ‘rookery’. Moreover the area was plagued by industrial pollution and inclined to flood, as it did with disastrous consequences in 1847. The *Manchester Guardian* hoped that before long it would be razed altogether.

But by 1861, with the closure of cellars and industrial expansion, Little Ireland no longer existed. A. B. Reach described a supposedly typical Irish cellar dwelling:

> There were few or no Irish in the houses we had just visited. They live in more wretched places still—the cellars. We descended to one. The place was dark, except for the glare of a small fire. You could not stand without stooping in the room, which might be about twelve feet by eight. There were at least a dozen men, women and children...round the fire, and the heat and smells were oppressive. This not being a lodging cellar, the police had no control over the number of its inmates, who slept huddled on the stones, or on masses of rags, shavings and straw, which were littered about.

However within Angel Meadow in 1851 Rob Hodgson and Mervyn Busteed reveal that the Irish occupied some of the better housing, and comprised only 38% of cellar dwellers.

It was generally assumed that such circumstances arose from the negligent habits of the Irish, content to accept an inferior standard of accommodation and cleanliness to the English. Even Catholic Bishop George Brown bemoaned the effects of the Manchester Irish introducing a ‘continuous flood of misery and squalid filth’. In 1836 Duncan observed of the Liverpool Irish:

> The Irish seem to be content amidst dirt and filth, and close confined air, as in clean and airy situations: what other people would consider comforts they appear to have no desire for; they merely seem to care for that which will support an animal existence.

Respectable Liverpool society reviled at the grime of Famine immigrants, and criticism did not abate thereafter. In 1855 the *Liverpool Herald* railed:

> Let a stranger to Liverpool be taken through the streets that branch off the Scotland Road, Marylebone, Whitechapel and the North End of the docks, and he will witness such a scene of filth and vice, as we defy a person to parallel in any other part of the world... The lower order of Irish papists are the filthiest beings in the habitable globe, they abound in dirt and vermin and have no care for anything but self-gratification that would degrade the brute condition.

The *Liverpool Courier* did not have an any higher opinion of them and habitually
referred to the Irish as 'the unwashed'. In a common line of middle class thought, Porcupine questioned how they could expect to run their country when they could not manage to keep their homes clean? The Manchester Irish faired little better. Dr. R. B. Howard described the inhabitants of Little Ireland in 1840:

Most improvident and dissolute in their habits, regardless alike of order, cleanliness, and comfort, a circumstance which in some degree accounts for its disgraceful and dirty condition, for it is always observable that those quarters where the Irish congregate are the worst in this respect.

In 1847 Irish-inhabited lodging houses were reported by the Guardian to be in 'an extremely filthy state'. In Newcastle too the Chronicle inquirer revolted at the squalor of Irish habitations in Sandgate, which he contrasted to English homes. The 1847 the report of Newcastle Board of Guardians on the spread of fever and the 1895 report of the Medical Officer likewise detailed the dilapidation and filth of the houses of families with Irish names inhabiting Sandgate entries, and in the 1854 Report of the Commission... on Cholera all the worst areas of Newcastle detailed were chiefly inhabited by Irish. Thus while Medical Officers acknowledged the link between poverty, bad accommodation and disease, most also were of the opinion that the Irish, with their filthy hovels, brought pestilence upon themselves.

It was not just Engels that found an appropriate metaphor in the Irishman's relationship with 'his disgusting domestic companion the pig'. Although keeping pigs was a common general working class practice (and R. Scola argues that eighteenth century court records clearly show that the urban pig was a feature of Manchester life well before Irish settlement became substantial), social commentators assigned this to the portfolio of Irish problems. In 1840 a correspondent wrote to the Liverpool Mercury complaining 'one cannot stir out but one's deafed [sic.] with Irish pigs and parsons'. Pigs were commonly kept in Manchester's Little Ireland (occasioning the criticism of the 1845 Report of the Commissioners into the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts), and Newcastle's unenforceable Swine Law (1848) was occasioned by Irish immigration.

The Report of the Medical Officer of Health's of the Privy Council of 1866
deemed overcrowding to be the universal evil consequent of Irish immigration. Before the Famine this was already serious in Liverpool, partly as it was the chief debarkation port (so censuses capture those in transit), but also because of the peculiar poverty and debilitation of those Irish who got no further, and in consequence of the town's extreme want of cheap housing. During the Famine and immediate post-Famine period visitors to Irish residences recorded with horror the overcrowding they witnessed. Duncan detailed that it was common in Liverpool to find upwards of forty Irish refugees sharing a cellar. In February 1847 the Manchester Guardian remarked that in St George's district and Angel Meadow twenty Irish frequently inhabited one house, and in April thirty-two were counted in a room in Little Ireland. So pressing was this problem in Manchester that the council was obliged to rent a disused mill to serve as an over-spill lodging-house. High concentrations were still being recorded by the inspectors of Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association in the early 1850s, and indeed the issue was given primacy in the Association's concluding report for the period, albeit noting that it was not confined to the Irish. In Newcastle the problem has a longer and a more general history, the town being notorious for extreme overcrowding. In 1861 it had an average of 7.8 persons per house, compared with 6.7 in Liverpool and 5.5 in Manchester. In Sandgate, where the Chronicle inquirer singled out the overcrowding in Irish houses, the average population density in 1850 was 26-30 per house, and its normal population of around 5000 persons swelled to around 10,000 every year in the harvest season. General Board Inspector William Lee insisted that Sandgate ought to be evacuated and bombed. In 1847 the Board of Guardians' report on fever in Newcastle detailed the problems caused by the overcrowding coincident with Irish immigration: 'In rooms of very small dimensions, and very imperfect ventilation, sixteen or twenty people sleep at night'. Mr Sang's 1853 report on Newcastle illustrates that the association between the Irish and overcrowding was slow to abate.

The existence of Irish communities in such wretched circumstances was often viewed as a simple demonstration of cause and effect. It was assumed that the Irish
chose to live like this through some perversion of national culture. The *Report of the Commission... on Cholera* identified the disinclination to complain of the Newcastle Irish. P. Gaskell observed:

The disregard to home comforts, which renders the Irish cabin a blot upon the history of its country, is exhibited still more strikingly when seen in the midst of a large town.

Hugh Shimmin (not a habitual critic of the Irish) described an Irishman's 'miserable dwelling', in *Liverpool Life*, where all home comforts had been pawned to buy drink. Engels questioned:

The worst dwellings are good enough for them; their clothing causes them little trouble, so long as it holds together by a single thread; shoes they know not; their food consists of potatoes and potatoes only; whatever they earn beyond these needs they spend upon drink. What does such a race want with high wages?

Extreme poverty meant that the Irish, and particularly the Famine immigrants, had no choice but to inhabit the poorest and most destitute quarters. The most penurious Irish immigrants settled in England (the most destitute getting no further than Liverpool) and gravitated to the poorest parts of its cities. But wretchedness was not solely believed to be generated by poverty. In 1843 Dr Duncan reflected:

It may be said that this is merely the result of their greater poverty, which deprives them of a proper supply of the necessities of life, and compels them to select the most unhealthy (because the cheapest) localities as their places of residence. To a great extent this is true; but at the same time there appears to be, among the lowest classes of Irish, such an innate indifference to filth, such a low standard of comfort, and such a gregariousness, as leads them, even when not driven by necessity, into the unhealthy localities where they are found to congregate; and which they render still more unhealthy by their reckless and their peculiar habits.

Although some insisted that when paid the same as the English the Irish lived equally well, most witnesses before the 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor* insisted that on the same wages they chose to live very differently, hoarding their money rather than improve their habitat. As Harris identifies lifestyles reflected impermanence, and furthermore national background was influential, given the very low standards of living that prevailed in Ireland, and the rapid dislocation from rural to urban life. Kerby Miller regards Catholic religion and Irish culture and experience
as leaving the immigrants passive and fatalistic, but to contemporaries this looked like irresponsibility. If the English had been in the same state as the Irish in their own country, reflected a peculiarly informed witness in 1836, 'I think they would be just the same.' Engels concurred, recognizing the implant of rural habits to urban context. Significantly witnesses testified that with prolonged residence in England Irish habits altered. However in 1851 55% of the Manchester and Salford population and 58% of the population of Liverpool were born outside the respective city, and so the problem of adjustment was not peculiar to the Irish.

The Irish did not generally create the squalid districts with which they became associated (albeit that poverty and sheer weight of number exacerbated them) and rarely owned the slum properties they inhabited. The fact that the Irish were generally not segregated meant that they shared their ghettos with an indigenous population of similar economic status, as is too often forgotten. Liverpool’s infamous slums already existed at the end of the eighteenth century, prior to the commencement of substantial Irish immigration, and this was exacerbated during the first half of the nineteenth century as the port experienced the greatest density of population in the country. Frank Neal estimates that while Liverpool’s population was at least 72% working class, only 24% of the town’s housing was within their budget. By 1845 the Liverpool slums were notorious, and it was officially labelled ‘the unhealthiest town in England’. Abraham Hume coined Liverpool the epithet ‘black spot on the Mersey’, and its dire public health problems are vividly illustrated in Hugh Shimmin’s reports. In 1843 Dr Duncan acknowledged that public health problems were principally caused by bad housing and overcrowding, rather than moral laxity. Cellar and court dwellings had long been a source of shame, and they were by no means monopolized by the Irish. In 1845 Liverpool already had a cellar population of 39,460. Although 19.4% of the Irish population of Liverpool lived in courts in 1851, so too did 17.6% of the non-Irish population. In 1864 courts were outlawed. At this time the borough had a court population of 110,000, and, as no positive action accompanied this ban, in 1871 12% of the population inhabited them (including 21%
of Irish households) and in 1903 1000 courts still existed. In 1847 the Registrar General lamented:

Liverpool, created in haste by commerce - by men too intent on immediate gains - reared without any tender regard for flesh and blood, and flourishing while the working population was rotting in cellars, has been severely taught a lesson that a portion of the population - whether in cellars or on distant shores - cannot suffer without involving the whole community in calamity. In itself, one of the unhealthiest towns in the kingdom, Liverpool has for a year, been the hospital and cemetery of Ireland.

Rabid building speculation made the situation worse. In response to Irish immigration and anticipated new building laws in 1846, a lot of shoddy housing was constructed. Jerry builders ignored corporation legislation and continued to construct houses which, according to the borough engineer, were 'nurseries of disease and death'. Pressure on housing with demolition of property for commercial and railway development exacerbated the situation, and Vauxhall inhabitants lived alongside chemical works, oil mills, gas works and diseased cattle clearing sheds. Liverpool corporation was publicly accused of having its priorities confused as in the 1840s it spent £100,000 on St George's Hall, which, Chadwick rather smugly observed, could have cleansed half of Liverpool's streets forever. In 1869 an article appeared in the *New York Times* condemning the Liverpool authorities for investing in docks instead of people:

The district in which the poorer classes live has been built in utter ignorance or greed. It is full of narrow courts, lanes, and alleys, cheap houses divided into small rooms, with a family in each, and a great number of inhabited basements. There is no ventilation indoors and very little out...This is the Sin of England - a disregard for the health, comfort, and lives of the poor and ignorant masses of the population.

Sandgate had long been infamous. In 1853 Mr Sang said of Dixon's Buildings, 'This place has long been famed for dirt and impurities of all kinds...Many of the houses are very crowded and very dirty - many of them inhabited by Irish families'. The *Report of the Commission... on Cholera* (1854) identified that circumstances were especially bad in those areas of Newcastle chiefly inhabited by Irish not because of their 'filthy habits', but more due to the ancient nature of property
and the insufficient accommodation. Like Newcastle, Manchester had grown very fast, its population increasing by 49.9% between 1821 and 1831, and a further 15% before 1851. This caused a chronic shortage of accommodation, rents in Newcastle that were generally higher than the average in London, and led to building speculation. These towns...have been erected with the utmost disregard of everything except the immediate advantage of the speculative builder', lamented Engels. Chronicling the problems aggravated by the Irish influx, an 1847 report of Newcastle Board of Guardians sympathetically demanded superior working class housing. Though this problem provoked him to demand government regulation, Kay, however, still managed ultimately to blame the Irish:

> Almost invariably they inhabit either cellars or houses built in low swampy situations, so insalubrious that the land has been sold at the lowest price to building adventurers, who seem to speculate upon the existence of a race of inhabitants who are satisfied with the minimum of comforts in life...Thus I consider that the buildings erected in Little Ireland, in Irish Town, and in some other of the worst parts of Manchester, almost entirely owe their existence to the immigration of the Irish.

Irish settlement, therefore, just tended to aggravate existing circumstances, but in flocking to the most notoriously squalid districts they became identified with them.

With improvement in their financial status and adaptation to urban living, and the clearing of the worst slums after the 1850s there is little identifiable specific reference to Irish housing conditions in Manchester. In Newcastle and Liverpool, by contrast, urban public health problems were far more enduring. This was not because the Irish there were especially negligent, but rather this was a general problem, largely attributable to the councils' lack of commitment to improvement. Interestingly, the yearly reports of the Newcastle Medical Officer of 1873 to 1900 make barely any reference to the Irish. It is revealing that when the Liverpool Irish became involved in local government, they championed the improvement of working class housing. J. G. Taggart was a rabid opponent of the Artisans Dwelling Act the implementation of which, he recognized, was severely aggravating conditions, and the Harford brothers crusaded to realize the corporation's turn-of-the-century housing scheme.

'Their poverty and tolerance of squalor intensified distaste for them in Britain',
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writes D. Beales. But if their contribution to urban environmental and sanitary problems was to precipitate popular prejudice, the domestic habits of the Irish must necessarily have clearly contrasted with general standards. It is debatable whether Irish circumstances were distinct from the generally appalling conditions of working class housing, especially given that innumerable reports on this particular issue make no specific reference to the Irish. Indeed it was on several occasions noted that, while Little Ireland, Sandgate and Scotland Road were infamous, other districts suffered far worse conditions.

II

As a major seaport, Liverpool was always more vulnerable to epidemics than Manchester or Newcastle, but in the wake of the Famine it was 'converted for a time into a "City of the Plague", by the immigrant Irish who inundated the lower districts', its death rate escalating by 2000%. If immigrants were not already suffering from typhus on arrival they were rendered vulnerable by malnutrition and exposure on the decks of steamers. In January 1847 Dr. Duncan predicted:

Should the destitute Irish continue to flock into Liverpool as they are still doing, there can be little doubt that what we now see is only the commencement of the most severe and desolating epidemic which has visited Liverpool for the last ten years.

Public meetings were called and appeals ensued for parliament to be made aware of the danger faced by the town. In February the number of deaths increased sharply and extra medical officers were engaged, an emergency hospital opened, accommodation for patients in workhouses expanded and three large fever sheds were erected. But still there were twice as many typhus sufferers out of hospitals as in them. 'The worst are anticipated', cautioned the Liverpool Mercury and all that could be done to stop it, considered Duncan, 'out of justice to the inhabitants of Liverpool', was to stop the Irish coming:

If ever there was an urgent occasion for some gigantic interposition of Government to set aside established laws to provide for an unusual and deadly emergency, I hesitate not to say that such now exists in the absolute necessity of interdicting without delay the immigration of the Irish paupers into this country as there is no other prevention to the sacrifice of human life which must be, and is daily the result.
Four boats were set up on the Mersey as quarantine hospitals and all vessels arriving were inspected. As soon as new fever sheds were constructed they were filled. By June immigrants arriving sick were returned to Ireland and those applying for relief were offered free passage back. These precautions taken by the vestry against the spread of fever and disease from the crowded dwellings of the Irish, are on a large and expensive scale: but not, it is to be feared, beyond the necessity of the case, lamented the Thirteenth Annual Report on the Poor Laws. In 1847 Irish represented 88% of patients in the fever hospital and an equal proportion of all those cared for by the health authorities. By February the debilitated Irish population were also being ravaged by diarrhoea, dysentery, smallpox, measles, influenza and scarlatina. Three relieving officers and ten Catholic and one Protestant clergymen, who had been administering to the sick, died. Typhus did not really began to afflict the non-Irish in any numbers until May, but by March the Mercury was warning of a 'danger to the health of every resident of Liverpool', and by April its editorials hysterically shrieked 'Sound an alarm! Sauve qui peut!':

inhabitants have now an imperative duty to perform, and that is, - to save themselves and their families from calamities such as have never been known here, and which threaten the most disastrous results. Unless the town be now cleared of the many thousands of the paupers belonging to the soil of Ireland, who are now impoverishing our parochial treasury, and engendering the most frightful diseases, from the dirt and destitution in which they are involved in the dark cellars and miserable garrets in which they are huddled together, we shall, indeed, find Liverpool not only converted into a Skibbereen on a large scale, but a lazaret house such as England has never had within its borders since the horrible days of the Great Plague.

Although, on account of the delaying effects of the longer journey, Manchester and Newcastle did not suffer epidemics on the scale of Liverpool, with the 'locust-like swarm of destitute and disease stricken peasants' in 1847 both did suffer the effects of the 'famine fever'. During the last quarter of 1846 the prevalence of disease among Irish entering Manchester was noted, and by May a fever hospital had had to be set up in Long Millgate, and enforced cleansing commenced. Initially it was noted that fever was 'confined to the Irish', and
accordingly in July 1847 76% of the patients treated by the doctors in the London Road district of the city were inhabitants of Little Ireland. By November fever was spreading to the indigenous population, but the Irish still comprised 47% of the patients in the fever hospital. With fever and cholera lingering through 1848 disused mills and workhouses were converted into emergency hospitals. One relieving officer and two clergy were among typhus's victims. The *Manchester Guardian* compared Little Ireland to the Black Hole of Calcutta, and termed it a 'pestilential place'.

In Newcastle, where Bishop Riddell was "martyred" administering to famine victims along with two of his clergy, although it was not as extensive, fever was almost exclusively confined to the Irish, who in December 1847 represented 80% of its victims in Newcastle workhouse. In June Catholic clergymen represented Irish interests at a sympathetic and constructive public meeting called to discuss the problem, and at the injunction of the town's magistrates the Guardians set up two fever sheds. Newcastle Dispensary attributed the increase in fever in the town to: the enormous influx of wandering Irish who have continued to pour into the town during the greater part of the year. Numbers of them labouring under fever on their arrival and it is surprising that the disease has not spread more extensively than it has hitherto done, among the inhabitants, when the crowded state of the lodging houses and tenements in the lower part of the town is considered.

The *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* reflected 'This town is experiencing, in a minor degree, the effects of the immigration of poor Irish, from which Liverpool has suffered so severely'.

The association of the Irish with disease was articulated mostly in the late 1840s and 1850s, when immigration merely worsened conditions that had already been the subject of critical reports. It has been suggested that, aside from the Famine period, the general health of Irish immigrants was superior to that of the indigenous population, as their orientation to physical labour would tend to emphasize. Health inspectors in Liverpool in 1845 were 'struck with the evidences of health' exhibited by migrant Irish: 'no medical man would aver, as many persons who do not have a
medical education do, that the fever (typhus) was brought over from Ireland by these reapers. However, contrarily, members of the town council were concurrently complaining that 'they make this a back door to Ireland, and they die here'. Indeed as early as 1801 when distressed Irish arrived in Liverpool it did not go unnoticed that dysentery soon ensued. In 1821 Little Ireland was noted as 'one of the worst centres of the Asiatic cholera' in Manchester, and the next outbreak in 1831 occasioned the worst of predictions. In 1831-3 the Irish were disproportionately afflicted by the cholera outbreaks that affected all three towns, and suffered a higher subsequent rate of mortality. In 1836 J. P. Kay noted that the Irish continued to represent a third of the cases treated by the Ardwick and Ancoats dispensary. In 1838 the Irish comprised over 43% of all fever cases in Liverpool, in 1840 migrant harvesters brought fever to Liverpool, and in 1843 fever continued to be associated with high concentrations of Irish settlement. Duncan acknowledged that they were peculiarly susceptible to fever and that it spread rapidly among them. In Newcastle in 1845 D. B. Reid complained:

A comparatively enormous proportion of those who receive the benefit of the infirmary, dispensaries, and fever house are trampers, on the wander for employment, the vagrant class, half mendicant, half hawkers, and sailors returned from voyages of hardship and privation. The first are chiefly strangers, English and Scotch; the second generally Irish. Indeed it is this latter people who constitute the great class that throngs the charitable medical institutions of the place.

Although the general health of immigrants improved after the Famine they continued to be susceptible. When cholera attacked Liverpool in 1848-9 its first and its majority of its victims were Irish. It spread more generally that typhus had in 1847, effecting Liverpool more severely than any other town in England. Although the Medical Officer did not link it with the Irish, Chairman of the Select Vestry Augustus Campbell complained that Liverpool was 'the hospital and cemetery for Ireland'. The Liverpool Journal observed:

Last year the people of Liverpool lived in the shadow of death. The streets swarmed with misery, and pestilence sat down in horror in our populous places. The unhappy poor of Ireland, flying from famine at home, or exported on economic speculation, came here as the nearest port and soon after their arrival breathed a tainted atmosphere, each inhalation a death to
nature. Hunger, neglect and filth, which like a parasite, exhausts even the life of poverty, had prepared them for the reception of fatal disease; and devoid of resources, they shrink into the fetid depositories of typhus. The returns of the Registrar contain the sequel... the symptoms are showing themselves that the evil is returning.  

The first cases of cholera in Manchester in 1849 were again Irish and the Newcastle Chronicle inquirer (1850) noted its prevalence among their population of Sandgate. The 1851 census confirmed D. B. Reid’s complaint, revealing a disproportionate number of Irish-born in Newcastle’s hospitals. When cholera returned to the town in 1853 so rife was it among them that the corporation provided Catholic priests with funds for cab hire to administer to its victims. The 1854 Report of the Commissioners... on Cholera complained that in Irish areas ‘here fever had its constant home’. In 1854 and 1866 the Liverpool Irish also again suffered first and worst from cholera. In 1866 the Report on the Public Health in Newcastle recorded that the Irish-inhabited area of All Saints had a far higher death rate (38.3 per 1000) than any other area of the city, and it suffered disproportionately from typhus. Even in 1874 H. E. Armstrong calculated that the Irish represented a disproportionate 17% of the patients admitted to the Newcastle fever hospital in the past eight years.

Kay attributed this apparent peculiar susceptibility to disease to a stronger inclination to complain and to seek charity, to bad diet, bad housing and to addiction to drink. While this assessment is loaded with prejudice and self-evasion of blame, Kay correctly acknowledged that poverty, and consequent overcrowding, unhealthy living standards and locational mobility, as highlighted by other doctors in all three towns, did render the Irish acutely vulnerable to, and inclined to propagate, disease. Duncan assessed that the ailments the Irish suffered were those common among the Liverpool poor, but because of their greater poverty ‘they are more liable to them than others’. He also noted that bad diet and dram-drinking rendered Irish women especially vulnerable, and, moreover, they exposed themselves to the “physical causes” of fever by ‘gregariousness’ and ‘innate indifference to filth’. In 1847 he observed:

It must be remembered that the Irish districts were at the same time the worse conditioned, containing the greater number of
filthy and ill-ventilated courts, damp and dirty cellars, and inferior lodging-houses. Had their population been English in place of Irish, and had no Irish famine occurred, their mortality must still have exceeded that of other districts of the town, although of course in a diminished ratio.\textsuperscript{142}

But the 1836 \textit{Report on the State of the Irish Poor} concluded:

from the filthy conditions of the bedding, the want of the commonest articles of furniture, the uncleanly habits of the inmates themselves, and the number which, without distinction of age and sex, are closely crowded together, they are frequently the means of generating and communicating infectious disease.\textsuperscript{183}

Typhus, so synonymous with Famine Irish, is a louse-born disease, which was virulent in Ireland.\textsuperscript{144} But in attributing its cause to 'extreme destitution and over-exertion' Mr. H. Harvey of Newcastle, identified characteristics which facilitated its spread amongst immigrants.\textsuperscript{185} For religious and cultural reasons the Irish also resisted vaccination rendering them unnecessarily susceptible to smallpox,\textsuperscript{186} and the keeping of wakes won them no admirers, spreading disease in 1847 and 1866.\textsuperscript{187}

It is commonly reiterated that Irish immigrants were stigmatized as disease carriers.\textsuperscript{188} Certainly there exists substantial evidence of middle-class prejudice on these grounds, and indeed allusion was manipulated to further political ends, for example by Liverpool Tory leader A. B. Forwood.\textsuperscript{189} J. P. Culverwell described the Irish immigration as having 'inflicted a deadly blow' upon the health of Manchester, through their 'generation of fever and human miasma'.\textsuperscript{190} J. P. Kay was of a like mind, tabulating evidence to demonstrate a direct correlation between 'colonization', 'demoralization' and 'physical depression'.\textsuperscript{191} In accord Duncan wrote:

I am persuaded that so long as the native inhabitants are exposed to the inroads of numerous hoards of uneducated Irish, spreading physical and moral contamination around them, it will be in vain to expect that any sanitary code can cause fever to disappear from Liverpool.\textsuperscript{192}

But in universally censuring the Irish Kay, Culverwell and Duncan found a panacea for all the cities' ills and an alleviation responsibility. In 1847 the \textit{Manchester Guardian} cautioned,

We are more pained than surprised to learn that the great overcrowding of the dwellings in Little Ireland and other neighbourhoods, chiefly inhabited by the Irish that are still inundating the country, is producing its inevitable consequence,
- much illness, especially fever of a more or less severe kind.193

The *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Poor Law Commission* (1848) blamed the Irish for the 'lamentable increase of fever cases in many Unions, especially in the north of England'.194 By this time their reputation as the bearers of disease was already well established in Liverpool. As early as 1818 when large numbers of Irish arrived in Liverpool the inhabitants of the town were fearful lest the fever 'which still ravages in Ireland should again be introduced into this town'.195 In 1845 Lyon Playfair observed:

> I found that an impression prevailed, not only with its authorities but also with the public generally, that the excessive mortality of that town was attributable to the migratory character of a large portion of its population, and not upon the structural arrangements or physical causes of disease in the town itself'.

Fingers were definitely pointed, and preconceptions affirmed, in 1847.197 The *Liverpool Courier* regarded 'the invasion' as being 'attended with the most disastrous consequences to the health and morals of the town'.198 Typhus was commonly known as 'famine fever',199 'Irish epidemic',200 and 'emphatically called the 'Irish fever".201 Even the Catholic Vicar Apostolic complained of 'the dreadful plague which the Irish poor have brought into our cities'.202 In 1850 the *Morning Chronicle* lamented that it was necessary for Liverpool to support the Irish poor 'in order to preserve the town from the constant scourge of a desolating fever',203 and throughout the 1850s Liverpool Select Vestry worried that Irish predisposition to disease represented a threat to their 'own poor'.204 In 1863 the term 'Irish fever' was again applied to typhus.205

The link with immigration was publicized in Manchester too,206 frequent references being made to 'Irish fever'207 and 'famine fever'.208 The President of Manchester Statistical Society declared bluntly of the 1846-7 typhus outbreak: 'its dissemination and virulence were co-existive, not with the prevalence of nuisances, but rather the current of Irish immigration so remarkable in that year'.209 In 1847 C. E. Mott, district auditor of Manchester, wrote in the *Guardian* that it was the general opinion that the source of the recent typhus outbreak (which was of the most 'threatening and dangerous character within living memory') was the Irish.210 The paper concurred labelling Little Ireland the 'nucleus of fevers and other foul
In 1854 the vice-chairman of Manchester Board of Guardians complained: 'Cases are confined almost entirely to the Irish. The fever that was introduced in 1847 has never left the township.'

Cooter insists that, in contrast, an association was not identified by the Newcastle press in the 1840s. Indeed he remarks (citing the findings of B. R. Robinson in 1847) that the Newcastle Irish were uniquely never exploited as scapegoats. Both the accuracy of this assessment and the supposed uniqueness of these circumstances are questionable. While public health surveys do exist in Newcastle which make no reference to the Irish, and there is the possibility that they were submerged in the midst of Newcastle's anyway chronic public health crises (in national surveys in both 1866 and 1875 Newcastle had the highest death rate), there is contrarily ample evidence that reveals that the Irish were associated with disease in the north east. Here too the local press did make reference to the 'Famine fever' and the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle cited at length the Quarterly Return of the Registrar General for 1847 which lamented that 'the poor of Ireland, dying of starvation and consumed by fever' are 'now lodged in the crowded and filthiest parts of the most insalubrious cities'. Newcastle Board of Guardians, meeting in 1847 to report on the spread of fever, treated this as an Irish problem, and tabulated its comparative incidence among Scots, English and Irish. The 1854 Report of the Commissioners... on Cholera in Newcastle retrospectively blamed the immigrants for the spread of 'Irish fever' in 1847 and suggested that they were responsible for extent of the recent cholera outbreak:

Nothing could be more ingeniously adapted for the engendering or disseminating of infection than the trampers boarding house, or the tenemented dwellings of the lower Irish.....From hence, when aggravated by privation, epidemic influence or other depressing cause, it spreads abroad.

Cooter regards the statements in this report as unrepresentative of local sentiment, but its conclusions derived from the testimonies of Newcastle witnesses. H. E. Armstrong echoed its criticisms, insisting 'that much of the sickness and death in the Borough is due to the Irish portion of the lower classes already referred to there can be no
This was moreover not a constant theme elsewhere. In the lengthy subsequent diagnostic debate into cholera in the *Manchester Guardian* throughout 1849 and 1850, there was no allusion to the Irish, and the vast majority of Medical Officers' reports on Liverpool for the second half of the nineteenth century make no reference to them. Consequently contrasts are not appropriate. Furthermore it is debatable how much the opinions of Medical Officers, parliamentary commissioners and even the local press reflected the attitudes of working class contemporaries. M. Durey urges that the Irish were neither *popularly* used as scapegoats nor abused as disease carriers, and indeed, even in Liverpool, there is far more evidence of public sympathy than recrimination.

### III

In 1847 *The Times* blustered: 'The present question is whether every English working man is always to carry an Irish family on his shoulders, as he does at the present moment. Do the working men of England choose to have it so?'. Irish immigration consistently represented a disproportionate financial burden to poor rates and private charities in all three towns. 'All the principal towns in Great Britain', complained Alison, 'are overwhelmed with an inundation of Irish poor'. But, though, complaint was muted in Newcastle and Manchester as compared to the principal Famine debarkation port of Liverpool, there was widespread awareness of this phenomenon and disquiet articulated in the local press. This imposition overwhelmingly fell on the middle or upper class rate payer who was compensated by cheap Irish labour. But, as A. Campbell told the 1854 Select Committee on poor removal, 'a great majority of the ratepayers of Liverpool only profit indirectly by the value of Irish labour', and there was no corresponding advantage for the 'industrious labouring man' who was compelled to pay 5s. rates instead of 2s. 6d. In 1850 the *Morning Chronicle* reported from Liverpool of the 'debt caused among the steady labourers of the town, many of them householders and ratepayers, by the
overwhelming numbers of utterly superfluous Irishmen that compete with them for bread, and sometimes force them upon the parish'. Furthermore there may, as a consequence of loud middle class complaint, have been some jealousy and resentment among the ‘native’ poor. J. Radcliffe of Liverpool’s Strangers Friend Society lamented that were it not for the burden of Irish immigration ‘they could not merely alleviate, but, in many instances, by increased relief, wholly remove the distress which attaches to the native poor’. This phenomenon embellished the general negative characterization of the Irish, and was exploited by Liverpool Tories.

As Irish settlement in Manchester grew claims for relief escalated at a disproportionate rate. Significantly Manchester’s Board of Guardians’ books distinguished Irish claimants from 1809. The trade depression of 1816-7 drew attention to the increase of Irish pauperism in the city and by 1818 the Lords Commission on the Poor Laws noted that over half of the paupers in the city were Irish. At the same time in Liverpool thousands of Irish poor were already being removed each year and the inflated expenditure this necessitated caused complaint. The Vestry records do not note ethnicity at this date but names indicate that the Irish formed a substantial proportion of claimants on its resources. In 1824 in an appeal to Parliament for relief the Churchwardens fatefully contemplated:

If the number of Irish labourers in Liverpool be already superabundant, which your petitioners contend that it is, how would that number be multiplied and how would the evil be aggravated, if a years residence, or a seven years residence entitled them to the privileges of English parishioners, if it enabled them to demand parochial support?

fig 1.1 See Manchester Board of Guardians, Accounts of the monies disbursed week by week to the poor by the Churchwardens, 1810-47, M3/3/6A and B.
In 1832 Manchester and Liverpool guardians petitioned parliament not to pass a Bill to take away their right to deport the Irish, and in 1833 Manchester boroughreeve Benjamin Braidley travelled to Dublin to investigate the problem. Private charities were accused of attracting Irish vagrants to Liverpool, and, while they were seen as having 'a claim on public sympathy', in 1832 £13,000 was spent on relieving Irish poor. With the introduction of the Poor Law Amendment Act English farmers anticipated that Ireland would soon attain its own legislation and so were reluctant to take on Irish agricultural labourers who therefore drifted back to live the season on the charities of Liverpool. Obviously unsatisfied with the new legislation, in 1835 Liverpool petitioned parliament for autonomous poor legislation given its peculiar Irish problem, and the majority of Liverpool witnesses interviewed for the Report on the State of the Irish Poor complained of the relieving of Irish poor increasing rates. In Newcastle removal orders, applications for relief, general examination books and Select Vestry minutes indicate that prior to the 1840s the Irish were generally out-numbered as a burden by the Scots. In 1841 Catholics represented less than 3% of inmates in the workhouse. But they were still regarded as a problem. By 1837 the Guardians were meeting to discuss how to handle this and concluded that 'every person removable' should be returned. By 1845 D. B. Reid complained that they were notorious. The 1840s saw lots of harvest labourers who failed to find work again returning to Liverpool as paupers. In 1841 and 1846 they represented 67% of cases on the books of Liverpool District Provident Society, and, as in Manchester, the 1846 Removals Act led to a huge increase in resident Irish poor applying for relief. The general feeling in Liverpool is, that the place which has derived the benefit of the labour of a man who is applying for relief, that that labour fairly entitles him to relief at that place' reflected Mr Lowndes, but in 1854 the Vestry estimated that this Act had cost the parish an extra £16,000 per year.

In November 1846 the influx of destitute Irish into Liverpool necessitated the distribution of bread and soup. By December Liverpool 'swarmed' with an 'irruption of starving poor'. Citizens wrote alarmed letters to the government and an official
deputation was sent to London to argue Liverpool's case as 'a town already unfairly borne upon by burthens [sic.] which do not belong to it'. Relief was demanded, concerns were voiced that Irish landlords and workhouses were paying their poor to come to Liverpool, captains of vessels were censured for bringing so many over and rates were put up for the first of many times during the next twelve months. In January 1847 demand escalated enormously, absorbing all of relieving officers' time and necessitating indiscriminate distribution. Records were set up of the numbers arriving, which demonstrated an increase in demand for relief disproportional to numbers entering Liverpool, implying imposition. The Liverpool Courier complained of a 'Pauperism Invasion'. Fears were voiced of holding public meetings in case they should attract more Irish poor, and parliament was petitioned again, questions being raised over whether London had any comprehension of how severe the problem in Liverpool was. In the first three weeks of 1847 the number of relief cases had increased by over 20,000 and by the start of February Fenwick street was impassable because of the vast numbers of Irish camping outside the parish relief office. In February Liverpool was divided into relief districts and police were appointed as relieving officers to investigate individual cases before distributing soup tickets. The new system did cost the parish less - £316 in the week ending 6 February as opposed to £388 the previous week - but costs were still high. Claimants had increased steeply in January and February but demand would expand even faster in March and April. On 10 April alone 10,845 were relieved. In March an auxiliary workhouse was opened. The Liverpool authorities desperately and repeatedly petitioned parliament for aid and for an embargo on immigration. The Liverpool press supported these pleas, arguing that the town was a special case and that national tax should support relief rather than local rates. 'The opinion of the Liverpool people is that as soon as the Relief Bill for Ireland is passed the Irish must take care of them', insisted Rushton. In exasperation in May the Mercury suggested sending 30,000 Irish paupers from Liverpool to London. By June the Vestry's petitioning had succeeded in getting the government to rethink remedial measures.
Poor relief began in Ireland and the need to issue a summons to deport Irish paupers was suspended. Consequently the Vestry decided to try to enforce removals. By December some 14,637 had been removed (see fig. 1.2). The Poor Law Removal Act (1847) did discourage applications for relief, but drove people (terrified of removal back to Ireland) to begging and to move inland (sometimes leaving dependants at the mercy of the Liverpool authorities). Liverpool’s prisons quickly filled rendering the Vagrant Act unenforceable. Rushton recalled: 'I saw from day to day that the poor Irish population forced upon us in a state of wretchedness which cannot be described, would within twelve hours after they landed, be found among one of three classes, viz., paupers, vagrants or thieves.'

The average number of Irish relieved weekly in Liverpool in 1847 was over 26,000 (40% of total relief cases) and 39% of those who debarked here were registered as paupers ('half-naked and starving'). During the financial year 1847-8 the Irish poor consumed 49% of the out-door relief distributed in Liverpool. In 1847 Edward Rushton contemplated that rates would have to increase by at least fifty percent solely as a consequence of Irish immigration. In 1847-8 Liverpool vestry spent £20,750 on outdoor relief to the Irish alone (see fig. 1.3). Frank Neal calculates that in 1847 the Irish poor cost Liverpool rate payers a total of £33,159. In 1852 the Vestry calculated that the Famine immigration had cost Liverpool an 'absolutely enormous' sum of over £70,000 and warned: 'the immigration of Irish pauperism...will have to be vigilantly guarded against to prevent a repetition of the former disastrous consequences'. Witnesses before the 1854 Select Committee on
Poor Removal agreed that Liverpool had ‘suffered most fearfully’, but offered no solutions, beyond protesting that the town ought to apply the workhouse test more vigilantly. Unfortunately opinion elsewhere insisted that Liverpool ought to pay, having ‘benefited more by their Irish commerce than by that of all the rest of the world together’.

There was obviously much sympathy for the immigrants. Edward Rushton marvelled that the indigenous population showed no ‘jealousy or dislike’ of them, ‘On the contrary, the greatest possible kindness has been shown, and I do not believe that anything could be more creditable to the labouring classes of that great town than their conduct towards the Irish poor in these circumstances’. The poor people arrive in a state of wretchedness painful to behold, wrote the Mercury, prompting lots of ‘indiscriminate almsgiving’. But by May 1847 rate-payers were meeting to express their discontent. To give a single penny...to an Irish beggar after this day is actually to pay him for stopping in Liverpool’, it cautioned after the policy of deportation had been adopted. By November public mood was becoming more hostile and the Mercury warned ‘our brothers in Ireland’ that ‘the hearts of the people of Liverpool are becoming actually steeled against all vagrants’. The Vestry told the Home Secretary:

Many of the rate-payers may be pauperized by the increase of the rates...The working classes are becoming exasperated at the supposed preference of Irish to English poor. The rate-payers are becoming clamorous under a sense of the injustice by which they think they are made to pay such an undue proportion of what they consider at least to be a national burden.
The *Mercury* predicted that heavy taxes would drive merchants, and so trade and industry, from Liverpool, accused the Vestry of being blase, advised ratepayers to petition parliament each week and organized meetings demanding redress of the 'scandal' of government inaction:

> The barbarism of local taxation for such provision - one of the results of the wisdom of our ancestors - now stands forth in all its deformity. Liverpool is at the moment bearing a burden which belongs neither to itself nor to the county, nor even to England, but to the United Kingdom, and that burden will bring bitter distress upon hundreds of struggling tradesmen and small householders.\(^2\)

The Tory press was less inclined to blame the government and began to attack the character of Irish immigrants. The *Liverpool Mail* was typical:

> The scum of Ireland come to Liverpool and die in thousands...They are beggars and paupers. They never were labourers. They never did an honest day's work in their lives.\(^2\)

Especially after the 1848 rising, with the cost of emergency measures augmenting the rate bill, the Irish were widely regarded as ungrateful.\(^2\)

In the winter of 1846 Manchester had nervously surveyed events in Liverpool. Relief claims were already disproportionately high at this time due to industrial depression and the new claims of settled Irish following the introduction of the Five Years Act (see fig. 1.4).\(^2\) By September 1846 the roads between Liverpool and Manchester were full of Irish,\(^2\) and with the Poor Law Removal Act yet more paupers were driven inland. In January soup kitchens were established\(^2\) and in April an auxiliary workhouse opened.\(^2\) On 16 January 1847 the *Manchester Guardian* observed that while last year Manchester had relieved 94 Irish families, so far that week 300-400 had been granted relief.\(^2\) During 1847 the average number of weekly Irish claimants in Manchester was 2740.\(^2\) During the first quarter of 1847 alone the number of Irish being relieved escalated by 10,000 - 60% of the total increase in the union.\(^2\) During 1847-8 Manchester spent £21,044 on outdoor relief to the Irish alone (see fig. 1.6), and Frank Neal estimates that during 1847 the Famine Irish cost Manchester rate payers £17,661.\(^2\)
Although the numbers being relieved daily increased,³⁰⁰ and, unlike in Liverpool, few Manchester rate payers were excused payment on account of poverty,³⁰¹ there is evidence of considerable public sympathy. Collections were conducted in churches,³⁰² public meetings were requested to address the problem³⁰³ and there was fury at reports of Irish starving to death in Manchester.³⁰⁴ In March a general committee was established, largely of working class membership, to visit every house in Manchester collecting for Irish distress.³⁰⁵ But in August 1848 a public meeting was called to complain at the increase in rates caused by Famine immigration and reimbursement was demanded from the government.³⁰⁶
The increase in Manchester interestingly was blamed not on Famine-driven Irish immigration, but on government policy, and, in particular on the 1846 'Five Years Act', which granted irremovability to any who could prove five years continuous residence, and accordingly reform was demanded.\textsuperscript{307} Manchester, with its large settled Irish population suffered the effect of the latter much more severely than Liverpool.\textsuperscript{308} Accepting that 'Manchester...is the centre to which all the Irish poor and vagrants of the district invariably tend...This has ever been the ordinary, almost the normal, condition of Irish pauperism amongst us', Mr Harrop (clerk of the Board of Guardians) complained,

But, since 1846, that has been changed into a state of things so grievous, that it seems scarcely likely to be long borne, without strenuous efforts for relieving the ratepayers from this new, heavy, and increasing tax...the present system is fraught with injustice to the ratepayers of large manufacturing towns, who, under the operation of the Irremoval Act, have not only a large additional burden imposed upon them from the agricultural districts of this country, but are still further pressed upon by this celtic incubus, in what seems to be a continually increasing ratio.

But Mr C. H. Richards (senior vice chairman of Manchester Guardians) urged,

they came here because they found labour connected with our manufacturing operations, and...we kept them because they were useful. When they grew old, after having given the benefit of their life of labour to the community, they ought not to be passed.\textsuperscript{309}

Though it was on a smaller and therefore less pressing scale, in Newcastle too the Famine period saw relief claims escalate. At the start of January 1847 the
Newcastle Journal commented on the growing influx of Irish into Newcastle, where they were failing in their hope of finding employment. By May it complained of the cost of poor relief having doubled during the last financial quarter, and by mid 1847 the Weekly Chronicle was complaining of the consequent increase in poor rates. In 1848 Newcastle Board of Guardians met in emergency session. The Chronicle inquirer noted:

I am informed that fully one third of the persons receiving parochial relief in this Union are Irish and Scotch, and that in All Saints' parish one half are Irish...fourteen years since there was but one Irish family receiving relief under the Poor Law in All Saints' parish, whereas there are now at least 1,200 natives of Ireland weekly relieved in the same district.

However the increase in rates in Newcastle in the year ending March 1848 was only 13% on the previous year, compared with 74% in Liverpool and 88% in Manchester.

This aspect of the Irish social problem did not necessarily diminish after the
Famine. In 1848 the number of Irish relieved weekly in Liverpool declined with the enforcement of removals to a proportionate 3500 per week (27%), but in 1849 numbers increased again as the Irish became more willing to enter the workhouse. In 1849 Edward Rushton wrote to the Home Secretary addressing 'the evils of which the people here loudly complain' and demanding expansion of the Removals Act to encompass not only those applying for relief, but those who return having been deported once, those caught begging and criminals, and legislation to limit numbers of deck passengers. That year Liverpool and Glasgow corporations met to discuss how to discourage Irish immigration, and decided to put pressure on steamship companies to increase fairs and restrict deck passengers. In 1850 and 1851 paupers streamed in again and the Liverpool Vestry issued placards urging the still sympathetic public not to encourage them with charity. Between 1848 and 1853 the proportion of Irish immigrants arriving in Liverpool as paupers stabilized around 33%. After 1854 relief tables stopped noting ethnicity and in 1863 the numbers of Irish landing even ceased to be published. By 1855 only 3% of those arriving in Liverpool were paupers and by 1858 this had dwindled to 1% (see fig. 1.9).

In the light of a report by the Board of Guardians the Manchester Guardian complained in 1851 of the 'really serious and alarming irruption' caused by 'an enormous shoal of paupers' who 'quarter themselves on our local poor rates for life'. Between 1846 and 1851 the number of English pauper cases receiving outdoor relief.
increased from 2,463 to 2,624 (+6.5%), but the number of Irish irremovable cases increased from 427 to 1,478 (+346.1%). The impression that Liverpool suffered the economic burden of Irish immigration disproportionately is thus inaccurate. For every year between 1844 and 1854, with the exception of 1847-6, Manchester, with its large settled Irish population and difficulty in removing Irish poor, distributed considerably more to the Irish in out-door relief than Liverpool did. The number of Catholics and Protestants in the workhouses of all three towns was surveyed in the last week of September 1852 and the last week of January in 1853, and the proportion of Catholics in Manchester was considerably greater than that in Liverpool. Significantly, and by contrast to Liverpool, until the 1870s, a separate record was kept of Irish receipts in Manchester. The reduction of the necessary term of residence legislated in the 1860s indicated the growth of tolerance and the decline of the problem on the national scale, but in Manchester during the 1850s and 1860s the famine crisis peak was exceeded more than half the time. During the period of 1850-70 Irish outdoor relief recipients generally represented 35-40% of claimants, and during the period 1857-8 reached 53%. Even in the last quarter of the century Catholics consistently represented around 50% of the inmates of the New Bridge Street workhouse, and in 1900 31% of Crumpsall workhouse, and 22% in Chorlton and Salford. Thus it seems comparatively indulgent that in 1879 Liverpool still complained of having to bear a burden for the whole country.

In Newcastle too Irish-sounding names continued to be prevalent in the Account Books and Weekly List of Paupers during the second half of the century, and assistant overseer of All Saints George Grey continued to complain of Irish families being abandoned at the mercy of the guardians while the men toured the county in pursuit of employment. However Newcastle never had to encounter a problem on the scale of that endured by Manchester and Liverpool. Thus in 1852-3 while Liverpool removed 3549 Irish poor and Manchester 217, Newcastle only deported 24.

The English expected the Irish to be grateful for their charity, but, especially
after the Famine, as many immigrants perceived England as responsible for their 'exile' and expressed this through nationalism, the host society became less sympathetic. Generally the rate-paying middle classes regarded the Irish as parasites, and criticized Irish supposed improvidence, financial irresponsibility, thirst for charity and inclination to take for granted that the state would provide, encouraging support for the introduction of an Irish poor law. Its attitude mirroring that of much of respectable society, *Punch* was sympathetic to immigrant sufferings in the immediate wake of the famine, but soon came to regard the Irish as 'the sons and daughters of beggary; the blight of their own land, and the curse of the Saxon'. In 1855 the *Liverpool Herald* complained, 'the citizens of Liverpool are taxed to maintain the band of ruffians and their families, in time of national distress'. 'A British Philistine', in correspondence with *Porcupine*, grumbled, 'their turbulence and thriftlessness cause the waste of millions of money, wrung, in the shape of taxes, from the honest and industrious'. 'All Irishmen will go to bed for a month at a time, at the expense of the parish', the *Newcastle Chronicle* complained. Manchester Juvenile Refuge refused to admit 'the low class of Irish inhabitants' because 'we have found that if we give way to the admission of that class of persons we should soon have our institution crowded'. Thus they were classically stigmatized as the undeserving poor, especially in comparison with the Jews who catered for their own communities in establishing autonomous Boards of Guardians.

The policies of Vestries were frequently deemed too lenient and indiscriminate. Manchester was certainly forbearing compared with surrounding towns, making no distinction between resident English and Irish in the awarding of relief. With the huge increase in demand experienced in the previous year, by 1827 this was the cause of severe complaint, and so procedure was tightened up and the necessary period of settlement increased in 1833 to fifteen years (see fig. 1.1). In 1836 George Cornwell Lewis agreed with the visiting overseers' complaints of Manchester's 'misdirected benevolence', which rendered the town a magnet for Irish paupers and subsequently debased their morals. In 1847 Manchester guardians
protested that they must be permitted to retain their right to remove Irish poor, and
joined Liverpool vestry in campaigning for relief in Ireland. In 1848 a national
survey revealed that Manchester was supplying over thirty percent of the total relief
distributed to all the Irish resident in England and Wales. In 1855 it was remarked
that the Irish represented 38% of all paupers in Manchester, as opposed to 31% in
Liverpool. This was attributed to the fact that Liverpool was inclined to deport them
more quickly, but the Manchester Board of Guardians, faced with the comparatively
high cost of removal, were satisfied to conclude 'upon the whole, we were more
benefited by Irish labour than we were burdened by Irish pauperism'. As was
criticized also in Newcastle, which furthermore did not separately categorize Irish
claimants, sympathy and administrative distance from London, deferred the strict and
inflexible imposition of residency requirements (in Newcastle at least until 1853) and
enforcement of removals. In 1847 Liverpool guardians were overwhelmed by the
plight of refugees 'broken down by famine and distress'. 'It is distressing to see them',
lamented Rushton, and though not obliged to relieve the non-resident Irish poor, they
did. Liverpool continued to be legislatively wary and faced with the prospect of
amendments to the Poor Law Removal Law in 1854 it joined Manchester and
Newcastle in petitioning parliament, advising:

    They should be wanting in their duty, not only towards the rate
    payers, but the poor of the said parish, did they not humbly, but
    earnestly, protest against the proposed legislation, certain as it
    is to inflict upon both the ratepayers and the poor hardship and
    injustice at all times, and occasionally the most disastrous
    consequences.

Faced with this prospect again in 1858 they complained that the present system
already threw 'a sufficiently heavy burden upon English rate payers', and insisted 'let
the cost fall upon those whose duty it is to bear it'. In 1863 circulars were sent to
other Vestries to co-ordinate opposition, and hostility was voiced to further Bills to
amend the removals law in 1871, 1876 and 1882.

    Some did abuse the system. In Newcastle the number of entries in the
minute books for 'Removal to Ireland' greatly exceed the numbers actually deported,
suggesting that poverty was not so desperate that the threat of removals could not
deter claims. Indeed in 1856 the Board of Guardians, petitioning the House of Commons, said that the power of removal was 'of great value as a test on stimulating the Scotch and Irish Poor (not desirous to return to their native country) to successful exertion in obtaining a livelihood for themselves'. Liverpool complained of being 'the Pass House for all England' as Irish threw themselves upon the authorities to get free removal back to Ireland. But it is unlikely that misuse was as widespread as its infamy implies. Irish poverty was extensive, burdensome and genuine, as Mancunian directing overseer Ner Gardiner protested. Irish fluctuations mirror the general trends of relief applications, but during times of economic hardship the Irish, seldom securing stable employment, were hit first and hit worst. For example, when severe weather threw Liverpool dock workers out of employment in February of 1855 Irish represented 78% of cases relieved by the District Provident Society and 82% of applications for parish relief. Many only managed to find seasonal employment, and, with decelerating immigration, the existing Irish-born population aged disproportionately. Furthermore traditionally Irish migratory agricultural labourers left their families at the mercy of the rates at harvest time. However fear of deportation, ignorance of the system and the development of autonomous internal networks of social security meant applications were lower than they otherwise might have been. Consequently, as an index, this understates the extent of Irish immigrant poverty.

Cooter asserts that in the administration of poor relief a further contrast exists between Newcastle and elsewhere. However, although differences in the chronology and extent of immigration lessened the burden in Newcastle, Cooter is inaccurate to assert that there is a contrast in the approach of administrative bodies. Although Northumberland only expended £3 on deporting Irish compared to the £1,198 the county of Lancaster spent, Newcastle Board of Guardians petitioned parliament in 1856, 1858 and 1863 to defend its right to removal, and, indeed, the Poor Law Commission received complaint about their conduct with unwarranted enforced removals.
Engels wrote that Ireland provided England with ‘pimps, thieves, swindlers, beggars and other rabble’.\(^6\) Already in 1800 the stereotype of the ‘inherently violent’ and criminal Paddy was well established. Subsequently the apparent increase of crime in early nineteenth century towns was squarely blamed on Irish immigration.\(^6\) While the educated classes mused over the relationship between Irish criminality and national and religious determinants,\(^3\) Irish crimes were reported sensationaly in the local press, confirming preconceptions.\(^3\) In 1854 the *Manchester Guardian* said of the Irish immigrant;

> His notion of the best means of integrating himself with his adopted country is to be ready to brawl with, kick, punch, and pistol her citizens on the slightest provocation.\(^3\)

Alleging that ‘Irish Papists’ were responsible for three-quarters of the crime committed in Liverpool, the *Liverpool Herald* described the Irish as ‘the very dregs of society, steeped to the very lips in all manner of vice, from murder to pocket picking’.\(^7\) The apparently criminal inclinations of the Irish were a polemic delight to Liverpool Tories and Protestant evangelicals. ‘We submit that the state of Ireland is intimately connected with the state of poverty and crime in England’ observed the *Liverpool Mail* in 1849. Here discussions about crime statistics degenerated into sectarian mud-slinging. At the 1892 school board election Canon Honeyburn advocated that it was pointless spending money on trying to educate Catholic children, because they were of ‘the lowest and most degraded class from which cornermen and criminals were made’.\(^6\) Even ‘Un Jeune Irelandais’ in correspondence with *Porcupine* insisted that the Liverpool Irish masses were not ‘representatives of the people of Ireland, any more than the paupers and criminals of London should be regarded as representing the people of England’.\(^7\) The irritation and cost of Irish criminality did them no favours. When the model of the ‘criminal class’ was formulated in the 1860s it was identified specifically with the Irish,\(^7\) making them particularly susceptible to policing strategy. As B. Williams reflects, middle class Manchester found in the Irish the requisite metaphor ‘for the opposing forces of
subversion, vice and barbarity'. They are disliked, reflected Mr Brereton Grime, 'not on national grounds, but from an unfavourable opinion of their character. Irish areas were termed criminal 'rookeries' and 'haunts of thieves and desperadoes'. Faucher's comment is typical:

Misery of every description, fever, roguery, debauchery, and theft, were rife amongst them; their neighbourhood was the chosen retreat of vagabonds and criminals; scarcely a day passes without some disturbance or without some serious crime.

Official crime statistics were not regularly kept in Liverpool until after 1848, but in the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor they represented a third of those taken into custody. In 1849, swelled by the Famine immigration, the Irish represented 50% of the criminals in Liverpool gaols. By 1862 very complete statistics are available, indicating a disproportionately high level of involvement in crime (see fig. 1.10). According to Lowe's calculations, during the mid-nineteenth century the Irish generally represented 25-30% of the annual prosecutions in Manchester, 30% in 1861, 22% in 1871, 18% in 1881, and in 1891 13%. The Irish contribution to crime appears even more disproportionate when it is considered that crime figures represent only the Irish-born. Juvenile crime among the Irish-by-descent (encouraged by the lack of juvenile employment and progression from begging) was a great problem in Liverpool, and in Manchester too seventy percent of juvenile offenders were reported to be the offspring of Irish parents. The Irish were also over-represented in committals to gaol, and even in 1900 the diocesan census revealed a third of the inmates of Strangeways to be Irish. In Newcastle the number of Irish-born criminals was not regularly collated except for during the years 1861-69. Rather than less Irish criminality (as Cooter supposes) this implies rather a later emergence of awareness of the problem, for throughout the 1860s the proportion of Irish crime in Newcastle ranged from a disproportionate 19% (1861) to 25%(1867) (see fig. 1.11). In January 1864 the proportion of Catholic prisoners in Newcastle Borough Prison was 61 out of 145 (42%), a figure comparative to that of Manchester City Gaol where Catholic prisoners represented 260 of the 583 (45%). In 1870 Catholics constituted
around 56% of the inmates of Liverpool gaol. Because of different policing policies it is dangerous to draw chronological trends or to make comparisons between cities. Furthermore statistics are often confusing as they do not specify whether the number of crimes represents appearances or individuals.

Irish crime tended not to be of a 'serious' nature, but rather to consist of generally sporadic, individual offences, associated with poverty. Moreover at the height of the Famine immigration there is evidence of the Irish committing crimes in order to get shelter. Indeed by November 1848 the Vagrancy Law could no longer be applied as the prisons were full. The English gaols are excellent winter quarters for starving Irish paupers', wrote Edward Rushton, affording 'the wretched and unfortunate Irish better food, shelter and raiment, and more cleanliness than it is to be feared many of them ever experienced elsewhere'. Consequently by 1849 Liverpool gaol, built to house 500, contained 1,100 prisoners, and the authorities began to petition for the right to remove them along with paupers. The types of
crimes that the Irish were mostly apprehended for were vagrancy (see fig. 1.12), larceny (see fig. 1.13), prostitution (see fig. 1.16) and drunk and disorderly conduct (see fig. 1.18). There is also much complaint of them trying to defraud local charities, trade unions and the poor law, and the issue of base coin was very common among the Irish in Newcastle and Liverpool. However the Irish were generally over-represented in every class of crime, and Irish criminality mirrored general trends, there being no peculiarly Irish crimes.

Rioting, fighting and drunken Saturday night brawls were a prominent theme of Irish community life in Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle. 'The Irish Yahoo', reflected *Punch*, '...sallies forth in states of excitement, and attacks civilized human beings that have provoked its fury'. Liverpool's Constable Dowling lamented in 1846, 'They keep the neighbourhood where they reside...in a constant state of uproar and confusion on Saturday nights, Sundays and Mondays, and generally a portion of
The Irish were thought to enjoy a good fight and, a Liverpool magistrate declared, were 'activated by a spirit as ungovernable and reckless as...savages'. The *Manchester Guardian* was forced to report 'outrages' so frequently that it deemed them 'characteristic' of the 'peculiarly pugnacious disposition of the natives of Green Erin'. By March 1830 it demanded:

The lawless and outrageous conduct of the lower classes of Irish in this town is becoming perfectly intolerable; and we fear it will be necessary to make some terrible examples, before they will be induced to yield a proper submission to the laws.

Though generally intra-communal, this feature of Irish culture distinctly alarmed onlookers. Gaskell recorded:

Often, indeed, the whole population of court, street, or entire district, forms a faction, in opposition to that of some other in the neighbourhood; and the cries of "O'Flanagan" and "McCarthy", are as rife as in the heart of Connaught.

Tension between Orange and Green were exacerbated and perpetuated by Liverpool politics, and frequently found expression in violence. Clashes in 1835, 1839, 1841, 1845, 1846, 1850 and 1851 occasioned pleas to magistrates to outlaw parades in Liverpool, and although 12 July parades were banned from walking in the borough in 1853, clashes still occurred in 1865, 1870, 1873, 1874, 1877 and 1878. Moreover sectarianism became a pretext for everyday casual brutality. But, as D. MacRaild observes, even when the Irish were attacked by other groups, because of the pervasiveness of the stereotype of the Irish as violent, such skirmishes were generally determined 'Irish rows' by the press.

But for the presence of the police’, Dowling insisted, Irish districts 'would be a scene of constant uproar and bloodshed'. However, conflicts were exacerbated by unwelcome police intervention, and were subsequently sensationalized in press reports. The *Newcastle Chronicle*’s reporting of the 1851 clash between English and Irish immortalized as the ‘Horrid War i’ Sandgeyt’ made no mention of the Protestant ranter who provoked the clash, chronicling it merely as a territorial faction fight. It detailed:

The supremacy which they endeavoured to assert was quite of the Hibernian sort; there appeared to have been no disposition to plunder. "Destructiveness" seems to be the prevailing organ,
and the wholesale demolition of property the object, accompanied with utter recklessness of life and limb.413

There were similar regular complaints about Newcastle's Lime Street "colony" 'who appear to be perpetually brawling and fighting, and are the annoyance of the police'.414 The Irish-born represented 30-40% of arrests for rioting and breach of the peace in mid-century Manchester, and three times in the late 1850s the figure reached 50%.415 Liverpool figures were not published until 1862, but even Irish-born represented 41% of arrests for rioting and breach of the peace (see fig. 1.14). Similarly convictions for assault were very high (see fig. 1.15)

Liverpool was a particularly riotous town and the Irish (particularly Irish women) were usually implicated in breaches of the peace. 'This influx of semi-savages brings all the turbulence and disorder of Popish Ireland with it', grumbled the Courier.416 As well as in Orange-Green disturbance they were prominent in 1832 cholera riots,417
1855 and 1867 bread riots (both took place at times of great distress but the local press had little sympathy for those involved labelling them ‘roughs’, ‘the lowest and the vilest’, ‘pickpockets and prostitutes’ and protesting ‘this is not a riot of the working men’\textsuperscript{411}) and anti-Salvation Army riots in the 1870s (proselytizing missions into the Liverpool slums were greeted with stone throwing. The \textit{Liberal Review} reflected that the Salvation Army only had itself to blame!\textsuperscript{419}).

In Liverpool there was a particularly high proportion of Irish females represented in criminal statistics. In 1870 Liverpool gaol housed more Catholic women than Protestant or Catholic men.\textsuperscript{420} This attracted attention and was of particular concern to Father James Nugent.\textsuperscript{421} The vast majority of those convicted were prostitutes. Prostitution was a particularly bad problem in Liverpool, it being a port, and, despite the denials of clergy in the \textit{Report on the State of the Irish Poor}, Irish women dominated the trade.\textsuperscript{422} Although Irish girls were prominent in prostitution in Manchester and Newcastle as well, in Liverpool they were especially over-represented. In 1837 there were nearly 1300 brothels and houses of ill repute in Liverpool and Irish women represented 44\% of prostitutes taken into custody in 1854, and Catholics over 60\% of prostitutes investigated in 1864.\textsuperscript{423} When statistics began to be published in 1870 Irish-born women represented 46\% of the prostitutes arrested, and though their proportion declined over the century, they continued to be over-represented (see fig. 1.16). When police began a crusade against brothels in 1891, throwing prostitutes out onto the streets, so many were Irish that Father Nugent had to set up a refuge for them.\textsuperscript{424} Evidence suggests that most Irish women did not come to Liverpool intending to work as prostitutes but were driven into it by desperate poverty and lack of alternative female employment.\textsuperscript{425} Father Nugent wrote:

\begin{quote}
A great number of Irish girls do drift onto the streets: they come to England imagining they only have to come to England and there is bread for them directly: innocent girls come over expecting they can get situations immediately: they have no money and no friends and they fall into these houses; but I find few girls indeed come over from Ireland who have been prostitutes in Ireland.\textsuperscript{426}
\end{quote}
A tendency towards excessive intervention did little to ease the already strained relationship between the Irish and the police. In the 1830s this was an unwelcome novelty. The types of crime which the police were designed to tackle were those in which the Irish were over-represented, and, moreover, police were under pressure to justify their existence to ratepayers through results. Assaults on police tended to be more common in Ireland than England, and in mid-Victorian Manchester the Irish were responsible for 30% of assaults on constables, and in Liverpool 44%. When regular police statistics began to be published in Liverpool in 1862 the Irish-born were convicted for 43% of attacks on police (see fig. 1.17).

It repeatedly happens that, in order to apprehend one Irishman in the Irish parts of the town, we are forced to take from ten or twenty, or even more, watchmen. The whole neighbourhood turn out with weapons; even women, half naked, carrying brickbats and stones for the men to throw...the Irish are
completely masters in every part of the town. Such clashes were routine, but in 1838 seven Liverpool Irishmen were transported for murdering a policeman and major 'Anti-Police' riots occurred in Ancoats in May 1843 and in Little Ireland in August 1845. When A. B. Reach toured Manchester with a police guide he remarked on how the Irish shied away from this man. In the late 1850s and 1860s policing policy, under middle class pressure, became more aggressive, and specifically targeted the Irish. Thus, influenced by current policing tendencies, the number of arrests is not an unbiased indicator of Irish criminality. Interestingly Irish convictions leapt markedly in Liverpool in 1897 (especially for drunk and disorderly, begging, assaults and prostitution) at a time when general statistics were stable, implying a specific policy of targeting Irish. Consequently 72% of attacks on police were committed by the Irish-born (see fig. 1.17). In 1854 defendants in Newcastle complained that 'it is quite sufficient that they were Irish to make the police take them into custody'. The decline in Irish arrests from the 1870s onwards is effected by a shift away from preventative policing to detection.

Although the number of Irish in the Manchester police was more than proportional to the size of the city's population this is a falsely positive statistic, as there was little recruitment from within the local community and a Protestant bias. Moreover after 12 July disturbances in 1835 it was alleged at a meeting of leypayers that the Manchester police included many Orangemen amongst their numbers, and that they were guilty of deliberately provoking Catholics. Relations were even more strained in Liverpool. As early as 1833 the Superintendent of Liverpool himself observed that policemen were being too heavy-handed with the Irish, complaining 'On Saturday nights, the Watchmen are Bullies, and the extramen their seconds'. During 12 July clashes in 1835 Irish attacked the police. Liverpool's first head constable was Catholic Irishman, James Whitty, (a deliberate gesture by the Whig council, in Frank Neal's opinion) but when the Tories regained control of the council Orangemen were appointed to the Watch Committee. Watchman H. G. Harbord indeed prominently marched at the head of Orange processions. When magistrates
tried to ban membership of Orange clubs in 1844 the Watch protested, Councillor James Parker coming to their defence. Members concerned said that they had resigned from their lodges, but there were rumours of secret membership, and the ineffectiveness of the prohibition necessitated its renewal in 1852. The permitting of Orange parades between 1842 and 1851 provoked accusations of partiality and lead to strained relations with the Irish and lots of consequent attacks on the police. In 1852 police bludgeoned Catholic worshippers, escaping from a collapsing chapel, believing them to be rioting. Senior officers tried to distort the evidence when this was brought before the authorities leading to the dismissal of Head Constable Dowling. This incident determined magistrates to outlaw Orangeism in the Watch, and new Head Constable Greig brought a new more impartial approach. Irishmen continued to form a quota of the Liverpool police proportional to their population size, but, as in Manchester, it is likely that most were drawn from the Protestant minority, and many may well still have harboured Orange sympathies.

Contemporaries generally attributed Irish criminality to cultural and racial (and, in Liverpool, religious) peculiarity. When the Famine Irish swelled England's prison population the cause of this phenomenon was irrelevant to many observers who regarded it as vindication of their opinions of the Irish. But Fitzpatrick accurately determines: 'Irish drunkenness, violent behaviour and party fighting owed more to the harshness of life in urban Britain that to the cultural inheritance of rural Ireland'. Frank Neal makes the valid point that unless Irish immigrant crime statistics are put in the context of the "at risk" population (i.e. the poor, the unskilled and the casually employed) they grossly over-exaggerate Irish criminality. Liverpool's particularly high Irish crime statistics are accounted for by the fact that, as the New York Times put it, 'the Irish who get no further than Liverpool are, a great many of them, among the most miserable of all who are compelled to leave their native land. It is the nearest refuge for those who commit petty crimes, or who have failed in their courses'. Father Nugent echoed these sentiments:

The criminal class in Ireland, as Liverpool increased its docks and commerce, found a better market for crime there. The poverty of Ireland did not afford the same market and the same
facilities for crime and public opinion is much stronger in Ireland as regards prostitution and that kind of crime than it is in England so I could mention small towns in Ireland in which a whole street has been driven out and they have come and settled in Liverpool. Owing to the tide of immigration from Ireland, Liverpool is an exceptional case as regards the criminal class of Catholic.44

Significantly as Irish economic circumstances improved, their proportion of arrests declined. After 1866 the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle ceases to note the nationality of defendants appearing in court, but it is unascertainable whether this is due to a decline in Irish committing crime or the emergence of opinion that nationality was no longer relevant. In 1882 Digby Seymour told the Quarter Session:

He had often referred with great satisfaction to the marked good behaviour of the Irish residents in the neighbourhood. They did not swell the ranks of the criminals in anything like the proportion that from the poverty of their majority one might have expected them to have done; and he had often noticed with satisfaction their loyalty and good behaviour. He believed that there was not a gentleman on the Grand Jury who would not support that statement.455

The fact that the Irish represented such a criminal problem in the first half of the nineteenth century is partially because theirs was the type of crime that the police were designed to, and pressured to, tackle, and because policing tended to be heavy-handed and intrusive. But 'Irish' areas were noted for crime before the height of immigration, as a result of poverty, under-employment, lack of education, dislocation and a high concentration of taverns - the Newcastle Chronicle called Sandgate in general 'the City of Sin'446 - and so this was not a distinct problem confined to the Irish, and not an ethnic perversion (as much contemporary theorizing concluded), but a common economic and cultural issue. Indeed as regards crime Liverpool was 'a special case', with very high crime figures in general, given the widespread poverty and under-employment, the lack of factory-induced discipline and the facility of theft due to the quays being open to the public and piled with unattended goods. Even at the turn of the century Liverpool gaols contained one ninth of England's prison population and one seventh of all prisoners aged 16 to 29.457
The association of the Irish with drink may be stereotypical, but it was no myth in nineteenth century Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle. The alcoholic excesses of Irish immigrants fascinated social investigators, frustrated the Catholic church, and caused nationalists like Doherty, Denvir and Heinrich to despair:

The demon drink is the fatal phantom that lures thousands to their doom. Drink—drink is the crime and the curse of Irishmen in this country. It is the stigma which, of all others, is the most fatal to their character, the cloud that hides the brilliant lustre of their many virtues.

In 1842 the *Northern Star* scoffed that the ‘Irish lambs’ were paid in ‘a good swig of whiskey and a few shillings’. Ribbonmen, Repealers, Irish Confederates and Fenians always met in pubs and in February 1867 a Fenian head centre was dismissed for his perpetual drunkenness. Drunken rows were regularly reported in the local press, Kay, Engels, Gaskell and Faucher chronicled the excesses of the Irish, and this is a prominent general theme of witnesses in parliamentary committees. Manchester boroughreeve Benjamin Braidley told the 1834 Select Committee into Drunkenness that, while the English grew amiable with drink, ‘a party of Irish drinking whiskey or spirits, they will quarrel or fight before they reach home’, while Liverpool dock master Henry Purnell observed ‘my opinion is, that at least ninety of every hundred of them are fond of whiskey and rum; that a great majority of them are drunkards or on the way to become so; when sober they are quiet and orderly, but when drunk they are the terror of the neighbourhood in which they reside, they are quarrelsome and disturb the peace of families’. Lots of Liverpool witnesses before the 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor* related that the Irish were far more ‘addicted to drink’ than the English, devoted all their spare time and money to it, were incapable of holding down jobs because of their fondness for it, and S. Holme and T. Dover told how they paid all their other men of Fridays but their Irish on Saturdays to avoid drunken disturbances. Edward Davies described the infamous Manchester Saturday night brawls:

There are a number of houses where the illicit whiskey is sold, and these places are crammed with Irish the whole of Saturday night. Parties of men come mad drunk out of these places,
armed with pokers and staves, and patrol the streets in order to assault any person whom they may meet, but especially the Irish from other provinces. The 1834 Select Committee into Drunkenness and the 1877 Select Committee on Intemperance reported that the largely Irish inhabited areas around Lace Street, Liverpool, and St George's Road, Manchester, were, in order to cater for their peccadillos, filled with large pubs and gin palaces, and (in 1855) the Liverpool Herald described the 'numberless whiskey shops crowded with drunken half clad women, some with infants in their arms, from early dawn till midnight' in the area around Vauxhall Road. In mid-nineteenth century Manchester the Irish generally comprised 25-37% of arrests for drunk and disorderly and were still 16% in 1891, while in Liverpool they were even more consistently distinctly over-represented (see fig. 1.18).
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**fig. 1.18** See Reports of the Police Establishment and the State of Crime with Tabular Returns, 1862-1900.

Statistics from Manchester indicate that 60% of the Irish arrested in the town were drunk, irrelevant of whether arrested for being drunk and disorderly. Evidence suggests that a similar circumstance existed in Liverpool. 'An Irish David' wrote to Porcupine explaining that the numbers of Irish in Liverpool gaols could 'be largely accounted for...by drink'. Accordingly Father Nugent (admittedly, as a temperance campaigner, a biased source) estimated that nine-tenths of the prisoners in Liverpool gaol had been convicted of offences induced by drunkenness, this being especially remarkable amongst Irish women. Indeed the fact that it was the policy of the Liverpool police to put all those arrested for drunk and disorderly before the
magistrates, meant that the town's statistics are higher than those of elsewhere.\textsuperscript{474} Furthermore extremists of the Liverpool Vigilance Committee put pressure on the head constable in the mid 1870s to increase his public house inspection corps. This produces a misleading jump in the statistics, and as vigilance declined in the 1890s so too do statistics.\textsuperscript{475} Drinking to excess was a particular feature of the celebration of St Patrick's day, when generally the number of arrests for drunk and disorderly among the Manchester Irish exceeded fifty, and sometimes reached as many as a hundred.\textsuperscript{476} On St Patrick's Day 1856 the \textit{Newcastle Weekly Chronicle} noted that some revellers were in the 'condition which has always been considered excusable in an Irishman on the feast of his patron saint',\textsuperscript{477} but other witnesses were less accommodating.

Illicit distillation was very widespread in Manchester and Liverpool,\textsuperscript{478} which was 'a great place for making smuggled whiskey, drinking it, and disposing of it', William Dillon reported in 1836.\textsuperscript{479} The fifty people convicted of illicit distillation in the New Bailey in 1833 were almost without exception Irish.\textsuperscript{480} Gaskell estimated there to be at least one hundred stills at work in Manchester 'producing genuine potheen of the highest strength'\textsuperscript{481} and in 1836 Joshua Pritchard estimated an annual loss to the revenue of £20,000 in Manchester.\textsuperscript{482} The communal violence that resulted from police destruction of stills was a subject of press fascination.\textsuperscript{483} Though it was less a subject of local curiosity there, in Newcastle too Fordyce and the \textit{Newcastle Weekly Chronicle} indicate that this was practised among the Irish,\textsuperscript{484} and furthermore the Newcastle Irish were very much involved in alcohol smuggling.\textsuperscript{485}

While this 'addiction'\textsuperscript{486} is well documented, analysis of why the Irish drank so heavily seldom goes beyond deeming it a 'characteristic propensity'.\textsuperscript{487} Even modern studies of the subject have still tended to assume that this was merely an aspect of Irish culture.\textsuperscript{488} However alcohol consumption in nineteenth century Ireland was generally lower than in England,\textsuperscript{489} and so the excesses of immigrants must, at least in part, represent a response to the strains of dislocation and 'exile'. J. O'Connor's study conclusively proves that there was a much greater propensity among Irish immigrants, than Irish natives, to drink excessively.\textsuperscript{490} The unfortunate take to drink as a solace to
drown sorrow’, ‘Un Jeune Irelandais’ told Porcupine. Engels acknowledged broader economic and social determinants:

And since the poor devil must have one enjoyment, and society has shut him out of all others, he betakes himself to the drinking of spirits. Drink is the only thing which makes the Irishman’s life worth living...so he revels in drink to the point of the most bestial drunkeness. How can society blame him when it places him in a position in which he almost of necessity becomes a drunkard.

It was cheaper to get drunk than to eat, and Akenson sensibly observes, ‘This has nothing to do with being Irish and a lot to do with being a twenty-year old male with money in pocket and Saturday night to bum’. Moreover public houses also had important social, cultural, economic and, especially, political functions within Irish communities.

Irish drinking was a source of great concern to an English Catholic church eager for respectability. ‘Talk about leakage!’, complained Canon Mumane, ‘...It is scuttling the ship.’ Bishop Bewick in his 1880 Pastoral termed it the “arch-enemy” of the Newcastle Catholic church. But already by 1834 the Report from the Select Committee into Drunkenness reported that many in Liverpool had joined a temperance society. In 1843 80,000, ‘chiefly Irish of the humbler classes’, took Father Mathew’s pledge in Manchester. ‘The landlords complained loudly’, sniped Culverwell. Indeed such was the demand that Father Mathew was delayed in his return to Liverpool. Engels supposed that most broke it within the month, but the Manchester Guardian reflected that the peaceful, soberly conduct on St Patrick’s Day 1846 ‘speaks volumes for the results of the mission of Father Mathew’. The invitation to come to Liverpool was sent by St Peter’s (Seel Street), where there had been a total abstinence society for some years, and it contained 6000 signatures. He addressed crowds of several thousands and 40,000 took the pledge. As in Manchester this severely effected publicans’ trade, and John McArdle was typical in converting his pub into a grocery store until the fervour had subsided. Such was the success of the visit that Father Mathew returned to Liverpool in 1849 and 1854. Among those who took his pledge in Liverpool was J. Denvir who was the first to join Father
Nugent's successor movement. The Famine influx largely undid the work of Father Mathew and the successes of the Irish Catholic Temperance Association in Manchester in 1846, as it brought in a mass of new immigrants and gave the church more urgent concerns. Comparatively Father Mathew had little support from the Catholic church in Newcastle, where a branch of the League of the Cross was not established until 1885. But in 1844 meetings in Newcastle raised money to support Father Mathew's work in Ireland and in 1852 he visited the city. Furthermore St Patrick's Temperance Society (which had its own drum and fife band, and was active in the nationalist movement) played an important role in the community. Father Nugent inherited the mantle of Father Mathew with the establishment of the Total Abstinence League of the Cross in Manchester and Liverpool. He succeeded in converting several thousand Liverpool Irishmen to teetotalism and this is reflected in the declining numbers of convictions for drunkenness on St Patrick's Day. By 1888 the League had ten branches in Liverpool and operated in conjunction with the Arch Confraternity of the Sacred Thirst and the Society for the Suppression of Drunkenness. Nugent also established Popular Concerts in the 1860s, to attract people out of pubs, which proved very successful. In Manchester from the 1870s onwards St Patrick's day celebrations were co-ordinated by the Salford Diocesan Temperance Crusade, which, like Nugent in Liverpool, arranged popular concerts in the Free Trade Hall. Through such institutions as Manning's League of the Cross (established 1872) and Vaughan's Crusade of Rescue (albeit that as an advocate of temperance he was the 'despair of the total abstainers'), and experiments such as the Truce of St Patrick, the Truce of God and the use of Indulgences, Irish drinking became less of a subject of remark in both towns as the century progressed, as it did for the working class as a whole with the development of alternative forms of recreation and meeting places, the demolition of slum rookeries and heightening aspirations of 'respectability'.

Engels, Gaskell, Cooke Taylor, George Wise and A. B. Forwood, like witnesses in 1836, saw the influx of Irish as increasing 'native' drunkenness.
However, while illicit distillation may have been increased by the Irish, this accusation may be inverted. For, as T. R. Marr noted, intemperance was a conspicuous feature of Manchester working class culture in general. Cardinal Vaughan was reputed to have remarked that he had never been in any city, in Europe or in America, where the sight of drunken men and women was as common as it was in Manchester. In Sandgate J. Smith notes that almost every other house was a pub, as is confirmed by the *Newcastle Chronicle* and J. C. Street, who chronicles exhibitions of public drunkenness there with no specific reference to the Irish. B. Love reflected:

> the number of persons that frequent gin palaces is astonishing...The destitution of want appears to be met and counterbalanced only by the excitement of gin! Temperance societies have certainly wrought wondrous effects; but the mighty mass is unchanged...The greatest benefit that could be conferred on the poor of Manchester...would be the passing of an Act of Parliament for the suppression of beer-shops.

The United Kingdom Alliance boasted large working class audiences at its Free Trade Hall meetings, and the Manchester and Salford Temperance Society, established in 1830, sought recruits 'chiefly of the working classes', but by 1840 it only had an estimated eight thousand members. In 1902 Manchester still had just short of three-thousand legitimate alcohol outlets, and 'chronic drunkenness' remained 'the major threat' to the Manchester police force. While the ratio of arrested drunks to population was 1:175 in Newcastle and 1:34 in Manchester, in Liverpool it was 1:24. As a port Liverpool had an 'unenviable notoriety' for public drunkenness. After the passing of the 1830 Beershop Act over 800 beershops opened in Liverpool in the next nineteen days. When Abraham Hume surveyed Vauxhall in 1848 he counted one drinking establishment for every 103 people. In 1857 it had 1493 pubs and 897 beershops and in 1870 1919 pubs and 334 beershops. Hugh Shimmin illustrated the problem in general. Perhaps ironically, but credibly, Liverpool too had a vigorous temperance movement and the issue of drink was prominent in local politics.

This is another area in which Cooter draws a contrast, assuming that while the
Irish were notorious for drunkenness elsewhere, in Newcastle circumstances were different. However there is very little evidence to justify this supposition, and it does not necessarily follow that because reporting of Irish drinking was less excessive in Newcastle that integration was superior. Rather the Liberal middle class press of Manchester and Liverpool merely found it an attractive theme upon which to moralize.

VI

The negative characterization of the immigrant Irish derives from an unfavourable opinion of their moral character, which A. Redford\textsuperscript{30} and J. H. Clapham\textsuperscript{31} reiterate. In Liverpool such commentaries are profuse. They are perhaps to be expected from the Tory \textit{Liverpool Herald} ('They are the very dregs of society' and 'The curse of Liverpool'\textsuperscript{32}), and A. B. Forwood ('the lowest strata of society'\textsuperscript{33}), but even the Liberal \textit{Porcupine} referred to them as 'our Barbarians'.\textsuperscript{54} It lamented:

\begin{quote}
Thousands of poor, debased wretches are allowed to live the lives of heathens and to die the death of dogs. No part of England is sunk in so deep a mire of drunkenness and vice and misery as this rich and splendid and many-pulpitted Liverpool.\textsuperscript{35}
\end{quote}

Engels regarded Irish immigrants as having reached the 'lowest stage of humanity'.\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{36}} To Arch Deacon Sinclair the Manchester Irish were characterized by 'ignorance and barbarism',\textsuperscript{37} and to J. C. Street the Newcastle Irish represent 'the sinful'.\textsuperscript{38} Kay regarded them as innately and profoundly debased - 'a barbarous race',\textsuperscript{39} 'a class resembling savages in their appetites and habits'.\textsuperscript{40} After the 1848 rebellion the usually tolerant \textit{Liverpool Mercury} launched an attack on Irish character:

\begin{quote}
It is not to be forgotten too, that much, very much of Irish misery lies quite beyond the reach of any 'remedial measure' of a government, being seated in the character of the Irish people. No government, except by a very indirect and gradual process can change the idiosyncrasies and habits of a nation, and convert a slothful, improvident and reckless race into an industrious thrifty and peaceful people'.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

The Irish were regarded, moreover, as not merely degraded, but degrading - 'the ready-made nucleus of degradation and disorder'.\textsuperscript{42} Kay was not alone in supposing them to operate a negative moral influence on the surrounding working
Indeed this was a widespread middle class fear, reiterated by Engels, Carlyle, Henry Booth, Gaskell, Cooke Taylor, Culverwell, William Duncan, Edward Rushton, the *Newcastle Chronicle* inquirer, the Liverpool press and Vestry and parliamentary commissions, which prompted demands for an Irish poor law in order to discourage immigration. Significantly George Comewall Lewis introduced his investigation:

> It is stated that the Irish immigrants have exercised a pernicious influence on the English and Scotch working classes, by lowering their wages and debasing their moral character.

It was proposed that the Irish taught the English 'what is the minimum means of life, upon which existence may be prolonged', instilling 'a barbarous disregard of forethought and economy', an indifference for 'domestic virtues' and 'domestic comfort', and a 'systematic evasion or violent resistance to law and order'. Thus the masses were dangerously 'demoralized', 'degraded', 'deteriorated' and 'debased', forcing 'the Englishman's level of civilization, down to the Irishman's level'. As early as 1827 the *Report on the Select Committee on Emigration* observed that the Irish would 'deluge Great Britain with poverty and wretchedness, and gradually but certainly... equalize the state of the English and Irish peasantry'. The self-interested fears of the middle classes are obviously influential here. Motivated by self interest of a different kind (in discussing the prospective introduction of poor laws into Ireland, and thereby a decline in the amount of cheap labour available), interestingly, of the witnesses before the 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor* questioned directly on the moral influence of the Irish 65% in Manchester and 77% in Liverpool deny there to have been a negative effect.

There is no polemic reason for the Victorian philanthropic moralist to highlight those who evaded slum life. Few commentators acknowledged immigrants heterogeneity, as Francis Jordon and the Parish priest of St Peter's, Liverpool, did. Rather there is an over-concentration on failures and the worst of Irish character and experience. Polemic dictated observation. Even the exponents of scientific racism accredited the Irish with some positive features, but empirical imbalance and a
monochrome historiography mean that examples of Irish industry, charity, sobriety, honesty, economy, ambition and family virtue are seldom highlighted. The numerous witnesses who in 1836 talked of the improving character of immigrants are rarely, if ever, cited, and institutions such as the Mutual Improvement Society of Young Irishmen have been forgotten. The church worked hard to inculcate sobriety and respectability, to control wild behaviour, suppress secret societies and the drinking problem, and their subsequent success, along with their membership of such institutions of municipal respectability as school boards and boards of guardians, brought recognition of the priesthood as 'a valuable social as well as religious force'. Indeed Heinrich, like Bogue and Liverpool I.N.L. member Patrick Kearney, protested that the immigrants were 'in every moral attribute infinitely superior to the race among whom their lot is cast', and, like Denvir, J. Whitty, G. F. Shaw, M. Falvey, J. Muspratt, R. Steele, and A. M. Sullivan worried that they were being degraded by residence in England and the 'evil influence of factories, workshops, and the immoral associates attaching to them'. In Liverpool he was horrified by the scenes he witnessed but characterized Irish immigrants as victims rather than perpetrators:

In no town that I have visited...are there more striking evidences of vice and degradation than are here to be seen. By day wrecks of humanity - male and female - degraded and worn-out by the dread canker of vice and drunkenness are to be seen in bye-courts and at street corners - grimed and horrent - more like spectres in a distempered dream than beings formed in the image of the Maker. By night vice in a hundred forms is to be seen in the bye-ways and thoroughfares with no constraint on its effrontery and no effort to conceal its hideousness. The drunken laugh that grates painful on the ear - the tongue that addresses the casual passenger in the language of vice and coarseness - is too often in the tone of the poor degraded Irish girl, who, far from home and friends, guidance or protection, sank into the vicious vortex which swamps virtue and destroys the bodies and souls of thousands in such a town as this.

In Newcastle by contrast Hugh Heinrich regards the effectiveness of the Catholic Church, the degree of ethnic cohesion and the assimilation of local mores as generating a superior moral condition. But not only did interested Irish nationalist parties proclaim Irish virtue. The Newcastle Chronicle inquirer in 1850 was similarly
moved,

Their vivacity and contentment was wonderful; features which among the native poor I never liked to see, but which among the Irish seemed so natural that I never felt dejected in their houses. Their religious faith seems to have a wonderful influence upon them in a social point of view... Their politeness, too, manifests itself even in their lowliest condition. 368

Such testimonies advance Cooter's assertions that the Irish uniquely did not constitute a social problem in Newcastle, that there they ‘did not serve the function they often did for Anglo-Saxon populations elsewhere, of becoming a focus for the expiation of social shortcomings or a means of appeasing social psychosis’.369 But, given that further investigation implies that in many respects the Irish in Newcastle lived in circumstances and conducted a lifestyle little different to their fellow countrymen in Manchester, it emerges that the contrast lies not in the Irish immigrants themselves, but is rather environmental, firstly in the gravity of general working class social problems in Newcastle, and secondly in the perspective of the chronicling of working class life in Manchester, Newcastle and Liverpool. In Liverpool by contrast the type of immigrant (the “refuse Irish” as A. Smith put it370) was different and furthermore they entered (and exacerbated) a politically and religiously hostile environment ready to make play with all their failings. Manchester (“the chimney of the world. Rich rascals, poor rogues, drunken ragamuffins and prostitutes form the moral, soot made into paste by rain the physique, and the only view is a long chimney: what a place! The entrance to hell realized!”)371, in the 1830s and 1840s, and Liverpool, in the 1850s and 1860s, were the subject of a plethora of philanthropic, propagandizing and moralizing studies, in which the Irish became a current, and journalistically fashionable emblem. As most of these investigations were conducted by non-residents, they reveal less about Anglo-Irish relations in Manchester than about the middle class Victorian lurid fascination with examining its social underbelly. Consequently contrasts between Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle are less straightforward than they immediately seem.
2. Economic Status: an Index of Relations and a Source of Hostility?

The latest research suggests that the economic impact of nineteenth-century Irish immigration has been exaggerated, and former interpretations are dismissed as Marxist hypothesis. For the historian it is possible to identify that the Irish were the victims of some of the worst manipulative dealings of nineteenth-century capitalists. However, contemporary impressions were less sympathetic, for there is considerable evidence that the working class regarded the influx of Irish as representing an urgent threat to their livelihoods.

J. H. Clapham, S. Pollard, J. A. Jackson and J. E. Handley (all relying largely on 1830s evidence) observe that the Irish, prepared to accept lower wages on account of their poverty and economic and cultural background, represented threatening competition for jobs and, glutting the unskilled labour market, effectively forced down the general rates of wages. Indeed Redford and Kitson Clark term this tendency the 'main social significance of the Irish influx' and the characteristic of Irish immigration most damaging to inter-communal relations. This subject requires further economic investigation and geographic and chronological specification. In Liverpool their sheer weight of immigrant numbers and poverty were able to negatively influence wage rates more than anywhere. Already by the 1820s the parish committee was complaining:

With respect to Ireland the facility of intercourse between that country and this and especially Liverpool already operates to the serious disadvantage of the English labourer - The number of Irish competitors for work in the Liverpool market in very great; and from the extreme poverty of the Irish poor they are induced to remain in this country by the most scanty and miserable subsistence: the consequence of which is, by perpetual intercourse and unrestrained competition gradually to reduce the character and situation of the English labourer to the unfortunate condition of the Irish peasant.

Here J. K. Walton observes that Irish competition was 'a widespread divisive factor inhibiting the formation of neighbourhood solidarities', like A. Shallice, believing that from the 1850s economic grievances caused the Irish to 'displace the state and
the employers from popular demonology as the prime cause of poverty and unemployment.\footnote{9}

There is evidence that a few employers did take advantage of cheap Irish labour to cut wages in the 1830s,\footnote{10} and artificially suppress wage increases by initiating rumours in Ireland of the ample vacancies and opportunities available in order to flood the labour market.\footnote{11} But evidence of this is very scant and has been highlighted disproportionately by historians. In 1849 it was alleged that experienced dock workers were being dismissed in favour of Irish who were prepared to accept lower wages.\footnote{12} A. Campbell explained in 1854 why Irish labour was regarded as so ‘extremely valuable’ in Liverpool:

\begin{quote}
We could not do without it either in town or in country. In the present state of the labour market, English labour would be almost unpurchaseable if it were not for the competition of Irish labour. The English labourers have unfortunately been taught their rights until they seem to have forgotten their duties...therefore we have derived very great assistance from the Irish...we are very frequently able to put on the screw of the Irish competition.\footnote{13}
\end{quote}

The Manchester manufacturers who testified to the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor (faced with the prospect of the introduction of Irish poor laws threatening their supply of cheap Irish labour), witnesses before Poor Law inquiries, Boards of Guardians and the provincial press, all reflecting middle class opinion, revealingly, likewise protested of the necessity of Irish labour to the vitality of the economy.\footnote{14}

However, the extent of the Irish economic impact has been challenged by B. H. Hunt\footnote{15} and, more thoroughly, recently by J. G. Williamson,\footnote{16} whose social-saving projections suggest that Irish immigration was never extensive or concentrated enough to have negatively influenced general real wage levels in the long-term.\footnote{17} Rather, Irish immigration ‘crowded-out’ potential native migration,\footnote{18} a theory expounded as early as 1835 by J. P. Kay.\footnote{19} Williamson observes that as predominantly unskilled workers the Irish had a minimal impact on skilled labour supply, and, given the absorptive capacity of the market, unskilled labour’s real per capita income was effected only fractionally.\footnote{20} He calculates that even during the Famine decade real wages of the unskilled would have grown by only 1.14\% per year in the absence of
Irish immigration, as opposed to the actual increase of 0.88%.[21] Where they entered a trade en masse, as witnesses noted in 1836, he concedes that they did have a greater effect, and, moreover, they effected the areas of their greatest concentration and points of entry more than the overall conclusions suggest.[22] As predominantly young adults, with an accordingly high labour participation rate, the Irish had a greater impact on labour markets than other less selective immigrations and than population statistics suggest.[23] But as the Irish progressively entered more skilled trades so their material circumstances and aspirations improved, and they were effectively economically acclimatized. Williamson also suggests that immigration positively encouraged the non-Irish population to strive to improve their skills more rapidly than would otherwise have been the case.[24] Interestingly this concurs with an observation of C. H. Richards (of Manchester Board of Guardians) in 1854 'that the Irish taking the lowest class of employment, at a smaller rate of wages, have compelled the English to seek, and to fit themselves for, better-paid work'.[25]

The economic debate it seems is far from over, but contemporaries had conclusive opinions on the subject. Fears were promoted by the fact that wages were notoriously low in Ireland.[26] Visiting Manchester in 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville remarked:

Among the workers are men coming from a country where the needs of men are reduced almost to those of savages, and who can work for a very low wage, and so keep down the level of wages for the English workmen who wish to compete, to almost the same level.[27]

Engels, J. P. Kay, A. Alison, P. Saintsbury, and the Manchester Guardian, all concurred in concluding that Irish immigration diminished wages, and parliamentary commissions of the 1830s, enquiring into whether immigration should be aborted, were inspired by fear that immigration was causing a decline in native living standards.[28] M. T. Saddler cautioned:

THE WANT OF A PROVISION FOR THE POOR OF IRELAND...IS A GRIEVOUS INJURY TO THE WORKING CLASSES OF ENGLAND...the English labourer and workman finds himself interfered with, and his remuneration reduced, if not himself thrown actually out of employment by this constant and vast emigration.[29]
Though Carlyle was sympathetic to the plight of the Irish ('What can they help it? They cannot stay at home, and starve. It is just and natural that they come hither as a curse to us') he regarded their misfortune as impacting on the English labourer:

He is the sorest evil this country has to strive with. In his rags and laughing savagery, he is there to undertake all work that can be done by mere strength of hand and back; for wages that will purchase him potatoes...The Saxonman if he cannot work on these terms, finds no work...the uncivilized Irishman, not by his strength, but by the opposite of strength, drives out the Saxon native...the condition of the lower multitude of English labourers approximates more and more to that of the Irish competing with them in all markets; and whatsoever labour, to which mere strength with little skill will suffice, is to be done, will be done not at the English price, but at an approximation to the Irish price.30

Though many contemporaries report that wage undercutting rarely occurred where the Irish and English were employed in the same job, and witnesses qualified their remarks by noting that the influence was restricted to certain trades, eighteen of the twenty-two Manchester witnesses (largely manufacturers) questioned directly on the issue in the 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor* concluded that Irish immigration had led to a lowering of wages.31 Comparatively ten out of twenty Liverpool witnesses regarded Irish as lowering wages, but a further six regarded them as hindering wage increases.32 In Manchester there was presumed to be a link as the highest point of immigration coincided with an economic depression. Already by November 1846 the *Manchester Guardian* reported that the influx of Famine refugees was inciting fears regarding wage levels.33 By 1847 mills were shutting, unemployment soaring and food prices high, and the *Guardian* (in an editorial headlined 'Distress in Manchester') complained of the aggravating influence of the 'torrent of Irish immigration'.34 This was equally pronounced in Liverpool with its large and noticeable Irish population and manipulative political Establishment. The nature of Liverpool's economy fostered competition. Here the insecure and competitive nature of dock employment fostered divisions and rivalries and hence encouraged sectarian tensions.35 Liverpool merchant Henry Booth queried:

Is anyone sanguine enough to imagine that the independent character of the English labourer...can be sustained amidst the debasing competition, resulting from the external influx of poverty and degradation in the never-ceasing importations of
Irish peasantry? In 1850 Dr Mackay of the *Morning Chronicle* reported from Liverpool on the 'distress caused among the steady labourers of the town, many of them householders and ratepayers, by the overwhelming numbers of utterly superfluous Irishmen that compete with them for bread, and sometimes force them upon the parish.'

Contemporaries moreover reflect that this was a prevalent opinion among the working masses. Marx regarded the British working class as fundamentally divided between an English proletariat and an Irish proletariat, the former hating the latter on account of their acting as competitors for job and suppressers of wages. A. Alison was in no doubt that 'the prodigious influx' of Irish poor was 'an evil'; can there be the smallest doubt that this immense foreign swarm has been the main source of the extraordinary distress which, for the last fifteen years, has prevailed among our labouring poor? It is the last drop which makes the cup of misery overflow; and, considering that the Irish have been so immense a drop, it is no wonder that it is running over in torrents.

Although John Belchem asserts that the Welsh, rather than the Irish, were regarded as the main economic challenge to indigenous artisans in Liverpool, and that wages were only diminished in the lowliest labouring jobs, by the late 1840s and early 1850s Irish wage suppression was widely **perceived** in Liverpool. The economic effect is hard to measure, but if the Irish drove down wages anywhere it was in Liverpool. In 1836 Mark Falvey noted, 'the only opposition between English and Irish labour and mechanics is confined to the competition of wages', and in 1848 a meeting complained: 'heartily do the workmen of England wish that their Irish brethren would seek work elsewhere leaving them the whole loaf'. This opinion it seems was moreover not confined to the first half of the century. In 1881 the *Liverpool Review* reported that 'a large number of working men who hate the Irish for coming to this country and lowering the rate of wages'. In 1894 the Irish leader of Liverpool S.D.F. John O'Brien criticized employers for having enticed cheap Irish labour to the city, but interestingly the Liverpool Trades Council's anti-aliens campaign of the early 1890s was orientated against Eastern European Jewish and Chinese immigrants, not
Witnesses informed the 1833 Report...on the Employment of Children in Factories that 'it is generally believed that they have caused wages to be lower than what they otherwise would have been in Manchester'. Corn Law rhymster Ebenezer Elliot evoked a popular sentiment as he penned, 'Irish hordes were bidders here, Our half-paid work to do'. Weavers told the first poor law commission that they could not compete with the Irish who were prepared to work for less and hand-loom weaver, J. Nesbitt complained to the Report on the State of the Irish Poor:

It is a prevailing opinion among the English operatives that the great influx of Irish into this town and neighbourhood injures them; this has been their opinion from the earliest day that I remember. Poor-laws for Ireland have been advocated by all the persons whom I have heard speak on the subject, on the ground that they would be beneficial to the...English by keeping the Irish at home.

E. Welboume notes that it was 'a common saying that prosperity would not return to the north until every Scotchman went home, bearing two Irishmen on his back' and a member of the miners union insisted that it had not been forgotten 'that stout north country pitmen had been driven to America by the wage competition of those strangers'.

English radicals joined with respectable sociologists and philanthropists in demanding the introduction of Poor Laws and other reform in Ireland in order to halt the influx of cheap Irish labour. At a meeting of 'Liberal and Enlightened Protestant Mechanics' in Newcastle advocates of Catholic Emancipation appealed to local self-interest:

Poor Irishmen are now compelled to leave their homes, to seek Employment in this and other Places in Great Britain, where there is hardly sufficient work for yourselves. They must have bread. They are men like yourselves; they have wives, they have children. If they cannot support them at Home, they must seek subsistence elsewhere. I am sure you do not blame them...the Poor are left to themselves, and are obliged to come her to divide labour with you. If Emancipation were granted...there would be Plenty of work for the Irish at Home, Plenty for Englishmen at Home, and the country would prosper.

A meeting of Newcastle labourers reiterated this theme:

CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION, by giving Peace and Security,
and of course, More Trade and Manufactures to Ireland, will
give Employment to Irish Labourers in their own Country, and
so prevent their being obliged to come to England, to the injury
of English Labourers as they do at present. It is the Interest,
therefore, of all English, as well as Irish, Labourers to support
with all their POWER CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.\(^{55}\)

The subject was resurrected in 1848, as Mr Gow's speech at a meeting of Manchester
trade delegates illustrates:

> If the Irish had their rights, they might go back to their own
country, cultivate the land that gave them birth, and thus relieve
the English labourers from their competition, and do away with
that animosity which prevailed between the English and Irish.\(^{56}\)

Although some rightly identified employers' economic exploitation,\(^{57}\) it is likely that
the majority did not share in the enlightened sentiments of radical leaders\(^{58}\) However,
surveying the gutter press on sale in Manchester and Liverpool D. G. Paz observes
that surprisingly little attention was devoted to this subject.\(^{59}\)

The theme was also taken advantage of by Irish nationalists, who sought
popular support for the Repeal cause by stating that oppression of Ireland created a
situation where "the Irish operatives were literally taking the wages out of your
pockets, and the bread out of your mouths".\(^ {60}\) At a Liverpool Repeal meeting a Mr
Grady expounded:

> Much was said as to the Irish coming over to this country and
interfering with the market for labour; but he ventured to say
that if the accursed Union was repealed 40,000 of the labouring
men even in this town would forever take a farewell leave of it.\(^ {61}\)

Irish Confederate M. Somers told Chartists:

> You see 20,000 Irish Porters at your Docks driven from their
own country by misrule depriving you the artisans of Liverpool
of your bread but I ask you Democrats of Liverpool to assist us
as our cause is one'.\(^ {62}\)

Interestingly in the Home Rule campaign Liverpool Liberals again later emphasized
that independence would put an end to immigration.\(^ {63}\)

Tories everywhere exploited Irish economic impact to their own ends, but this
was especially pronounced in Liverpool, where the theme was adopted as a rallying
call for Tory democracy.\(^{64}\) In 1857 the Tory 'Liverpool Herald' provocatively alleged
that Irish were being employed on better terms on the docks than natives,\(^ {65}\) while in
1867 the *Courier* complained: 'They come here to seek employment, and by their competing with their English fellow labourers, tend materially to reduce the daily chance of obtaining work'.

Harris supposes that ethnic conflict was consequently 'a constant fact of life' in textile districts. In 1840 M. McGuiness told the *Freeman's Journal*:

> It is impossible to describe their animosity towards us; after abusing us they often assemble in large numbers with all kinds of weapons, to drive us from the work. It makes no odds whether we are Catholic or Protestant, to be Irish is offence enough - we are all treated alike.

E. D. Steele and P. T. Phillips, like contemporary observers, see economic circumstances as precipitating the 1852 Stockport riot, J. Foster identifies economic motives behind the 1861 Oldham disturbances, and it is highly likely, though problematic to prove, that in Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle too, economic grievances contributed to inter-communal tensions. Cotton manufacturer J. Bellclaire, who took on Irish labour in order to cut wages, unsurprisingly had to keep his English and Irish employees segregated and wage-undercutting precipitated considerable violence and tensions on the railways in the north-east. Economic depressions focused attention on the Irish and certainly there is evidence of hostility in Manchester correlating with the recessions of 1847 and 1867. It is likely that economic resentment lay behind much of what is articulated under the pretextual banners of religious, cultural, racial and political grievances, and every time hostile attention was focused on the Irish economic objections were resurrected. Indeed T. Gallagher sees competition between un-unionised Protestants and Catholics for unskilled labour as one of the principal sources of Liverpool's unusual animosities. In 1850 a Manchester clergyman predicted that 'our manufacturing and coal supplying districts will soon rise to expel Popery, by which they mean the Irish Papists, considered by them to be the cause of their misery.' Senior accordingly regards the Orange movement as expressive of economic fears given the 'apparent threat' to living standards, but equally the movement can be accused of exploiting such fears. The conspicuousness of the Irish rendered them collectively accusable, and thereby the
Irish were more susceptible to economic based hostility than any other migrant or immigrant group.

Additionally there is evidence of the Irish aggressively monopolizing certain trades. Although D. Bythell is critical of the exaggeration of the incidence of this in general, he concedes that in the peculiar instance of Manchester, the Irish did progressively monopolize the hand loom weaving trade. Baines' *History of the Hand Loom Weavers* affirms:

> Accustomed to a wretched mode of living in their own country, they are contented with wages that would starve an English labourer. They have, in fact, so lowered the rate of wages as to drive many of the English out of the employment, and to drag down those who remain in it to their own level.

Dublin silk weavers and northern Irish linen weavers moved to Manchester in the years following the end of the Napoleonic wars, stimulated by public subscriptions and the decline of the native industry, and Irish peasants who had previously only woven domestically received low wages in the sinking trade which the English and Scots were not prepared to accept. However, as B. Collins observes, 'though the involvement of the Irish prolonged the existence of the industry, their participation was a symptom of its decline rather than a cause'. By 1835, Redford calculates, there were very few English hand loom weavers left in Manchester, and the manifestos of the local weavers' committees in 1839 demonstrate the strength of the Irish contingent. By 1840 they comprised 60% of the 1551 hand loom weavers surveyed by Joseph Adshead in Manchester, and in 1851 65% of hand-loom weavers in Angel Meadow and 52% of power-loom weavers. There is also evidence in all three towns of the Irish using hostile practices to drive the English out of the increasingly Irish-dominated trades of market stall holding (in the 1830s they comprised three-quarters of the market stall holders in Manchester) and bricklayers' labouring, and in the 1830s the Oddfellows dictated the distribution of employment in certain Liverpool yards and foundries. 'During my whole life, to my knowledge, I have never employed anyone as a server of bricklayers but Irishmen', recalled Liverpool builder Samuel Holme. Denvir made a similar observation regarding stonemasons'
labourers. Indeed such a 'Hibernian closed shop' was building that during the construction of Manchester Assize Court in 1864 labourers walked out when the foreman appointed a gang leader that was not Irish. In 1836 James Muspratt told the 1836 Report that in his Liverpool alkali works all but one worker was Irish - 'I found it impossible to have a larger proportion, as they contend with the English, and wished totally to exclude them.' In Liverpool the Irish comprised 76% of dock-labourers, dominated the night-watchmen, and Ulstermen monopolized shipwrights and carpenters trade to the extent that the twelfth of July became known as 'Carpenters Day.' Liverpool docks were divided between a Catholic north and a Protestant south, but divisions were not absolute and derived as much from specialization as religion and ethnicity. Monopolization prevented wage diminution in other sectors but almost without exception drove down wages in the monopolized trade and, furthermore, exclusive practices prohibited the integration promoted by inter-ethnic socialization in the workplace. But monopolies did tend to be limited in endurance, strongholds diminishing as employment became more stable and skilled, and as dying trades reached their inevitable demise.

Historians reiterate the reputation, as epitomized in Mrs Gaskell's *North and South*, of the Irish as strike-breakers. D. Bythell indeed notes that, most of the strikes of the early nineteenth century were, furthermore, not aimed against the introduction of machinery, but against blacklegs. However the incidence of Irish strike-breaking has been greatly exaggerated. Such activity during the 1844 miners strike has become the relentlessly cited stuff of historical legend. Lord Londonderry's threat to break the strike by importing men from his Irish estates was frustrated as his agents urged caution, partly in response the interference of Newcastle Hibernian Society and the outcry of the *Northern Star*. Londonderry begged his strike-threatening employees, "While there is yet time reflect!" Consequently far smaller numbers of Irish came for this purpose to the north-east than is generally supposed. The *Tyne Mercury* reported that an estimated 5,000-10,000 Irish blacklegs entered Newcastle, but this is without doubt a considerable exaggeration. Indeed research by A. J. Heesom
suggests that the figure imported by Londonderry was more like 180. Importation was often rather merely utilized by employers as a rhetorical threat, and it was not this (contrary to Treble's suppositions) that broke the strike. Londonderry's blacklegs did not make a success of this foray into mining. By October 1844 only about 50 remained, the rest having been shipped home and former pitmen having had their positions restored. Furthermore the Irish blacklegs were greatly out-numbered and out-skilled by influxes from the Durham lead mines, and from Wales, Scotland, Cornwall and Staffordshire. Londonderry's venture was exceptional, and Cooter reflects that the incident brought more infamy on Lord Londonderry and his skilled non-Irish blacklegs than on the Irish, which he regards as being confirmed in the subsequent apparently unopposed entry of the Irish into mining. However there is, none the less, evidence of residual contemporary resentment. The Irish are again implicated in strike-breaking in the north-east in the nine-hours engineers strike in 1871, but here once more they were greatly outnumbered by the skilled foreign workmen imported from Belgium, Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. There is much more evidence of Irish being employed in this manner in peripheral areas of Northumbria, Tyneside and County Durham, and, although this may not have directly affected the populace of Newcastle, it is likely that it did contribute to the characterization of the Irish as strike-breakers. The evidence of cotton manufacturers J. Potter, J. Guest and J. Taylor before the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor is similarly frequently cited, but there is scarcely any other evidence of the Irish being used in this way in Manchester. Irish did come to Manchester in 1853 as strikebreakers, but, as in the north-east in 1844, potential blacklegs were immediately urged to return by the local Irish. In Liverpool, with its competitive and casual trades it might be expected that this activity was common, but the only documented example of Irish workmen acting as blacklegs is in the 1803 bootmakers' strike. Evidence of Irish strike-breaking is therefore considerably more scant than historians have hitherto suggested, and there is conversely ample evidence that the Irish were very active in trade-unionism. However the psychological impact of these few cited
infamous incidents should not be overlooked.

Gallagher proposes that differences in the reception of Irish immigrants in Glasgow and Liverpool can be explained by dissimilarities in the economic contexts, and this judgement is also valid in comparing Liverpool with Manchester and Newcastle. While Liverpool had a long trading history with Ireland and consequently attracted individuals with economic interests in the field, it also had a long experience of being the first refuge of those fleeing hardship. Early nineteenth century immigration coincided with expansion of the port and news of consequent opportunities travelled to Ireland. But overwhelmingly the Liverpool Irish continued to constitute, as Belchem puts it, 'a class apart, unable, unsuited or unwilling to take advantage of opportunities elsewhere in Britain or the new world'. As England industrialized, Liverpool de-industrialized, losing its manufacturing base that had emerged in the eighteenth century, as investment was concentrated in trade. Shipbuilding moved to Birkenhead, chemicals to Widnes, and cotton mills failed because of inland competition. Consequently Liverpool's economic structure changed drastically in the first forty years of the nineteenth century, and with it demand for skilled workers dwindled, trades becoming increasingly precariously casual and often hereditary, brutal and exclusive, fostering jealousies and facilitating the Tories' wooing of the Liverpool working class. Thus Liverpool's labour market placed English and Irish in daily competition, perpetuating resentments that expressed themselves in political allegiances and street violence.

Textiles linked Manchester with Ireland since the seventeenth century and from the early nineteenth century, as the competition of cheap factory-produced English cloth and the declining demand from English manufacturers for linen yarn as warp was killing off the Irish domestic textile industry which had traditionally supplemented agricultural incomes, Irish flocked to Manchester from north-central Ireland in pursuit of work. Indeed by the Famine period this was a well established pattern, and already the Irish immigration into this mature economy was suspected of being potentially hazardous to the native livelihood.
Cooter insists that in Newcastle economic hostility was not as important a factor in inter-communal relations as was the case elsewhere, and he regards the economic opportunity available after 1840 as one of the principal reasons for the supposedly superior reception of Irish in the area. In this assessment there is some merit, not so much because contextually employment profiles differ (for in the internal city economies contrasts are less marked than is peripherally the case), but because of the differing chronology of economic expansion and of immigration. As T. P. MacDermott identifies, comparatively easy Irish integration in the north-east has a lot to do with their good timing. By contrast with Manchester, Newcastle's industry did not undergo a comparative expansion until the mid-century. Its initial substantial Irish influx was driven both by Famine destitution and the attraction of its buoyant labour market and thereafter, while Manchester industry underwent a coincident down turn, provoking hostility to the multiplying numbers of Irish, Newcastle experienced a period of boom and opportunity, with the rapid development of railways and harbours, coal, iron, chemical, engineering and shipbuilding industries boosting the town's economy as a whole, encouraging rapid immigration from all over England and facilitating Irish integration. Moreover, as B. Collins identifies, employment sectors were clearly structured and unionized in Newcastle, while in Liverpool, by contrast, employment was more casual and competitive.

Many witnesses testify that they did the jobs that the bulk of the English rejected. 'Every kind of drudgery was thrust upon them, and they must perform it rather than starve in the streets. They were largely employed in all the roughest and heaviest work in the country', observed the Bishop of Liverpool. The Earl of Donoughmore adopted a rosier perspective: 'It is perfectly notorious that the poor Irish are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water in the different towns of England, that there is a large population of them fulfilling very humble, but at the same time very useful occupations in Liverpool and Manchester. Harris relates the incident of Irish women having to be taken on after a Manchester manufacturer imported fibre from Brazil which was so dirty that the English refused to handle it,
and Fielding details that, because of the risk of contagion, only Irish girls could be got to work in Salford sanatorium. The Gateshead Observer remarked,

A hard working fellow is Pat and shirks no labour, however severe or however dirty. An Englishman or a Scotchman may not be very fastidious and yet there are jobs in our chemical or other works which neither John nor Sandy likes to put his hand to and gladly leaves to Patrick.

In the wake of the Famine most immigrants were indigent and self-employed, managing to 'merely eke out a livelihood' as, for example, hawkers, scavengers, rag and bone sorters, and 'low lodging house' keepers. In surveys of Liverpool Vauxhall in 1847 and St Thomas' Toxteth Park in 1854 the Irish were respectively 33% and 28% irregularly employed, 18% and 22% paupers, 25% and 42% 'bad characters', but only 23% and 6% regularly employed. In general Lowe identifies that the occupational status of the Lancashire Irish was inferior to natives, but it is necessary to take into consideration that the bulk of arriving immigrants were working class. In their trades profile inter-city Manchester and Newcastle differ less than their peripheral economies do and, contrary to Cooter's assumptions, there appears to be little evident difference in the occupational status of the Irish in the two cities. Liverpool by contrast employed the largest number of dock labourers of anywhere in the country. Irish often came to Liverpool to work on dock construction and stayed on as dock-labourers. Before the 1846 Select Committee on Railway Labourers R. Rawlinson estimated that the Irish constituted three-quarters of those involved in the construction. In 1851 they comprised 76% of those employed in dock labour, 40% in 1871, and in 1891 still 50%. Heinrich observed:

The Docks furnish the Irish labourers with a market for the only commodity they have to vend - i.e. strong arms, broad shoulders, and brave hearts that are cheerful and jocund in the midst of toil. The whole line of docks, extending nearly six miles, swarms with Irish life. The leading men in the sheds - the first in many of the warehouses - the strongest men at the wrench - the most enduring in the stifling ship's hold or the laborious and exhaustive sack-carrying are Irishmen. There is, in truth, a marvellous amount of Irish power to be seen in the Liverpool Docks.

Contrary to Heinrich's rather rosy interpretation such men were known locally as "dock rats", "the Lazarus of the working class" and the employment was termed "the
last refuge of the unfortunate”. In Newcastle T. J. Nossiter estimates that Grainger’s rebuilding programme employed some 2000 Irish labourers. T. P. O’Connor wrote:

They became jetty-men, blast-furnace men, shipbuilding and engine-yard workers. They lifted countless tons of iron ore from the deep holds of vessels. They toiled in metal and brass foundries and roughing and finishing mills...wherever there was a call for pick, shovel, sledge-hammer, or mere physical energy, the new-come-overs were engaged.

Although the Irish generally did work requiring strength and endurance, their entry into mining was not as substantial as might therefore be expected. It is not true that, as T. P. O’Connor asserted, the Irish immediately were able to find ample ready employment in this area. English evidence contrasts with Scotland where Irish miners were preferred. Cooter (echoing Clapham) regards entry into mining as inhibited by its ‘inbred and exclusive’ nature, and Harris suggests that religious differences fostered exclusion, but it is perhaps more significant that after 1844 they faced competition from an abundance of skilled labour. There may be instances where they are employed in coal mines, but they are very rare; they do not make good miners’, George Grey recorded in 1854. Furthermore mines were remote from the urban areas where the Irish preferred to settle and the trade required more commitment to settle in a vicinity than the Irish were prepared to give. Although MacDermott exaggerates in supposing that until 1870 there was ‘an almost complete absence’ of Irish labour from Tyneside mines, in 1841 there were only 12 Irish coal miners enumerated in Newcastle, and 32 in 1851 (see Fig. 2.1 and 2.2). Similar factors hindered entry into railway labouring (it employed only 3% of Irishmen in Newcastle in 1851 - see Fig. 2.2), which, by contrast, in America they monopolized. Irish entry into shipbuilding was again slow. In 1851 there were only three Irish shipwrights in Newcastle (see Fig 2.2). But, unlike in Liverpool they did begin to make inroads, and by the early 1880s sufficient numbers of Irish had been employed in shipbuilding for the vicar of St John’s to lament their poverty in consequence of the recent lay-offs in the shipyards. Aside from dock work in Liverpool trade profiles are broadly similar to those of Manchester and Newcastle, comprising general labourers, builders’ labourers (many of them employed in dock building), chemical,
foundry, glass-house and sugar workers, street-sellers and lowly artisans. The recorded trades of the Manchester Irish Confederates tried in August 1848 (men not at the bottom of the Irish economic profile, but necessarily with the time and education to involve themselves in politics) provides an interesting employment sample; two are labourers, three weavers, two clothes dealers, two glaziers, one a groom and one a shoe-maker. J. H. Smith’s survey of Deansgate in 1851 reveals the Irish to constitute 64% of tailors, 48% of boot and shoe makers, and 44% of those employed in building trades. Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle attracted the itinerant Irish and especially before the Famine were swelled by Irish agricultural labour in the summer months. Surveying Little Ireland in 1841 Mervyn Busteed finds 26% of Irish labourers to be employed in agriculture and in Angel Meadow in 1851 the Irish comprised 40 out of 47 agricultural labourers. Seventy-five percent of male emigrants described themselves as labourers, and most would remain casual unskilled labour on markets (the single most important employer of Irish Catholic labour according to Steven Fielding), docks, railroads, canals, in warehouses, building and public works. Mervyn Busteed’s study of Little Ireland in 1841 found 38% of the economically active Irish to be general labourers and Busteed and Hodgson’s survey of Dyche Street Angel Meadow in 1851 found the Irish to comprise 70% of general labourers and dominate most of the lowly areas of employment. A. Hume’s 1850 survey of Liverpool found 48% of Irish family heads to be in irregular employment, and in 1851 60% of the Liverpool Irish were employed in unskilled jobs, compared with 49% of the population of Liverpool in general. In 1841 46% of employed Irishmen in Newcastle were listed by census enumerators as common labourers, and by 1851 the proportion was still 44% (see Fig. 2.1 and 2.2). For both men and women work was generally irregular.

Census takers were not especially interested in what women did, and this, more than historical neglect, accounts for the lack of analysis of their employment profile. Female immigrants whose trades are specified remained (contrary to Mayhew’s observations in London, and Harris’s consequent suppositions)
overwhelmingly enumerated as domestic servants. In 1841 44% of Irish women in Newcastle who had a trade were listed by census enumerators as in domestic service, and the 1851 this figure was 38% (see Fig. 2.3). Liverpool had the largest number of domestic servants in the country (reflecting the fact that it had a large professional class), and this was the most common employment of Irish women. In 1851 Irish comprised 12% of the domestic servants in the Abercromby Square area surveyed by Lawton. Lees' study of London reveals that Irish domestic servants generally worked in less well-off and respectable houses than English domestic servants, and, given attitudes to them evident in Liverpool, it is likely that this was the case here too. Fielding observes that in Manchester Nonconformist households were hostile to Catholic girls practising their faith and so it was common for them to work for Jewish families. Cooter assumes that there was a comparative lack of demand for female and child labour in Newcastle as, unlike in Manchester, there was not abundant employment in textiles (of which many had acquired domestic experience in Ireland). However, this did not mean that there was a large surplus under-employed female population in the city; rather females opted to emigrate to areas of more ample employment. Moreover, having said that, even in Newcastle 10-15% of Irish women in Newcastle did still find employment in factories (see Fig. 2.3). Lowe and Harris note that entry into textile factory work was not as substantial as might be expected given the great demand for female labour. However, on the contrary, numerous contemporary Mancunian witnesses noted that large numbers of Irish women were employed in factories. The 1833 Report...as to the Employment of Children in Factories noted that it was common for Irish to settle in Manchester with the hope of getting their children into mills, and accordingly of the girls attending St Augustine's Catholic Sunday school 198 were employed in factories. This is confirmed by Smith's survey of Deansgate where they comprised 20% of female textile workers. Lowe himself observes that Irish women were emancipated into cotton mills much more than Irishmen. In 1871 7% of Irish females in Manchester worked in cotton factories, compared with 6% of the non-Irish female population of the city.
Liverpool it seems that there were few skilled and well-paid jobs for women, and what decent female trades there were excluded Irishwomen, who lingered as hawkers, sweated needlewomen, sack menders, and rope and jute makers. In all three towns many were occupied in domestic craft industries, and there seems to have been a distinct preference for home-based employment. In Newcastle this represented the largest sector after domestic service. This tendency is especially pronounced among female heads of households, the majority of whom are recorded by census enumerators as lodging-house keepers. In Liverpool in 1851 29% of Irish women are enumerated as having no trade, while the figure for Manchester is surprisingly higher at 37%, compared with the figure for non-Irish women in the city of 19%. Interestingly Collins remarks that most women emigrating from the north-west counties of Ireland did so as part of a family rather than as individuals, implying that they did not emigrate in order to market their skills, as can be supposed for many of the far more common single male emigrants. However, as Lowe remarks, the occupational status of Irish women in Lancashire differed less from natives than that of Irishmen did, reflecting the fact that the variety of and hierarchy of female employment was more limited. However returns from Newcastle in 1841 and 1851 illustrate that female employment was becoming increasingly varied and, moreover, some improvement in status is detectable (see Fig. 2.3).

Though other witnesses in 1836 denied that this was the case, Daniel Hearne insisted that 'jealousy' was inhibiting the economic advance of the Manchester Irish, as J. M. Werly and R. Miles reiterate. In the First Report of the Poor Law Commission Kay demonstrated the widespread belief among manufacturers that the Irish not only lacked the necessary skill, but were also fundamentally of unsuitable character for industrial employment:

This preference is justified in a great degree by that apathy of character which is a characteristic of those who feel few of the wants of civilized life, and who, therefore, being with meagre fare, and narrow dwellings, acknowledge but slightly the stimulus of emulation or hope: in whose apprehension the brutal sloth of the savage resembles the placid contentment of the instructed artisan.
Samuel Holme attributed 'one third of the difference between the Irish and Scotch to education, and two-thirds to national habits and nature'. Those who have not been so successful never found their nationality any bar to success...If in the workshop sons of Erin are sometimes subjected to a little chaff, they are seldom the victims of prejudice', reported the Newcastle Chronicle in 1867, but in 1881 it reported:

Last week, a man sought employment in a factory in Newcastle. He saw the foreman, who inquired as to his capacity to perform a particular kind of work. After receiving the information he sought he told the man to return next day at ten o'clock in the forenoon. The man went out, fully expecting to get started. The foreman questioned him again, - "where are you from?" - he enquired. The workman told him his address in Newcastle. "That is not what I mean" said the foreman. "Are you not an Irishman?". "I am." was the reply. "Then I can't employ you", rejoined the foreman. The poor fellow asked if that was the only reason why he was unsuitable, and was answered in the affirmative.

Cooter regards entry into coal as restricted by employers' prejudices, and there is evidence also that this was the case in coastal shipping. J. R. Clynes recalled seeing 'NO IRISH NEED APPLY' outside Manchester factories. In 1850 the Liverpool Mercury recalled that fifteen years ago:

They even preached a crusade against Catholic servants being employed by Protestants. many a poor, industrious girl lost her situation through their unrivalled denunciations, and many a poor Irish porter was discharged from his work because he was either known or suspected to be a "Romanist". What a happy change!

But one third of the adverts for domestic servants in the Liverpool Daily Post continued to make religious specifications. In 1861 Porcupine lamented the ongoing use of discrimination in Liverpool job advertisements - 'The meanness, hypocrisy, and intolerance implied in the phase, "No Irish need apply", has cast a reproach upon Liverpool, and justly so'. Father Nugent lamented, 'True religion, true humanity, and education would banish from society that bigotry which is as narrow-minded as it is insulting - "No Irish need apply"'. In Liverpool Heinrich criticized the 'insolent libellers who deny that the Irish people possess the qualities essential to material success', and reflected that if they did rise it was 'in opposition to prejudices and various hostile circumstances such as no other member of the community has had to
encounter and overcome. There is evidence of Irish understandably changing their names and accents in order to secure employment. These circumstances seem to have been most entrenched in Liverpool, where, O'Day identifies, it remained difficult for Irish to obtain an apprenticeship as late as the early twentieth century. Rev. T. Fisher, William Dillon and Francis Jordon protested, There is no jealousy in Liverpool against the Irish: no disposition to keep them down or discourage them, or to put them on a different footing from the English. But other witnesses in 1836 reported that Welsh warehousemen never gave plum positions to the Irish. Whitty reflected:

There is a decided preference given to English operatives, so that, wherever English and Irish come in competition, the preference is given to the English. This remark applies generally; for example, the Irish are nearly excluded from the dock police in this town, and in the watch, preference is given to English.

Reverend T. Robinson confirmed, There are more English and Scotch in respectable circumstances, who, the latter especially, naturally favour their own countrymen. The Ulstermen, most numerous in Liverpool, were perhaps worse than any other group for excluding other Irish and the monopoly of the carters' trade by Protestants ("an Orange preserve" in Denvir's terms) is by no means just a consequence of lack of skill.

Political inclination furthermore did their employment prospects no favours. In 1848 it was suggested in Liverpool that the names of known Irish Confederates should be published so that they could be dismissed and there were wider appeals for employers to take on only Englishmen. In August 100 Irish dock labourers were dismissed for refusing to sign on as special constables. During the 1860s (as R. Belany's letter to the Newcastle Daily Chronicle demonstrates) employers were reluctant to take on Irish for fear that they might be Fenians. In Liverpool M. J. Whitty discouraged Irish from participating in Manchester Martyrs parades because of the likely effect on their employment prospects, and correspondent to the Liverpool Courier warned: 'Let them beware of arousing a counter cry of 'England for the English' from the English working men and labourers and being met, as was once
the case, with the notice 'No Irish need apply'. In 1885 speaking before a crowd of Manchester Irish John O'Leary denounced the activities of the dynamiters as likely to 'mean ruin to thousands of the Irish in England'.

However it is debatable whether this occupational 'ghettoization' was genuinely, as O'Grada supposes, always the result of native prejudice and communal suppression. Economic and employment structure (like residential integration and living conditions) were determined more by the nature of the working class labour and housing markets into which they came than by their 'Irishness'. Mobility was limited by class structure, internal kinship networks, the maturity of the economies of Liverpool and Manchester, traditions of hereditary employment (as in iron and steel manufacturing in Newcastle and the Irish inclination to enter sinking trades). Separate cultural and economic characteristics furthermore contributed to their impoverishment. They were handicapped by religious financial commitments and the habit of sending back money to Ireland, and individual ambition was not a characteristic, or at least not pronounced, part of Catholic or Irish culture. Samuel Holme reflected, 'invariably those who become bricklayers' labourers remain bricklayers' labourers. I scarcely ever knew them wish to get higher.' Many, as Harris and Jackson highlight, moreover, had little commitment to improving their employment or social position within Britain. For these people working life in Britain was merely a 'means to an end' within the scope of their Celtic ambitions. C. H. Richards reflected: 'They have great natural capacity, but they have not the same application.' Additionally he revealed: 'To use one of our local phrases, they have a great disinclination to be "rung in by a bell"; they prefer domestic labour: tailors and shoemakers, mat-making and chip-selling, and matters of that sort.' Many young girls came to Manchester hoping to attain employment in factories or as domestic servants but were disappointed on account of having 'scanty clothes, no reference as to character, as well as having habits opposed to English ideas of domestic management'.

In Mrs Gaskell's *North and South* workers in Milton (ie Manchester) were
angry to be put out of work by "a Paddy that did na know weft fro' warp", but their indignation was tempered by pleasure at the idea of the bungling way in which they would set to work, and perplex their new masters with their ignorance and stupidity, strange exaggerated stories of which were already spreading through the town. Lack of the skills for, and experience of, industrial employment was perhaps the most important factor inhibiting Irish advance, as George Cornewall Lewis contended in response to Daniel Heame. The extent of Irish skill is impossible to quantify with any accuracy, but, although many (aside from the Famine period) left the most industrialized and urbanized parts of Ireland because of the decline in their skilled trades, it was certainly widely believed that they were of inferior capabilities. Even where they entered England having attained experience in Irish industry, differences in practice devalued their abilities. Collins identifies a disparity in motivation between emigrants from different regions of Ireland; those coming from the north-central areas sought to utilize their textiles skills in England, while those coming from north-west Ireland were essentially looking for new opportunities having thrown off a peasant existence. Immigrants settling in England (it being a casual and easily reversible move, in comparison with emigration to the new world) tended to be the poorest and most uncommitted and incapacitated, the Liverpool Irish comprising the worst of these. In the First Annual Report of the Poor Law Commission, J. P. Kay identified that employers preferred English or Scotch labourers to Irish on account of their superior skill. W. J. Lowe surveyed a number of Liverpool and Manchester streets and detected a great skill disparity between the English and the Irish, but he surveys a very small sample of streets and it is doubtful whether his results are therefore representative. In Back Woodward, Halton and Burke Streets in Manchester he finds 17% of Irish males skilled as opposed to 48% non-Irish in 1851, and 25% Irish as and 50% non-Irish in 1871. In Bevington and Downe Streets in Liverpool he counts that 22% of Irish males were skilled compared with 27% of non-Irish in 1851, while in 1871 14% of the Irish males were skilled and 12% of the non-Irish. More credibly Pooley estimates that in Liverpool in 1871
57.4% of Irish-born household heads were semi-skilled or unskilled, compared with 38.9% of the total population. Heinrich's estimate was even more pessimistic. In 1872 he calculated that 146,900 of the 180,000 Irish in Liverpool were 'living by unskilled manual labour'. The skill disparity explains the division of the Liverpool docks into the Catholic northern area and the Protestant Southern ship-servicing area, at least as much as sectarian recruiting. J. Bennett calculates that 44% of Irish-born males and 56% of Irish-born females were illiterate. These figures are, without doubt, largely attributable to the exclusion of Catholics from Liverpool schools after 1841. Generally those emigrating were, as Redford identifies, furthermore, either too old, and without capital, to take on an apprenticeship, or too young to have completed one in Ireland, and, being casual labourers, they did not normally remain long enough in a trade or an area to attain skills or promotion.

The Irish seem to have found it hard to improve their skills and to attain promotion. While they dominated hand loom weaving (which required little capital, training or skill), a much lower proportion gained employment in textile factories, and even where they did it was not as spinners, but a lower-paid power loom operators. Busteed and Hodgson's survey of Angel Meadow found the Irish comprising 52% of power-loom weavers. In 1871 only 3.6% of Irish males were employed in cotton factories, as opposed to 7% of the non-Irish male population. Although many Irish found it easy to enter the building trade (many already having acquired the necessary experience in Ireland), they rarely rose within it. In 1871 only 200 of the skilled bricklayers in Manchester were Irish, but there were 750-1000 Irish bricklayers' labourers. In St Thomas's, Toxteth Park in 1854, as in Liverpool Vauxhall in 1847, only 2% of the Irish residents managed to attain a status above the 'labouring class'.

If the collective economic characteristics of the immigrant group are regarded as providing a register of inter-communal relations it is hardly an optimistic one, for there is substantial evidence of extreme and enduring poverty among a large proportion of the Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle Irish population. Indeed
Fitzpatrick regards their economic failure as the factor most distinguishing Irish immigrants, rendering them 'disproportionately noticeable'. This was especially remarkable in Liverpool with its overwhelmingly under-skilled Irish resident population, and which attracted those forced from Ireland for negative reasons without the means and motivation to get any further, and to where the economic adventurers returned to be passed back after failing in their pursuit of work in England. In 1840 the Mercury lamented, 'We have seen scores of these poor fellows, with blistering feet, and scarcely able to crawl, wandering through our streets, begging for bread, and trying to raise the means of carrying them back to Ireland'.

Contemporary evidence suggests that immigrants expected to achieve superior living standards here, but many failed to find work, and became destitute, reduced to dependency, vagrancy, crime and prostitution. Even where they found work, the unskilled Irish were generally the first to be laid off and generally were able to accumulate little savings. 'They are the first to suffer and the last to benefit by any change in the commerce of the town', wrote Father Nugent. Dock labourers in Liverpool tended to be at the mercy of the elements, and consequently reports appeared in the press of them not being able to afford to enjoy their customary carousing on St Patrick's day on account of bad weather having disrupted ships arriving in the port. The 1833 Report...into the Employment of Children in Factories explained that Irish parents 'at particular seasons of the year, have very trifling or no means of subsistence but what they derive from the children's labour'. The Second Report on the State of Large Towns describes the Irish as 'the vagrant class, - half mendicant, half hawkers' and Losh revealingly reflected that apart from the Irish, 'the convict and most profligate', the working classes of Newcastle were better off than elsewhere in England. In April 1842 Manchester Irish handloom weavers raided a bread shop, and in 1855 and 1867 they were involved in Liverpool bread riots. During the Famine immigration was not merely more destitute but also less selective (although most immigrants were drawn from those areas with well established patterns of chain migration and people from the most destitute areas of
Ireland could only afford to emigrate at this time when in receipt of assisted passages. In A. Campbell's 1847 survey of Liverpool most Irish were classified as having no visible means of support or being labourers in irregular employment. Before and after this period most immigrants were young adults, but during the 1840s immigration was diverse in age and consequently included many economic dependents. Harris tries to explain the greater Irish propensity to resort to begging and concludes this to be a way of life to them, Ireland being at a more retarded 'stage of modernity' than England and, consequently, less advanced in 'capitalist attitudes'. However this also simply indicates their lower collective economic status and lack of ability to attain stable and regular employment. Furthermore improvement can not necessarily be assumed over time. In 1898 concerts of the Liverpool Food and Betterment Association were so Irish-dominated that they concluded with Auld Lang Syne rather than the National Anthem, and even in 1905-6 the poor-law guardians' means tests indicated the Irish to be still economically the dregs of Manchester society.

The employment of the Irish immigrant community collectively did progressively become more diverse, skilled and less casual, although it is questionable whether the progression was as rapid as Cooter suggests. Even in the 1830s there is some evidence of economic achievement, but by the 1860s an Irish middle class was emerging on a greater scale as they entered professions. After the Famine positive motives progressively again determined the emigration decision, and after 1870 most immigrants came from north-east Ireland, the south and the east coast (those areas most economically integrated with northern England and Scotland), and shared many of the characteristics of internal English migrants. Collective economic improvement is registered in the declining numbers of Irish living as lodgers and in the funds raised for political purposes, for church and school construction and in the growth of Irish social clubs, benefit and insurance schemes and shop ownership. In the classic immigrant way many built up small businesses, and there was always a 'petite-bourgeoisie' of publicans (like Mayor of Newcastle John Fitzgerald, Charles...
Larkin's father, and former Irish champion boxer Jack Langan who left £20,000 upon his death in Liverpool in 1846).  

The *Liverpool Weekly Mercury* reiterated the theme: 'Many of the most prosperous men in England, and more especially in Lancashire, are of Irish birth, who have found here a larger and richer field for their talents and energies than they were able to meet with in their own country'. Denvir concurred, boasting: 'there is no town in the country in which we have made greater progress than in Liverpool. Irishmen are gradually emerging from the ranks of unskilled labour and becoming more numerous among the artisans, shopkeepers, merchants and professional classes', no longer monopolizing bricklayers' labouring. But like T. P. O'Connor he had a political agenda in emphasizing how successful the Irish in Britain had been. According to Lawton already by the early nineteenth century a gulf was appearing between Liverpool's successful Irish merchant community and the mass of new immigrants. Numerous Liverpool witnesses in 1836 testified to the success of the Irish in the town. According to Francis Joseph Liverpool already had around 500 'highly respectable' 'upper class' Irish, many of whom had 'risen from men to masters'. In 1847 Edward Rushton claimed to know several who had become prosperous tradesmen, for 'the instances are common' of them rising to 'a higher grade'. By 1848 the *Mercury* reported them to be represented in every rank in society. In the early 1840s large parties of 'respectable' Irish began to be reported celebrating St Patrick's day, and the Home Rule movements of all three towns had educated middle class leaders. By 1880 the Irish middle class of Liverpool was sufficiently numerous that a nationalist club was set up for their use, which operated like a gentleman's club, charging entrance fees, subscriptions and tarrifs. Father Nugent was always ready to boast of the success of the Liverpool Irish and in 1848 he acclaimed:

Her sons, driven by stern necessity or adventurous enterprise, have opened up new sources of commerce; they line your quays, fill your places of business. Some of the wealthiest, most enterprising, and largest hearted men, most benevolent, among our merchants, are sons of the soil.
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In the nineteenth century Liverpool had a larger concentration of merchants, brokers, bankers and accountants than anywhere else in the country, including London. In 1851 6.5% of this professional population were, according to Lawton’s calculations, Irish, but at this time they constituted 23% of the city’s population. By 1871 24% of the Irish-born in Liverpool had entered ‘skilled manual occupations’, but only 9.5% were in ‘Skilled non-manual occupations’, and 6.6% in ‘professional and intermediate occupations’. Of the 180,000 Irish in Liverpool in 1872 Heinrich counted 300 ‘merchants, and holding first class positions’, 1500 ‘merchants of the second class’, 3500 ‘shopkeepers’, 3500 ‘clerks’, 15,000 ‘skilled artisans’ and 800 ‘men holding professional positions’. Irishmen were successful in all areas of life in Liverpool. Irish doctors of note included 1836 witness James Collins, Irish Confederate leaders Murphy, Francis O’Donnell and Lawrence Reynolds, and A. M. Bligh (accredited as founder of the Home Rule movement in Liverpool) continued the traditional link between Liverpool doctors and nationalism. James Whitty became chief constable and editor of the *Liverpool Daily Post*. Notable Liverpool-Irish merchants included Francis Jordan, Charles Petres, and Confederate leader McManus. William Dillon was a prosperous linen and wool draper and Lawrence Connolly was a fruit broker. Mark Falvey was a businessman (of variety unknown) and Pat O’Brien built up a prosperous coal business. Liverpool’s Irish legal aristocracy included Q.C. J. G. Gibson, barrister Dr. Commins, magistrate C. J. Corbally, lawyer R. R. Cherry and solicitor George Lynskey. James Muspratt was a manufacturing chemist and John McQuatters a starch manufacturer. Samuel Holme owned a building company and ‘Emperor of Engineers’ George Lyster worked on the construction of Liverpool docks.

In relation to the Famine immigration the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle* (rather optimistically) boasted ‘many of those refugees soon found employment among our own industrial population, and many are now in positions of trust and respectability’. Furthermore, Irish children began to enter apprenticeships (see Fig. 2.1 and 2.2). By the end of the nineteenth century Newcastle Catholic children
received much needed industrial training in the Bishop Chadwick Memorial School (established 1882) and St Vincent's Industrial School, Elswick (established 1893), and were subsequently apprenticed to local engineering firms.309 Touring Newcastle in 1850 the *Newcastle Chronicle* inquirer encountered respectable and educated Irish,310 and in the 1850s the *Chronicle* and the *Tablet* commented on the economic and social improvement of the Irish community.311 In 1854 the *Chronicle*, surveying St Patrick's Day celebrations remarked:

The respectable and orderly character of the procession, together with the comfortable appearance of the persons composing it, speaks favourably for the improved condition of the Irish labouring class, and affords an instance of their perfect ability to improve their social state, when they are favoured by happy auspices.312

The Irish trades listed by enumerators in Newcastle in 1851 included the white-collar occupations of clerks, merchants, policemen, attorneys, newspaper reporters, inland revenue officers, teachers, customs officers, medical officers and surgeons (see Fig. 2.2) In Newcastle Hugh Heinrich remarked that the Irish prospered in comparison with their English fellow workmen. Here, he acclaimed, was a unique example of Irish competitive self-fulfilment:

Many...have worked their way to competence, a few to independence, while the great bulk of them find constant employment at good wages, and are in a condition of comparative prosperity. It is, in truth, a high tribute to the industry and energy of the Irish people and furnishes the best and most conclusive rejoinder to the malicious libels of their slanderers.313

He calculated that in 1872 one in six of the Newcastle Irish achieved a 'condition of comparative prosperity' and counted 400 Irish 'businessmen' and 4000 'skilled artizans'.314 Denvir confirmed that a significant proportion achieved prosperity in Newcastle, citing the example of Bernard McAnulty who arrived from Ireland in 1836 and built up a large and prosperous drapery and bedding business.315 In the 1841 census McAnulty is recorded as a twenty year old draper living in a house in Dog Leap Stairs with twenty-five other Irish, but by the 1860s he is recorded in the list of Newcastle Guardians and Paid Officers as a merchant.316 Perhaps an even more remarkable rags-to-riches story is that of Charles Diamond, who emigrated from
Maghera to Newcastle and built an empire of 37 newspapers.\textsuperscript{317}

Though Lowe’s occupational analysis of individual Manchester streets registers little chronological improvement,\textsuperscript{318} this is a rather false measure as individuals attaining economic stability would move away from depressed areas, just as they melt away from the dominant historiographical personification of the immigrant Irish.\textsuperscript{319} In 1851 Busteed and Hodgson detected ‘some hints of social mobility’ among the Irish in Manchester.\textsuperscript{320} In the 1871 census 15.1\% of Irish households in Manchester, as opposed to 16.1\% in 1851, were returned as ‘labourers’.\textsuperscript{321} By this time the Irish had consolidated their position in textiles, entering factories in greater numbers,\textsuperscript{322} and many found stable employment as corporation labourers. Fielding illustrates that by the 1880s a middle class Irish ‘shopocracy’ was developing.\textsuperscript{323} Former weavers James Leach and John Doherty attained respectability (economically if not politically) as newsagents, publishers and bookshop owners.\textsuperscript{324} Blundell remarked that Manchester was unique in the numbers of its Catholic population who achieved prominent positions in civic and social life.\textsuperscript{325}

The scale, breadth and time-scale of Irish economic improvement is impossible to quantify with any accuracy, and neither is there any simple way of testing it comparatively with progress of the working class as a whole. While examples of success can be cited these did however remain the exception and the majority at best achieved only a slight regularization of occupation and wage. Moreover, as D. Clarke points out in the American context, with constant new arrivals minority success was always overshadowed in general external perception.\textsuperscript{326} The Irish as a group never achieved economic success on anything like the scale of the Jews in Manchester or the Irish in America;\textsuperscript{327} however they generally initially constituted (both economically and psychologically) a different type of immigrant, and, as the successful frequently melt away, testimony and demographic surveys inevitably underestimate this section of the Irish immigrant population. Hornsby-Smith regards occupational normalization as symptomatic of structural assimilation, and if viewed in this light nineteenth century Irish immigrants in Liverpool,
Manchester and Newcastle remained substantially unintegrated.\textsuperscript{328}

Furthermore it is hard to differentiate the self-improving Irish from the always-present but statistically invisible and ideologically unexciting middle and upper class immigrants.\textsuperscript{329} For though the working class numerically and historiographically dominate Irish immigration, they were never homogenous. The Irish middle class always regarded England as a superior breeding ground for their talents and, although the ambitious generally went to London,\textsuperscript{330} there was always an immigrant Irish middle class in Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle,\textsuperscript{331} from the artisan craftsmen who emigrated from Dublin as it declined as a fashionable centre after the Act of Union,\textsuperscript{332} to the wealthy merchants who had, since trade between the two countries began, been attracted to Liverpool.\textsuperscript{333} Revealingly William Dillon distinguished that most of those who had got on in Liverpool by 1836 had had some capital or contacts to get them started.\textsuperscript{334} Examples include Daniel Lee who was already at the forefront of the calico and muslin trade in Manchester by the start of the nineteenth century;\textsuperscript{335} Trinity-college trained Newcastle judge Digby Seymour;\textsuperscript{336} radical barrister George Condy;\textsuperscript{337} Charles Russell who came to Liverpool as a solicitor and rose to become Lord Chief Justice;\textsuperscript{338} Thomas Oates was a professional trade union agitator who had never himself been a workman;\textsuperscript{339} Manchester merchant Lawrence O'Neil;\textsuperscript{340} S. R. Graves (son of an Irish magistrate) became a large Liverpool shipowner;\textsuperscript{341} John Sheppard was an owner of substantial property and a magistrate in Ireland;\textsuperscript{342} and John de Fonblanque Pennefather owned an Anglo-American firm of cotton brokers and remained an Irish landowner.\textsuperscript{343}

The relative facility of reaching the three towns, as well as their economic characteristics, says a lot about the capital and commitment of the immigrants they attracted. This consequently may have a great bearing on both the capacity for economic success and on the tendency to be regarded as competition, thereby significantly influencing inter-communal relations.
Fig. 2.1 Irish Male Trades in Newcastle in 1841, as derived from the census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Labourers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor's Apprentice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholster</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock and Watch maker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Cutter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlery maker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason's Labourer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Maker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner Apprentice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calico Printer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes Dealer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lead Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Factory Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Miner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural labourer</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Independent Means</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Maker</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Makers Apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Cutter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Polisher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobaccoist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedlar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler Builder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Refiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry man</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Turners Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Maker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach makers Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Cutter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers Apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Mason</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer Apprentice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Weaver</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolcomber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer in straw plait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Draper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast iron Founder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In army</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Boy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Sweep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Description</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer to Boiler Builder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer in Soap Factory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Maker's Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter's Apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Wheel Fitter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whip Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners Apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter and Glazier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Polisher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle blower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Painter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Binder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress Maker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordial Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Army</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder's Labourer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmaker's Labourer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer in Saw Mill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Labourer</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Draper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker of Silks and Cotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old clothes Dealer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Deviser in Trades</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer and Flour Dealer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision Merchant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent for Tea and Coffee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer in Stationery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Glass Seller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer in Oil Paintings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer in Rags</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk of Earthenhame</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker of Hardware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalminer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Moulder's Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith's Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer in Lead Factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Founder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Chaplain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector of River Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent to cattle salesman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calico Printer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Porter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Works Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candle Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Dresser</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Labourer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Sharpener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer for Water Company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper's Messenger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector of Subscription for Ragged School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stick Breakers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beggar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Wright</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer in Engine Works</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe and Boot maker</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass cutter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell hanger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Cutter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Painter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Grider</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery Labourer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsmith</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushmaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Maker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazzock Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer's Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemonade Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason's Labourer</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housepainter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper and Hawker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker of Hardware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer in Haberdashery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobaccoonist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions Dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallow Chandler</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle Dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawl Hawker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk of Hardware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer at Foundry</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitensmith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Brigade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture Reader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Reporter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Revenue Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooker in Spinning Mill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Worker</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer in Glass Works</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Cleaner in Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer to Blacksmith</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naizer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer in works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging House Keeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Grider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat cleaner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errand Boy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer in Rag Shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuitant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the 1841 Census</td>
<td>According to 1851 Census</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washerwoman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwoman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General labourer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet maker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamstress</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book binder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker in Marine Store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer in lace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker in plate glass factory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker in lead factory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker in Worsted Factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lint Winder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging House Keeper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mess Woman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itinerant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Independent means</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Servant                     | 292                       |
| Washerwoman                 | 32                       |
| Charwoman                   | 18                       |
| General labourer             | 24                       |
| Milliner                    | 20                       |
| Dress maker                 | 55                       |
| Shoemaker                   | 10                       |
| Stay maker                  | 3                        |
| French polisher             | 1                        |
| Painter                     | 1                        |
| Pottery maker               | 14                       |
| Mat maker                   | 1                        |
| Hat box maker               | 1                        |
| Hawker                      | 41                       |
| Grocer                      | 5                        |
| Tallow chandler             | 1                        |
| Dealer in earthenware       | 10                       |
| Dealer in eggs              | 1                        |
| Fruiterer                   | 7                        |
| Milk woman                  | 1                        |
| Hawk of books               | 1                        |
| Old clothes dealer          | 7                        |
| Drapery hawkers             | 2                        |
| Hawker of cotton goods      | 1                        |
| Cap dealer                  | 1                        |
| Dealer in oil paintings     | 1                        |
| Marine store worker         | 8                        |
| Work in tobacco shop        | 3                        |
| Firewood merchant           | 10                       |
| Dealer                      | 4                        |
| Pipe dealer                 | 1                        |
| Shawl hawkers               | 1                        |
| Labourer at paper mill      | 1                        |
| White lead factory worker   | 18                       |
| Works in Glass House        | 2                        |
| Plate glass polisher        | 2                        |
| Factory worker              | 23                       |
| Weaver                      | 1                        |
| Spinning Mill employee      | 48                       |
| Flax mill employee          | 29                       |
| Governess                   | 2                        |
| Midwife                     | 2                        |
| Matron                      | 1                        |
| Assistant matron            | 1                        |
| Nurse                       | 9                        |
| Teacher                     | 4                        |
| House keeper                | 14                       |
| Cook                        | 1                        |
| Lodging House Keeper        | 22                       |
| Beer shop keeper            | 2                        |
| Works at ropery             | 13                       |
| Errand Girl in Mill         | 1                        |
| Hair Sealing Labourer       | 1                        |
| Vocalist                    | 1                        |
| gardener                    | 1                        |
| Rag sorter                  | 10                       |
| Rag gatherer                | 8                        |
| Labourer at rag shop        | 1                        |
| Worker in bottle house      | 1                        |
| Hotel waiter                | 1                        |
| Traveller                   | 1                        |
| Beggar                      | 2                        |
| Cadger                      | 2                        |
| Prostitue                   | 4                        |
| Annuitant                   | 2                        |

3. "Beware of the Pope and the Devil"

Religious differences have been regarded as a primary influence in cultivating Irish introversion and ambient antagonism. However it is questionable how genuine and active religious prejudices were, if these were ever sufficiently acute to generate hostility in themselves, and whether religion merely provided a pretext, unwarrantedly highlighted by contemporaries and historians, to rationalize and legitimize more mundane and material objections.

Catholicism was regarded suspiciously and criticized loudly by the English Protestant 'respectable' classes and popular alarmists as menacing, militant and foreign, the religion of England's old enemies and of superstitious peasants. Best regards 'No Popery' as 'a fundamental characteristic of the British Protestant', but this was more an aspect of national tradition than theology. Irrespective of their real strength and of how they were treated as individuals, Catholics as a category remained in popular mythology an omnipresent menace, writes Linda Colley, who challenges the opinion that anti-Catholicism was progressively diminishing in the nineteenth century. Moreover G. I. T. Macbin insists that while educated opinion may have become progressively increasingly tolerant, working class bigotry intensified. Liverpool pamphlets and press portrayed Catholicism as fostering disloyalty, poverty and crime:

Popery has so polluted their mental faculties and debased the physical and moral habits of the Irish peasant that it is impossible to ameliorate his condition as a social animal. He does not think as an Englishman or Scotchman and Welshman because he is so saturated with traditional falsehood.

Popular histories were full of bad Catholics and good Protestants, and with the development of the mass-reading public print propagated and enhanced prejudices - 'Britons were encouraged to look through the Catholic glass darkly so as to see themselves more clearly and more complacently'. The persecuting character of popery is notorious, declared a Newcastle pamphlet, 'fifty millions of Christians have suffered death under its iron hand'. The 'tyranny' of the Roman Catholic church,
wrote W. E. Adams to the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*, 'invades his mind, corrupts
his conscience, terrifies his very soul. There is no such despotic machinery in the
world as that controlled by the Catholic Church'.

B. Peacock recalled, 'The Roman Catholic churches were attended by the very
rich or very poor people, and foreigners, which, in the belief of many Protestants,
made them suspect'. Irish immigration enhanced the xenophobia fundamental to No
Popery. Colley writes:

Protestant Britons have traditionally viewed the predominantly
Catholic Irish as the Other, and have been so viewed in return...There is considerable evidence that at grass-roots level
the Welsh, the Scottish, and the English saw (and often still see) the Irish as alien in a way that they did not regard each
other as alien... we should recognize that, mainly for religious
reasons, the bulk of its population was never swept into a
British identity to the degree that proved possible among the
Welsh, the Scots, and the English.

These attitudes, evident in contemporary journals, the reflections of both English
Protestant and Irish Catholic commentators and in official record, had been voiced
since the Reformation, and Irish immigration and its militant response to religious
criticism provided polemically manipulable evidence for the propagation of the anti-
Catholic ethic. Accordingly it is widely presumed that Protestant Irish immigrants
assimilated easily to English society and did not encounter the prejudices and barriers
suffered by the Catholic fellow-countrymen, and lack of contemporary information
available about them testifies to a lack of interest in them, as opposed to the infinitely
sensational cataloguing of immigrant Catholic misdeeds. The greatest factor in
fostering negative attitudes towards the Irish among the indigenous population was
religion', writes D. M. MacRaild. He perceives anti-Catholicism as 'never far below
the surface' in England, and the famine immigration is regarded as precipitating a
twenty-year period of popular sectarianism. While such observations are applicable
to the Liverpool context, by no means was this representative. M. Durey, by contrast,
suggests that these frequently cited sentiments are misleading, suggesting that, in spite
of the determined provocation of Protestant incendiaries, anti-Catholicism was
surprisingly weak among the working classes, as contemporary Manchester and
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Newcastle testimony confirms.

Religion is debatably the most significant factor distinguishing Liverpool from Manchester and Newcastle.\(^1\) The peculiar hatred which Christians feel to Christians - that sharp, consuming, femininely-fierce hatred - burns nowhere so devouringly as it does in our religious town', lamented *Porcupine*.\(^2\) With its large Ulster Protestant population, evangelical clergy, anti-Catholic Protestant establishment and Tory-courted Orange party, provoked by substantial Irish immigration and immigrant self-assertion, religious controversy here was significantly more constant and acrimonious than anywhere else (perhaps other than Belfast) and has been perceived as the source of on-going street violence and sectarian ghettoisation. It was not till I arrived at Liverpool that I saw political and religious bigotry carried to the greatest possible height, and combined in the most exquisite proportions', lamented Philalethes:

> The ordinary state of feeling towards the Roman Catholics is one of settled distrust and dislike; and under the railing accusations and rabid declamation of the No-Popery orators, this turns into positive hatred. It is melancholy to hear men, otherwise amiable and benevolent, speak with bitter contempt of that poor Roman Catholic brethren, whose ignorance and helplessness ought only to excite their active sympathy.\(^3\)

The local liberal press deprecated prejudice and constantly looked with false optimism for improvements in relations.\(^4\) Many middle-class Liverpudlians were frustrated and embarrassed by religious conflict and Liverpool Historical Society specified as its primary rule that in debates 'Theology shall not be introduced'.\(^5\) But sectarianism permeated much of Liverpool life. *Porcupine* lamented that sectarian considerations inspired all administrative decisions in Liverpool,\(^6\) and every municipal policy debate was manipulated for sectarian points scoring.\(^7\) D. G. Paz writes that after the 1870s anti-Catholicism generally diminished as a popular issue (remaining confined to educated circles), everywhere except Liverpool, 'where its special mix of politics, religion, and ethnicity kept alive the traditional responses'.\(^8\) Interestingly Newcastle has comparatively been portrayed by Cooter as having a religious structure which facilitated good inter-communal relation.\(^9\) Both of these extremes require revision, but evidence suggests that this latter is interestingly more
controversial than the former stereotype.

The chronology of 'No Popery' testifies to the vital-influence of hostile external and individual provocation. Interested parties from the start of substantial Irish immigration were active in striving to foster popular Protestantism and make political gains via exploiting anti-Catholicism. The revival of evangelical Protestantism in the early 1820s initiated a period of virulent 'No Popery'. At the turn of the century in Liverpool Catholics-Protestants relations were not acrimonious, but during the first quarter of the century a Reformation Society operated in Liverpool, exciting much tension, and the building of St Patrick's church provoked protests that Catholics already had enough churches in Liverpool. In the early nineteenth century G. Connolly identifies that Manchester too was tolerant of Catholics. But by the early 1820s, following the demise of the respected senior Catholic missionary Rowland Broomhead, and encouraged by the rising tide of immigration from Ireland and the consequent militant fervour of Catholic missionaries, Manchester experienced a pamphlet war, which in Connolly's opinion constituted 'the worst religious feud in the twin towns since the seventeenth century'. With a huge pool of potential laity keen Catholic and evangelical missioners fought for theological superiority. This controversy, initiated by Protestant hostility to the Manchester Hibernian Society and Catholic attacks on the Manchester and Salford Bible Auxiliary, raged in the cheap, widely distributed, mutually discrediting tracts produced by militant Protestant Reverends Melville Home, W. Roby and N. Gilbert, and Catholic champions Reverend Joseph Curr, 'Irish Labourer' and 'Irish Weaver'. The vitriol from the Protestant parties was, however, confined to criticism of the Catholic Establishment, the Irishness of its Manchester laity receiving little attention. The Catholic (after 1822 The Catholic Phenix [sic.]), edited by N. Gilbert, was regularly published in 1821. Masquerading as a Catholic journal, it seditiously chronicled the bigotry and persecution of the Catholic church, and was widely distributed among the poor. Much of the responsibility for this dispute must be attributed to the Catholic church itself, with enthusiastic young missionaries like Joseph Curr becoming increasingly
fundamentalist and launching 'a jihad against all things non-Catholic'. Significantly Curr’s writings and edited versions of standard Catholic texts continued to be employed in Catholic schools in Manchester long after the controversy had blown over.  

Colley regards the Catholic Emancipation Act as inspiring a genuinely popular belligerence. Colley regards the Catholic Emancipation Act as inspiring a genuinely popular belligerence. By 1829 fear that the Protestant constitution was endangered, in Gilley’s terms, engendered a new ‘bitterly anti-Catholic popular Toryism’. The Manchester and Salford Catholic Association and Newcastle Catholic Religious Defence Society were established in 1825 to petition for relief and to ‘stem the torrent of calumny misrepresentation and abuse’. In its second half-yearly report, the Newcastle society complained of slander which ‘broached all the absurd and often refuted tales, invented in the worst of times and for the worst of purposes’, aired at the past two Northumberland county elections. The Evangelical Champions, just one of the pamphlets inspired and published in Newcastle, satirized the combination of Dissenting ministers against Catholics. The following year a Catholic Defence Society was established in Liverpool ‘to counteract the abusive torrent daily pouring out from that portion of the Press engaged in the services of the religious tract societies, and the weekly stream flowing from the pulpits of itinerant and illiberal preachers’, and within six months it spent £50 on distributing tracts. The meetings of the anti-Catholic Emancipation party in Manchester were small, ‘respectable’, private affairs, consisting largely of Protestant clergy (who rang their church bells with the rejection of the 1825 Bill). But while these individuals cried “Remember Smithfield!”, Manchester Guardian editorials and large public meetings articulated enthusiastic popular support for Emancipation. Indeed 16,378 signed a petition demanding it. That crowds shouted of apprehended Irish “Damn them, kill them; they are all heretics” was provoked more by the widespread Irish rioting that erupted after the rejection of the 1825 Bill than by genuine religious antipathy. In Liverpool Whig endorsement encouraged the majority of Tories to virulently oppose the Bill, but the issue was complicated by Canning’s support for Emancipation. Frank Neal
writes that the debate over the issue was low-key here,\(^5\) and indeed, compared with Manchester and Newcastle it did not really excite the town. The *Liverpool Mercury* proclaimed Emancipation's virtues and there were public meetings in support and petitions organized for and against.\(^5\) By 1829, however, McNeile was orchestrating a campaign of opposition. He proclaimed the Bill "a national crime" and threatened to 'deluge his native land with blood in an attempt to repeal the Catholic Emancipation Bill'.\(^5\) Both sides again orchestrated petitions which boasted 33,000 supporters and 30,000 opponents. There was thus no obvious overwhelming public leaning, but this demonstrates substantial popular interest, and the anti-Emancipation activists continued to campaign and petition for the next decade.\(^5\) In 1838 Liverpool was still appealing to parliament to repeal the Emancipation Act, and public interest is illustrated by the fact that petitions could still boast over 3000 signatures. Indeed retrospective opinion on the Act became a touch-stone of political identities and at the 1847 election this endured as an issue.\(^5\)

In Newcastle the Emancipation controversy augmented a revived awareness of its Catholic community, provoking a pamphlet war in 1829 comparable with that conducted in Manchester a few years earlier,\(^5\) and overwhelming anything evident in Liverpool. 'Two very inveterate parties arose in Newcastle', Richardson's *Local Historian's Table Book* recorded in 1829, 'which were strongly opposed to each other, insomuch that the town for some weeks was inundated with party papers'.\(^5\) Addresses from the Catholic Association\(^5\) and other pro-Emancipation bodies, both local and national (emphasizing Catholic loyalty and the ultimate economic advantages of the legislation to Protestant working men\(^5\)), were printed and distributed in Newcastle, as were the hostile declamations of Lord Kenyon and Abraham Scott (asserting that Emancipation would destroy the English constitution and monarchy, augment Papal territorial ambition and end Protestantism in Ireland\(^5\)), the tocsins of Rev. G. S. Faber of Long Newton (who regarded Emancipation as an insult and provocation to God\(^5\)), and the parliamentary speeches of Peel, R. H. Inglis, Sadler, the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Eldon and the attorney general.\(^5\) The *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*
strongly advocated Catholic claims. Such was the fervour over the issue that it brought together previously irreconcilable parties. Petitions in favour of Emancipation were widely deposited around the city, the Protestant party asserting that signatories were being paid and (god forbid) that women and children were being permitted to sign. Inimical petitions were similarly distributed, their promoters inviting, 'all such of the inhabitants as value the safety of the Constitution, to lose no time in subscribing their names'. In response to a 'most numerously and respectably signed' pro-Emancipation requisition a meeting was planned for the 10th of March. Originally it was to take part at the Guildhall, but so many wished to attend that it had to be adjourned to the Spital Field. 'An opportunity will be given you to express your opinions on the Question, whether, Roman Catholics ought to be admitted to Parliament to the utter subversion of the Constitution of 1688', implored a poster addressed to the PROTESTANTS OF NEWCASTLE, '...attend and by your votes preserve to your children, the blessings so dearly purchased by your Ancestors'.

James Losh, Dr Headlam and W. H. Ord advocated Emancipation before a very rowdy crowd, estimates of the size of which vary between 4000 and 12,000. The Newcastle Weekly Chronicle complained:

> the conduct of some of the party on the 'Protestant Hustings', as they were called, exceeded everything of the kind we ever witnessed...They seemed to have formed a premeditated plan to prevent discussion and create confusion, conscious, no doubt, of the weakness of their cause, and their total inability to cope with the host of talent which was opposed to them.

But the resolution advocating Emancipation was defeated by a large majority (of approximately three-to-one according to the Newcastle Courant or five-to-four in the estimation of the Weekly Chronicle). 'A boasted triumph of the intolerants', the Chronicle grumbled. Losh recalled,

> The clergy and the Methodists had formed a junction and by bringing up a number of colliers etc., they out-numbered us; in all other respects they made a miserable figure. They had not on their side one magistrate, one barrister, one physician and one attorney and one surgeon. Their genteel partizans consisted of Methodists, a great many of the clergy and a considerable number of old women.

Reflecting the widespread local interest in the issue a special second edition of the
Tyne Mercury was printed to report the meeting’s proceedings. An anti-Emancipation petition followed, containing 7,724 names — ‘very extraordinary exertions were made to procure signatures’, brooded the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle — and Methodists gathered for an anti-Catholic meeting. A hostile circular warned:

Protestants be on your guard against pretended friends, be honest faithful and persevering, prove yourselves worthy of that religion and constitution so dearly bought by your Ancestors, and soon the truth of your cause will put to confusion every Enemy to Benevolence, Justice and Truth.

However an opposition amendment in the council (moved by Mr John Brandling) failed to find a seconder, and Losh reflected that popular endorsement was coerced by the Church of England:

the violent part of the clergy preached against the Catholics...the petitions were placed both in the churches and the vestries and in the Methodist meeting houses for signatures, and... the most inflammatory handbills were widely circulated, calling upon all Protestants to sign them in order to preserve themselves, their families and their religion from destruction. It is true also that a great number of children signed them, and that they were left at the Toll houses at the entrance of the town etc.

As in Manchester there is little evidence of working class support for the campaign against Emancipation, which was, furthermore, aimed against the ecclesiastical hierarchy with little reference to the ethnicity of Catholics, and with the passing of the Bill the anti-Catholic alliance dissolved.

The 1820s were not a period of on-going and all-pervasive sectarian strife in any of the three towns, and by 1836 Liverpool witnesses testified that tensions had abated. The anti-Catholics were still a relatively small body, and there is little recorded consequent inter-communal violence. Significantly, the Manchester Guardian could ridicule 'No Popery';

we live in awful times. While O'Connell triumphs in Clare, Petre wins at Doncaster. For the second time, a Popish colt carries off the St Leger; and eighteen Protestant three-year-olds are beaten by several lengths. Among the losers is a colt belonging to the head of the church himself. Will it, can it, be said any longer that the Protestant ascendancy is in no danger? We repeat it, the times are truly awful. The constitution in church, state and St Leger, is in the utmost peril.
As Gilley points out, 'No Popery' furthermore had little to do with immigration, most of the anti-Catholic literature in England (unlike in Scotland) making no reference to the Irish.83

Opposition to the annual grant to Maynooth seminary kept anti-Catholics busy after 1829. When this was made permanent in 1845 agitation in Manchester and Liverpool was engineered respectively by Reverends Hugh Stowell and Hugh McNeile, both leading lights of the Exeter Hall conference. They organized petitions, summoned public meetings, and issued tracts declaring the grant irreligious.85 McNeile labelled the college 'that unclean den of every ghostly, political, and moral abomination, that unbearable nuisance, which the Protestants of Great Britain must straightway determine to get rid of'.86 When Liverpool's Tory MP Lord Sandon made the mistake of defending the grant in the Commons, McNeile launched an onslaught so devastating to Sandon's reputation that he could not stand for re-election in 1847.87 Co-operative links having been established and proven in the 1842 election, Orangemen and Tory councillors participated in Liverpool's anti-Maynooth demonstrations.88 The pro-endowment *Liverpool Mercury* ridiculed those attending such gatherings, 'nine-tenths of whom would have attended at the call of Mr McNeile to hear a speech about Jezebel, or hang Lord Palmerston in effigy',89 and lamented that such demonstrations might be interpreted as representative of the feelings of the Liverpool public.90 But the anti-Catholic alliance was impressively demonstrating its ability to manipulate public opinion. Having declared the Protestant alarm 'unreasonable' and welcoming the endowment, the *Manchester Guardian* received an irate barrage of criticism from correspondents.91 But although the public attended the disapproving meetings called by dissenting ministers,92 the Protestant Operative Society,93 and touring lecturers such as James Lord, of the London Protestant Association,94 in 1845 this issue substantially failed to provoke the desired popular opposition in Manchester. Indeed, contrarily, support for Maynooth not only came from Irish and Catholic parties. A petition in favour of the grant contained 804 signatures of "magistrates, bankers, merchants and manufacturers", including eleven
magistrates, ten aldermen and eleven other members of the council, and a public meeting in the town hall (summoned by Stowell) was hijacked by O'Connell-cheering Irish and consequently, ironically, issued a resolution in support of the endowment. The Maynooth issue was however exploited by local Tories at the 1847 election when Stowell tested prospective candidates' Protestant credentials, and surfaced again in the receptive wake of 'Papal Aggression'. In 1856 Stowell was still demanding disendowment of 'the incubus of Maynooth - one of the darkest and heaviest burdens that England ever cursed herself with', and Liverpool Tories still proclaimed their opposition in the 1847, 1852 and 1857 elections. 'Bigotry reigns triumphant' wrote Sir James Graham in 1852, lamenting that no candidate could win in Liverpool were he not prepared to exhibit his anti-Maynooth colours. Even in 1862 Maynooth was still the main topic of discussion at Liverpudlian 12 July rallies. The issue also excited less interest in Newcastle than Maynooth's critics hoped. Significantly the town lacked an equivalent of McNeile or Stowell to sustain controversy. But circumstances were not wholly peaceful. Interestingly Rev. Mr. Riddell wrote to Rev. Mr. Hogarth (his vicar general) in January 1845 expressing his nervousness of 'introducing an Irishman' as a priest in Newcastle in view of 'the late row'. In May 1845 dissenters met in the Postern chapel and decided to send three representatives to the Anti-State Church Conference in London. Thomas Davidson recalled attending another two public meetings to discuss the grant. The Newcastle Weekly Chronicle reported one of these, in the Nelson Street Music Hall, which was crowded and disrupted by Catholics, but succeeded in carrying a motion opposing the grant. In 1846 a branch of the Roman Catholic Institute was established in Newcastle 'to redress all the grievances which appertained to the Catholic body, and it also endeavoured to publish tracks for the dissemination of religious knowledge among all ready to learn, so as to enable them to judge for themselves of the misrepresentations of their enemies'. It was not until 1852, when the North of England Protestant Alliance tried to really make it a local issue, that Maynooth received significant attention here, however, and even then it was done with little success. At a meeting
pitiful attendance (aside from Bernard McAnulty and a ‘battalion of Irish navvies’\textsuperscript{109})
necessitated adjournment - clear evidence, the \textit{Gateshead Observer} remarked, of the
lack of public interest.\textsuperscript{110} The issue was debated in the Newcastle election that year
(Mr Headlam came out openly against the grant and Mr Watson was interrogated:
‘Are you not a zealous and active advocate for the support of Maynooth\textsuperscript{111}), but it was
by no means the only issue, and R. J. Cooter perhaps exaggerates the influence of Mr
Watson’s earlier endorsement of the Maynooth grant upon his defeat.\textsuperscript{112} In 1857 the
Maynooth grant was again raked up in local politics, with Mr Carstairs (an anti-
Maynooth Liberal) standing for Newcastle, but his bigotry prompted both ridicule in
the local press and ultimately contributed to his defeat.\textsuperscript{113} ‘Who, then are Mr. Carstairs’
friends?’; enquired the \textit{Newcastle Weekly Chronicle}, ‘A small knot of religious bigots,
who pride themselves on their attachment to extreme Protestant principles, in whose
eyes Roman Catholicism is an invention of the evil one, the Pope Antichrist, and the
college of Maynooth an utter abomination’.\textsuperscript{114}

John Belchem regards the 1850 ‘Papal Aggression’ outrage as the first
deliberate identification of the newly conspicuous (given the famine immigration and
the 1848 conspiracy) immigrant Irish as embodying the evils of the Roman Catholic
church.\textsuperscript{115} The government and Anglican Establishment-endorsed protest at the re-
establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in England (as Lord John Russell put it, an
“insolent and insidious aggression”\textsuperscript{116}), fuelled by the apparent rapid advance of
Catholicism (given the ‘second spring’ and alarm at conversion in high places), if
never precipitating “anti-papery mania”\textsuperscript{117} comparable with the ferocity encountered in
Liverpool and Stockport, initiated a flurry of popular interest in both Manchester and
Newcastle. Indeed Newcastle was not so conspicuously tolerant as Cooter and Neal
suppose.\textsuperscript{118} In November and December 1850 Anglican-dominated meetings hostile to
the restoration were held in all three towns.\textsuperscript{119} A meeting of the ‘Protestant
Workingmen of Manchester’ in the Corn Exchange declared that “the people’s liberty
was not safe” from the influence of “spiritual despotism...anti-scriptural, intolerant
and persecuting”, but it did not attract the anticipated number of spectators.\textsuperscript{120} An
address from the people of Manchester against the 'Papal aggression' contained 51,657 signatures, but, while its organizers claimed that it reflected public opinion, signatories, like attendance at meetings, were dominated by clergy and active Anglicans. Petitions were read out in the House of Commons from the Newcastle Wesleyans and New Connexion Methodists. Ranter clergy took full advantage of the alarm. In 1851 and 1852 Father Gavazzi (an apostate priest who ranted in canonicals) toured the north, lecturing in Manchester and Liverpool and Dr Tadini spoke in Newcastle. Preachers at Newcastle Protestant Alliance lectured on the evils of Popery and Hugh Stowell held public meetings declaring that the Catholic church intended to subjugate England, 'to persecute and prosecute every Protestant...to set up the Inquisition in our land...and to make Queen Victoria a Papist', sentiments echoed in scarcely more clandestine tones by Anglican Bishop James Prince. When Manchester's two MPs (John Bright and Thomas Milner Gibson) both voted against the Ecclesiastical Titles Act Stowell 'declared war', but popular reaction was more ambiguous. Five thousand copies of Martin Tupper's sonnet 'Romish Priestcraft-1851' were handed out on the streets of Manchester during 1851. That year Hewitt C. Watson resigned from the National Public School Association horrified by the bigotry of Manchester rate-payers, and middle-class flutterings continued into 1852 with St Paul's Literary and Educational Society in heated debate. In Liverpool 'Papal Aggression' 'brought on what appeared to us one of John Bull's periodical fits of lunacy', recalled Denvir, 'bigotry raged fiercely'. Contrary to Frank Neal's supposition that 'the issue died a quiet death' in Liverpool, here meetings were more numerous, popular and hostile than elsewhere, with McNeile again at the forefront of agitation. A letter to the Liverpool Mercury in early November expressed amazement at the 'fuss and flutter' occasioned. A petition in mid November ('one of the longest and most influential requisitions ever got up on any former occasion') which included signatures of 'some of the principal merchants, clergy, and gentry of the town' demanded an anti-Papal demonstration. There is little doubt, from the strong feeling which has been exhibited on the subject that there will be a numerous
none
Ireland street brawls, and riots in Birkenhead. Denvir recalled witnessing mob violence in central Liverpool which the police were far from impartial in handling. Intercommunal relations had deteriorated at an accelerated rate, observes Lowe. Violent clashes occurred around 12 July in Liverpool in 1850 and 1851, when it was rumoured that Orangemen were being imported from Ireland to Liverpool for the purpose of sustaining agitation. Here as in Manchester there were instances of both priests and nuns being assaulted. In May 1851 Sandgate was also disturbed by riots. The Newcastle Journal recorded:

The Irish are congregated there in great numbers and it is said that for some time past they have been cultivating feelings of hostility towards the English portion of their neighbours in consequence of the recent agitation on the Papal Question.

Tensions simmered for several days before exploding, due to the provocation of evangelical clergymen, into the "Horrid Battle i' Sandgeyt". When the Irish attempted to lynch "Ranter Dick", the English took the novel step of siding with the police and assisted them in a rout. Over sixty Irishmen were taken into custody. In 1852 Lord John Russell and Lord Derby (issuing a proclamation forbidding Catholics to process of public streets carrying symbols of their religion two weeks before the election) exploited the issue at the general election and it was utilized by parliamentary candidates in all three towns, exacerbating tensions which were further enhanced by news of rioting in Stockport which prompted demands for revenge in Irish Manchester. The police and army were put on alert and the Bishop of Salford pleaded for calm. In Hulme a fight between two individuals quickly escalated and the cry of "murder the Orangemen" was raised:

in less than five minutes...several hundreds of Irishmen were seen running in all directions, armed with pokers, staves, bludgeons, hammers &c; and the cry was raised that the Protestants were about to burn down St Wilfred's Catholic chapel.

Maintained by the well-publicized on-going parliamentary courting of bigotry, 'ill-feeling' in late 1853 caused the Irish of Regent Road and Oldfield Road to bring in reinforcements and to provoke a row by making 'preparations for an offensive display. Musicians in several beerhouses played party tunes'.

104
In the wake of 1848 and the social and economic problems that accompanied the Famine immigration, the 'Papal Aggression' underlined the extraneousness of Irish immigrants and 'rendered respectable anti-Irish Catholic feelings'. The 1850s are accordingly commonly portrayed as a low point in inter-communal relations. Belchem writes that at this time 'religion emerged as the defining element in working class communities', compelling Catholics to 'group together in collective self-defence around their local priest and church'. The extent of popular understanding of the theological controversy is contentious, popular clashes having more to do with territory than theology, and when provocation from the press and ranter clergy lapsed tensions rapidly evaporated in Manchester and Newcastle. However the Catholics were left distinctly edgy and defensive. For example, in 1857 a near-lynching occurred in Manchester when an omnibus drove through a Catholic schools procession. 'It appears now, that with a procession of Roman Catholics there must be a "row", I think it high time that the said procession be put a stop to altogether, or not be allowed to perambulate the principal streets', complained Jas. Wild to the Guardian. Interestingly other correspondents criticized the paper's coverage of the story alleging anti-Catholic bias and inappropriate religious interpretation, asserting that the Irish were justified in their anger at the driver who endangered their children.

While the dis-establishment of the Irish church, so long an acknowledged wrong, provoked meetings in support in all three towns in 1868, in Liverpool it also provoked opposition meetings organized by the Conservative Workingmen's Association and the Liverpool 'Constitutionalists' and a meeting of Friends of the Irish Church in Newcastle Town Hall degenerated into a brawl. When Gladstone was defeated as candidate for south-west Lancashire the bells of Manchester Cathedral were rung, and in 1871 Manchester Orangemen condemned him as 'no patriot, no Englishman, no protestant and as a disgrace to the country'.

Surveying nineteenth century anti-Catholic ranter clergy D. G. Paz observes that they ranged from the sincere to popular entertainers to rogues. Liverpool was an
especially popular and welcoming venue for all such men. McNeile began to reside in Liverpool in 1834 and, through orchestrating the campaign against the Whig school reforms with ‘much floridness and fire’, became a popular anti-Catholic celebrity. But for McNeile’s influence Frank Neal supposed that the schools affair might have ‘blown over’. Indeed J. Bentley goes as far as to say that ‘McNeile dominated the religion of Liverpool’ between 1834 and 1868. In 1839 he called for Catholic chapels to be brought down, and when in 1841 carpenters attacked St Patrick’s chapel the Liverpool Mercury lamented:

We suppose that this is to be taken as an ebullition of that spirit which the Rev. H. McNeile, and other orators of the Protestant Association, have been so seditiously endeavouring to evoke for political purposes...Probably he spoke only metaphorically, but he should remember that many of his ignorant and prejudiced hearers at Amphitheatrical gatherings do not understand metaphors.

The anti-Catholic campaign of 1835-41 was so vicious and bellicose that it alarmed English Anglican clergy in the town. Neal cites the Liverpool Albion which observed that the campaign convinced the shipwrights that the Irish were their ‘natural enemies’. By the 1860s McNeile was attacking ritualism, provoking Porcupine to complain:

This week religious rancour had high carnival in Liverpool. One day’s paper alone contained the reports of two meetings, at each of which something like a downright riot took place...While Dr McNeile is spouting about ritualism and Dr Taylor is ranting against the wickedness of candles and the blasphemy of altar-cloths, thousands of poor debased wretches are allowed to live the lives of heathens and to die the death of dogs. No part of England is sunk in so deep a mire of drunkenness and vice and misery as this rich and splendid and many-pulpited Liverpool; and the most influential and popular of our clerical orators are occupying themselves in the inflaming of sectarian passions, or endeavouring to put out candles, instead of trying to enlighten ignorance.

After 1890 George Wise inherited McNeile’s mantle. Obsessed by ritualism, his firebrand rhetoric motivated a working class Protestant army against those Anglican clergy in Liverpool accused of Catholic practices. He paraded apostate nuns to rail against the Catholic church, employing the salacious tactics of Murphy, and established the British Protestant Union to fight against “Romanism, Ritualism and
Infidelity’. So provocative was Wise that Tories refused to have him as a candidate, and in response he established an independent Protestant party which won three seats in Liverpool in 1903. Wise played on the Irishness of Catholics as a popular means to rally hostility. Liverpool also attracted itinerant ranter clergy. In 1844 T. D. Gregg’s ranting provoked a scene which ‘rivalled that of Donnybrook fair’. ‘Angel Gabriel’ (a simpleton who dressed as an angel and summoned audiences with blasts from a trumpet) was touring Liverpool in 1855, as was Rev. Patrick McMenemy (a ‘corrupt demagogue’, as Paz terms him, who was arrested for brawling in a brothel). Gavazzi lectured in Liverpool in 1851, 1860 (when he established a ladies collecting body to support proselytizing in Italy), and 1875. In 1861 a Dr John Cumming preached against Popery and Rev. J. R. Conor lectured on the Battle of the Boyne in 1867, accompanied by a band playing “Croppies Lie Down”. Frank Neal estimates that in 1858 there were up to fifty Anglican scripture readers operating in Liverpool and holding open-air preaching sessions, and during June of that year several were attacked by Catholic mobs. Porcupine complained of ‘the gospel of hate and of ignorance which is proclaimed nine nights out of ten’ in Liverpool and called for anti-Catholic preachers to address the immediate social problems of Liverpool and to cease stirring up trouble. Philalethes described going to hear one of Liverpool’s ‘popular preachers’:

He stood up in his pulpit, as if he was sure of the unbounded mental submission of his congregation. His action and delivery were highly theatrical; and he was not wanting in a certain sort of Irish eloquence...His whole sermon was a savage declaration of war. It was absolutely incendiary, and if the public mind had been in an equally inflammable state, there is no degree of excess to which it might not have led...The ordinary state of feeling towards the Roman Catholics is one of settled distrust and dislike; and under the railing accusations and rabid declamation of the No-Popery orators, this turns into positive hatred.

In addition the Anglican establishment in Liverpool encouraged enmities. Bishop Ryle was a keen opponent of ritualism and courted his Orange parishioners by lamenting the decline of ‘aversion to papists’, which he lauded as part of British heritage and culture.
Second in notoriety only to McNeile in the hierarchy of anti-Catholic ranters was Hugh Stowell (of Christ Church, Salford). Known as the 'Head Protestant Watchman', he was labelled 'a genuine specimen of a claptrap declaimer' by the Manchester Guardian, which defended Catholic priest Daniel Hearne in 1840 when he sued Stowell for libel (Hearne having been accused of forcing a parishioner to crawl for penance. Stowell's witness, the aforesaid parishioner, turned out to be a lunatic). Stowell identified Irish immigration as augmenting Catholicism in Manchester and accordingly opposed it. He founded Manchester's Protestant Operative Association in 1838, and the society also generated popular orators J. H. MacGuire, Samuel Condell and John Atkinson. Manchester also witnessing the tirades of indigenous demagogues Henry Mead, Melville Horne, W. Roby and N. Gilbert, and regularly attracted itinerant ranter clergymen such as T. D. Gregg (of the Dublin Protestant Association), Joseph Slattery, and Liverpool's Hugh McNeile. The Manchester Guardian was cynical about their efforts:

We have long been satisfied that the labours of the Stowells, McNeiles, and other people of the same kind, tended to increase, rather than diminish popery; but the fact is, that those people cared very little about either popery or protestantism. They saw, or imagined they saw, that a party advantage was to be gained by abusing the Catholics.

Cooter asserts that it was hard to encourage militant Protestantism in Newcastle in the 1840s and 1850s, but nevertheless several individuals did try to harangue the populace into intolerance. The Newcastle Chronicle's Inquiry into the Newcastle Poor (1850) noted the provocation of ranter clergymen in the city, one infamous, though so far unidentifiable, example of which was "Ranter Dick" whose rhetoric precipitated the "Horrid War i’ Sandgeyt" in May 1851. The Newcastle-upon-Tyne Catholic Tract Society complained of the malicious influence of evangelicals:

they are making use of every species of black art and magical and necromantic incantation to invoke the long laid demon of bigotry with its hell-shout of "No Popery"...our religion is daily portrayed in the most hideous and disgusting colours, and in colours as false as they are hideous and disgusting.

Gavazzi persistently lectured in Newcastle in 1854, 1857, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866,
1871 and 1876 and tried, unsuccessfully, to organize an anti-nunnery movement there.\(^{201}\) Hugh Stowell-Brown, a popular Liverpool evangelist, similarly made frequent visits to Newcastle.\(^{202}\) Captain Gordon's anti-Popery vitriol provoked Charles Larkin to challenge the lecturer to a verbal duel.\(^{203}\) Rev. J. A. Wylie moralized upon 'The Present State and Progress of Romanism in this Country', comparing its spread with that of the plague and asserting that Catholics were plotting to take over England and that 'Parliament was acting the part of traitors to the Queen'.\(^{204}\) Closer to home Robert Dixon, 'an old man who is afflicted with religious monomania', was also in the habit of breaking the peace of the town by,

inveighing bitterly against the witchcraft and sorcery which he alleged was practised by the Catholic priesthood - The prisoner in his defence said he had suffered persecution for seventeen years from the Catholic priests. They commenced their persecution with a private correspondence with his wife, and they molested him day and night with their witchcraft ways.\(^{205}\)

Some evangelicals, notably Stowell and Murphy, manipulatively sought to attain working class support by setting themselves up as champions of the masses against Manchester-school manufacturers, identifying themselves with economic and social radicalism.\(^{206}\) Murphy advocated a statutory minimum wage of five shillings,\(^{207}\) while Stowell orchestrated education rallies, opposed the New Poor Law and established female refuges and adult study groups.\(^{208}\)

However their reception was not necessarily enthusiastic. A Dr. Tadini who came to lecture on 'No Popery' in Newcastle in 1851 was charged with charlatanism and was driven from the town.\(^{209}\) When T. D. Gregg spoke in Stevenson's Square (before an audience, the \textit{Guardian} noted, of 'about ten people') his lecture 'on the evils of popery' was not warmly received;

\begin{quote}
During this tirade he was several times interrupted by hisses, yells, and groans from his auditors; and, at the latter part, there was a slight manifestation of an attempt to drag him from the platform.\(^{210}\)
\end{quote}

Recognizing the potential threat to public order (more than, it seems likely, being motivated by any fondness for Catholics, as Cooter implies) the authorities did their best to silence these men.\(^{211}\)
William Murphy’s tour uniquely engendered a transient working class enthusiasm, in part as it coincided with economic slump, Fenianism, the revival of old antipathies with the debate over the dis-establishment of the Church of Ireland, increased membership of Orange lodges and pro-Garibaldi demonstrations.\textsuperscript{212} Significantly Murphy harangued not only on the evils of Catholicism but adopted a tone which was furthermore blatantly and provocatively anti-Irish.\textsuperscript{213} He usually chose to lecture on a weekend, when plenty of potential Irish rioters were in the vicinity,\textsuperscript{214} and for his lectures in Manchester Murphy engaged a hall to seat 800, just yards from St Wilfred’s Catholic School.\textsuperscript{215} The Mayor of Liverpool travelled to London to try to get Murphy’s planned visit to the area outlawed, and upon his failure alarm developed in the city.\textsuperscript{216} When ‘the Controversialist’ began to lecture in Birkenhead Liverpool police prepared for trouble and Orangemen marched to hail Murphy in Birkenhead provoking Orange-Green clashes in Liverpool.\textsuperscript{217} There were appeals to the Irish not to provoke Murphy - Porcupine warned, ‘You foolish Roman Catholic labourers, Murphy lives and battens on your hostility...You are making a martyr of him; and nothing pays now like martyrdom’. It lamented:

The Birkenhead zealots would be quite disappointed if he did not give them at least as much buffoonery and blackguardism as he favoured the Birmingham people with; and as Popery and priests and nuns are the sole subject of his buffoonery and blackguardism, and as we happen to have a very zealous and inflammable Irish population here, who, for their parts, will deem it a point of honour not to be outdone in zeal by their Birmingham brethren, we may expect a cheerful time of it. Riot we must look for: bloodshed is only too probable...all because some crack-brained idiots choose to bring a rantipole Irish harlequin to grin and bellow about the Pope and the priests and the confessional.\textsuperscript{218}

In September 1868 Murphy journeyed to Manchester with a months lecturing planned. However on arrival he was arrested. Excited and disappointed crowds greeted him after his release from prison.\textsuperscript{219} The Manchester Courier protested at the gagging of this advocate of queen and country.\textsuperscript{220} His presence in the city provoked a wave of counter-attacks on churches\textsuperscript{221} and, at a meeting attended by 4000, brawls.\textsuperscript{222} It was not even necessary for Murphy to unleash his vitriol, ‘his very name is sufficient to arouse the passions of the sect he offends’, lamented the Newcastle Daily
The journal went on to declare: 'Murphy revels in nastiness... we have not an atom of respect for Murphy or his mission.' As in Liverpool, although Murphy never actually visited Newcastle tensions were provoked in the town, with the clashes he provoked in Tynemouth being widely reported. 'He has thrown the whole district into commotion, exacting apprehensions of even greater danger than that which has yet been provoked', wrote the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*. Murphy's popularity derived in part from his 'brilliantly achieved popular theatre' (doing little to promote Protestantism but taking great relish in his lurid and lascivious detailing of the evils of Popery - 'vulgar, abusive and obscene', as *Porcupine* termed it), and attacks on authority, as represented by magistrates and the police. However, though Murphy highlighted the Irish Catholic presence and underlined synonimity, lending coherence (if not legitimacy) to anti-Irish sentiment, interest in him quickly waned, Mancunian Tories refusing to acknowledge him as 'the Protestant Candidate', and Bishop James Fraser proving hostile to the polemic manipulation of sectarian strife. Moreover, as D. MacRaild highlights, it is significant that the press and local authorities generally opted to blame primarily Murphy himself, and not the Irish who habitually attacked his meetings, for the trouble generated.
provoking fatal riots, and in 1812 Canning's proclamation of support for Emancipation caused the 'No Popery' flag to be raised amongst other Liverpool Tories. The denominational schools debate which became prominent in the town in the 1830s crystallized this and, as immigration increased, anti-Catholicism became an increasingly important element of popular Toryism as the party sought to woo McNeile's Operative Protestants. As Waller puts it 'religion was both a shibboleth and fundamentally inspirational'. Consequently the elections of the 1830s were acrimonious and violent, and in 1837 the Catholic Defence Association was established to answer slanders at the coming election. The election day saw serious disturbances, initiated by the Irish, demonstrating 'the polarization of the two communities' effected by McNeile's campaign. Frank Neal rightly designates the election riots of 1841, which involved carpenters' attacks on St Patrick's church, 'openly sectarian' and acknowledges the campaign as dividing and antagonizing the unenfranchised working masses. Radical candidate Sir Joshua Walmsley was criticized for presiding over a meeting advocating protection of Catholics, and Machin and Neal regard anti-Catholic feeling as indeed fundamental in the Tory successes in this election campaign. In 1847 Tory candidates again boasted their anti-Maynooth and anti-Emancipation credentials. Paz writes that the 1852 election 'produced the most success for the anti-Catholics of any election before or since'. In Liverpool its main issue was emphatically religion. Tories took full advantage of 'Papal Aggression' and Maynooth again, and consequently returned two MPs. After trouble in Stockport (where clashes were precipitated by the Anglican Tory establishment exploiting popular bigotry - a tactic familiar in Liverpool), violence was anticipated at the election and arms were siezed. On the day Orange lodges paraded, the Irish stoned people wearing Tory colours and riots erupted. The Manchester Guardian condemned Lord Derby's anti-Catholic proclamation as an electioneering device designed to 'stimulate the sectarian passions of the electors', and disparagingly dismissed Liverpool's election result as a product of anti-Irish feeling, but Tory candidates in Manchester too played the Protestant card. In 1868
Liverpool Tories repeated the tactic, defending the church against dis-establishment and ritualism, revitalizing their appeal, which, with the Liberals in confusion, led two Tories to be elected. By the 1870s, with anti-ritualist hysteria at its height in Liverpool, Tories began to find religious leaders embarrassing and tiresome, but they could not risk forsaking them. Tory representatives were rather constantly obliged to reaffirm their Protestantism and any seen to be making faux pas of toleration were quickly dispensed with. As Waller puts it, 'The Orangemen's Conservatism was conditional on the Conservatives' Orangeism'. Anti-ritualism consequently loomed large in the elections of 1884, 1885, 1892 and 1895. In 1898 a delegate of the Working Man's Conservative Association reaffirmed, 'Politics dissociated from religion would be a miserable thing not worth fighting about', and indeed that year the Church Discipline Bill reaffirmed Tory-Protestant allegiances.

Except briefly in the 1850s and late 1860s anti-Catholicism was never, as in Liverpool, a dominant issue in Manchester and Newcastle electoral politics. In 1847 and 1850 Hugh Stowell canvassed election candidates in Manchester, testing their Protestant commitment and urging electors to vote with an Anglican conscience, but his appeals failed to dominate voters' priorities. As the 1852 election approached he issued a pamphlet reminding electors that Manchester MPs Bright and Milner Gibson had opposed the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, but both men were prepared to defend the action, and, with Mancunian interests failing to be inflamed by anti-Catholicism, both were returned. In 1852 Newcastle Liberal candidate, Watson, was scrutinized regarding his allegiances on account of his earlier endorsement of the Maynooth grant, which Cooter regards as contributing to his defeat. 'Were you not notoriously the nominee and tool of the Popish priests?', he was asked on the hustings. In 1857 Mr Carstairs tried to promote militant Anglicanism in his electoral favour, demanding abolition of the Maynooth grant and inspection of nunneries, but was rewarded with only ridicule and failure. D. MacRaild writes that in the late 1860s and 1870s
Fenianism reinvigorated fear of militant Catholicism 'to transform utterly the political culture of Lancashire'. In 1868 Conservative candidates C. B. Cawley ('a militant protestant') and W. T. Charley ('famous for hot protestant opinions') in Salford, and Birley and Hoare in Manchester took advantage of the debate over the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, exploiting the fears and prejudices of the new working-class electors. In their first victory in Manchester since 1832 Tories were 'swept to power by a gale of hysterical Protestantism'. This was not altogether symptomatic of popular feeling for militant Protestantism was the result and not the cause of this election campaign. However it re-emphasized the relationship between religious and political identification, reinvigorated fears of the political manipulation of the Catholic clergy and made nationalists consequently keen to emphasize their secularity. But MacRaild exaggerates this transformation, for after 1868 anti-Catholics lacked a major issue around which to galvanize their ranks, and so after this date, outside of Liverpool, anti-Catholicism was never again a major issue in local politics.

Orangeism was brought back from Ireland by Colonel Stanley's regiment of Lancashire Militia in 1798 and the first English Orange lodge established in Manchester. On the 12th of July 1807 parading Orangemen in the city were attacked by Irish Catholics in England's first Orange riot. In the days after the excitement 'No Popery' slogans appeared on walls and army recruiting parties toured the town playing 'Croppies Lie Down'. Immigration of Ulster weavers augmented the movement in Manchester, and by 1835 there were fourteen Orange lodges in the town. Once in England, Orangeism spread fast through northern cities. At the convenience of the Duke of York (as Grand Master) the Grand Lodge was moved from Manchester to London, but despite aristocratic patronage the movement remained emphatically northern and working class. After 1835 the Orange Order lost its former aristocratic support, and its proletarian character was consolidated. With its growing Ulster Protestant population and lack of strong trade unions for collective identification and defence of interests, Liverpool rapidly eclipsed Manchester (where Ulster Protestants
no longer settled in such numbers after the 1830s) as the centre of the movement. Comparing the two towns, Lowe regards the Manchester environment, with its free-trade politics and non-conformism, as considerably less hospitable to the movement than Liverpool. Generally Manchester Orangemen went no further on the 12th July than to hold good-natured patriotic dinners, but the late 1860s and early 1870s saw a temporary revival in Manchester Orangeism no doubt in response to Fenianism and Murphy’s visit, and emboldened by the repeal of the Party Processions Act in 1870. By the end of that year eight new lodges had been established in Salford. In 1870 the Guardian estimated that nine-hundred Orangemen marched on the 12th, and in 1871 2000 marched, both occasions producing scuffles. While visiting the city in 1872 Disraeli was made a member of the Order. This Orange renaissance was, however, the transient result of provocation, and before 1873 no more new lodges opened. The local press reported the last recorded march (in 1888, when 150 provocatively marched through Miles Platting, provoking a riot) as an oddity in a society otherwise inhospitable to religious bigotry, and in 1883 they gathered for a (last identifiable) demonstration in Manchester. However Steven Fielding notes that small-scale clashes continued to occur on the 12th of July in Collyhurst, where most of Manchester’s Ulstermen resided.

Newcastle by comparison is generally considered to have had a ‘complete absence of an Orange tradition’. However research reveals that this was far from the case, and so contrasts with Manchester are not appropriate. Orangeism was first recorded in Newcastle in 1811, with the establishment of a lodge at the Hare and Hounds pub on the quayside. Contrary to Cooter’s professions, by 1817 Orangemen were in the habit of processing yearly, and the Orangeman’s Companion was published here for the ‘Officers and Brothers of the Mount Zion Lodge, Newcastle’. Three-hundred attended the inauguration of Sir T. Burden as deputy grand master in Newcastle in 1817, and the bells of the town’s churches were rung in celebration. Such an established part of local culture were the yearly Orangemen’s parades that The Tyne Songster (1827) included a song about them, and by 1830
further lodges had been set up in the Cock Inn and Dolphin Tavern.\textsuperscript{298} As elsewhere these were composed of men of the humbler walks of life.\textsuperscript{299} The Report of the Select Committee on Orange Lodges reveals that by 1835 Newcastle had ten lodges.\textsuperscript{300} Orangemen maintained yearly processions pre-empted by clashes between gangs of Protestant and Catholic juveniles.\textsuperscript{301} As elsewhere the Liberal press had little sympathy for the cause and reported the ‘tyranny’ of the movement in Ireland so that the public could understand:

> the alienation of the bulk of the people in Ireland from the laws which have hitherto been administered with a view to the enabling the Orange faction to trample on them with impunity...The Protestant religion has been the stalking horse for bad passions and oppressive practices, and the name of religion is now profaned by men whose conduct is at variance with its precepts, and whose spirit is inevitably a stranger to the charity which it inculcated.\textsuperscript{302}

In 1881 the Northern Province of the Orange Association held its July celebrations in Newcastle and marched for the last recorded time.\textsuperscript{303} MacRaild regards Orange-Green tension in England as symptomatic of imported Irish culture and traditional territorial rivalry,\textsuperscript{304} and indeed with the influence of Ribbon and Orange societies often greater than that of the local clergy ‘sectarian national awareness was fostered first in the pub, [and only] later by the parish’.\textsuperscript{305} Norman McCord supposes that the growth of Orangeism reflects a growing resentment of increasing Irish Catholic immigration.\textsuperscript{306} However in all three locations they effectively operated as a variety of friendly society, their founders regarding them as a means of recruiting the English working class in the defence of property, and their meetings being encouraged by pub landlords, and associated with the distribution of patronage.\textsuperscript{307} Interestingly the movement was encouraged in Manchester at the time of the Blanketeers and manufacturing disputes, as ‘The great manufacturers felt that, men being embodied in the Orange Society, they were ready at all times to come forward in the suppression of disturbances’.\textsuperscript{308} Thus from an early date Orangemen were overtly recruited to defence of the status quo against men of their own class of more radical opinions. Those involved in Orangeism were not necessarily committed Protestants and indeed Senior astutely regards it more as
expressive of economic than of religious fears.\textsuperscript{209}

Given the character of Manchester Orangeism in 1807 Reverend Ralph Nixon expressed surprise that the Irish should be so hostile to it.\textsuperscript{310} The Irish tended to be content to disregard passively Protestants in general as "haythens",\textsuperscript{311} but they objected vehemently to Orangemen. In the 1820s rush-bearing had to end in Manchester as Irish took offence at the Orange lilies traditionally used.\textsuperscript{312} In 1835 the Manchester Guardian reported that a man walking through Little Ireland wearing a yellow flower was set-upon,\textsuperscript{313} and the Orange procession was attacked by Catholics screaming "These are Orange - let us tear their livers out".\textsuperscript{314} In 1851 a morris dancing troop was lynched in Oldham Road for dancing to a tune which sounded like "The Battle of the Boyne".\textsuperscript{315} In 1830 there was considerable uneasiness in the town as both sides accumulated arms in anticipation of a march, and Orange and Ribbonmen clashed.\textsuperscript{316} The 1830s saw yearly confrontations, generally the result of deliberate provocation,\textsuperscript{317} until the Order was dissolved in 1836.\textsuperscript{318} Partly due to the later settlement of a substantial Irish population in the area, there are no recorded clashes in Newcastle until 1856, when Orangemen processing from Newcastle to Gateshead were set upon by armed Ribbonmen at Felling Gate.\textsuperscript{319} Another incident followed in 1858 when Irishmen returning from chapel in St Anthony's were attacked by Orangemen outside the Ellison Arms (a known Orange meeting centre), resulting in a death.\textsuperscript{320}

In Liverpool Orangeism was, as in Manchester and Newcastle overwhelmingly and increasingly a working class movement.\textsuperscript{321} However it was far more popular here, was initially, at least, largely composed of Ulster Protestants (contrary to Neal and Lowe's suppositions\textsuperscript{322}) and it was courted by the town's Tory establishment. Thus by the 1850s Frank Neal regards the Liverpool working class as 'divided in a way that was unique in England'.\textsuperscript{323} From the 1830s to the 1850s with Tories (encouraged by McNeile) wooing the order it grew rapidly. In 1830 there had been 13 Orange lodges in Liverpool, by 1849 there were 40, and by 1860 100 and St George's Hall could no longer accommodate them.\textsuperscript{324} The ban on marching in
Liverpool does not seem to have had any effect on the popularity of the movement; indeed the fact that the 12th became the occasion of an outing gave it a holiday appeal and augmented its popularity.295 29,000 marched in 1859,296 50,000 in 1875,297 and in 1876 up to 80,000 marched in, according to Neal, 'the biggest Orange turn-out in English history'.298 Liverpool possessed an inducement to participation in Orangeism lacking in other towns in the 'sense of threat' of 'the baleful shadow of Ireland'.299 Orange-Green tension at a popular level essentially became a grudge conflict, remote from religion and often politics. Indeed with its territorial and provocative characteristics this has much of the character of traditional Irish faction fighting, albeit that the movement became progressively more English-peopled. Head Constable Dowling appropriately reflected that processions flaunted allegiances rather than beliefs.300 Neal perceptively observes: 'An important factor, difficult to measure, is simple tribalism, with all territorial and symbolic connotations'.331 As Bohstedt highlights, there was a certain flashy glamour to Orangeism with its swords, regalia and bands,332 and an attractive emblematic self-identification. Many of those taking part in agitation were youths, and more often than not they were drunk. D. MacRaild observes that Orangemen were 'more concerned with evangelical education than with simply breaking Catholic heads',333 but in Liverpool sectarian difference became an excuse to indulge in ritual violence and was often applied to crimes as an afterthought.334 Thus when Forwood praised Orangemen as 'the best, the most sober, the most temperate, the most thoughtful, and the most religious of the workingmen' it was entirely polemic.335 The Liverpool Irishman distinguished, 'no self-respecting Irishman, Catholic or Protestant, associates with this ignorant rabble; but, as Orange and Green colours are used, Ireland gets the blame for this rowdyism'.336 The Liverpool Mercury recoiled, 'They claim to be Protestants of the purest types, yet the conduct of many of them would disgrace Pagans, and their rancorous bigotry and disorderly conduct is condemned by all who have any regard for civil order and religious liberty'.337 Like much of middle class Liverpool Hugh Shimmin ridiculed and was revolted by them.338 But their violent response to Orange provocation did the
reputation of the Catholic Irish no favours. MacRaild observes that the working class of both Manchester and Liverpool were 'habitually parted on ethnic lines by Orange-related violence'; however it is highly questionable how representative of indigenous working class opinion Orangemen were, representing only a tiny fraction of the populace in either town, and comprised of young, male, unskilled, generally alcohol-embittered "roughs".

Gilley regards Orange-Green relations in Liverpool as 'a long and bloody civil war'. The town suffered its first Orange riot in 1819 as Orangemen processing on the 12th of July carried offensive banners and burned Catholic insignia. When an attack was launched military intervention was necessary. The Liverpool Mercury supposed that this was probably organized by Manchester Orangemen. Despite appeals, clashes recurred in 1820 attracting troublemakers and provoking the mayor to prosecute the order for breach of the peace. Thereafter only minor incidents occurred until 1835 and the movement generally declined. In 1835 the 12th of July parade was banned, but anticipation and rumour of Orange plans to burn an effigy of the Pope provoked serious Irish rioting and troops were again summoned. Liverpool Orangism did not disappear, as elsewhere, after 1836 and between 1821 and 1842, although no parades were held, the 12th of July was regularly commemorated with fights. As Frank Neal observes, the disturbances of the 1830s were generally small-scale, but they institutionalized the regular grudge-match confrontation of the 12th. The Whig council had suppressed parades, but with the return of the Tories in 1842, and the infiltration of Orangeism into the police, toleration increased at the same time as tensions were augmented by McNeile's anti-Catholic campaign. Liverpool witnessed armed riots in 1842, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1850 and 1851 in response to the 12th of July parades, provoking Home Office interest. Trouble was far more common on the 12th of July than on St Patrick's day as the former tended to be more provocative and the latter in Liverpool too large for any but the foolhardy to provoke. On the occasion provocative gestures did however tend to be made by both sides and considerable disruption, alarm and loss of trade resulted, as well as loss
of lives, leading to calls for parades to be banned. After widespread and prolonged rioting (partly provoked by 'Papal Aggression') in 1851 the Home Office demanded decisive action. Accordingly in 1852 all processions 'in which it was intended to exhibit party badges, or do anything likely to create a breach of the peace' were outlawed. Lots of police had to be drafted in this year, and in 1853, to suppress Orangemen who intended defiantly to march. Thereafter until 1861 parades skirted the town boundary. Orangemen then began to convene in other towns, and after 1867 they started holding balls in St George's Hall. Violent incidents, however, continued to occur on the 12th. Trouble erupted in 1853, 1858, 1859, 1868, 1869 (as they tried to defy the law and march in Liverpool again and attacked a Catholic church), 1870, 1873, 1877 and 1878 (when effigies of the Pope were burned and Catholics reciprocated burning William and Mary), and 1880. Both sides drank heavily and the Irish awaited the return to Liverpool of the Orangemen. The Mercury thus still regarded the 12th as 'their special feast of misrule...notorious and objectionable to peaceful and tolerant citizens...a saturnalia of drunkenness, debauchery and riot'. With trouble predicted at the Home Rule election, in 1886 Liverpool corporation asked for Irish legislation governing parades to be extended to Liverpool, but the government refused. Between 1886 and 1889 Waller counts 30 Orange riots. When Orangemen rioted on the 12th of July 1892 a lot of the Liverpool press didn't report it. The Liverpool Review regarded this as partiality, but 'sectarian violence was so familiar that pens tired of describing it'. Violence was furthermore habitual on Guy Fawkes Day (with its traditional burning of effigies of the Pope and William III), usually accompanied the 29th of May Protestant shipwrights' parade, as in 1839 when a 'heady battle' ensued, and by the early 1840s Orange funerals had also emerged as an occasion for provocation and attack. Tensions were furthermore not just confined to set-piece confrontations - throughout 1843 and 1844 Orangemen executed a campaign of disturbance in the St Patrick's area, and Burke relates how at Wallasey the Catholic congregation habitually filled their pockets with stones before setting off for mass as Orange assaults were common. Neal illustrates how
Orange-Green violence remained a regular aspect of working-class Liverpool life throughout the 1850s and 1860s: Churches were attacked, prostitutes fought over religion, children played "Catholics and Protestants" and Cardinal Wiseman, visiting the town in 1859, was stoned by Orangemen.\(^{373}\)

Be it in the much-lauded defence of monarch and constitution, or simple anti-Irishness, Liverpool Orangemen were consistent in their hostility to Irish nationalism. Meetings of Repealers were attacked and O'Connell's effigy burned in the first half of the century,\(^{374}\) and by the 1860s Orangemen had emerged as vociferous popular opponents of Home Rule.\(^{375}\) But their championing of 'patriotic' causes did nothing to win them respectability. *Porcupine* regarded Orangemen as a worse influence on Liverpool than the Catholic Irish - 'Orangemen are just as blatant, silly, unreasoning and tyrannical as Papists, and they have (amongst us at least) very much more influence'.\(^{376}\) When they threatened a counter-demonstration to the proposed Manchester Martyrs procession *Porcupine* warned the Irish:

> Liverpool is a place peculiarly unsuited for such demonstrations. It enjoys among other privileges, the possession of many peculiarly rough, reckless and rowdy Orangemen. Some of these men, look you, are your own countrymen; and they hate anything savouring Roman Catholicism with a hate as fervid as bigotry, ignorance and stupidity are capable of conceiving. You, on your part, are not very fond of them, or likely to be too scrupulous in the way of expressing your sentiments...Orangemen will look on your funeral procession as a grand Papist demonstration - a thing to be pelted with Protestant brickbats, and covered with Boyne mud. Each part will, from the very outset, be on the watch for some act of hostility from the other. Under such circumstances, who can tell what is likely to begin?\(^{377}\)

Tories couldn't condone Orange riot, but they did justify it as defensive. Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland also inspired them to virulent patriotic rhetoric.\(^{378}\) *Porcupine* regarded it as ridiculous that Orangemen sought to portray themselves as keepers of the peace and defenders of the status quo, and castigated the mayor for acknowledging them as such. It protested, 'their principles are utterly obsolete' and reflected middle class annoyance - 'the respectable, quiet, enlightened people of the town found the place almost too hot to hold them'.\(^{379}\) It seems that much of respectable liberal opinion had a similarly low opinion of the Orangemen. The
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Liberal Review likewise condemned their appropriation of the defence of respectability, and criticized the Courier for supporting them.380

By the 1860s conscription of anti-ritualism produced renewed vigour and new disgraces leading to further condemnation by the Liberal press.381 The Tablet observed 'excessive ritualism is but another name for the Catholic religion, and the Catholic religion is that which this mob undertakes to fight against'.382 If it is considered that Roman Catholicism is making insidious progress in the country, that progress will not be checked by flaunting yellow ribbons up and down the kingdom, and ranting about Boyne water, sniffed Porcupine.383 By the mid 1880s the 'currant jelly' section of the Liverpool Tories were moreover becoming heartily sick and embarrassed by them.384 Anti-ritualist disturbances were also occurring in Manchester at this time,385 but the movement was never so popular as in Liverpool. In the 1890s George Wise further popularized anti-ritualism to build 'a new Orange army',386 and anti-ritualist Bills, drafted by Liverpool Laymen's League, were presented in parliament so frequently in the last five years of the century that they became known as simply as the 'Liverpool Bills'.387 There indeed seems to be no chronological diminution in Orange-Green antipathies and in 1909 Liverpool witnessed 'the most serious sectarian disturbances in mainland Britain', as a consequence of reprisals to parades.388

Religious tensions therefore have a distinct chronology in Manchester and Newcastle, unlike in Liverpool where religious confrontation was regular and ongoing. Theological bigotry in Manchester and Newcastle was essentially a minority indulgence of the educated classes, bolstering their social prejudices, and took minimal account of the ethnicity of adherents. Thus there is little evidence that in Newcastle or Manchester religious affiliations either isolated the Irish or damaged inter-communal relations to the extent suggested by Frank Neal.389 A Catholic Irishman expressed surprise at the salutations of the Newcastle Chronicle Inquirer - 'he seemed surprised to hear a few charitable and kindly words drop from the lips of one, whom he seemed instinctively to regard as a Protestant, and with much emotion, said "Indeed, sir, you are the first of your sort of people that ever spoke to me in that
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way in my life" but, aside from intermittent exchanges between schools and on St Patrick’s day, hostile incidents are rare. Interestingly there seems to have been more prejudice to the Irish from their upper-class English fellow-Catholics, and indeed initially from the English Catholic hierarchy, than from working-class neighbours, and where intra-class violence did occur with a religious pretext it is far more common between the Irish or with the Scots than between Irish and English. Contrarily in Liverpool religious bigotry was generally an affectation of the working masses, and as such profoundly effected day-to-day relations.

For the majority Catholicism was more a source of curiosity than hostility, especially, it seems, in the north east. The Newcastle song *The Skipper’s Dream* recounts an imagined encounter with the "Pop". Bishop Riddell’s funeral provoked great interest among non-catholics, and the performance of the blessing by witnesses in the 1866 Town Moor Races rioters’ trial was noted with some curiosity by the *Newcastle Courant*. Assessing the gutter-press distributed in Manchester and Liverpool D. G. Paz finds that most of it was anti-clerical in general and urged its readers not to be seduced by anti-Catholic polemic. Generally the popular press was more interested in Catholicism than the consciously-sensible middle-class press and traditional stereotypes were also reproduced, providing a good context for the recurring themes of popular gothic melodrama of sex and death. Consequently Paz concludes that, while the effect of cumulative exposure to such material should not be discounted, portrayal was inconsistent.

There is no evidence in either Manchester or Newcastle that non-Catholics would “hang a praste”. On the contrary the clergy generated some popular heroes, notably Father Mathew. When Daniel Hearne was dismissed by the church in 1846 there was a mass public meeting in his honour, a glowing testimonial from the *Manchester Guardian*, and a subscription was raised, including contributions from Protestants. Hearne reflected;

*He had been twenty-one years a Roman Catholic priest in Manchester, he had been out at all hours by day and night, and never yet met with an insult from any person differing from him in religion. On the contrary, all was attention, kindness and respect.*
In all three towns the clergy who attended the Famine sick were lauded. In 1847 the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* printed a glowing obituary for Bishop Riddell (Thus has another martyr been added to the already long list of Catholic clergy, who have laid down their lives, while administering spiritual consolation to their flocks) and crowds of all denominations packed the streets to pay their respects at his funeral. Such scenes were repeated at the internment of Canon Toole of St Wilfred's, Manchester, in 1892, and of Canon Liptrot of St Anne's, Ancoats, in 1893. On the death of Reverend Henry Gillow in 1857 and of Father Callan of St Mary's in 1873 the *Newcastle Chronicle* wrote respectable and affectionate obituaries. Vaughan reflected in 1881, 'I am much surprised and touched to find how kind and cordial people are - Protestants of all sorts and parsons, etc., have written most kindly'. In Liverpool the Liberal press praised the clergy for trying to improve the behaviour of the Irish and suppressing responses to Orange provocation. Father Nugent (founder of night shelters, poor schools and orphanages, temperance champion and saviour of fallen women) was especially celebrated. In 1889 the *Liverpool Review* organized a vote to name the most popular person in Liverpool which Nugent emphatically won, and in 1890 when the *Liverpool Citizen* repeated the exercise Nugent came third with 22,687 votes. Thus the regard accorded the clergy as educated well-meaning secular communal leaders was often shared by non-Catholics.

Moreover considerable evidence of general respect for the Catholic faith exists. The *Liverpool Mercury* welcomed the provision of new churches to cater for Catholics. In 1807 St Anthony's, Liverpool, was established by a Protestant gentleman out of sympathy for exiled French aristocracy, and the land for St Nicholas' and St Peter's chapels was furthermore given by Liverpool town council, the mayor attending high mass at the opening of the former in 1815. Similarly St Augustine's chapel, Manchester, was constructed with Protestant support, and the land for the construction of St Mary' and St Anthony's was effectively given by the Newcastle corporation. The *Tablet* noted:

> the great employers of labour...co-operate with us in promoting the social, moral and religious importance of our labouring
classes, and the education of our poor children in our own schools. Exceptions there may be, but they are rare...They look to us and our clergy to do our utmost, and to exercise all the influence we possess.\textsuperscript{414} 

Official toleration promoted good relations by discountenancing prejudice. Though there was an abhorrence of the prospect of Catholic clergy teaching English children,\textsuperscript{415} secular philanthropic societies and local authorities in Manchester and Newcastle provided for the education of Catholic children in England, and collected for those in Ireland.\textsuperscript{416} Bishop Bewick reflected:

\begin{quote}
We are at perfect peace with all the population of the district. We have received many substantial proofs of their good will in the past, and shall not fail to see them in the future.\textsuperscript{417}
\end{quote}

By the 1840s Cooter regards toleration as reaching a new height.\textsuperscript{418} Certainly this was the case officially. Cooter regards the election of Thomas Dunn as mayor of Newcastle as bearing no relation to attitudes to the Irish, but it is undoubtedly symptomatic of a growing toleration.\textsuperscript{419} Newcastle's workhouses were only the second in England to allow Catholic services on a Sunday,\textsuperscript{420} and, prior to the 1850s (when funds became tight), Catholic priests were paid to attend Manchester workhouse, where Catholics were encouraged to maintain their faith.\textsuperscript{421} Comparatively, despite support from, among others, Shimmin,\textsuperscript{422} such concessions were slow to follow in Liverpool. After hotly contested debates in the mid 1850s Liverpool Select Vestry conceded that children in the work house could be permitted to receive Catholic education and in 1858 a room was made available for priests to perform Sunday mass. However in 1861 Liverpool Select Vestry (encouraged by the Protestant Alliance) petitioned the government against proposals for Catholic schoolmasters and chaplains to be paid for their services in the workhouse, and this was not conceded until 1889.\textsuperscript{423} The Vestry also refused Whitty's appeals for a priest to be appointed to Kirkdale industrial school.\textsuperscript{424} Until the end of the nineteenth century in Toxteth workhouse Protestants worshipped in a specially built church, while Catholics (of whom there was twice as many) crushed into a dining hall,\textsuperscript{425} and Catholic chaplains were not permitted to attend prisoners in the town’s jails until legislation was passed in 1863, and, even-so, ultra-Tory councillors tried to stop them being paid, necessitating
intervention by the Home Secretary.\textsuperscript{426}

Manchester and Newcastle societies' response to Irish immigrant Catholicism was determined by their own religious heterogeneity and laxity. Unlike in Liverpool religion was not in Manchester and Newcastle such a 'defining element in the culture of working communities' as Belchem supposes,\textsuperscript{427} and therefore sectarianism was coloured more by suspicion than by theology. Fielding observes that religion, except where it had territorial connotations, generally left the working classes of Manchester cold.\textsuperscript{428} Religious dogmatism for the most part remained covert and was rarely solely sufficient to precipitate violence. Although many had attended church schools, had some acquaintance with the Bible and Christian ethics, and in censuses few professed no faith,\textsuperscript{429} for most people religion was passive.\textsuperscript{430} Lancashire (40%) followed by Northumberland (48.8%) had the lowest proportion of available seating in churches in proportion to population.\textsuperscript{431} But this problem was not just logistic, as it did not abate with building efforts, due to widespread indifference. In 1844 Engels observed 'almost universally a total indifference to religion'.\textsuperscript{432} In the 1851 census both Lancashire (27\%) and Northumberland (28\%) were among the areas of weakest attendance.\textsuperscript{433} An inquiry in Miles Platting in 1837 revealed that out of 176 families only 31 called themselves Church of England, and 97 were 'uncertain', while only 35 practised their religion.\textsuperscript{434} Visiting Manchester in 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville remarked that 'few but the Catholics go to church'.\textsuperscript{435} The only chapel that J. C. Street encountered in his tour of working-class Newcastle was a Catholic one,\textsuperscript{436} and Hugh Heinrich accordingly described Catholics as infinitely more active than any other denomination there,\textsuperscript{437} a view echoed by the 1850 Inquiry into the Newcastle Poor which described the English working class as totally unmoved by theological controversy.\textsuperscript{438} Joseph Cowen said of the Church of England, "that body never had, and has not now, any strong hold on the affections and convictions of the people of the North".\textsuperscript{439} Unlike Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle had a large Nonconformist population\textsuperscript{440} who Cooter presumes, generally hostile to the state-endowed Church, were not inclined to follow its anti-Catholic lead. However D. G. Paz illustrates that Nonconformists were often
contrarily extremely intolerant of Catholicism. The existence of a relatively large Roman Catholic "enclave" in a predominantly Protestant area gave Liverpool a characteristic ethos which has set it off as different, writes J. A. Banks, but Liverpool's non-Catholic population was perhaps surprisingly even more lax in its religious observation than those of Manchester and Newcastle. Indeed in the 1851 religious census more Catholics were attending church than members of the Church of England in Liverpool. Censuses in the 1880s and 1890s show a 33% attendance in the town, and Abraham Hume spent his life crusading to improve the low level of working class Protestant observance with little result. But, as a High Church vicar told the Daily Post, the Liverpool working class 'don't care twopence about religion at all; but they to a man hate "Popery" intensively'.

Though many historians have presumed it to be 'well nigh absolute', the synonimity of the Irish and Catholicism in Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle is questionable. Significantly D. G. Paz, examining the content of working class journals, concluded that these rarely linked the Irish and Catholicism. One of the distinguishing features of the Liverpool context, which Frank Neal distinctly underestimates, is the presence of a large population of Irish Protestants. Indeed Moore calculates that in 1841 they constituted one sixth of the Irish population of Liverpool. In Manchester too the Irish far from religiously homogenous. Though the proportion of Catholics thereafter substantially increases, G. Connolly estimates that in 1800 the proportion of Irish Protestants to Catholics in Manchester was 2:3, thus accounting for the number of Catholic-Protestant clashes in the early years of the century. There was a well established pattern of northern Irish Protestant hand-loom weavers settling in Manchester, and in the 1830s there were still an estimated 5000 Irish Protestants in the town. Furthermore the growth in Manchester's Catholic population in the eighteenth century was largely attributable to migration of indigenous Catholics. Rev. A. Hume estimated in 1858 that the number of indigenous English Catholics in Liverpool was approximately equal to the number of Irish Protestants in the town. Hume's calculation is perhaps an over-estimate, but J.
A. Hilton estimates that the Irish composed 70% of Liverpool's Catholics as opposed to 83% of Manchester's. In 1836 Thomas Parker reckoned there to be around 10,000 English Catholics in Manchester, and Newcastle had a well-established (though calculatedly religiously inconspicuous) Catholic population before the commencement of substantial Irish immigration. Indeed the Newcastle Catholic church was deeply proud of its long English heritage. Additionally the gravestones interned from St Augustine's indicate that large numbers of French and Italian Catholics resided in Manchester, joined later by Poles, Lithuanians and Ukrainians, and in 1846 Italian missionaries were at work in Manchester and Newcastle. As a major seaport foreign Catholics would have been even more numerous in Liverpool. Although Liverpool had more Irish priests than Manchester or Newcastle, and after 1873 an Irish Catholic Bishop, the great majority of priests in all three towns continued to be English, while Liverpool and Manchester furthermore had loud and infamous cliques of anti-Catholic Irish Protestant clergy. Thus Catholicism was not as alien and un-English as historians have suggested. But, as Paz cautions, most of the Catholics that the English working class would encounter would be Irish.

Religious hostility to the Catholic Irish requires a level of outward show. As Catholics became more confident in the 1830s and 1840s they became more open in the practice of their religion. But how visible was their Catholicism? Beales supposes that the superstition, primitiveness and ostentation of early Catholicism heightened Protestant hostility. There is considerable evidence of Irish devotional fidelity: they gave their money and labour to the churches, tended to be militant when religiously offended, in many cases let their religious priorities determine their political inclinations, cherished their rites of passage, maintained considerable respect for their clergy (the ‘cult of the priest' as W.M. Walker terms this more than spiritual esteem), religious imagery was displayed in even the poorest of Manchester and Liverpool Irish homes, and evangelical missions to convert Catholic Irish were ineffectual, often meeting a violent response. However hostile and polemic contemporary observers exaggerated priestly influence (‘They keep their
people in ignorance, and teach them that all other churches are but assemblies of heretics; and their people, not knowing any better, think to serve the cause of religion by taking a mean advantage of a man of different opinions to themselves', philosophized the *Liverpool Courier* and attendance levels (albeit no clear measure of personal religious sentiment) were low. In 1806 Rowland Broomhead was amazed to discover that so many Irish were not practising, and in 1828 only one in seven baptized Manchester Catholics attended services. When Broomhead opened St Augustine's and Daniel Hearne opened St Patrick's in Irish Town their main problem was to fill them. In 1833 Hearne conducted an independent census of Irish Town and registered that there were only 11,009 baptized Catholics out of an Irish population of 20,000, and of these only 'a few hundred' attended Mass. This is augmented by the findings of a survey of 172 families in Miles Platting in 1837. Here 37 described themselves as 'Irish', but only 23 as Catholics. Indigenous Catholics tended to be much more attentive to their duties, and as the proportion of Irish increased the proportion of numbers baptized to numbers attending correspondingly decreased. In 1884 Vaughan established a Board of Inquiry to investigate the leakage problem and commenced rescue work. In 1887 Austin Oates (secretary of Vaughan's Catholic Protection and Rescue Society) calculated that nearly 10,000 'Catholic' children in Manchester were in jeopardy of losing their faith from parental neglect. In 1900 Easter attendance levels varied between 24% at St Edmund's, Miles Platting, and 82% at St Alban's, Ancoats, the poorer the parish the lower the attendance being. Mid-week attendance levels were far worse, only 4% attending in Manchester as a whole and 0.4% in St William's, Angel Meadow. In Newcastle on Census Sunday 1851 only 3,387 of the estimated 10-15,000 Catholics attended Mass. However compared with some earlier estimates this is impressive. Moreover this situation does not seem to have improved much over time, despite the best efforts of the church, and in 1882 still only 39% performed their 'Easter duty'. In 1836 many Liverpool clergy lamented that their Irish parishioners were neglectful, and in 1842 they believed that barely one in ten Liverpool Irish Catholics were attending
In 1848 Hume confirmed that 70% of Catholics in Vauxhall ward were not practicing. The 1851 Religious census revealed that of an Irish-born population of 83,813 only 38,123 Liverpool Catholics attended mass on census Sunday. In 1855 it was estimated that 48% of Liverpool Catholics attended mass and 35% did 'Easter duty', and in 1865 50% went to mass and 43% attended at Easter. Circumstances were thus improving chronologically, in part due to a programme of church building, but only 32% were still performing their Easter duty in 1871 and official censuses ordered by Bishops in 1881 and 1891 still revealed high levels of negligence. The Irish were not indifferent to religion and much of the apparent laxity derives from the fact that, especially in the first half of the century, the Catholic church in England was over-stretched, lacking resources and manpower. St Patrick's, Liverpool, was always over-crowded with people left outside unable to gain entrance. Newcastle missionary James Worswick encountered an Irishman who had never before met a priest, which is not so surprising given the chronic shortfall in the town. In 1845 a Manchester priest wrote that, though there were 12 priests in the town, about 40,000 Catholics failed to perform their Easter duties as there was no-one to hear their confessions. Furthermore most immigrants had little familiarity with Tridentine Catholicism and had never acquired the habit of attending Mass regularly. Indeed for some time Stations continued in Irish homes. The clash of different varieties of faith is illustrated by the difficulties the Liverpool hierarchy had in outlawing wakes in the town. Until the advent of the influence of Ultramontane ideas the English Catholic church did not look with any fondness on its new Irish laity and objections to the predominantly English Catholic clergy, along with poverty, work commitments, mixed-marriages, dislocation and notions of propriety kept the Irish away from church. Although clerical control and empathy increased in the 1850s the 'devotional revolution' by-passed the pre-Famine generation and contemporary Catholic observers continued to lament their devotional laxity. Thus it is unlikely that the Irish were any more conspicuously religious than their non-Catholic neighbours. However the Irish were not prepared to be the passive subjects of religious bigotry, and so popular
hostility was encouraged by their militancy.

Irish Catholicism tended only generally to be conspicuous when combined with political and territorial allegiances, when provocatively distinguished and in the annual Manchester Martyrs, Whitsuntide and St Patrick’s Day parades (significantly in Manchester and Newcastle these never became the focus for violence as in Liverpool, Preston, Oldham and Stockport). Moreover, the Catholic hierarchy strove to portray itself as loyal, patriotic, Anglicized and unobjectionable, grasping every occasion to toast the monarch and sing the National Anthem. In 1825 Catholics met in the Turks Head in Newcastle, declaring,

we spurn with contempt the imputation of holding any principles of a disloyal tendency, we solemnly declare that every tenet of our creed is in the most perfect accordance with all the duties of faithful subjects.

Catholic chapels in Newcastle celebrated the coronation of William IV in 1831. On Victoria’s coronation day Catholic clergy in Manchester summoned their flocks ‘with the intention of soliciting from the Divine Being a prosperous and peaceful reign’, the Hibernian Society marched in the coronation procession, and five-thousand Catholic school-children congregated on Ardwick Green to sing the national anthem. In 1881 when the Prince and Princess of Wales visited Liverpool they were well received in Irish quarters. Despite the I.N.L.’s proscription of participating in royal jubilee celebrations Irish were conspicuous in their participation. In 1887 Catholics represented a large proportion of the Manchester children attending the breakfast to celebrate the jubilee, in 1892 Liverpool priests preached sermons celebrating the diamond jubilee, and Liverpool I.N.L. leader Lynskey became known as ‘Jubilee Jeremy’ after attending the mayor’s garden party to celebrate the 1899 jubilee. The ‘Loyal and True to their KING AND COUNTRY’ character of Catholics was a greatly emphasized theme during the Catholic Emancipation campaign. In November 1851 the opening of St Chad’s school was undertaken with a conspicuous and deliberate patriotic flourish. As at the time of the ‘Papal Aggression’, at the height of the Fenian agitation Catholic clergy became almost obsessive in their compensatory reiteration of proclamations of loyalty. Indeed the
Newcastle Catholic Church was so proud of, and anxious to maintain, its English heritage that it was only with reluctance that, before the advent of Ultramontene principles, it acknowledged its Celtic brethren. In Liverpool any lapses in this overt loyalty were immediately seized upon by a vigilant Protestant Tory press. Even Liberal *Porcupine* was not beyond the odd bluster:

> We have some fault to find with our Irish friends in Liverpool. Nothing could be in worse taste than the foolery of drinking the Pope's health before the Queen's...this we emphatically hold to be neither wisdom, nor independence, nor manliness, to be only deliberate impertinence and vulgarity - of a kind so contemptible that *Porcupine* feels somewhat sorry to give it any importance by noticing it at all.519

Religion collectively identified the Irish and realized and magnified prejudice. Many historians reject religious disturbances as pretexts, symptomatic of economic tensions.520 However in Liverpool religious acrimony was a strong aspect of working class culture and as such should not be lightly dismissed. But in the Manchester and Newcastle context, aside from during transient periods, it is false to presume, as N. Kirk does, that ethnic friction pushed the English working classes into the arms of the Orangemen and the Tories, and the Irish under the thumb of the priesthood.521 Religion was never as important a determinant influence in inter-communal relations as has been presumed here and represented no impenetrable barrier to class loyalty. Moreover D. G. Paz interestingly contends that as the nineteenth century progressed religiosity became a diminishingly important constituent of anti-Irishness, and culture and politics became more important. He ponders: 'Perhaps the English, as they became more "secular", stopped disliking the Irish because they were Roman Catholic, and started disliking the Irish because they were Irish'.522 Cooter regards the religious tolerance of Newcastle as a major determinant factor in the apparently superior reception of the Irish here.523 However it was not as exceptional as he supposes, having a history of controversy comparable to Manchester's, and contrasts between the two cities are explicable more by differences in the chronology of settlement than by contextual influences or characteristics of the immigrants. In this respect contrasts with Liverpool are far more appropriate.
4. Politics as a Means of Assimilation and Isolation

The political orientation of Irish immigrants in nineteenth century England has been deemed seditious and alien. It is presumed that ethnic and class affiliations were mutually exclusive, and, thereby, that not only did common political interests fail to promote integration, but inclination actively fostered isolation and introduced ethnic and cultural divisions that weakened the capacity for class solidarity, facilitating bourgeois exploitation. They rarely take part in political agitation, except their nation or faith is attacked, typically reflected Reverend Vincent Glover of Liverpool in 1836. Ethnocity is perceived as a skin that is progressively shed during the process of integration, with the emergence of class consciousness only in the last quarter of the century. Thus John Devoy regarded his compatriots as becoming less Irish if they involved themselves in class, trade or electoral politics. However, though for most contemporaries 'Irish politics' was inseparable from 'the Irish Question', research reveals that immigrant Irish were deeply implicated in the problems of industrializing and urbanizing Britain, finding a common 'community of occupation, interest and struggle' with the working class, and consequently their political affiliations were not one-dimensional. Indeed, conversely, nationalism fostered political consciousness and political activity, rendering the Irish peculiarly active in their class. Collusion was not in the interests of the economic and political elite, and was not at times favoured by the Catholic church or Irish nationalists, but, in an era when there was no single working-class party, but a number of specific-issue combinations, Irishmen were concurrently Chartists, radicals, trade unionists, councillors, Liberals, Tories, Socialists and nationalists.

The extent of Irish political sway is notoriously hard to estimate, but Tories complained and nationalists bragged of their potential. Indeed the belief in the political muscle and militancy of the Irish in Liverpool goes along way to account for Orange and Tory fervent opposition to them there. The strong influence of the Irish of Newcastle was the subject of concern at an 1859 Lords Select Committee, and by
1874 their voting capacity (an estimated 1000 persons), made Gladstone and John Morely anxious to cultivate the friendship of Irish communal leader Bernard McAnulty. In 1872 the *Freeman's Journal* bragged that the Irish in Manchester could exercise 'a decisive influence', estimating that their voters in the city numbered 11,000. By 1881 the estimate had risen to 20,000. Herbert Gladstone's list of seats "dominated" by the Irish vote included Manchester North East, North, South-West and Salford South. But the proportion of Irish voters in these divisions was only about ten percent, and the actual voting capacity of the Irish was even less than this suggests. Only in Liverpool were they sufficiently numerous, concentrated and co-ordinated to be able to dictate to the Liberals and elect their own MP, and even here it was not until 1885 that any significant numbers of Irish became eligible to vote. Despite the registration efforts of the Home Rule Confederation and the Irish National League, and despite expanding enfranchisement, the majority of the Irish continued to be disqualified by poverty and mobility. But those who could vote did so with impressive co-ordination, and formal exclusion did not preclude them from widespread political participation at a more informal level, or from political consciousness. Indeed Irish personation at elections was a particular problem in Lancashire. Furthermore Irish did not necessarily dance to the tune of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Some were too alienated to become involved in parliamentary politics, but many were too integrated to believe that only Irish parties represented their interests. O'Tuathaigh assumes that the Manchester Irish were politically alienated as, unlike in Liverpool, they lacked an ethnic voting block on the council. Although this circumstance derives simply from residential patterns, it is both indicative of physical integration and symbolizes an assimilation into broader class interests and issues. But as far as political relationships and communal relations were concerned it was more important that the Irish were widely believed to be politically influential than whether they actually were.

I

Contemporary hostile propaganda, and historical tradition, has portrayed Irish
politics as priest-driven. The Manchester Irish Roman Catholic, observed Culverwell, like his brethren elsewhere, has two, and only two, topics of interest - politics and religion, and his interest in the former depends mainly from its influence upon the latter. R. J. Cooter, like J. H. Treble, makes much of priestly influence, regarding it as separating the Irish from the mainstream of working class politics and determining their voting inclinations until at least 1895. Studying the Irish in Glasgow, Bernard Aspinwall explores this argument further concluding that the Catholic church served a conservative social purpose, establishing links between working class and upper class brethren, prolonging deference and preserving alienation from British political conventions. As often the only educated members of immigrant communities priests did inevitably have some political sway, but the way in which they exercised this influence requires some re-examination.

In the first half of the nineteenth century the Catholic hierarchy sought to preclude its congregations' participation in societies using oaths and rituals, and did not distinguish between secret seditious societies and trades or radical organisations. In 1831 clergy were instructed to refuse sacraments to any member of an organization bound by a secret oath, such societies being deemed the church's "arch-enemy". Clergy told the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor that they were in the habit of using their influence to keep their parishioners from joining trade unions. In 1838 Bishop Briggs (Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District) warned:

we anxiously caution you, dearly beloved brethren, who form a part of labouring and manufacturing classes, to flee from every society and union that is illegal; and not to enter into any combination which is injurious to the rights of others, unjust and illegal, whereby you prevent others from accepting a smaller remuneration from the specific price you have fixed for yourselves.

As a consequence of clerical proscription Manchester Irish left the bricklayers union in the early 1830s and established their own association with no secret oath. Rev. John Ashurst turned the children of reform supporters out of Granby Row Catholic school, Manchester, and in 1839 Liverpool clergy warned Irish not to join the Chartists as 'no Catholic who belonged to them would receive the sacraments of their
church'. In 1859 Father Connolly of St Mary's, Newcastle, was still exposing members of secret societies for public condemnation.

However not all priests adopted the hierarchy line, and some began to distinguish between secret societies and trade unions. Ruth Ann Harris remarks that it was 'hardly surprising' that Irish priests trained in 'the highly politicized atmosphere of nineteenth-century Ireland' became involved in championing the rights of their 'exploited and discriminated against' parishioners. Illustrative of this is the one surviving reply to Bishop Briggs' circular asking Manchester clergy for views on which societies should be outlawed. Friend of John Doherty, Rev. Henry Gillow (St Mary's, Mulberry Street) insisted that all societies, except for the Knights of St Patrick, were genuine charitable and trade organizations, and ought not to be precluded, as the men needed and must have the right to combine to defend wage levels. In 1836 responsibility for judging societies was devolved to clergy discretion and by 1838 trade unions were consequently no longer prohibited. The clergy didn't intervene in the Manchester spinners turn-out and did so positively in the builders strike. The best known advocate of such toleration (although, Connolly cautions, he was opposed to trade unions longer than Gillow) is Rev. Daniel Hearne, who exemplifies the immigrant Irish capacity to combine nationalism and social and industrial radicalism. On the radical platforms of 1830s and 1840s Hearne advocated Corn Law Repeal and the Ten Hours Bill and denounced the factory system and Lord Londonderry's attempt to break the Durham miners' strike. Hearne's language became increasingly violent and consequently in January 1846 he was suspended by the Bishop of Manchester, precipitating a furious public row, his overwhelmingly Irish congregation taking Hearne's side, with mob violence around and inside St Patrick's church as the priest with his Irish bodyguard dared the Bishop to expel him. Later Canon Toole (of St Wilfred's, Hulme), similarly also a nationalist, became trustee of the Irish-dominated Manchester Bricklayers Union. P. Cadogan, interestingly labels the Newcastle Catholic church 'radical in politics', although, as in Manchester, evidence of this is not copious.
unions became more popular and less secretive, and as concern for their congregations' interests grew with Manning's 'Social Catholicism' and celebrated intervention in the London dock strike of 1889, the church establishment became progressively more tolerant. Condemnations became less frequent in Pastoral letters during the 1840s. Moreover it is important to note that political pressures were equally exerted on Anglican and Dissenting congregations, who, like most Catholics, religious out of habit and up-bringing rather than deep theological conviction, were prepared to draw psychological barriers confining the church's field of influence, and, additionally, as Denvir observed, there were always churches where it was known that the priests would conspire to turn a blind eye.

Aspinwall attempts to redress what he terms a traditional left-wing definition of working class political 'success' (that is that the Irish should have become involved in trade unions and radicalism and defended the interests of their class), arguing that as a community, with the encouragement of the Catholic church, they remained attached to the idea of land and succeeded in their own objectives of 'building institutions, churches, schools and an effective community'. However in the north of England many Irish upon emigration were already urbanized, industrialized and alienated from the English status quo, and the social niceties of the Catholic church were only acknowledged when they coincided with economic interests. Consequently the Irish in the north were not nearly as passive and conservative as Aspinwall portrays them to have been in Glasgow.

It is frequently reiterated that poverty, piecework, lack of skill and industrial experience in Ireland, want of commitment to a future in England, segregation of labour plus the discountenance of the Catholic church kept the Irish out of trade unionism until the 1880s and 1890s, with the development of new unionism and the organization of unskilled workers, when 'the Irish stereotype was hastily modified from strike-breaker to strike-maker'. Moreover E. H. Hunt regards the Irish as retarding the development of trade unions, hindering their attainment of respectability and engendering disunity with their divisive ethnic orientation. Alan O'Day suggests
that E. P. Thompson manipulates evidence 'to minimize competition and strife, as part of a thesis articulating the cohesion of the labouring poor during industrialisation'.

However, in Manchester, with its early history of labour militancy, evidence suggests that immigrant Irish had a peculiar inclination for combination, fostered by their Irish background. Revealingly J. P. Kay assumed that Irish industry had been destroyed by the militancy of its labourers. As early as 1799 the *Return on Freemasons' Lodges* showed that most members were Irish weavers, who participated not for subversive reasons, but to protect their craft at a time of hardship, as they did when they turned out in 1808. In 1836 many witnesses testified to the systematic evasion of clerical disapproval, to their 'mutinous disposition' and predilection for combination:

It often happens that when there is discontent or a disposition to combination, or turn-outs among the workpeople, the Irish are the leaders; they are the most difficult to reason with, and convince, on the subject of wages and regulations in the factories. They are so voluble and have such a command of words, that they often mislead the English by this means. They are also very violent in threatening and intimidating others who refuse to turn out with them, or who fill their places after they have turned out.

Manchester Irish were very organized in the building trades, were in the 1830s and 1840s prominent in strikes in shoe-making, tailoring, weaving and the 1842 general strike, and in the 1860s were unionized in the cotton industry. The 1850s and 1860s generally saw the Irish and the working-classes united against employers, notably in 1853-4, 1859-61 and 1869.

In Liverpool too the Irish were active at an early stage. In some ways immigrants here were less suited to unionism than their compatriots elsewhere, as casualism bred competition, brutality and corruption, and the progressive decline in skill over the century rendered Liverpool labourers less likely subjects for unionism. Furthermore, here Gallagher regards religious and ethnic differences as inhibiting the unionization of trades. Like Bohstedt, and with some credibility, he assumes that, precluded from friendly and trade societies, Liverpool Irishmen defended their economic interests through the Orange order, Ribbon societies and religious
fraternities.56 These judgements are affirmed by Liverpool witnesses in the Report on the State of the Irish Poor who denied that the Irish were more inclined to agitate than the English.57 But there is much contrary evidence. By the 1830s they were participating in the Coachmakers’ Union and Builders’ and Labourers’ Union.58 In 1833 a strike by a combination of building unions, which went on for twenty weeks, was organized by the Irish, who dominated the organization. The Irish are frequently plotting, and are always ready for a turn-out’ lamented builder Samuel Holme.59 Again they led the mechanics and labourers turn-out,60 and when O’Connell visited Liverpool in 1836 he was escorted by the trades societies.61 Belchem writes that they remained at the forefront of unskilled strike activity throughout the 1830s and 1840s, and that the all-Irish corn porters were the most militant section of the dock labour force.62 It has been suggested that the deterioration in their public image in the late 1840s caused them to retreat from trades organisations.63 But conversely the economic implications of growing prejudice meant that in 1848 the Irish were prominent amongst the unemployed porters demonstrating on the Exchange.64 In 1879 Irish were involved in a brick-makers riot in Bootle where union men (Irish) attacked non-union men.65 This kind of exchange seems primitive in the context of the respectable and disciplined new unionism which ‘swept across Liverpool with considerable force’ in the 1880s and 1890s.66 The National Union of Dock Labourers, established in 1889, was very popular amongst the Irish and it appropriately became very intimate with Liverpool’s Home Rulers.67 In 1890 the Liverpool Weekly Mercury remarked on how many of the striking dockers sported shamrocks on St Patrick’s day.68 Indeed the Irish made the N.U.D.L. so popular here that its central office was moved to Liverpool in 1891. In 1889 Edward McHugh got his friend Michael Davitt to negotiate on behalf of the striking dockers, enhancing the union’s Irish connotations.69 Rule 19 of the N.U.D.L. declared: ‘No member shall use unbecoming words or references to any other member’s religious opinions, or nationality, or antecedents, it being a fundamental principle of the union that all men are brothers’, and in 1891 its annual report pronounced:

For the first time in the history of the labour world, distinctions
of nationality and religious creed and political party and colour of skin were set aside, and the common brotherhood of the workers asserted and vindicated...the utter helplessness and uselessness of capital without labour.°

But in the dock strike there were still sectarian divisions. For example the, largely Protestant, Carters Union overwhelmingly voted against joining the strike.° Gallagher indeed goes as far as to attribute the ultimate failure of the N.U.D.L. on Liverpool as due to the isolation of the Irish.° By contrast Taplin minimizes its importance, regarding sectarianism as easily overwhelmed by economic necessity.° Given the context it is fair to suppose that the N.U.D.L. did face problems in uniting all dockers because of sectarian differences. But Belchem offers a revisionist and highly valid explanation for the failure of New Unionism on Merseyside; that it was not due to sectarianism or casualism but to the well established and profoundly influential traditions of formal political allegiances.°

Irish trade unionism (unlike radicalism) emerges only later in Newcastle, reflecting contextual regional economic differences (with the later development of industry in the north east and contrasts in the type of industry and subsequent organization of labour) and the differing chronology of immigration. But the Irish progressively became active and noted trade unionists, celebrated for their role in the 1881-3 Durham miners strike.° Unionism expanded during the last quarter of the century. The fact that the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants met in Newcastle Irish Literary Institute suggests considerable Irish participation,° and in the 1890s many were incorporated in the Tyneside and National Labour Union (later the National Amalgamated Union of Labourers).°

Many Irish immigrants were experienced agitators, who emerged in England as labour leaders. D. Thompson called Mancunian John Doherty 'probably the most important and influential trade-unionist in the first half of the century'.° Having campaigned against the Combination Laws,° in 1829 he founded the National Association for the Protection of Labour° and, at the Isle of Man conference of the Scottish, Welsh, English and Irish spinners (extending his work as secretary of the Manchester Cotton Spinners), the Grand National Union of All the Spinners of the
He modelled the organization of both, he professed, on the tactics of O'Connell and the United Irishmen. Doherty was not, however, such an anomaly as R. A. Harris suggests. Similarly prominent in the weavers' unions were Irishmen Edward Curran (secretary of the Manchester hand-loom weavers' union, who represented them on the executive of the Manchester Trades Council in 1839), John Campbell, James and John Allinson, Peter Power, Patrick Flinn, Maurice Donovan (secretary of the union), Daniel Donovan (who was involved in the 1837 strike at Guest's Mill, and who, as president of the power-loom weavers' union, represented them at the Trades Delegates Conference during the Plug Plot strikes) and Christopher Doyle (secretary of the power-loom weavers union, leader of the strike at Guest's Mill and Ten Hours Movement activist). Other Manchester Irish trade union leaders included John Murray (of the shoe-makers) and Thomas Doyle (who represented the painters). Irishmen served as spokesmen at meetings of the unemployed in 1848, and, as a young man, J. R. Clynes organized a spinners' union in the mill in which he worked.

By the second half of the century the Irish began to rise to prominence in Liverpool. By the 1860s the Working Tailors' Association was lead by Irishman Mr Smith. It is not surprising that Irish dominated the personnel of the N.U.D.L., including Richard McGhee (president), Edward McHugh (first general secretary), James Larkin, Peter Larkin, Thomas Kilkelly, Michael Connolly (president) and James Sexton (secretary). As Taplin identifies, their ethnicity was incidental as the N.U.D.L. aimed at uniting all dockers, not just the Irish. Sexton (who was born in Newcastle of Irish parents) criticized dockers who let 'political and religious bigotry and ignorance' divide them, and devoted his time to trying to decasualize Liverpool labour. Many of these men were also committed nationalists, as was J. G. Taggart, the first secretary of Mersey District of the National Union of Gasworkers and General Labourers. Although Trade Unionism emerged later on Tyneside, by the 1880s Irish names (like Pete Curran, leader of the Gasworkers' Union, Hugh Boyle and John McCowey who were prominent in the Northumberland Miners' Association,
George Hill who was a pioneer of the Eight Hours movement, Tod Colgan and Joe Cummins\textsuperscript{105} proliferated among the labour spokesmen of Newcastle noted in Royal Commissions.\textsuperscript{101}

In relation to the Irish in America, D. P. Moynihan writes: 'for the Irish nationalism gave a structure to working-class resentments that in other groups produced political radicalism'.\textsuperscript{102} However Irish political interests in Newcastle, Liverpool and Manchester were not just separatist, nationalism indeed breeding disregard for the status quo and ideal radical credentials. Echoing the enthusiastic sentiments of Engels\textsuperscript{103} and James Connolly,\textsuperscript{104} E. J. Hobsbawm described the Irish in England as 'a cutting edge of radicals and revolutionaries' uncommitted by tradition or prosperity to society as it existed.\textsuperscript{105} While such a reputation found them few friends among the Establishment, it endeared them to the enlightened working class. English radicals regarded Ireland as important, fearing that coercion and the lower living standards prevalent there would spread to England, and went to great lengths to secure Irish immigrant support.\textsuperscript{106} Treble and Thompson disagree about how working class Irish immigrants responded to the division between O'Connell and radicals in 1837,\textsuperscript{107} but evidence, especially from Manchester, suggest that they found little difficulty in reconciling allegiances. This is not to suggest that all Irish immigrants into England were politically radical, but research indicates that this was true of a large portion of them. Henry Hunt and Feargus O'Connor regarded the incorporation of the immigrant Irish in British radicalism as a priority.\textsuperscript{108} The success of the former's appeals is demonstrated in the presence of Irish weavers at Peterloo. Samuel Bamford described the enthusiastic reception radicals received from the poor Irish weavers of New Town as they marched to St Peter's Fields.\textsuperscript{109} Furthermore Irish comprised a large contingent of the New Cross working men who decided to form the Manchester Political Union, 'determined only to accept full and radical reform'.\textsuperscript{110} Participation in the Catholic Emancipation campaign, both in England and Ireland, provided the immigrant Irish with important organizational experience. Symbolically an Irishwoman who appeared at the New Bailey prison court in 1832 had named her two
sons Henry Hunt and Daniel O'Connell. After the passing of the 1833 Coercion Act the Irish became increasingly prominent and numerous in the Political Union, which opened a branch in Little Ireland. Members of its council included John Doherty, John Campbell (a radical newsagent), the "unflinching democrat", "dungeon proof patriot", and advocate of the Ten Hours Bill, Christopher Doyle, George Condy (radical barrister, editor and part-owner of the radical Manchester and Salford Advertiser, campaigner against the Poor Law Amendment Act and abuses of factory labour, and for an eight-hour day, universal suffrage and independent working class political action) and Edward Curran (who also founded Manchester Operative Political Union, represented the town on the National Union of the Working Classes, was a speaker for the Friends of Civil and Religious Liberty, and was an active member of Manchester Reform Association). Doherty ran a radical bookshop-cum-newsagency in Manchester, was active in the factory reform and anti-Corn Law movements, protested against the Poor Law Amendment Act, campaigned in support of the Reform Bill, and edited Voice of the People (with its weekly column on Irish affairs) and Herald of the Rights of Industry. In 1833 he established the Regeneration Society, which aspired to mobilize politically the working class and created panic with its revolutionary declarations. Other all-round radicals and exponents of working class political action included Thomas Oates (reporter for the Voice of the People and editor of the Union Pilot and Co-operative Intelligencer, and secretary of Manchester Reform Association), James Leach (another radical bookshop owner, friend of Engels, advocate of the Co-operative Movement, new Redemption Societies, workingmen's associations and the ten hour day, and author of Stubborn Facts about the Factories and David Ross (active in the Mental Liberty Committee and vice-president of the Young Men's Anti Monopoly Association). It is therefore not surprising that in 1841 the Irish dominated the anniversary Peterloo meeting on St Peter's Fields.

Newcastle radicalism is not as well documented and it was not such a prominent centre of subversive politics in the first half of the nineteenth century as
Manchester. However, as early as 1819 (when the Irish community was not yet substantial), flags boasting shamrocks and Irish tricolours were noted among the banners at the Town Moor meeting held in sympathy for Peterloo. T. A. Devyr was the corresponding secretary of the Newcastle-based Northern Political Union, and James Bruce, who 'held broad views on social questions', as well as being prominent in the local nationalist movement, was, Felix Lavery noted, a popular speaker at the Bigg Market. Participation is therefore evident, but the Newcastle Irish community did not become really prominent until the second half of the nineteenth century, when they were significant as advocates of Irish nationalism, rather than as exponents of working class rights, albeit that nationalism had a significant following among Newcastle radicals.

Although Liverpool did not have a strong popular radical tradition in the first half of the nineteenth century (in part due to the local peculiarity of many of the working class already being enfranchised and effectively wooed by protectionist Tories who appealed to their economic interests), where flourishes of radicalism are evident Irish participation is usually detectable. When Liverpool Whigs organized a celebration to vindicate the honour of Queen Caroline Irish and Catholics were prominent, Liverpool Precursor society in addition to Repeal enthusiastically demanded abolition of tithes in England, municipal reform, vote by ballot and electoral reform, and Irishman Mark J. Falvey co-edited the 'co-operative newspaper' The Bee. Later when Home Rulers became increasingly influential in Liverpool, as in Newcastle, they made their radical credentials plain. James Lysaght Finegan was 'a notorious radical', Justin McCarthy was active in Liverpool Parliamentary Debating Society, McHugh (devotee of American radical Henry George) became a radical lecturer on Merseyside in the 1890s, and T. P. O'Connor (former champion of the London radical clubs) retained his involvement with the progressive press and interest in the labour movement.
In the 1840s free trade dominated Liverpool politics. Indeed K. Moore regards this issue as the foundation of divisions in the Liverpool working class between Whigs and Tories, which accounts for the relative failure of Chartism here. As in Manchester, Liverpool Irish (many of them dock labourers) were active in the free trade campaign, recognizing more trade through the docks as being in their economic interests. Many were members of the Anti-Monopoly Association and in the Irish Reform News Room they debated how Corn Law repeal could be achieved. This caused a clash of interest with the ship-servicing artisans (many of them Ulster Protestants) who wanted the Navigation Laws preserved and so were natural Tory supporters. Thus an economic issue became a sectarian one. In 1841 Anti-Corn Law Association meetings, attended by Catholic Irish, were attacked by ships carpenters, synonymous with Orangeism, who then proceeded to assail St Patrick's chapel.

John Belchem has predicted that the debate regarding the extent of Irish participation in Chartism will develop into one of the most important controversies in nineteenth century labour history. Hunt regards the Irish as uninterested before 1848, when, he believes, they only became involved for nationalist purposes. The Irish role in Chartism has traditionally been evaluated negatively, affiliation promoting extremism, and so constituting a source of discredit. Furthermore J. H. Treble concludes that support for O'Connell and the breaking-up of Chartist meetings meant that the extent of mass support for Chartism in no way correlated to the prominence of Irish Chartist leaders. However it has since been questioned whether support for O'Connor and O'Connell was as incompatible as Treble presumes, his evidence consisting largely of official pronouncement. Though there is little evidence regarding the birth-place or religion of the Chartist crowd, D. Thompson, R. O'Higgins and J. Belchem estimate the level of Irish participation as similar to that of native inhabitants, there existing a sense of common interest and common-oppression, and an enthusiastic articulation of the demand for justice for Ireland and the need for alliance. Indeed the most recent Chartist study, by P. Pickering, regards the Irish as 'proportionately over-represented' in the Manchester movement.
Clashes between the Manchester Chartists and the O'Connellite Irish (as represented by the Anti-Corn Law League's 'Irish lambs') have been disproportionately highlighted. Trouble was largely confined to June 1841 when a series of retaliatory disruptions occurred at meetings. The Anti-Corn Law 'Police' who co-ordinated some of this (spreading rumours, for example, that the Chartists were hanging O'Connell and Hearne in effigy), were recruited from among members of the Repeal Association and were well paid by the League. However, men like John Kelly, 'Big Mick' McDonough, William Duffy, James Daly and John 'prepare-to-meet-your-God' Finnigan were not just hired thugs but, like the mass of Irish Mancunians, genuine advocates of Corn Law repeal. Irish weavers represented a quarter of the 17,000 signatures on a 1839 petition. The antagonism between the A.C.L.L. and the Manchester Chartists was a peculiarity of local politics, which derived not from the division between O'Connell and O'Connor, as Treble suggests, or from Chartists contesting Corn Law repeal (indeed in 1826 6000 Manchester workingmen signed a petition in favour of repeal), but from the tension between competing pressure groups and from objection to the organization and personnel of the A.C.L.L. The latter was effectively a manufacturers' pressure group, with whom the radicals had formerly clashed on numerous issues. John Doherty, for example, campaigned for repeal of the "infamous and monstrous" Corn Laws, but, as a factory agitator, clashed with the leaders of the A.C.L.L. His deep mistrust of this manufacturers' lobby was vindicated at the end of 1841 when the League circulated rumours that he and Lord Ashley were trying to whip up the ten hours campaign as a 'Tory trick' to divert popular attention from the Corn Laws. Consequently in 1842 Doherty publicly pronounced that he anticipated little reward for the working classes from the A.C.L.L.'s efforts. Doherty took no part in A.C.L.L. clashes with the Chartists, but when he was shouted down at a meeting to discuss the Factory Bill in 1843 the Manchester Courier blamed 'League Irish'. James Leach also mistrusted the A.C.L.L., but he additionally had some more ideological objections, believing that a different solution must be found. He implored, 'if they would take all chance of a
working man being enabled to live by his labour as a mechanic, they ought, at least, to give him the means of falling back on the land as a security for liberty and life'.

Speaking at Granby Row Fields in June 1841, O'Connell complained of:

the folly of the chartists in resisting the cry for cheap food, and said he should like to know if a shopkeeper told one of them he might have 2lb of bread for a penny, whether he would answer, "No, I want the charter, and must give you two-pence" - (Cheers).

After the Repeal Association expressed its want of confidence in O'Connor O'Connellites distributed placards questioning,

Who has been the uniform opponent of any alteration to the unholy bread tax? Feargus O'Connor...Who said the repeal of the Union would be of no service until the people's charter was obtained? Feargus O'Connor's paper, the Star. Working men, if you want cheap bread and free trade - if you want the repeal of the Union - if you desire to see the people's charter carried...prevent your cause being destroyed by sham hands...if the people are to conquer, let them be united; united they can never be while O'Connor leads.

It has been widely presumed that loyalty to O'Connell among the immigrant Irish is indicative of a snub to class interests. However at the same June 1841 meeting O'Connell declared that he supported four of the five points of the People's Charter (not annual parliaments) and significantly placards circulated calling on the public not to be fooled by the divisive tactics of 'a factious clique of hired fools, to create disunion between chartists and repealers'. O'Connellites and members of the Operative Anti-Corn Law Association were by no means precluded from being Chartists. Indeed there was a considerable overlap of personnel - Edward Curran and Christopher Doyle were both anti-Corn Law and Chartist lecturers. The organizations were so incestuous that a O.A.C.L.A. meeting was broken up in October 1841 by indecision regarding whether a Chartist or a Repealer should act as its chairman. At the anniversary meeting of Peterloo an Irish workingman and Corn Law repeal advocate declared his support for the five points of the Charter, and in October the O.A.C.L.A. and the Young Men's Anti-Monopoly Association, in joint session, resolved to agitate for the Charter. In 1848 the two groups were reconciled in an enthusiastic alliance.
The Chartists made a direct play for Irish support, staging reconstructions of the trial of Robert Emmet and employing Irish orators, attracting large Irish audiences.¹⁷º In 1839 R. J. Richardson (a Manchester National Chartist Convention delegate) claimed to represent 30,000 Irish.¹⁷¹ There were branches of the National Chartist Association in Little Ireland¹⁷² and Repealers signed the National Petition.¹⁷³ In Manchester the Chartist banners combined harps and shamrocks.¹⁷⁴ When O'Connor spoke in the city he emphasized his Irish origin, and it was no accident that he chose Manchester as his venue in October 1841 to announce that 'henceforth he would go for the Repeal of the Union along with the Charter'.¹⁷⁵ O'Connor lectured on repeal in Liverpool in 1843¹⁷⁶ and in 1844 denounced the 'gross injustice practised upon Daniel O'Connell' announcing himself 'an Irish Repealer and an English Chartist'.¹⁷⁷ In Newcastle in 1839 O'Connor called onto the platform, ‘My Irish friend’, T. A. Devyr, and Bronterre O'Brien, a regular speaker in Newcastle, in 1842 went to great lengths eulogizing this “new feature” of the second National Petition.¹⁷⁸

Although it was important in the early history of Chartism, being the first northern city to adopt the National Petition,¹⁷⁹ and the source of much violent rhetoric,¹⁸⁰ after the arrests that resulted from the 1839 “Battle of the Forth”¹⁸¹ and the disillusion induced by the collapse of the General Strike and the planned 1840 rising,¹⁸² Chartism in Newcastle was not as vociferous and active as in Manchester, and consequently it is not as completely documented. Here too men like Peter Doyle were both O'Connellites and Chartists, leading D. Thompson to conclude: 'He perhaps illustrates as well as anybody the danger of assuming a king of ideological purity among the rank and file of popular movements'.¹⁸³ Those arrested in July 1839 included Peter and Barnard Flannaghan, William Campbell and Peter Devine.¹⁸⁴ A Chartist public meeting invited the people of Ireland to join in their struggle,¹⁸⁵ and in 1848, although there was no concrete union and joint action here between Chartists and Repealers, the parties convened to pronounce their support for repeal of the Act of Union and for John Mitchel.¹⁸⁶

Belchem highlights the anomaly that while Chartism has been portrayed as
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notoriously unsuccessful in Liverpool, the city occupies the largest single file in the Home Office Disturbance Papers for 1848. Liverpool is traditionally viewed as poor ground for Chartism on account of its economic structure. The Liverpool working class largely comprised unskilled labour and waterfront artisans committed to the Tories, with few of the skilled craftworkers who elsewhere constituted the backbone of Chartism. Moore controverts that the movement was stronger in Liverpool than has hitherto been suggested and insists that explanations in terms of economic structure are overestimated, for if anything kept the workers from Chartism it is not indifference but prior political commitment. However it was economic interests that in many cases determined that prior commitment. Certainly in 1839 confusion regarding the nature of Chartism rendered participation in it an insult for enemies to sling at each other. When the *Liverpool Standard* accused Precursor leader George Smith of making Chartist speeches he fervently denied it, condemning Chartists as 'ignorant revolutionists', many of them Tories and anti-Catholics, and welcoming Rev. Mr. Gibson's denunciation of them. Moore regards the Liverpool Irish thus as consciously rejecting Chartism in favour of Repeal. Peter McDouall and Christopher Doyle lectured in Liverpool in 1841, but by 1842 the movement was losing much of its momentum. In 1844 an address by William Jones pre-emptively called for the English working class and Irish Repealers to unite (interestingly not for the Irish to join the Chartists). Suspicion remained in 1848. Irish Confederate leader Reynolds denounced divisive and distracting Chartists 'class politics' and leaders struggled to mobilize Confederate in alliance with the Chartists. Moore is therefore right to regard links between Irish Confederates and Chartists as 'nothing like as strong' as was the case in manufacturing districts. Although Liverpool Chartists were temporarily revitalized by the union, there is no comparison with the enthusiastic Manchester alliance. Indeed Moore does not regard the two groups as co-operating in 1848 in Liverpool, Chartists being rather merely 'overshadowed' by Confederates.

When the N.C.A. executive declared "some of the best in the camp of liberty are Irishmen" this was certainly true of Manchester where the Irish were
disproportionately over-represented in the Chartist hierarchy. In 1841 the Chartist branches of Manchester and Salford submitted forty-one names for membership of the general council of the N.C.A., of whom at least seven were Irish-born. Irish Chartist lecturers included Edward Curran, Philip McGrath, John Doherty, Maurice Donovan, John Murray, Charles Connor. Patrick Murphy Brophy, David Ross, John Campbell, George White, James Leach (the one-time president of the N.C.A., who claimed responsibility for the idea, and who, ironically, represented the English Chartists in the symbolic handshake with the Irish Confederates on St Patrick's day, 1848), Christopher Doyle (one of the directors of the Chartist Land Company, who was lecturing on Tyneside in 1844) and Daniel Donovan (leader of the Manchester Chartist council and National Assembly delegate, whom O'Connor described as one of the 'veritable OLD GUARD'). Among those Manchester Irishmen on the Chartist National Executive were Thomas Clarke (also director of the Chartist Land Company), Christopher Doyle, James Leach, Peter Murray McDouall and John Campbell (who became its secretary and was included on O'Connor's list of trusted Chartist leaders published in April 1841). In Newcastle too it seems that the Irish were prominent. T. A. Devyr (later a writer for Irish World) was perhaps the city's most prominent Chartist, and, with two indictments pending, he was forced to flee to America in 1840. Among the speakers at the 1839 Good Friday meeting was an Irish lecturer called O’Niel, and Henry Cronin (a Chartist noted for "outrageous conduct") organized drilling, established a radical school and, with his interrogative "canvas", effectively terrorized Bedlington. Significantly Bernard McCarthy was the only Liverpool Irish Chartist of any repute.

Assessing disturbances in London, Gilley regards the Garibaldi commotions as dramatically demonstrating the differences in political loyalties of working class English and Irish. Accordingly Cooter suggests that differences of allegiance during the conflict between Garibaldi, the hero of liberal England, and the Pope enhanced the political isolation of the Irish by making them seem 'totally out of touch with English political realities'. This is perhaps true in Liverpool, but less certain in Newcastle.
(which Cooter refers to) where anti-Garibaldi incidents are rare and relatively trivial.

In 1859 Liverpool Irish collected funds to support the Pope against Garibaldi and the Catholic bishop went to Rome to present money and good wishes. In 1860 when Pio Nono reiterated the appeal for money and men Liverpool Irish again responded, and the Liverpool Catholic Northern Press attacked Garibaldi. Porcupine ridiculed Irish disloyalty:

The murtherin Saxon
We turned our backs on;
For England’s inimies
We’ll always aid;
Her hated rule, boys,
Is mane and crule, boys;
Her yoke we spurrin
In the Green Brigade.

However conflicts of affiliation did not become obtrusive until 1862 when a Birkenhead Anglican clergyman (a known Orangeman) organized a workingmen’s meeting in ‘Sympathy for Garibaldi’, announced on orange banners. Catholic mobs launched an angry assault on the venue of the debate and on Protestant churches. This provoked a furious reaction from the Liverpool press. Not only was the attack regarded as anti-Protestant, but, more significantly for the Liberal press, anti-free speech. The Mercury implied that priests condoned this violence to intimidate their political opponents. When another debate on the same subject was arranged (provocatively it could be said), preparations were made for trouble. Belligerent Irish massed again armed with staves and led by priests commenced an attack on the police. A night’s rioting left two police dead and 12 Irish in gaol. This was the most severe clash associated with Garibaldi in the country and it provoked a national outcry. Amid much criticism of the local magistracy it was suggested that the incident really had nothing to do with Italian politics. Porcupine lamented:

If the poor ignorant savages...knew what they were fighting for, we could hope to reason with them. But what’s Garibaldi to them, or they to Garibaldi?...Savagery may triumph for the moment, but Englishmen, after enjoying freedom of opinion for centuries, are not going to lose such a treasure without a struggle...Irish priests and their congregations cannot learn too soon that mob law will never be permitted to override our most ancient and cherished social liberties.
The *Liverpool Courier* complained:

> How long is Birkenhead to live under the fear of Bludgeon law? Are free Englishmen to be domineered over by the Pope's ragged Legermen?...These ruffians will not permit an assemblage of Englishmen to express their sympathy with a brave and honest hero. Tomorrow they will endeavour to close our schools, our public worship or a political meeting.\(^{32}\)

When another meeting was proposed the army was sent in and Liverpool Orangemen prowled the streets of Birkenhead looking for Irish to beat up.\(^{23}\) Sectarian relations deteriorated on Merseyside. Irish correspondents wrote to Liverpool papers dissociating themselves from those taking part\(^{34}\) and Irish Liberals disowned their co-religionists in the 1862 Liverpool election.\(^{35}\) In 1864 *Porcupine* criticized Liberal councillors Whitty, Yates and Sheil for opposing a council motion to invite Garibaldi to Liverpool (on the grounds that it constituted an insult to Catholics) and reflected, 'Roman Catholics are liberal as long as they have to secure anything from Protestant Governments. They are advocates of despotism at all other times'.\(^{36}\) But it observed that unease was explicable as Liverpool Orangemen were trying to identify themselves with Garibaldi.\(^{37}\) In 1864 the Garibaldi-enamoured *Mercury* protested that Liverpool Catholic club was indulging in anti-Garibaldi songs and speeches.\(^{38}\)

Irish hostility to Garibaldi determined the in vogue currency of abuse at the Newcastle races in 1866\(^{39}\) and, Cooter suggests, underlining differences in orientation, perhaps augmented subsequent opposition to Fenianism. In October 1867 the *Newcastle Chronicle* lashed out:

> By acts of culpable indiscretion they have contrived to throw away much of the sympathy they would otherwise have had the right to claim.\(^{40}\)

However the violence at Newcastle races was an isolated incident indicative of inebriation and the fear of Fenianism, rather than fundamental differences of political orientation, and this incident cannot be compared to the disturbances in Birkenhead. Garibaldi had already visited Newcastle in 1854, and twice in 1862 without provoking any comment.\(^{41}\) The only incidents prior to 1867 were when certain Irishmen threatened the owners of a ship called the 'Garibaldi' ('The petty persecutions to which Messrs. Rogerson have been subjected...at the hands of the unreasoning and intolerant
Irish ought to get them increased support from the public', railed the Newcastle Daily Chronicle, and when a threatening letter was sent to an Italian tradesman in 1864 signed by "A Hibernian". This latter was immediately condemned by the Catholic clergy, who protested that the culprit was probably not even Irish, and the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle dismissed the incident as the work of a crank - 'evidently a fellow whom no true Irishman would countenance'. Therefore contrasts with Manchester, which experienced no documented clashes, are unwarranted. The issue did not again precipitate open conflict and was too distant and short-lived to significantly influence relations in the long-term. Incidents in Liverpool had far greater meaning, demonstrating the sympathies and divisions of the working class crowd, and deeper repercussions.

Irish interest in domestic, municipal politics has been dismissed as the manipulation of votes and parties for nationalist and religious ends, derived from the supposition that the experience of nineteenth century Irish politics instilled an orientation towards national and not local issues. This was the conclusion of George Comewall Lewis and J. P. Culverwell. However working class participation as a whole in formal politics did not start to develop substantially until the last quarter of the century, and, assisted by the nationalist union with the Liberals, the Irish were in fact able to become peculiarly involved at this level. The rapid integration of the Irish in Newcastle in municipal politics has implications for both local tolerance and Irish assimilation, confidence and ambition. Bernard McAnulty was the first Irishman to sit on an English town council, being returned as a Home Ruler for East All Saints 1874-82. Thomas Dunn (1842-3) was the first in Newcastle's succession of Irish Catholic mayors, and later he served as an Alderman. Stephen Quinn (who represented St Nicholas ward on the city council and was 'since his early manhood connected with the business, the education, and the municipal life of the city') was sheriff, alderman and Mayor of Newcastle, as later were Johnstone Wallace and his successor Alderman Fitzgerald. Digby Seymore (who led the counsel for the Manchester Martyrs' defence) combined being a nationalist with being Recorder of Newcastle.
E. Timlin and John Fitzgerald, Beattie and Harkus were members of Newcastle
council in the 1890s, and John Scanlan, Tom Larkin and Austin McNamara were
prominent in local government. Like James McHugh and John Mullen, McAnulty
also served on the board of Guardians and, like many other Irishmen in Newcastle, on
a school board. Furthermore a Catholic priest chaired Tynemouth Education Board
from 1889-91.

Of Liverpool in 1872 Heinrich wrote, 'here the Irish people are represented on
every local Board and Committee'. Weight of numbers, community confidence
and alliance with the Liberals made the Liverpool Irish prominent in municipal affairs to
the extent of conspicuousness, provoking accusations of Tammany politics and
questions of what Home Rule had to do with the government of Liverpool? Brady
writes that Irish involvement in Liverpool municipal politics was regarded as 'a sort
of anarchistic side-show so far as the Liverpool authorities and townspeople were
concerned', but Irish influence was too weighty to be dismissed so lightly. Moreover
they were not just there to bang the Home Rule drum, and were increasingly actively
involved in city government. Indeed it was asserted that the Irish were plotting to
monopolize the municipal government of Liverpool.

In 1866 R. Sheil was the only Irish Catholic on Liverpool council, causing
Shimmin to complain 'Irish interests are but imperfectly represented'. Co-operation
with the Liberals in the next ten years added J. Whitty ('the Daniel O'Connell of
Liverpool'), and John Yates, who like Sheil sat on the select vestry, health
committee and the school board. By the early 1870s Home Rulers began to
challenge successfully Liberals, producing an effective ethnic voting block on the
council, and also contested school and poor law board elections. Dr. Commins and
A.M. Bligh became aldermen; C. MacArdle was on the school board; first
working class councillor J. G. Taggart and Bligh on the health committee, G. J.
Lynskey on the finance and water committees and Taggart on the estates committee,
baths committee and Lancashire Asylums Board, before being expelled from the
council for pro-Boer disloyalty. In 1906 Porcupine described him as 'the ablest of the

Irish nationalists', who, 'knows more about municipal administration, perhaps, than even the Town Clerk'. During 1892-5 nationalists shared the running of the city council with the Liberals, five nationalists being deputy chairmen on council committees, and after superseded them as the council's second biggest party. Aside from nationalist councillors, E. Browne was an Irish Liberal member of the school board, and Irish Tory Democrat James Lowry was chairman of the select vestry. When the old Home Rule leadership was ousted in 1898 by the Harford brothers the focus on local community interests intensified, especially in the areas of housing and employment, reflecting, as Belchem suggests, the changing priorities of the second generation of Irish immigrants. This success is far more indicative of Irish militancy than of a receptive environment, and Liverpool did not have an Irish or Catholic Mayor until 1943 (Austin Harford). Revealingly by 1903 a motion was put forward at the United Irish League conference to exclude all those not Irish-born, recognizing how acclimatized many had become.

The Irish were distinctly more prominent in municipal government in Newcastle and Liverpool than in Manchester. According to G. Connolly Catholics were active in Manchester public life in the late eighteenth-century when Daniel Lee was a councillor and alderman. John Doherty participated in a movement trying to secure radical control of local government in the 1830s, was vocal in parish meetings, and printed a series of pamphlets on local government reform, but Irish input in this area is thereafter quiet until the end of the century when McCabe and Boyle rose to prominence through the Liberals and Rose Hyland became the first woman on Manchester Board of Guardians and Eva Gore-Booth emerged as a delegate on Manchester Education Committee. Manchester did not have a Catholic mayor until 1913 (Dan McCabe).

In 1872 Heinrich insisted, 'the Irish are attached to no party but to Ireland' and in theory members of the I.N.L. were not allowed to belong to English political parties and were banned from participation in local elections, but during the last quarter of the century the campaign for Home Rule promoted close practical co-
operation between Liberals and Irish nationalists. By 1870 Newcastle Liberals were unanimously pro-Home Rule and had a keen interest in ameliorating conditions in Ireland. Joseph Cowen in particular made Irish reform a personal crusade, campaigning for release of Fenian prisoners, and, along with Burt, seceding from the Liberals over the issue of coercion. These opinions were articulated locally through the *Newcastle Chronicle*. Newcastle took great pride in being the first English constituency to return a member pledged to Home Rule, and Cowen's efforts precipitated grateful addresses from the Newcastle Irish:

> Your...deep sympathy with our national aspirations, place you among those whose memories are cherished by every Irish patriot, and among Englishmen there is not one who, by persistent energy, determined advocacy, and honesty of expression used in the cause of Ireland, has enshrined himself more lovingly in the Irish heart than you have.

John Morely too was an enthusiastic Home Ruler, becoming chief secretary for Ireland in 1886, and many nationalists disapproved of local Parnellites contesting his seat. John Barry offered a hand of friendship to Newcastle Liberals in 1887 and by 1890 Newcastle L.N.L. had a Gladstone branch. However Newcastle did have a Liberal Unionist contingent. Goschen spoke there in 1886 and 1893, a workingmen's unionist club was established in 1894, and two Unionists were elected in the 1895 election. But Cooter regards it as appropriate that it was in Newcastle that in 1891 Home Rule was officially acknowledged as at the forefront of the Liberal platform. Home Rule Bills were promoted by Liberals as 'deserving of the most strenuous public support', and Newcastle Liberal Club attended the funeral of "father" of the Irish in Newcastle' Bernard McAnulty.

In the 1874 election Irish support for the Liberal candidate in St Michael's ward, Manchester, was so extensive that local Tories accused him of having joined the Home Rule Confederation. Manchester Land League wrote fan-mail to Joseph Cowen, and after Parnell's arrest Irish in St Michael's ward abstained in the 1881 election rather than vote Tory. In 1882 a public meeting complained that Liberals were not paying enough attention to Irish interests, but in 1885 Manchester nationalists defied Parnell's instructions to vote Conservative and remained staunchly
Liberal and all six Liberal Associations in Manchester passed resolutions warmly supporting Gladstone's Home Rule. In 1885 members of Manchester and Liverpool Liberal Associations attended a Free Trade Hall banquet called by the National Reform Union to celebrate Irish members who had suffered imprisonment. By 1887 Manchester Liberals orchestrated Home Rule demonstrations, and in 1890 they were responsible for inviting recently released William O'Brien to Manchester. The Guardian regarded this as fitting, given that Mr Schwann, Liberal member for north Manchester, was an ardent advocate of the Irish cause and had campaigned for O'Brien's release. In 1889 at the National Liberal Federation annual meeting in Manchester Gladstone emphasized Irish issues. Gladstone ('the world's greatest statesman') indeed became very popular amongst the Manchester Irish, and after 1891 his portrait replaced Parnell's in Manchester homes. J. R. Clynes recalled going to hear him speak in Manchester on the subject of Ireland, but having not 'the slightest hope of getting into the hall'. In the 1892 general election the I.N.L. central executive urged branches to poll 'every Irish vote' and to assist in the Liberal canvass, which they did with great thoroughness. In 1893 the Manchester Irish met to express their support for and gratitude to the Liberal party and John Morley was enthusiastically received in the city. So was their espousal of Home Rule, that Manchester Liberals resolved it to be 'the first object' of the party in December 1894, and consequently the main Conservatives strategy of the 1895 election was to attack this allegiance, which they did with some success, it proving a liability to Liberals in all but the North division. However their pro-Home Rule campaign won Liberals an increased share of the poll in central Manchester, John Dillon visited the city to express thanks to them, and the Manchester I.N.L. castigated John Redmond for opposing the Liberal government. Irish publicans became very involved, canvassing for the Liberals despite their advocacy of local option.

Unlike in Liverpool nationalists in Manchester were unable to operate autonomously, but some were able to establish a semiautonomous role within the Liberal party. Thus half of the New Cross ward Liberal executive council had Irish
names. The best documented examples of this breed are Dan McCabe (of St Michael's ward, and vice-president of North Manchester Divisional Association) and Dan Boyle (I.N.L. organizer for Lancashire and Cheshire, councillor for New Cross ward, vice-president of North East Manchester Liberal Association and campaign manager for the division during the 1900 general election), who, as ethnic leaders and Liberal radicals, in the 1890s cemented the common interest. However, though many Irishmen gained prominence in Liberal wards, they were limited to three of the city's six divisions (Manchester North, North East and South West) and their influence at divisional level was weak. Thus when in 1897 the North East division (containing New Cross Ward) elected eight representatives to sit on Manchester Liberal Union only one was Irish, despite dominance at municipal level.

The Irish were never able to dominate Liberal policy and differences remained regarding temperance and voluntary support for Catholic education. The relationship was moreover not always wholly amicable; in 1885 the Liberal Union were accused of deliberately offending the Irish as the East Manchester candidate was a Unionist and the North-East candidate an Irish landowner, and until 1891 Liberal Unionists could remain members of Manchester's Reform Club.

The Catholic sympathies of the Liverpool Liberals were apparent at an early date. In 1836 Whigs invited O'Connell to the city, and in 1844, as the Catholic Club was set up to co-ordinate votes, the party courted their favour by organizing meetings for 'Justice for Ireland' at which O'Connell spoke. In the 1837 election the Irish accordingly backed the Whigs and in 1847 co-operation secured the defeat of the town's Ultra-Tory parliamentary candidate Sir Digby Mackworth. Russell's Ecclesiastical Titles Bill however damaged relations significantly. Irish were not prepared to support sitting Liberal Thomas Birch at the 1852 election as he had supported the Act, but stoned the Tory candidates. By the late 1850s Whitty and Sheil were again singing the praises of the 'great and progressive Liberal party'. Increasingly Irish co-operation was appreciated as vital to Liberal fortunes, but proximity to Ireland and sheer concentration of numbers rendered the Irish here more
assertive and autonomous than was the case anywhere else. This declaration of independence brought confusion and division to Liberal ranks, as witnessed nationally, Waller points out, only after Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule.320

By the 1870s Liverpool Irish were no longer content to have their interests represented by the middle-class Whig Catholic Club, and Home Rule candidates began to challenge Liberal seats. 'We therefore decided to make some public men', wrote Denvir.321 This decision, Brady observes, was a move 'of some political sophistication'.322 In 1873 Dr Andrew Commins did not fulfil his threat of standing in a Liverpool by-election on a nationalist platform, but the Liberal candidate's subsequent defeat provoked speculation about Irish potential.323 This was confirmed in 1874 when Irish abstention caused the majorities of Liberal MPs Caine and Rathbone to be seriously dented.324 After the election, in which nationalists influenced voting practice much more than the Catholic Club, the latter was reconciled with the Liberals and became part of their official organization, leaving nationalists free to direct the Irish vote.325 Brady remarks that the eclipse of Catholic by nationalist influence occurred far earlier and more completely in Liverpool than was the case in Ireland.326

In the 1875 Scotland ward election Home Ruler Lawrence Connolly challenged a Whig, to become Liverpool's first Home Rule councillor. Accusations of ingratitude to the Liberals soon began to emerge.327 The party recognized the Irish to be indispensable rather too late, several ward associations selected Home Rulers in 1876. The working relationship with the nationalists was the lodestone of Liverpool Liberalism', writes Clarke.328 Predictably Conservatives accused Liberals of being hand in hand with Irish nationalism, presaged disaster, and thrived on the differences appearing within Liberal ranks, which were all too visible in the nervous speculations of Porcupine.329 The Irish were not appeased by Liberal concessions and they were again challenged in the Home Rule-dominated election of 1876 (bringing victories for Commins in Vauxhall and Bligh in Scotland ward)330 and in 1877 (with Patrick de Lacy Garton's defeat of a Catholic Liberal in Scotland).331 The Mercury accurately predicted that their next move would be to put forward a parliamentary candidate.332
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As the Irish became more confident they began to put pressure on the city's Liberal MP, Rathbone. His refusal to concede (occasioning congratulations from *Porcupine*), however, alarmed local Liberal leader Holt who recognized that it was electorally imperative to accommodate Irish interests.\(^{333}\) By the 1880 by-election Holt worried that 'unless we can square the Home Rule element we will lose 2500 votes and the election'.\(^{334}\) Threatened with A. M. Sullivan standing as an independent Home Ruler, or Irish abstention,\(^{335}\) Liberal candidate Lord Ramsay controversially promised to support William Shaw's Home Rule inquiry, much to the alarm of the Liberal front bench.\(^{336}\) The *Mercuy* described the consequently enthusiastic polling of the Irish 'content and energetic workers of Liberalism'.\(^{337}\) This pledge was a gift to the Conservatives who played the Home Rule card to much effect. The election had the highest turn-out of any recorded before the 1880 general election, and, while not an especially impressive Tory victory, Ramsay was defeated.\(^{338}\) On reflection Lord Sefton advised Holt:

> It was *Home Rule* that made the Tories and Moderate Conservatives poll to a man, to say nothing of keeping many moderate Liberals away altogether. If you are to fight again, your candidate must state distinctly that he cannot vote for inquiry into anything that directly or indirectly means the dismemberment of the United Kingdom.\(^{339}\)

But in the general election of the same year when Samuel Plimsoll refused to placate Irish demands he was defeated, and in 1882 Liberals suffered when the Irish abstained in reaction to the Coercion Bill.\(^{340}\)

In 1883 nationalist-Catholic allegiances further deteriorated as Home Rulers decided to challenge nationalist Liberals, including John Yates in Vauxhall. His challenger Pat Byrne called for support for 'true national principles as opposed to Whiggery and sham Nationalism', and rejection of 'Union Jack Papists' and 'English popinjays'. But Catholic loyalties triumphed as Yates won easily in this ward where 1200 out of 1500 voters were Irish.\(^{341}\) Defeats in Scotland, Exchange, Vauxhall and St Paul's furthermore encouraged the gulf that was increasingly obvious between the old respectable leadership and the new hard-liners emerging in Liverpool.\(^{342}\) Alliance with the Liberals was regarded as all too cosy. In *Irish Programme* Denvir attacked loyalty
to the Liberals as causing Irish needs to be neglected. While the Liberals were becoming increasingly accommodating they could not be reconciled to these extremists. The Mercury condemned Irish nationalists of this kind as 'noisy, arrogant, pretentious, grotesque, and aggressive, but not formidable', and applauded 'reasoning' Irish for not being seduced by these 'Extremists'.

The 1885 general election was remarkable in Liverpool not just for the election of England's first Home Rule MP, T. P. O'Connor, but because of Parnell's intervention in support of O'Shea as Liberal candidate for Exchange, in contravention of his own manifesto backing Conservatives. The business was an embarrassment to O'Connor and was hardly welcomed by Liverpool Liberals, despite Parnell's pledge to support them in other constituencies. As O'Shea lost by only 55 votes, despite the fact that most Irish electors had no fondness for him, Denvir recalls, the episode says more for Parnell's clout than for Irish-Liberal relations. In some other Liverpool seats, however, Irish revolted and supported Liberals, as in Kirkdale where James Samuelson combined sympathy for nationalism and labour. Here John Redmond only got 765 out of a potential 2700 Irish votes. When Gladstone announced his support for Home Rule the majority of Liverpool Liberals welcomed it and 'among local Irishmen the general feeling is one of hearty approval'.

In May 1885 a Liberal Unionist Committee was established (attending the Reform Club) and a candidate challenged O'Connor's seat (as other Liberals always refused to do). In 1887 Liberal Unionist Chancellor of the Exchequer G. J. Goschen was defeated in an Exchange by-election as the I.N.L. canvassed for an alternative Liberal candidate. This caused great embarrassment and the Times railed that a minister could be defeated by 'the Irish rabble' and lamented the extension of the franchise. In 1897 a Liberal Unionist was elected for Exchange, provoking 'considerable embarrassment' among the Liberals.

Other Liberal elements still reconciled easily with nationalism such as Land League subscriber John T. Brunner and editor of the Liverpool Daily Post, and Liberal MP for Bridgeton, E. R. Russell, and in 1888 Liberal radicals invited John
Dillon MP to a Reform Club dinner. Between 1889 and 1891 Liberals benefited from Irish electioneering and registration work and the city even had an Irish Liberal Association. John Morely spoke in Liverpool on 'The Irish Question', and the Liberal Association organized a defence fund for Parnell. After clearing his name Parnell came to Liverpool to celebrate at a Reform Club banquet in his honour.

T. P. O'Connor (incidentally a member of the National Liberal Club) had always been a great admirer of Gladstone, and when the Liberal leader visited Liverpool in 1886 the two of them exchanged compliments. When Gladstone came out against Parnell, O'Connor, valuing the Liberal alliance, quickly turned against his former leader, and in the elections of 1890, 1891 and 1892 he encouraged Liverpool I.N.L. branches to put their faith in the Liberals. In 1895 the I.N.L. accepted an offer of financial help from the Liberals, effectively compromising their independence. But in the election of that year strain was evident as Liberals lost Exchange and O'Connor's Scotland majority was halved. In 1899 O'Connor was voted the Liberal Review's 'Man of the Week', but that year the I.N.L. effectively declared its independence from the Liberals. By the 1900 general election O'Connor urged the Irish to remain loyal to the Liberals after the majority of the party had relinquished their commitment to Home Rule, and on that account he was damagingly challenged by more aggressive nationalist Austin Harford.

Forwood increasingly made great play of this alliance presenting the Liberals as treacherous dupes of the Irish, and the increasing social radicalism of Liverpool nationalists alarmed more conservative Liberals. In 1889 when St Anne's divisional Liberal Association, Gladstone Club, Shamrock League and I.N.L. met to choose a joint candidate the Irish were not happy with the selection of a Catholic slum-landlord and chose their own candidate, a pro-labour Jew, reflecting changing community priorities. Addressing Liverpool Reform Club in 1899 Sir Edward Grey emphasized that the party must look to objectives other than Home Rule, and when formal cooperation ended it was a relief to many Liberals. Nationalists' pro-Boer speeches were embarrassing and when the Marquis of Northampton therefore suggested the
abandonment of the Home Rule cause Liverpool Reform Club greeted it with
cheers. Liberal Councillor Grant resigned from St Anne's ward as maintenance of
the constituency necessitated courting Home Rule. But in 1900 the electoral
importance of the Irish was demonstrated as, with nationalist organizers in Exchange
concentrating on helping O'Connor cling on to Scotland, the Exchange Liberal
candidate suffered a heavy loss.

Liverpool Conservatism was infamous for exploiting working-class anti-Irish
and anti-Catholic sentiments. Kirk regards Conservatism as not merely exploiting
ethnic divergence for immediate political ends, but fostering awareness of it in the
long term 'as a means of dividing and controlling the working class'. In 1881 the
Liverpool Review analysed why Liverpool was Tory, concluding that it was on
account of popular dislike of the Irish as wage suppressers and religious aliens.
Revealingly the same article was reproduced in 1898. The majority of the English
were unshakeable Conservatives, and the Irish kept them so', writes H. J. Hanham.

Prior to the Whig reforms of the 1830s Liverpool Tories, assured of municipal
dominance, had no need to court the favour of Orangemen. The Whig council's
introduction of non-denominational schooling in 1835 provoked a furious Protestant
reaction, orchestrated by 'real creator of the modern Conservative party' Hugh
McNeile. Support of the town's Irish clergy, who put their churches and schools at the
Tories' disposal, was central to the party's resurgence. In the general election of 1841
Tory majorities increased and in the municipal election of the same year 13 of 16
wards returned Tory councillors. On the day of the general election Tory workingmen
ported Orange ribbons and their candidates were stoned by the Irish. McNeile's 'Irish
Brigade' marched through the streets of Liverpool with Bibles attached to long poles
and the result was 'proclaimed by exultant pealing of church bells'. The issue
revitalized the party who consequently advocated Protestantism as a rallying call. By
this time no Tory candidate could be elected without McNeile's endorsement and
from its foundation in 1838, the Operative Protestant Association remained central to
Tory fortunes. From 1841 Tories dominated Liverpool through a policy of portraying
patriotism (in a town conscious of bombardment by foreign immigrants) and political liberty as threatened by Popery. This was implicitly linked with ethnicity, exploiting workers fears of the economic threat of Irish immigration. Already by the 1840s some moderate Tories were becoming uneasy with the direction McNeile determined, but these tactics were too successful to be moderated. The Tory *Liverpool Standard and Liverpool Herald* enthusiastically endorsed the Orangemen. Irish Orangeman John Sheppard was elected as Tory candidate for North Toxteth in 1842, and in 1847 McNeile and his cronies brought forward 'uncompromising Orange zealot' Sir Digby Mackworth as a candidate, who campaigned for the repeal of Catholic Emancipation and reintroduction of the Test and Corporation Acts. In 1862 Tories objected to John Yates as a Liberal candidate on account of his Catholicism. G. Melly lamented, 'the old bigotry and intolerance is as strong as it was a when they would not even allow a Roman Catholic to hold the place of a tide waiter in her Majesty's customs'. The Murphy riots illustrated that sectarianism could effectively mobilize the newly enfranchised working class, and the tactic was revitalized with the establishment of the Workingmen's Conservative Association. In the registration court Conservatives objected to householders with Irish names as 'the lowest scum of the earth'. Their tactics changed little in the last quarter of the century and if anything Orange bigotry became more influential and more extreme, anti-ritualism animating the party. In 1886 the *Liverpool Daily Post* concluded that the party owed its success to Forwood and to 'old-fashioned darkness and bigotry'. After Forwood's death Liverpool Conservatism lacked strong leadership and Protestantism became a source of unity as Salvidge and Wise pushed the W.M.C.A. into a commanding position.

Home Rule was a gift to the Liverpool Tories, who consistently ridiculed and condemned the movement exaggerating implicit dangers for Liverpool and implicating the Liberals. Orangemen congratulated Forwood for such declarations, but he needed protection against Irish assaults. Interestingly when the Irish turned against Parnell some Liverpool Conservatives jumped to his defence as 'the sturdy Protestant'. During Home Rule debates in 1892 and 1893 Forwood appealed to
working men's pockets, painting a grim and emotive picture of Home Rule filling Liverpool with unemployed as Irish industries were bankrupted. Lord Randolph Churchill was brought to Liverpool to three times declare that Ulster would fight and be right.\textsuperscript{385} The issue of patriotism was also resurrected against the Irish at the turn of the century, as Conservatives campaigned to eject nationalists from the corporation for being pro-Boer.\textsuperscript{386}

Sectarianism was not, however, the sole foundation of Conservative success. Neal claims that McNeile 'won over' the working class, but, as Moore points out, many were already habitual Tories.\textsuperscript{387} Protection was an important rallying call to tradesmen and dock artisans alike,\textsuperscript{388} civic duty and pride were emphasized,\textsuperscript{389} and perhaps most importantly Liverpool Tories perfected Tory Democracy firstly under Samuel Holme, later A. B. Forwood, and finally under Archibald Salvidge.\textsuperscript{390} Combining these elements with sectarianism, it has been suggested that the movement Salvidge led anticipated Fascism.\textsuperscript{391}

After the alarm at the 1848 aborted rising and 'Papal Aggression', the Irish presence, though perhaps not the 'single mainstay of the Conservative party',\textsuperscript{392} became a politically manipulable issue elsewhere. Manchester looked with disdain on the 'Political Protestants of Liverpool',\textsuperscript{393} but the best documented example of Tory ethnic exploitation outside Liverpool is the 1867 Manchester election, in which approximately seven-thousand working men voted Tory.\textsuperscript{394} As the Liberals embraced Home Rule the Conservatives increasingly played the Unionist card and cultivated popular prejudices. Speaking in Manchester in 1892 Arthur Balfour pronounced: 'If we have to choose between injustice to Englishmen and Scotchmen and injustice to Ireland, I, for my part, am prepared to go for injustice to Ireland as the least of two evils. - (cheers).\textsuperscript{395}

The Irish also played a more positive role in the success of Liverpool Conservatism. Brady boasts that 'it seems safe to say' that there were almost no Conservative Irishmen in Liverpool,\textsuperscript{396} forgetting that many of the Orangemen who constituted the backbone of Liverpool popular Conservatism were Ulstermen. There
were also many Irish-born Conservative councillors (for example James Lowry, T. McCracken, P. Guffie, C. Petrie and William Grey Ellison McCartney) and MPs (J. G. Gibson, S. R. Graves, and Lord Claud Hamilton). Furthermore differences with the Liberals occasionally brought Catholic Irish into the Conservative fold. In the 1861 election Liverpool Catholics voted Conservative because of Liberal support for Garibaldi, and the bells of Catholic churches rang to celebrate the Tory victory. Catholics, furthermore, could never be reconciled with the Liberals over denominational education, and indeed Conservatives courted them over the issue, to the wrath of Orange elements. Parnell's instruction to vote Conservative in 1885 was conveniently in line with fears that the free education outlined in the Radical Programme was a threat to denominationalism. Eight out of nine Liverpool seats were duly won by Conservatives, provoking Orange accusations of 'truckling to Catholics and Ritualists'. T. P. O'Connor's opponent in 1900 plugged his Irish ancestry and Tory Democrat credentials. It has also been suggested that Irish voting Conservative was significant in the Manchester results in the elections of 1874 and 1885. In 1876 Manchester Conservative candidate Mr Powell pledged himself to support for Home Rule but he was booed at a meeting of Irish electors. In Newcastle Tory Charles Hammond also professed support for Home Rule, and the issue received little hostile manipulation in the 1867 election, as, Cooter reflects, the background of a popular militant Protestant Toryism was lacking.

That the Irish tended to vote Liberal rather than allying with Labour is not indicative of class alienation, as until 1900 the socialist movement remained notably weak in general. As McCabe professed, while there was a sense of common cause, the Manchester Irish saw their best interests (both class and ethnic) for the present being with the infinitely stronger Liberals, particularly since the I.L.P. viewed Home Rule as an issue which merely divided the working class along 'irrelevant sectarian lines'. Bohstedt reflects that, unlike in Manchester, Liverpool lacked a skilled artisan class or factory proletariat, hindering the evolution of a labour movement, while, comparing it with Glasgow, where he regards working men as rejecting sectarianism in favour of
socialism, J. Smith views Liverpool's Labour movement as weak because of the domination of Tory Democracy and Irish nationalism, both of which appealed for, and got, working class support. But in Liverpool labour did emerge, sponsored by Irish nationalism. A second generation of nationalists (including Sexton, Taggart, T. Kelly, William Grogan, Hugh McAleavy, Pat Byrne, J. Grant, L. Connolly, J. Clancy and the Harford brothers) prioritized labour issues, causing tensions with older Home Rulers (such as the unsympathetic Dr Commins). In 1890 Sexton launched the 'Bootle Rebellion' in protest at Parnell's over-conservative social policies. Sexton was on the executive of the Fabians and was one of the first to join the LL.P. He proclaimed that it was in the Liverpool Home Rule movement 'that I imbibed most if not all of my progressive ideas'. Taggart was of a like mind explaining 'all social and labour questions are part and parcel of Home Rule'. Irish presidents of Liverpool Trades Council included Sexton and Tory Democrat James Lowry. In 1882 a branch of the S.D.F. was established in Liverpool, lead by Irishman John O'Brien. On account of O'Brien's origins, and because advocates of labour on Merseyside in general tended to be nationalists, Orangemen began to attack S.D.F. meetings in 1886. In 1889 councillors Connolly and Taggart spoke in support of the labour candidate for West Derby William Matkin. This provoked Forwood to lament that Tories now had two classes of Home Rulers to fight, Gladstonians and labour. In Great George Street and South Toxteth 1892 municipal elections Irish voters rejected labour candidates in favour of Home Rulers, heeding Lynskey's inflammatory advice to "remember they were Irishmen first and Liverpudlians after". During the strike-riven and poverty-striken early 1890s nationalists strongly advocated the rights of workers. In 1891 Taggart appealed to the I.N.L. at its party conference to take on the cause of labour, and in 1892 Councillor Clancy approached Liverpool Trades Council on behalf of the unemployed, asking it to organize demonstrations and relief work. Sexton became chairman of the new Unemployed Association, sat on the Labour Committee, opened a labour bureau and organized a campaign asking for subscriptions. T. P. O'Connor subscribed to the labour bureau and endorsed Sexton's campaign to have dockworkers
brought under the Factories and Workshops Act, provoking an address of thanks.\textsuperscript{420} I.N.L. member (and future Liverpool Irish Labour leader) James Larkin organized demonstrations of the unemployed, and after became a regular street-corner Socialist orator in Liverpool.\textsuperscript{421} Under O'Brien and 'theatrical Irishman' Bob Manson demonstrations became increasingly militant. O'Brien became frustrated with the L.T.C. for not helping the unemployed and in protest stood for election in five wards simultaneously.\textsuperscript{422} In 1894 and 1897 the I.N.L. discussed the possible threat of the I.L.P. to its organization, and ruled that members should be allowed to join no other organizations.\textsuperscript{423} At the same time in the Manchester New Cross Ward election the I.L.P. accused the Liberal-nationalists of stealing their programme. McCabe and Boyle were firmly within the radical wing of Liberalism. Supported by local trade-unionists in their policies, they encouraged the adoption of working class candidates by the party,\textsuperscript{424} and defended the I.L.P.'s right to hold political meetings on municipal land.\textsuperscript{425} In 1897 the \textit{Manchester Guardian} described Dan Boyle as 'the most stalwart champion in the council that the Labour cause ever had'.\textsuperscript{426} By the end of the century Irishmen P. Walls and Pete Curran (later Labour MP for Jarrow) were emerging as labour leaders in Newcastle.\textsuperscript{427} By the 1906 General Election the Irish were working enthusiastically for Labour in Manchester, and I.N.L.-educated J. R. Clynes became Labour MP for the city.\textsuperscript{428} In Liverpool Sexton's transition was complete as he stood as the Labour candidate for West Toxteth.\textsuperscript{429} The U.I.L. branches that formerly had been decked in Liberal red and Irish green, were now also be decorated in Labour yellow.\textsuperscript{430}

II

Manchester and Liverpool have been exaggeratedly portrayed by the contemporary sensationalist popular press, and by historians, as cities packed with armed and ardent Fenian separatists. The nature of nationalist participation has been distorted, and consequently it has been exaggerated as an incitement to hostility. Rather, in practice, evidence strongly suggests that nationalism actively promoted
integration into the English political system. Additionally it is debatable just how unfavourably seditious opinions would have been received in the midst of a politically conscious and radical working class such as Manchester's, and evidence from Newcastle (despite the comparative paucity of Irish numbers) reveals that contrasts are by no means as distinct as Liverpool and Manchester's notoriety suggests.

In April 1798 Bow Street officials travelled to Manchester to arrest United Irishmen. The following year a House of Commons report detailed how societies of United Irishmen were operating in this 'centre of conspiracies'. Converts had been made among the resident Irish population, there were reports of drilling, and the White Hart Inn (known as 'Liberty Hall') had become a meeting place for Irish nationalists. The report expressed concern at the following these seditionists were gaining among the people of Manchester, some of whom had, with Irish encouragement, formed their own Constitution of United Englishmen. Connolly speculates that many of the rumours about the activities of United Irishmen were exaggerated. Undoubtedly this is true, but there is evidence of United Irishmen settling in Manchester, such as John Murray (who became an ardent radical and Chartist), who was celebrated as an 'old paddy veteran from our sister isle'.

Throughout the 1820s, 1830s and 1840s the Home Office received reports of Ribbonism in Manchester, indeed O'Connell regarded it as the centre of the movement. Denvir wrote that there were eight Ribbon lodges in the city by 1830, who co-ordinated the clash with Orangemen of that year. Connolly traces substantial Irish numbers in the Freemasons and Ancient Knights Templar, both of which were regarded as subversive organizations, and while at first Manchester Hibernian Society was an innocent welfare organization, by the 1830s it had a nationalist agenda. Despite denials, the clergy feared it had links with the Irish equivalent, and it became increasingly suspect in 1832 as it identified itself with the Friendly Sons of Erin, the Patriotic Society of the Shamrock, and the Knights of St Patrick, all of which the clergy condemned as covers for Ribbonism. The Hibernians are evident until 1838, when, condemned by the church for corresponding with the Dublin Ribbonmen, they
sought anonymity as sick and burial clubs, and operated covertly within branches of the Repeal Association. Appropriately in the 1830s the three presidents of the Northern Union of Ribbonmen were based in Newcastle, Manchester and Liverpool. In Newcastle the Hibernian Society remained strong for longer, as the campaign of the Catholic church against it illustrates. Whereas it was stifled in Manchester, the Irish lapsing into Chartism and the Confederatism for collective assertion, the church had considerable difficulty suppressing Ribbonism in Newcastle. In 1858 Bishop Hogarth lamented, “the Hibernian Society, we regret to find, is too widely spread among the industrious poor of our Diocese”. As late as 1862 R. Belaney (who estimated there were still 300 Ribbonmen in Newcastle) wrote to the Chronicle:

There is a general impression in this country that all Irishmen who come into it are as a matter of course Ribbonmen...But it is only an act of justice to the masses of Irish who live among us, to make it known, that the great number who are Ribbonmen, is exceedingly small in comparison of the great number who are not...the rest are wont, most unjustly, to be branded with the same odious name of Ribbonmen, and to suffer on account of it, employers being often unwilling to take Irishmen into their works lest they should belong to that society.

Belchem and Connolly regard Liverpool, with its close links with Ireland and large Ulster ('prime Ribbon territory') population as a 'natural breeding ground' and 'particular stronghold' for Ribbonism. Evidence supports this. In 1822 Liverpool Ribbon delegates attended a major conference in Ireland, and in the early 1830s, when leading Liverpool clergy met in discussion with the Knights of St Patrick and demanded that secret communication with Ireland should be renounced, the Knights refused. Rev. T. Robinson confirmed in the Report on the State of the Irish Poor that in the early 1830s a secret society in Liverpool communed with an equivalent in Ireland. The Dublin-based Irish Sons of Freedom rivalled the Northern Union (also known as the Sons of the Shamrock) operating in Liverpool in the 1820s and 1830s and was amongst those marching in the Liverpool St Patrick's day parade of 1841. As the primary port of entry for Irish immigrants Liverpool played an important role in both societies. The Leinster-based society fought with its Ulster rival for the allegiance of the Liverpool Irish during this period, in an extension of traditional
inter-county rivalry. Particularly active in maintaining that tradition were the Molly Maguires with their oaths of mutual assistance.\textsuperscript{449} In 1832 a Hibernian Political Union was established in Liverpool to promote repeal of the Union and the abolition of tithes.\textsuperscript{450} By 1836 Liverpool clergy claimed to have put secret societies down, but in 1838 correspondence was discovered between Liverpool Hibernians and Dublin Ribbonmen,\textsuperscript{451} and, despite further clerical efforts, in 1844 D. Hearne still regarded the Liverpool Hibernians as Ribbonmen.\textsuperscript{452} Indeed the Northern Union had infiltrated church-endorsed benefit societies, such as the Knights of St Patrick, St Patrick's Fraternal Society and Liverpool Catholic Friendly Society, whose funds were being employed to finance terrorism in Ireland, and a Liverpool Hibernian Benevolent Burial Society was established in 1832 which bogusly swore loyalty to the Queen, while the Sons of Freedom operated in secret with no facades.\textsuperscript{453} Liverpool Ribbonmen met in pubs and indeed a number of licensees held office, including some women. In 1842 Whitty estimated that there were thirteen Ribbon pubs in the town.\textsuperscript{454} In 1844 it was furthermore alleged that 'an immense number of the police' belonged to Ribbon societies. Consequently in 1852 Ribbonmen, as well as their traditional rivals Orangemen, were banned from the force.\textsuperscript{455}

The scale of participation and the nature of Ribbonism is hard to determine in the urban context. When the \textit{Newcastle Chronicle} inquirer stumbled upon a ribbon meeting in Sandgate in 1850, he reflected that the gathering seemed as much social as political.\textsuperscript{456} While they did, as Bryson declares, exist to oppose Orangemen, this was not Ribbonmen's only, or indeed their prime, function, especially outside Liverpool.\textsuperscript{457} Moreover, Belchem's study of them in the latter town reveals this to have been only one of their many functions. Ribbon societies allowed collective assertion of labourers, provided relief and employment networks for trampers and new arrivals, and fostered Irish identity and political cohesion.\textsuperscript{458} Indeed, serving both class and ethnic interests, Ribbon societies bridged the gap so often regarded as unfordable by historians. Using secrecy, oaths, rituals, and frequently changed passwords and signals, and promoting 'organized crime, sectarian protection and collective
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mutuality', R. J. Cooter sees Ribbonism's exclusivity as fostering working class suspicion and hostility. Such societies indeed represent the implant of Irish traditions, and were in some ways defensive. However it is arguable how alien their practices were from those of other contemporary clubs and unions, equally scorned by the Catholic church, and, while it is frequently reiterated that they operated under the cover of benefit societies, this was in fact the primary practical function of Ribbon societies in England.

Support for O'Connell, given the very public division between O'Connell and O'Connor, is regarded by J. H. Treble as doing little to advance working class unity. However the exclusivity of allegiances is the subject of debate. Treble contentiously asserts that Irish political affiliation in England was dictated by O'Connell, and reinforced by their priests' wholehearted commitment to his programme.

O'Connell certainly did have a large personal following in Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle. In June 1828 and June 1836 meetings of Mancunian sympathizers raised subscriptions for his election expenses. In 1833 John Doherty told a vast open-air meeting that "20,000 real, stout, determined Irishmen" in Manchester were ready to assist their fellow countrymen in resisting the Coercion Bill, and a petition containing 14,000 names was produced demanding withdrawal of the Bill, abolition of tithes and the introduction of a Poor Law in Ireland. O'Connell spoke in Manchester and Newcastle in 1835 and 1841 and was 'hailed with deafening applause' by huge and very excited audiences. The Newcastle Journal disparagingly scoffed, 'The Irish Big Beggarman is actually to be exhibited alive, and fed, in Newcastle...There is not an Irish hod-man or Popish pig-jobber within ten miles around but will attend'. O'Connell was a regular visitor to Liverpool, speaking there in 1831, 1836, 1837, 1840, 1843, 1844, 1845 and 1846. He was always 'welcomed with the most deafening and enthusiastic cheers', and in 1844 tickets to hear him speak traded as three times their official price. At a Reform Association meeting to raise election expenses for O'Connell a labourer declared:

He stood there as the representative of millions who had hitherto been treated as aliens in their native land... He did not stand their to rip up old grievances, or repeat anything that had
been done in ignorance by the British people (Hear, hear)...He wished to give the right hand of fellowship to every just and sensible Englishmen; his countrymen were willing to bury the past in oblivion - but they were determined to be raised to the same scale of social and political rights as their fellow citizens in the United Empire (Loud cheers)...he would place his family as a rampart, and stand behind them with a musket in defence of his rights and liberties (Cheers).472

Some took their loyalties very far. In a Shudehill beershop in September 1841 a man was stabbed for insulting O'Connell.473 Reflecting that this was not simply the act of an extremist crank, the issue of rumours of Chartist insults to O'Connell (popularly of burning and hanging his effigy) was adopted by the Anti-Corn Law League that year as a means of rousing the Irish to violence.474 In March 1844 large bodies of Irish gathered in Liverpool and Newcastle to express their concern at the trial of O'Connell. Dr Reddell related:

he found, as he visited the hovels of the poor and sick in the town, the utmost concern was manifested by them, and every Irishman asked him what was likely to be the issue of them...if any misfortune was to befall Mr O'Connell...then every Irishman would consider that it was inflicted not on a friend, but the father and protector of their country (applause).475

Processions in Manchester subsequently celebrated O'Connell's release from prison.476 His death in 1847 was commemorated with a Mass in St Mary's church, Newcastle,477 and his body lay in state on a steamer on the Mersey where 'immense crowds of the public of Liverpool' were allowed to pay their respects before it.478 Afterwards O'Connell became a folk legend. On St Patrick's day 1850 Liverpool Irish carried banners of O'Connell through the streets.479 The 'Friends and Admirers of the Late Lamented Daniel O'Connell' were still meeting in Manchester in 1854, and raising funds to support John O'Connell as an MP, in Liverpool in 1858 poor Irish gave money to support O'Connell's family,480 and in Newcastle Town Hall in 1860 a large, 'respectable' and enthusiastic audience gathered to hear a lecture 'On the Life, Times and Death of Daniel O'Connell'.481 Of 1875, when O'Connell's centenary was celebrated in Dublin, Denvir recalled, 'so great was the rush to cross the channel for the celebration that we chartered several fine steamers...and kept them for several days fully employed in crossing and recrossing'.482
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Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle all developed powerful branches of the Repeal Association and Precursors. Doherty became secretary of the Manchester Repeal Association, and a repeal petition, available to sign in his shop, by April 1834 had accumulated over 26,000 signatures. In a 2p. pamphlet of O'Connell's writings and speeches, which Doherty published and distributed, his postscript urged radicals of 'whatever country gave you birth' to help. In 1839 there were 3000 Precursors in Liverpool, and in 1840 Luke Healy told O'Connor that, he had no doubt, from the intense feeling that was entertained for Repeal, that before Christmas there would be 5000 Repealers in Manchester and the surrounding districts alone.

Between April 1840 and January 1841 Manchester contributed £208 12s to the Repeal coffers, and before the end of December 1840 a thousand females alone had enrolled as associates. In 1841 a Repealers Journal was published in Liverpool and the movement claimed a membership of 3000. 1842 saw a Repealers Hall and an Irish Reform News Room opened and collections of rent averaged £20 per week. 1843 witnessed 'Monster Meetings' in Manchester and Liverpool and swelling financial contributions. In 1844 Liverpool contributed £348 to repeal coffers. Faucher described the fervour of O'Connellite Irish in 1844:

Often they assemble in hundreds at the corner of Oldham and Ancoats Streets. One of their number reads in a loud voice the Irish news, the addresses of O'Connell, or the circulars of the Repeal Association; and afterwards, the whole is commented upon without end and with great clamour, by the closely pressed crowd.

However Irish affiliations were not homogeneous, and political differences were often at the root of inter-Irish street battles. More importantly, support for Repeal also did not preclude participation in working class politics, as is illustrated by the diverse allegiances of 'O'Connellites' John Doherty, Edward Curran, Christopher Doyle, James Leach and George Condy. Indeed, it fostered it.

Perhaps more significantly admiration was by no means exclusive to the Irish. 'Friends of Ireland' convened in Manchester in 1831 to condemn the restriction of O'Connell's meetings and issued a petition demanding repeal of the Act of Union signed by 12,000. The following year a Friends of Ireland Society was established 'to
aid the patriotic exertions of Daniel O'Connell for the freedom of Ireland'. Lots of native radicals attended the 1836 Manchester meeting, and radicals invited O'Connell to Liverpool to celebrate his achievement over Emancipation, and 'friends of reform' raised £300 for his Dublin election expenses. 'We hope the example thus set by the operatives of Liverpool will be generally followed by the working classes throughout the country', praised the Liverpool Mercury. In 1844 the editorials of the Mercury condemned O'Connell's imprisonment and, like the many English Protestants who attended and spoke at meetings for this purpose, campaigned for his release. Upon his death the paper commemorated him as 'a great man'.

But not everyone was so enthralled. Upon his visits to Liverpool O'Connell had to have a body guard to protect him against Orange attack. In 1836 Orangemen provoked a disturbance by booing the 'Big Beggarman', and the Standard was little less inflammatory, scoffing, 'This is the O'Connell by whose presence the town of Liverpool is to be polluted...whether the loyal Protestants of Liverpool will suffer this man to appear and depart from among them unrebuked remains to be seen'. In 1843 a heavily policed meeting in which O'Connell spoke was, as predicted, besieged by a 100-strong armed Orange brigade, and during his trial in 1844 Orange carpenter youths burned effigies of him and attacked meetings calling for his release.

Although Liverpool continued to contribute more to repeal coffers than Dublin in 1846, dissent was starting to emerge. In May Doheny spoke in Liverpool, advocating Young Ireland, and the widespread disenchantment provoked by the humiliation of Clontarf was registered in declining attendance at meetings. In June George Archdeacon was denounced by O'Connell (trying to reassert his threatened authority) and dismissed from the Liverpool Repealers for making physical force speeches. When O'Connell spoke in Liverpool in July he received a stormy reception from an audience hostile at rumours that he was going to ally with the government. Former leaders of the Repeal Association George Smyth, Terence Bellew McManus and Robert le Poer French quickly voluntarily followed Archdeacon, and urged others to do likewise. Le Poer French declared: "I honestly
confess and feel that it is now right to declare that I cannot, dare not, be a party to a national repudiation of physical force in every contingency.  

At the N.C.A. Birmingham convention in 1843 'an Irish mafia, daring and eloquent', of Christopher Doyle, Thomas Clarke and Philip McGrath (all Mancunian-Irish Chartists), called for a union of the Chartists and Irish nationalists. Five years later this was realized. In 1848 Young Ireland abandoned its formerly elitist and undemocratic leanings, and, with the demise of O'Connell and inspired by risings in Europe, Irish nationalists emphasized socio-economic considerations more than religious, thereby negating much of the prior incompatibility with Chartism. An Irish Confederate club was established in Manchester in early 1847 in the former Chartist haunt of Great Ancoats Street. By 1848 thirteen such units existed in the town. Encouraged by O'Connor's denunciation of coercion, industrial depression, turn-outs and talk of the French revolution, inclination to unite with Chartists was growing. Declarations of common suffering were issued and at Chartist meetings there were cheers for "O'Connor, Repeal and the Charter". A number of former Irish Chartists joined the Confederates, including James Leach, John Murray, P. M. McDouall, John O'Hea, J. J. Finnegan, Michael McDonough, Daniel and Maurice Donovan and James Hoyle. At a January Confederate meeting in Dublin James Leach advocated an alliance. In the Mancunian context, given the history of overlapping allegiances, this was not such a 'fundamental departure' as Strauss suggests.

St Patrick's day 1848 saw the first public outing of the united Irish Confederates and Chartists in Manchester - the commencement of the 'Three Glorious Days'. Feargus O'Connor, accompanied by T. F. Meagher and M. Doheny, 'proclaimed their alliance', in both English and Gaelic, before a large crowd assembled in the Free Trade Hall. English Chartists and Irish Repealers "fraternized" and shook hands. O'Connor described this meeting as the realization of his goal of unity. Certainly it brought a new political unity to the Manchester Irish community. Clergy appeals not to participate, this being 'likely to annoy the well-disposed portion of our fellow citizens', went unheeded. The following day a
demonstration demanded repeal of the Union, and in the evening 'an Anglo-Irish soirée' was held in Manchester Town Hall. Here the union was celebrated by around four-hundred workingmen, who heard speeches from O'Connor and Doheny dwelling 'chiefly upon the community of cause between the democracies of England and Ireland', and declaring that 'unless England and Ireland were allowed each to govern itself, the democracies of both countries would be crushed by the united aristocracies'. The 19th of March was marked by a joint camp meeting on Oldham Edge, attended (in the pouring rain) by what Doheny declared to be half a million people, but the Manchester Guardian more conservatively estimated to be around 16,000. To promote the alliance James Leach and George Archdeacon began publishing *The English Patriot and the Irish Repealer*. Euphoric declarations ensued. Confederate James George Clarke proclaimed:

> Feeling each succeeding day more strength in the union we have formed, and more delighted in the happy amalgamation of the ill-used operatives of both England and Ireland, we hereby renew our former pledge of brotherhood, and declare that nothing shall separate us, but that we shall pursue our onward march to freedom.

Talk of 'physical force' rapidly ensued after the Irish rising, and "O'Brien, Meagher and Mitchel" (recently arrested in Ireland for sedition) became the customary cheer at Chartist meetings. A meeting of Chartists on the 5th of April declared:

> The Chartists in this country would agitate the land if England dared to draw a sword or point a bayonet at Ireland or Irishmen (Applause).

On the 10th of April proclamations of unity were reiterated to coincide with the Kennington Common meeting, and on the 21st Mitchel and Smith O'Brien were proposed as delegates for Manchester at the National Chartist Convention. Between mid-April and mid-July there were thirty-eight recorded public meetings of the alliance in the city, including a demonstration of 7,000 in Stephenson Square on 29 May to protest at John Mitchel's conviction and 'express their determination to avenge the wrongs they have done him'. Demands for a rising were by now endemic. Mrs Theobald called upon women to assist:

> The Repealers, for their part, were determined to go back to Erin-go-bragh - (Cheers). They were prepared to take the field.
by storm, and whether Lord John Russell liked it or no, they would make him like it (Cheers).\textsuperscript{536}

The suspension of Habeas Corpus in Ireland provoked spontaneous angry marches.\textsuperscript{537} On the 30th of May and 1st of June armed mobs, marching under banners of 'Mitchel and Liberty, or death', attacked police stations, and contemplated taking the town hall by force. Mounted police with cutlasses and hussars charged the mob.\textsuperscript{538} The \textit{Manchester Guardian} complained 'How long is this to be endured?'\textsuperscript{539} Belchem sees these actions as co-ordinated by the Irish contingent, provoking division between them and the Chartists. But the local press makes no such distinctions.\textsuperscript{540} 8-10,000 (or 40,000 as the Chartists claimed) attended a meeting on Blackstone Edge to protest against the transportation of Mitchel and Ernest Jones where 'the speeches were the most seditious and violent that have been uttered for many years past'.\textsuperscript{541}

It is not clear how numerous or how involved the Irish Confederates and the Chartists were, but significantly the police found it very hard to distinguish between the two groups. They estimated that there were around seven-hundred active Irish Confederates in Manchester, operating from thirty-two clubs meeting in twelve known places.\textsuperscript{542} The police took the alliance very seriously, and with rumours of a planned rising 10,974 special constables were recruited in March 1848.\textsuperscript{543}

A simultaneous rising was planned for the 12th of August.\textsuperscript{544} Manchester was to be burned, police stations attacked and the magistrates shot.\textsuperscript{545} Raffles were held among the Irish for guns and pikes, an arms shop opened at the Rochdale Road headquarters of the 'Brian Boroihme Club',\textsuperscript{546} and, in a provocative display, Confederate clubs marched and drilled in military fashion on Cheetham Hill.\textsuperscript{547} Police and military were readied, mill owners warned and the fire brigade put on alert.\textsuperscript{548} On the 11th the leaders were involved in an all-night strategy planning session.\textsuperscript{549} The Chartists of Ashton-under-Lyne, Dukinfield, Stalybridge, Bolton, Bury, Oldham and Royton were to arm on Monday night and march on Manchester, where they would be received by their 'brethren in arms' and fire six or eight of the largest mills.

This rising failed ultimately because of lack of co-ordination and communication and a huge military and police presence. Fewer turned out from
Oldham than had been expected and consequently they lost their nerve. The Ashton delegation arrived too early, and having shot a policeman panicked. In Manchester vast numbers massed. But a huge police presence (the mayor having been tipped-off of their plans by a renegade Confederate\textsuperscript{559}) intimidated them into waiting for the peripheral delegations to arrive before they commenced. However, none got that far.

The hitherto derisory \textit{Guardian} sighed,

\begin{quote}
In the annals of conspiracies and emeutes, in all countries, there probably does not exist one instance to parallel that of Monday night last in this district. At least we know of no conspiracy at once so extensive in its ramifications and so numerous in its confederates, which failed so signally and utterly in its object...There is now no doubt that the various chartist associations and Irish Confederate clubs...were in a conspiracy for the purpose of assembling in all their strength, and every man armed,...to march upon Manchester, and there stealing a march upon the authorities, for the purpose of striking a blow, which should carry with it alarm and terror throughout the district, and even show the government of the country, that, if the insurrection had been put down in Ireland, there was not wanting either the materials or the disposition for an insurrectionary movement in this part of England.\textsuperscript{551}
\end{quote}

On the 13th the police struck, arresting fifteen Irish Confederate leaders and eighteen Chartist leaders, effectively crushing the movement.\textsuperscript{552}

W. J. Lowe casts doubt over whether there ever would have been a rising, arguing that the organization, arms, numbers and will were absent and that talk of rising was merely a means to sustain morale.\textsuperscript{553} However contemporary evidence is contrary, and this was certainly not just the work of a few hot-headed extremists. New club-houses had to be found in late August as so many wanted to attend meetings and funds were enthusiastically donated for the defence of prisoners,\textsuperscript{554} but in the autumn (assisted by a decline in economic difficulties) the movement disappeared almost without trace. This should, however, not in itself be used as a judgement of its prior importance, especially given that the same can be said of Chartism.

Belchem writes that union between Chartists and Irish Confederates was really a Manchester phenomenon, and has little to do with Liverpool politics.\textsuperscript{555} Here the agitation of 1848 was indeed overwhelmingly Irish dominated, and more covert and seditious, resembling the Fenian plotting of the 1860s far more than the celebrations.
of class unity of Manchester. Agitation in Liverpool was co-ordinated by the politically educated nationalist middle-classes, which did little to enhance unity with Chartists. Dr Reynolds, for example, warned a Chartist demonstration: 'I would not set class against class, and I would not join you if I though you would have any hatred of the middle class'.

In January 1847 McManus attended the ordainment of the Irish Confederation in Dublin. By February McManus, George Smyth and Dr Murphy were representing Liverpool on the Irish Confederate Council. A Confederate club was set up in Liverpool in June, pre-empting the formation of clubs in provincial Ireland, and it quickly became a popular organization.

Enthused by revolution in France, Liverpool talked of physical force earlier and with more commitment than Manchester, and while public gestures of reconciliation with Chartists were made, Liverpool co-ordinators being closely linked with the Dublin leadership, from an early stage the principal purpose of the movement was to provide diversionary activities in the event of Ireland rising. In March unemployed porters demonstrating on the Exchange demanded 'bread or blood', and rumours circulated of Irish agents being in Liverpool to co-ordinate a rising. As St Patrick's day approached police were informed that the Repealers of Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow were 'concocting mischief and even entertained the idea of setting fire to these towns possibly on the 17th'. Precautions were taken against arson, troops arrived, pensioners and several thousand special constables massed and parades were banned. When the day passed quietly a petition was sent to the mayor thanking him for his efforts, but others ridiculed the police for over-reacting. The Liverpool Mercury protested: 'The police authorities have made another fruitless attempt to suppress the constitutional right of the Queen's subjects to meet in public and discuss their grievances'.

Mass meetings celebrated the union between Chartists and Confederates. But the 'union' seems to have enhanced the Confederates Irish immigrant mass platform rather than reconciling them in practical co-ordination with the English. Interestingly
most of the meetings reported in the local press are gatherings of Confederates with little reference to Chartists participation. Talk of arming immediately ensued. It is interesting to compare the sentiments aired at Confederate and Chartists joint meetings held simultaneously in Liverpool and Manchester to coincide with the Kennington Common meeting on the 10th of April. While in Manchester unity and common interests of the English and Irish were emphasized, in Liverpool the meeting had an overtly nationalist agenda. Dr Reynolds proclaimed:

Let the Chartists of England and Irish Repealers unite in one grand body, and all the powers of England, and foreign assistance to help them, could make no impression upon the phalanx they would represent.

Reynolds established an 'iron-mongery business', selling weapons by raffle and subscription, and arms consignments were rumoured to be arriving from Ireland. These stories were dismissed by the authorities, who nevertheless ordered all incoming vessels and trains to be searched. Lowe and Neal too dismiss reports of arming, but there is considerable evidence to suggest that it was extensive. Informers revealed that Confederate clubs were teaching members how to build barricades, were drilling and having target practice, and hay-forks were being distributed to those who couldn't afford pikes. Alarm was growing and intelligence reports were received from New York saying that the Irish Brigade was planning to land in Liverpool, but the authorities remained anxious to subdue panic and statements were issued denying that the town was under threat. Mitchel's conviction provoked renewed anger and revitalized enthusiasm for rising. Confederates were in the meantime becoming more highly organized, establishing planning, arming, propaganda and finance divisions. It was estimated that by this point there were between thirty and forty clubs in Liverpool each with 2-4000 members.

When Ireland rose in July Liverpool panicked, and the Dublin press reported that it had, as planned, risen too. Although 400 members of the "Felon or Mitchel Club" did indeed go over to Ireland, McManus, who had assured Duffy that Liverpool was ready to commence diversionary activity, was angry that his promise and planning did not come to fruition.
Lowe writes that the 'Liverpool Confederate movement was effectively dead by the end of July', but as far as the authorities and the public were concerned that was far from the case. Liverpool police were informed that a rising was being planned for the 1st of August. 'Every possible preparation was made for any emergency which might arise': pensioners and special constables were sworn in and armed, a gunboat was stationed on the Mersey and the army set up camp in Everton. In 1850 Liverpool police estimated that these measures had cost them over £1150. Appeals from a panicking public for the suspension of Habeas Corpus to be extended to Liverpool were however declined. Interestingly a counter-petition also circulated condemning the proposed suspension of Habeas Corpus as 'an indelible stain on the town of Liverpool', and a spontaneous march protested about its suspension in Ireland. The Newcastle Daily Chronicle scoffed at the Habeas Corpus request and reflected 'their fears, and the cause of alarm, seem to be greatly exaggerated'. In 'Recollections of an Old Liverpudlian' one of the special constables remembered the great panic occasioned, but 'I don't think the civilian forces in one single instance came into hostile collision with "the enemy". In fact we were unable to meet with the enemy. We sought him east, west, north and south, amidst wild rumours of battles and sieges elsewhere'. With instructions from the Home Office the police raided Confederate clubs, recovering a mass of weapons and their minute book which revealed plans to barricade streets and fire Liverpool. On the 14th of August mass meetings, infiltrated by police informers, suggested imminent action, but on the 17th police struck, arresting Chartist and Confederate leaders.

After the arrests the press immediately began to minimize the scale of the movement. Frank Neal and W. J. Lowe likewise discount its importance, declaring that support for it was 'tepid and limited', and depreciating estimates of the number of Confederates in Liverpool. However contemporary police and press reports suggest that support was extensive, and the conspiracy failed, as in Manchester, because of effective police action, rather than lack of motivation on the conspirators' part, although the removal of leaders, notably McManus, to participate in the rising in
Ireland stopped effective co-ordination.591

Lowe writes that, as the Liverpool agitation did not really involve any practical union with the English working class, Confederate activities provoked popular hostility rather than enthusiasm.592 Evidence supports this. By August labourers were complaining of agitation damaging trade and emergency measures augmenting rates. Day after day the Liverpool Mercury received letters from working men angry at the Irish. Some suggested names of known Confederates should be published and they should be turned out of work, and others appealed to employers to only engage Englishmen. The Mercury lamented 'the growing feeling of animosity between the English and Irish portion of our humbler townsmen', discouraged victimization of Irish as likely to encourage extremism, and called on the 'respectable' Irish working class to give some demonstration in support of law and order.593

In 1845 McAnulty had become president of the Newcastle "Confederate" club and, in June 1848, of the "Number 1 Felon Repeal Club", into which 124 eager members were enrolled within twenty-five minutes.594 Newcastle's low-key Chartism and tenacious Ribbonism hindered the formation of a Chartist-Irish Confederate union. However, throughout 1848 McAnulty kept a boat standing by to assist Darcy McGee, who was trying to raise the Glasgow Irish, and allegiance and support for risings elsewhere was pledged at Chartist meetings.595 A meeting coincided with the Kennington Common convention, which, as in Liverpool, ended up discussing solely repeal of the act of Union, and adopted a petition in its favour, and in June a large public meeting gathered on the Town Moor, 'for the purpose of affording an opportunity to the Chartists and Repealers of this town to record their sympathy with the 'prosecuted patriot', John Mitchel'.596

The 1848 alliance has been dismissed as 'nothing more than well-intentioned, expedient rhetoric'.597 Lowe asserts that there were no concrete plans, insufficient popular support, no workable legacy and no official co-ordination of the two movements outside Liverpool and Manchester.598 It increasingly became apparent that the two groups were at tactical cross purposes. Irish Confederates had made
physical force speeches and wanted an immediate response to co-ordinate with the rising in Ireland, and consequently they could only ever be united in spirit with the physical force wing of the Chartists. Belchem sees the Irish as prepared to ‘infringe the codes and conventions of public space and political behaviour’, emboldened by the excitement of 1848, but the Chartists as constrained by British codes of political conduct, and consequently the union weakened rather than strengthened the working class front. He concurs with Lowe in regarding failure as the inevitable outcome of a half-hearted, ill co-ordinated hollow union of two organizations ‘not at all familiar with each other’. After the Kennington Common fiasco Confederates are portrayed as overshadowing the dispirited Chartists. This was indeed true in Liverpool. However, given the considerable history of prior interaction between the various parties in Manchester, and the ease and enthusiasm with which they were united, this should be queried. The six months before August 1848 progressively saw the disintegration of the mass platform necessary for a successful rising. For a while the alliance succeeded in prolonging northern Chartism, and indeed reinvigorated it in Liverpool, but it could not preserve it. It is evident that among the immigrant Irish, initially the motive force, the failure of the rising in Ireland in July added despondency to the preoccupation with the problems of the influx of distressed and disorientated Famine victims, no more fit to rise than those in Ireland had been.

Writing of the outcome of the events of 1848 in America, Belchem asserts that it necessitated a redefinition of identity among the Irish community. Its outcome was equally significant in England as, along with the Famine influx, this contributed to a strengthening of ethnic allegiance and community identity. But at the same time respectable society recoiled with the realization of the danger represented by this ‘internal other’, and Chartist aspirations of political respectability were crushed by their association with the violent Irish. It is remarkable how the old images of Irish savagery were resurrected to condemn the Chartists and divide the working class front. The English Patriot and Irish Repealer in August complained of the use of ‘The Old Original Dodge! Divide and Govern’. Lowe identifies that this was recognizable
even in the trials of the Liverpool and Manchester insurgents. While prisoners in Manchester were accused of wanting to redistribute political power, the more Irish-dominated offenders from Liverpool were charged with anarchically conspiring to destroy power and property. The really remarkable alliance in 1848 is, in Belchem's opinion, that between the public and the forces of law and order in defence of the status quo. An Old Liverpudlian indeed recollected joining up as a special 'amidst an eager crowd of fellow-patriots'. The Irish were identified as unEnglish separatists and seditionists, and this characterization, heightened by the 'Papal Aggression' and fortified by Tory propaganda, is commonly portrayed as initiating a period of hostility in the 1850s, undoing much of the positive development of the 1840s. However the extent to which they were left isolated socially and politically has been exaggerated. In Liverpool the Establishment indeed succeeded in turning sections of the working class against the Irish, but in Manchester there was too much positive unity evident in 1848 for it credibly to have been suddenly extinguished thereafter. Moreover in Newcastle with little evident Irish warmongering in 1848, and less of the accompanying social problems experienced in Manchester and Liverpool, it is unlikely that the population was notably susceptible to hostile characterization.

Lowe and Gilley contrast the extent of support for nationalism in 1848 and 1867 as an illustration of the development of community identity and political orientation. It is interesting that as Irish communities became increasingly settled and confident they became increasingly separatist. Tom Gallagher observes in Scotland that participation in Irish nationalism by second generation immigrants 'was as much a sign of alienation from the Scottish social system as a positive identification with Ireland', but national assertion also develops with community confidence and is a privilege of those whose time is not entirely consumed by the struggle to survive. Only in the 1860s does Lowe regard the Irish as undertaking widespread political involvement, believing that by this time the Catholic church had built a social organization for nationalists to build upon.

Though its scale is problematic to quantify, C. G. Smith estimated that in 1867
there were over 56,000 Fenians within fifty miles of Manchester. Head Constable Greig of Liverpool observed in 1866: 'I find the great majority of Irish labourers in this town...Manchester...and Newcastle...if not actually enrolled members of the brotherhood, are strongly impressed with the spirit of Fenianism'. Fenianism expressed the rage, articulated by John Mitchell and T. A. Devyr and shared by all the unwilling exiles that the Famine created, which they were in no state to express in 1848. Denvir wrote: 'It will not be wondered at that one who saw these things, even though he was only a boy, should feel it a duty stronger than life itself to reverse the system of misgovernment which was responsible'. As Kerby Miller identifies, an irate sense of exile was widespread even where inappropriate to personal circumstances, and this was exploited by nationalists. The stress of relocation was channelled into nationalism even by those for whom emigration was a positive choice. Like Lizzy and Mary Burns, who decorated their Manchester home in green and black, and J. R. Clynes, who on account of his parentage felt a duty to attend I.N.L. meetings, for both the Irish-born and the Irish-by-descent nationalism had a strong attraction, enhanced by loneliness, poverty and a sense of being hard-done-to. British-born children of Irish parents were brought up tutored in family chronicles of English misdeeds. Joe Toole reflected, 'Love of Ireland is, of course, natural to me; apart from that, my Irish grandparents insisted upon it'. In all three towns references are made to Irish gathering to hear The Nation read. Dr Mallen told the Newcastle Amnesty demonstration:

Dungeons might enclose their bodies, sin might cover their souls inches deep, the drink of English public-houses might damn them ten-thousand times, but they would never lose their love of their country.

Among the Liverpool Irish a sense of nationalist purpose was especially pronounced. 'Every pulsation of the national heart in Ireland was as warmly and as strongly felt on this side of the channel as though we still formed part of our mother island', Denvir recalled. With constant immigration and active nationalists always present, a strong sense of 'Irishness' was preserved. Comparing the Irish population of Liverpool with that of Glasgow Gerald Manley Hopkins observed that the former
retained a pronounced resentment of the town in which they had come to reside. They were, wrote Heinrich, 'sterling, true, and manly in the highest sense - Irish in heart, sentiment and soul'. Many participated in sentiments voiced by the Liverpool orange-seller girl in George Weerth's poem: 'for the good of my people...I should like the clover of Tipperary to grow over and choke the roses of England'.

Nationalism united (albeit sometimes with initial reluctance) Irishmen of diverse regional, economic, social and cultural backgrounds and genuinely contributed to a strengthened secular community identity, enhancing confidence and self-esteem. It was generally safe to be an Irish nationalist in the north of England, and progressively did not compromise one's respectability. T. P. O'Connor wrote:

In Newcastle...some of the wealthiest and most influential citizens were nationalists. They were prominent in the professions. They owned business houses and they were mayor's aldermen, town councillors, and members of boards of guardians. On every local governing body exiles of Erin or their descendants were watching and fostering the interests of faith and nationality.

T. N. Brown, like Kirby Miller, regards Irish American nationalism as 'something more than an Irish export', being both fostered and coloured by the experience and circumstances of emigration. This is equally applicable to Britain. Indeed Doyle regards the Irish in Britain as more obsessed with nationalism than those in America. John Devoy confirmed that in the 1860s 'The Irish in Great Britain were at that time even more intensely Irish than their fellow-countrymen who had remained at home...they were in the full sense of the term in an enemy's country'. It is not just coincidence that most nationalist leaders at some point experienced emigration. Heinrich observed:

In each district where Irishmen are to be found, Irish political feeling is instinct, and Irish patriotic feeling stirs the hearts of the people with a thrill as high and as holy as if they had never left their homes in the pleasant dells or sunny slopes of the "green hills of holy Ireland". Let the rights of Ireland be infringed, or the faith of Ireland slandered or alighted, and the flash of the eye and the flush of the cheek at once shows that no change of time or place alters the faith and fortitude of the Irish heart.

However there were more dreamers than doers and a great emphasis was placed on
the social side of nationalism. David Fitzpatrick observes that 'their modest political involvement was largely directed towards sustaining organizations within Ireland rather than serving the interests of expatriates', but, as Brown explains, nationalism did indeed serve a positive political and social function for the immigrant Irish:

Irish-American nationalism was riddled with ambiguities. An independent Ireland was the goal it pursued. But this was, after all, a remote possibility, a dream. Irish-American societies dedicated to this dream, however, were not at all remote. They were living realities, of consequence in American life. To all they offered companionship and to some business and political opportunities. They could transform a nobody into a somebody. In the minds of their members, therefore, these organizations tended to assume a greater importance than the pursuit of Irish freedom. Ends and means got confused.

Thereby nationalism exemplified conversely both an emotional sense of alienation and a practical exemplar of self-perpetuating social and economic integration.

December 1863 saw the first reports of Fenianism in Manchester, with speeches, fund-raising balls and tea-parties being held. Collections were made for the brotherhood of St Patrick in 1865, which, as Lowe illustrates, was quickly and effectively smothered by the I.R.B. The authorities took these developments very seriously. Detectives from Dublin arrived in Manchester to arrest Fenians, recovering seditious literature and arms, and remained during 1866. Collections for arms were being openly made, an engineering works turned out swords and bayonettes, and as St Patrick's day approached in 1866 soldiers and police readied themselves for trouble. However when Condon came to organize the city's Fenians he discovered a state of apathy and disorder. A period of re-organization followed, and in 1867 five hundred Fenians travelled by train from Manchester for the ill-fated Chester Castle raid, where informer Corydon witnessed them drilling. All had tickets from Chester to Dublin. Interestingly the Manchester Guardian observed that there was in the town much sympathy for this enterprise. The new I.R.B. chief executive, Thomas Kelly, established a head-quarters in Manchester, where on 11 September he was arrested with his aide Thomas Deasy. Fenian meetings in Liverpool agreed that Kelly 'must be liberated at any hazard', or 'the thing would collapse'. The numbers who were enthusiastic to participate in their subsequent rescue attempt to shelter Fenians and
raise funds is the first clear indication of the extent of sympathy for Fenianism in Manchester. Interestingly all those who were subsequently tried for police sergeant Brett's murder, though they claimed they were not guilty, admitted to being Fenians.  

The accidental shooting of Brett during the breaking of the prison van spurred an initial angry public reaction. Manchester Corporation offered £200 for the arrest of Sergeant Brett's 'murderers' and the government £300 for the capture of Kelly and Deasy while the Manchester Guardian demanded that 'the law must be invoked with unsparing vigour':

The community at large will certainly be culpable in the extreme if it allows the proved or assumed fact that the persons engaged in these plots are a comparatively small number to blind it to the truth of its being constantly in the presence of an armed enemy. In the streets in the workshop, and in the fields we come into daily contact with men who, under the guise of ordinary citizenship, are banded together for the purpose of making war upon the Government and our social institutions.

While a 'chain of friendly hands' spirited away Kelly and Deasy, society recoiled at 'the appearance of the public enemy in the heart of one of our greatest cities, organized and armed'. The Nation expressed its concern 'for the hundreds of thousands of our people, who, after years of toil in the service of England, are threatened with extermination because the Government is baffled in pursuit of two brave and daring conspirators'. The police were overwhelmed by informers, and many Irish were 'discharged wholesale' from their employments. The Manchester Courier articulated middle class Manchester's anger:

The importance of the Fenian conspiracy has been seriously underrated...Leniency has been tried already...all this gentleness has proved ineffectual, for rather it has served simply to encourage the rebels in their evil habits. Now, however, the time for gentleness has passed away.

Thousands of special constables were enrolled and house-to-house searches commenced, rounding up large numbers of Irish in what Denvir termed 'a perfect reign of terror', a wild expression of 'baffled vengeance'. 'Nothing that had ever occurred in England created such a wild panic', alleged John Devoy, The English people lost their heads and went into a frenzy of rage against the Irish. Every individual Irishman in England was made a special object of attack, as if he were
personally responsible for what had occurred in Manchester.\textsuperscript{683} Indictments for murder were levelled against twenty-nine Irishmen.\textsuperscript{684} A crowd set up camp outside the police station cheering the military and voyeurs crowded the police court - 'Their temper towards the men on trial showed they would lynch them if they could get at them'.\textsuperscript{685} A Besant noted, in hyperbolic tones, that 'the fiercest race passions at once blazed out into flame', driving the Irish to ground.\textsuperscript{686} John Devoy alleged that Irishmen in Manchester were 'beaten by mobs' and arrested 'merely because they were Irish'.\textsuperscript{687} Feelings did at times run so high that priests advised their flocks to stay off the streets,\textsuperscript{688} and defence lawyer W. P. Roberts was attacked in his hotel by an angry mob.\textsuperscript{689} 'Manchester was an armed camp, and panic still ruled', recalled D. Ryan.\textsuperscript{690} There must have been many cases like that of Owen Peter Mangan, whose Preston dry-goods shop was ruined by the suspicion aroused in the wake of the Fenian scare.\textsuperscript{671} However the council urged people not to strike out at the Irish (Alderman Clark calling for the public to separate 'from any participation in it the large proportion of the Irish population')\textsuperscript{672} and, contrary to O'Day's suppositions and Devoy's hyperbole, there is no evidence of inter-communal violence between the rescue in September and the hangings in November.\textsuperscript{673}

Irish crowds waited vigilantly outside the city gaol, and the \textit{Guardian} observed that 'No person moving among these people could fail to be struck with the number who were openly expressing their sympathy with the prisoners'.\textsuperscript{674} Fenians meanwhile raised funds to bribe the turn-key at the jail, debated whether to rescue or shoot Allen (as he had requested) before the British could hang him, contemplated assassinating witnesses in court or doing away with them before. 'They have the boys in Manchester who have all their addresses down already', Liverpool Fenians noted.\textsuperscript{675} Consignments of arms arrived,\textsuperscript{676} and Calcraft received threatening letters.\textsuperscript{677}

While those sections of public opinion already prone to anti-Irish sentiments were enraged at this overt manifestation of nationalist violence in Manchester, politically conscious working class organizations, especially in the light of the apparent manipulation of the trial and the subsequent hanging of Larkin, Allen and
O'Brien, expressed sympathy.\textsuperscript{678} During the trial there were hisses from the public gallery for the treatment of the prisoners,\textsuperscript{679} who complained that they had been 'convicted in consequence of the prejudices against Irishmen prevailing in the minds of the jury'.\textsuperscript{680} Reporters at the trial 'were struck with the utter improbability of Maguire having anything to do with the Rescue' and organized a petition for his release. 'But the evidence that was so defective in Maguire's case as to procure his release was quite sufficient to hang the other three', remonstrated Devoy.\textsuperscript{681} Protest meetings were held, and money flooded into the defence fund.\textsuperscript{682} The Reform League appealed to the Home Secretary, packed public meetings petitioned the Queen to exercise the royal prerogative of mercy, while influential citizens congregated in the Town Hall to petition the Home Secretary.\textsuperscript{683} \textit{Salford Weekly News} believed the executions were no cure and called on the government rather to introduce reform in Ireland.\textsuperscript{684} On the morning of the executions John Bright, John Stuart Mill and the poet Swinburne visited the prisoners.\textsuperscript{685} M. Harmon sees these developments as the closest Britain ever came to sympathy for Fenianism.\textsuperscript{686}

The death sentences 'drove another wedge between the alien and native peoples', writes O'Day.\textsuperscript{687} An admirer of Allen tried to murder a policeman who had testified against him.\textsuperscript{688} Rumours circulated that the Fenians would burn Manchester with Fenian fire (a rumour that surfaced again after the Clerkenwell panic, reflecting another low-point in inter-communal relations), as indeed was planned, and the \textit{Manchester Guardian} issued instructions for extinguishing it.\textsuperscript{689} Constables were issued with revolvers, operatives armed, troops sent, special constables sworn in, and the chief constable wrote to his opposite number in Liverpool asking if he could spare 100 officers.\textsuperscript{690} Manchester police appealed to railway companies not to bring voyeurs to the executions and mayors of local towns were advised to publish notices asking people to stay away.\textsuperscript{691} But huge crowds assembled along the barricaded and heavily policed streets to witness the hangings.\textsuperscript{692} The Lancashire Irish were 'nearly frantic with indignation'.\textsuperscript{693} 'Moderate and Fenian united', recollected D. Ryan.\textsuperscript{694} 'England hoped to terrorize the Irish by taking Irish lives, but she only fanned the spirit of
patriotism into a new flame and brought thousands of recruits to the organization', proclaimed John Devoy. But on the morning of the hangings Irish Manchester mourned:

"Throughout Manchester and Salford, silent congregations with tear-stained faces and hearts throbbing with a thousand emotions assembled in the various churches for a celebration of early mass for the eternal welfare of the young Irishmen doomed to die a dreadful death that morning."  

15,000 Irish marched to the New Bailey prison where they sang the Litany for the Dead. A. Besant recalled the tension:

"We drove up to the court; the streets were barricaded; soldiers were under arms; every approach was crowded with surging throngs. At last, our carriage was stopped in the midst of excited Irishmen, and fists were shaken in the windows, curses levelled at the 'damned Englishmen who were going to see our boys murdered'"

After the executions, in defiance of the clergy, three-thousand spontaneously marched in the rain before crowds of five to six thousand, initiating a yearly tradition that would become as much a part of the Manchester Irish calendar as St Patrick's Day. Larkin, Allen and O'Brien truly became Manchester's 'own patriotic saints'. Relics of the Martyrs were still preserved and displayed for public reverence in U.I.L. branches at the end of the century and it was common to find icons of the martyred three in Manchester Irish homes.

Though an isolated and atypical episode, the Manchester Martyrs affair proved significant in both Irish political and communal life. It reinvigorated community identity and solidarity, producing a new political consciousness and confidence, and a liberation from the political influence of the Catholic church, as is evident in the defiance of clerical opposition in the commemoration of the Manchester Martyrs. Engels reflected:

"All the Fenians lacked were martyrs...Through the execution of these men, the liberation of Kelly and Deasy has been made an act of heroism which will be sung over the cradle of every Irish child...the definite deed of separation between England and Ireland."

Suspected participants in the breaking of the van were still being tried in March 1868, and rumours continued of Kelly and Deasy being in Manchester, but
by April the *Guardian* reported, ‘there is little doubt that these sentences have had the
effect of breaking up to a great extent the Fenian organization in this city’. Several
Fenians had fled to America and except for a couple of balls to raise money for
arrested Fenians and the families of those executed, all was quiet.704 The Bishop of
Salford’s threat of excommunication in 1879 reconciled 700 Manchester Fenians with
the church, and during the next twelve months the number of lodges declined from 18
to 5. Visiting American delegates were horrified at this apparent dwindling and the
*Manchester Evening News* reported that a revival was to be attempted.705

Although nationalism’s efforts to attain respectability and sympathy for the
Manchester Martyrs did much to render it acceptable, it was not wholly politically
tranquilized or sanitized. In 1870 a large arms seizure was made in Oldham Road, ‘a
locality well known as a resort of Fenians’.706 In 1876 Irish broke up a meeting of
Joseph Biggar disliking his transition from Fenian to constitutional politics.707 The
*Liverpool Daily Post* summarized the press reaction:

The Rowdy Irish, the Riotous Irish, the Disorderly Irish, Irish
Ruffians, Irish Blackguards, Miserable Irish Factions, another
Irish Row, the Savage Temper of these Low Irish, Irish
Savagery, Irish Scum, a nice people to govern themselves,
another Donneybrook Fair, Irish in all their Glory, the Kilkenny
Cats in Manchester.708

By 1881 the *London Standard* reported Manchester to be again in an agitated state.709
The bombing of Salford barracks, which killed a boy of 7 and injured three people,
and initiated the dynamite war, ensured that the insurrectionary side of Irish
nationalism was not forgotten.710 It was rumoured also that Fenians were plotting to
attack the Town Hall, Exchange and Strangeways prison, to blow up the gas works
and poison a reservoir. These, apparently, received ‘but little credence from the
authorities’, but after warnings from the Home and War Offices troops were again
mustered and volunteers called up.711 D. Fitzpatrick observes that ‘in contrast to the
Fenian movement of the 1860s, the outrages of the 1880s were generally attributed by
the courts, the government and the British peoples to a handful of American
specialists rather than to the immigrant population’, but it can hardly have endeared
them.712 In October a ‘Monstre indignation meeting’ was held in the Free Trade Hall to
protest at the imprisonment of Parnell, with 'speeches of a wild and inflammatory character'. By 1882 St Patrick's day was again dreaded as the occasion for terrorism. Indeed after the Phoenix Park murders Vaughan lamented:

> We have a state of some uneasiness in these great towns. The Irish - some of them are so impudent that we might easily have a riot or a massacre of them by the English. I have had to make a speech at the Town Hall besides writing letters to get the English to believe that we are loyal. The bravado and folly of our poor Irish is beyond words. Some say the murders 'served them right', etc., and this is the presence of Englishmen.

While meetings were held to express public abhorrence at the Phoenix Park murders, a Fenian was arrested for touring Manchester pubs selling funeral cards celebrating the murders, and explosives were recovered. The *Guardian* expressed surprise that given the dynamite alarms elsewhere in the county nothing had occurred in Manchester, and when John O'Leary denounced the Irish dynamiters, his Manchester Irish audience expressed enthusiastic support for them. In 1893 processions celebrated the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Manchester Martyrs. Despite the opposition of the former Bishop Vaughan, by 1897 funds had been raised by public subscription to build the Manchester Martyrs memorial. In November 1898 J. Stephens laid the foundation stone in Mostyn cemetery, receiving 'a splendid reception', and, accompanied by Maud Gonne, he spoke at a demonstration attended by 100,000. That year the centenary of the 1798 rising was celebrated by the Manchester Irish. In 1900, as the English enthusiastically joined in celebrations of St Patrick's day and the green flag was hoisted above Manchester and Liverpool town halls, in honour of the contribution of Irish soldiers to the war effort in South Africa, Irish were 'uncertain whether it would not be compromising their patriotism if they wore the shamrock since it has become associated with the whole British public' and Irish National Foresters convened in Manchester to discuss whether to expel from the society any Irishman who was in the British Forces.

Denvir recalled, 'Whatever was the national organization going on in Ireland for the time being we...always did our best to have its counterpart in Liverpool.' Liverpool was strategically important as most traffic between Ireland, England and
America passed through it, but its I.R.B. movement was important in its own right. Within months of the I.R.B. being formed R.I.C. detectives were sent to Liverpool. In 1861 Porcupine characterized Liverpool's St Patrick's day speeches as typically constituting calls to arms against 'the bloody Saxon':

Most people here are sorry, sincerely sorry, to hear foolish Irishmen talking about French intervention and Saxon blood-thirstiness. It arms every dullard here with a subject for derision, whereby to annoy and offend honest Irishmen, who are as sick of The O'Donoghue foolery as any Englishman can possibly be.

That July T. B. McManus inaugurated the National Brotherhood of St Patrick in Liverpool. Activities were at first largely social and respectable, but by 1864 the movement seems to have been absorbed by the I.R.B. and Fenians were involved in rows provoking Porcupine to call them 'the lowest scum of the Irish emigrant population'. In June 1865 the Manchester Guardian reported that It has been rumoured for some time past that Fenian agents had been busily at work among the Irish population in Liverpool, and this was confirmed when Fenian papers were discovered on arrested Irishmen. By September the Mercury reported:

It is a matter of notoriety that Liverpool is one of the head-centres of the Fenian movement. The authorities have been aware of the fact for some time, but as the "patriots" located here were for the most part hot-headed Irish youths, led by a few designing fellows who have agitated and traded upon the political credulity of their countrymen for years, the movement was looked upon as altogether too contemptible to be dignified by a prosecution.

Porcupine likewise ridiculed the naiveté and disorganization of the movement. However lately suspicion had arisen that the movement was more serious. Americans were arriving and communications passed on. Although Greig minimized the movement as 'confined to the lower classes', meetings were attended by all social classes and resolutions adopted to use physical force. In response to arrests in Dublin, Liverpool Irish debated and drilled, raised money to fit out a privateer to bring down British commerce and talked of invading Ireland within the month. When Fenian chief George Archdeacon was arrested for high treason papers were discovered in his house from the New York Fenian headquarters and while police...
were searching his house members of the Irish Brigade entered and asked to buy copies of *Irish People*. In response to arrests several local leaders fled the town and the *Manchester Guardian* sniffed that 'the wretched rank and file are perfectly cowed and quiet'. Arrests also encouraged systematic evasion of observation. The *Manchester Guardian* cautioned:

> It has been discovered that not only are there large numbers of Fenians in Liverpool, that the ramifications of the society are extreme and complete, but that the headquarters of the organization in England are situated in this town, that some of the most determined of the conspirators are resident here, and from what they consider to be a place of safety have been directing the movements of the brotherhood in different parts of the country.

Head Constable Greig complained of Liverpool being misrepresented as 'the great hot-bed of Fenianism'. He denied rumours that Fenians were drilling in Liverpool and that arms were stored there, and insisted 'there is no ground for thinking that there is any Fenian organization in Liverpool, and further...there are very few persons holding such opinions'. In January 1866 he reiterated the opinion that 'there is not the smallest ground for any alarm'. But the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* reported that Liverpool 'has always been one of the great centres of Fenianism, and where the chief members have active means of communication', and the *Manchester Guardian* observed that 'Fenianism has flourished in Liverpool'. The latter reported that residents 'of a better class' had convened and resolved 'to counteract the teachings and preachings of the Catholic clergy who denounce Fenianism; and secondly, that no means should be left untried to induce Englishmen, Scotchmen and Irishmen to join the Fenian ranks'. By the end of the month Fenians plotting to burn Liverpool were surveilled. The *Mercury* reported:

> Ever since Fenianism was a name it has flourished in Liverpool, where the Irish element, in all classes of society is very strong. In fact, many men of Irish descent, who hold their heads high on 'change, are strongly suspected of coquetting with this new idée Irlandaise.

By September 1865 public opinion was already sufficiently edgy that when an unidentified ship was spotted on the Mersey there was a panic that it might be a Fenian pirate and a large quantity of ammunition was seized off a steamer entering...
the port. When a Fenian got drunk and proclaimed his sympathies in a Liverpool pub, supposing all around him would be in accord, he was beaten up. Excitement again erupted when a cartload of pikes was driven through the town, subsiding only when it became clear that they were destined for a man of war on the Mersey.

In September Liverpool police corresponded with their first in a series of paid Fenian informers, Peter Oakes and John Joseph Corrydon (variously known as John Carr, Corriden and Corridon). They were two of many 'Irish Yankee' Fenian officers sent to Liverpool by John O'Mahoney who recruited them from the American army. Oakes reported that with a joint rising in Ireland and Canada planned within the year, Liverpool and other English towns were to be fired as a diversion. Agents were reported to be travelling through the army and English towns trying to 'revive the Fenian spirit'. Informers' confessions led to the recovery of papers, arms and combustibles, news of which occasioned considerable alarm in Liverpool. Among those arrested for possession of arms in 1866 was Michael O'Brien, twelve months later to be 'martyred' in Manchester. Interestingly on this occasion he and his fellow conspirators were acquitted as the jury reasoned that the accused did not know that the arms they were moving were stolen. In December 1866 anonymous letters suggested where arms and uniforms could be recovered, to no avail, and offered, for £1000, to reveal where James Stephens was supposedly hiding in Liverpool. Informers (who 'daily deluged' Liverpool police) appealed for troops to be brought in. Police dismissed most reports as the same hearsay that had been circulating all year, but the Mercury still ridiculed them for being the victims of cranks:

Have not some of the communications lately acted upon been of a character that left little doubt that they were intended to injure the parties against whom they were directed? A man may be an Irishman and yet a good citizen - a fact which the authorities would do well to remember at present.

Throughout 1867 the police continued to receive such reports. In mid February they did, however, receive a valid tip-off from Corrydon, as he warned the authorities about the planned Chester castle raid. Liverpool Fenians planned to seize arms and then to sail for Ireland. Two special trams had been engaged for the purpose and
'suspicious looking' craft were reported off Holyhead. Some of the soldiers guarding the Castle had Fenian sympathies and supplied the Liverpool leaders with plans.\textsuperscript{760} The Head Constable immediately divulged his knowledge to the Chester authorities, and took precautions to prevent repercussions in Liverpool.\textsuperscript{761} Many Liverpool papers scoffed at the scheme, but the \textit{Mercury} cautioned: 'Cool-headed, practical people might laugh at such a Quixotic undertaking, but it should be remembered that the brotherhood are more noted for their daring than for their discretion'.\textsuperscript{762}

Not only was the movement widespread, it was disciplined and military. By 1865 Irish had infiltrated the 64th Liverpool Rifle Volunteers (known locally as the 'Irish Brigade') to learn the use of arms, and planned to steal weapons and ammunition in the event of a rising. By September 1866 it was reported that the regiment was three-quarters Fenians, and they had also infiltrated the Naval Reserve, Artillery Volunteers, Press Guard and Engineers.\textsuperscript{763} Fenians were regularly arrested in possession of uniforms.\textsuperscript{764} By the winter of 1866 there were reported to be up to 18,000 Fenians in Liverpool,\textsuperscript{765} contributing funds to the organization,\textsuperscript{766} and fund-raising raffles were held up to three times per week.\textsuperscript{767} Informer John Wilson told the police, 'There is scarcely an Irishman in Liverpool who is not a sympathizer in the movement, whilst many are sworn members of the Brotherhood'.\textsuperscript{768} There was also a Ladies Committee which collected money for the families of convicted Fenians.\textsuperscript{769}

The suspension of Habeas Corpus in Ireland caused consternation among Liverpool Fenians. It was rumoured that Fenian leaders were fleeing from Ireland to Liverpool, and indeed delegates from Ireland, America and all over England met in Liverpool to plan.\textsuperscript{770} In November rumours of Fenian intentions were widespread producing an 'uneasy state of the public mind'. Two extra R.I.C. constables arrived, arrests were made, locks were removed from rifles in the town's arms stores and dock patrols increased.\textsuperscript{771} By mid December there were reported to be 30,000 Fenians in Liverpool ('the great centre of the Fenian organization in Lancashire'), who were again said to be planning to fire Liverpool before New Year.\textsuperscript{772} At the end of February Liverpool Fenians sailed for Ireland where a rising was rumoured to be
imminent. These plans continued throughout March when schemes to fire the docks were resurrected. Though the authorities could not believe in such a Milesian programme, they evidently anticipated that something serious might take place, observed the Manchester Guardian. Police guards were put on docks, banks and arms stores, the army called out, additional firemen called up, volunteers sworn in, a battleship stationed on the Mersey (Was it supposed that a Fenian armada was about to enter the Mersey?, scoffed Porcupine), and, suggesting the seriousness of the alarm, prominent citizens were warned. But police deliberately tried to keep operations as low-key as possible given the potential hysteria which informing demonstrated was possible. The inhabitants are beginning to receive further and more unpleasant indications that they are living in stirring times, reported the Mercury, and the danger was apparently the constant subject of conversation along the line of docks. St Patrick’s day was anticipated with ‘great alarm’. When gun shot was reported to be heard it (mistakenly) provoked fear that a rising was about to start, and excitement developed around the gaol as crowds gathered to hail the ‘the supposed “heroes”’ after it was reported that the police were arresting Fenians.

When nothing materialized Porcupine reported that the authorities’ performance was ‘as disgraceful as it was ridiculous’. It boasted:

Why the old women of Liverpool, armed with mops and broomsticks, ought to be able, at five minutes notice, to protect us against a Fenian army ten times as large as any of the poor handful of ragged and demented creatures whom the police dispersed at Kilmallock or Middleton.

The Courier likewise labelled police reaction a ‘farce’.

Thereafter Liverpool Fenians were subdued until August when Kelly and Deasy were sent to revitalize the Lancashire movement. News of the breaking of the van produced great excitement in Liverpool. Denvir recalled that half a dozen Liverpool Irishmen attended the Manchester meeting planning the rescue of the two leaders. Certainly telegrams were sent between Liverpool and Ireland discussing liberating Kelly and Deasy, and armed Fenians set off for Manchester. The affair gave ‘a fresh impulse to the Fenian movement in this town’. Kelly and Deasy were
reported to be escaping via Liverpool in bales, boxes and barrels, were rumoured to be disguised as harvestmen, to have sailed for Montevideo and New York, and even coffins travelling through Liverpool by rail were searched for them.\textsuperscript{787} Suspicion that men involved in the breaking of the van were hiding in Liverpool produced arrests and great excitement.\textsuperscript{788} Visiting Liverpool at this time, Joseph White described it as being ‘in a state of feverish excitement’.\textsuperscript{789} Trouble was anticipated when the outcome of the trial was known. Volunteers and pensioners were called up, a warship arrived, and police were armed.\textsuperscript{790} In October Liverpool Head Centre Chambers was arrested for his part in the rescue. This was ‘very much calculated to discourage the “body” in Liverpool’.\textsuperscript{791} By this time police pressure caused leading Fenians to flee Liverpool, as it had got ‘too hot’, and Manchester became the movement’s headquarters.\textsuperscript{792} It was rumoured that if Chambers and the other Fenians were convicted there would be a raid on Manchester.\textsuperscript{793} Troops were sent and it was whispered that Fenians were plotting to attack Liverpool gasworks and Kirkdale gaol.\textsuperscript{794} By late October so many Fenians were informing on each other that the movement was riven with tensions.\textsuperscript{795} By December the number attending Fenian meetings was declining, and beerhouses that were former refuges were closing down.\textsuperscript{796} Employers reported and dismissed suspected Fenians from their employ.\textsuperscript{797}

\textit{Porcupine} distinguished:

It is absurd to argue that an act of mercy will be construed into an admission of weakness on the part of our rulers; and if the later are magnanimous, they will boldly show their contempt for such an undignified supposition, and refuse to sanction a deed which will disgrace the reign of Queen Victoria...there is still room to hope that Calcraft’s hands will not be laid upon men who are, after all, widely removed from criminals in the ordinary acceptation of the word.\textsuperscript{798}

The \textit{Mercury} too was anxious that the ordinary Irish should not be blamed,\textsuperscript{799} identifying that the greatest threat of Fenianism was its potential to ‘excite jealousy and hatred between the English people and the Irish population residing amongst them’.\textsuperscript{800}

The Head Constable of Liverpool replied to his opposite number in Manchester that the 100 officers requested at the time of executions could not be
supplied as Liverpool herself was in too much of an excited state. A procession for the Manchester Martyrs was banned and armed police prepared to prevent any attempt being made. Porcupine sympathized:

We at least have never denied that they have had heavy wrongs of misgovernment, such as, let it be frankly avowed, no power on earth could compel Englishmen or Scotchmen to bear. We admit, too, that there are still some grievances which must be removed before we can expect Irishmen to believe in England’s good intentions and take kindly to her.

But it appealed to Irishmen not to march, as the planned Orange counter-demonstration for Sergeant Brett’s widow threatened to descend into a riot:

Think what sort of winter we have coming on. Think how hard the times will be with many of your own poor countrymen. Think what an amount of combined energy, earnestness and liberality will be required from the benevolent individuals and the charitable associations of Liverpool to tide the poor population anyhow over the coming months, and then say if this is a time to set Fenian demonstrations going and to bring up an English-against-Irish sort of feeling? If there were nothing else to influence us but the absolute certainty that the holding of the procession will cause many deserving and peaceful poor Irishmen to be thrown out of employment, we should be energetic in our protest against it. For heaven’s sake let us be neutral in Liverpool, and let us be friends...Cry “Ireland for the Irish”, and welcome, says Mr. PORCUPINE; but in the meantime let us have Liverpool for the English and the Irish and the Scotch and the Welsh and the Yankees and the Germans and all the rest, as many as like to come; and let us all agree to live in co-operation together and leave our national quarrels to be fought out elsewhere.

The Mercury warned:

The demonstration was one of the most dangerous that could have been announced in such a community as Liverpool. Class feeling and party hatreds that have happily been in abeyance for some time were likely to be aroused by the mere mention of a display that was obviously meant to be an expression of sympathy with a cause which is condemned by the great majority of people of this country...Sufficient has become known of the Fenian plans to make the movement especially abhorrent to the people of Liverpool...Private and unoffending citizens were to be ruined; commercial communities were to be thrown into confusion, unarmed policemen shot in the cause of this detestable organization. These circumstances, without further aggravation, were sufficient to incense the people against the Fenians.

Despite the appeals of the clergy 30-40,000 Irish still gathered and began to march, while thousands massed along the proposed route, before being dispersed by
Police. The committee of the Working Men's Association expressed thanks to the
mayor and magistrates for preventing the funeral procession.

After the '67 rising in Ireland refugees were reported to be descending on
Liverpool. But by February 1868 the movement was reported to be dying out fast,
as prominent Fenians fled (like 'rats deserting a sinking ship', scoffed the *Mercury*).
The police however continued to receive reports from informers, many, it was
believed, simply malicious. Rumours of a rising still circulated, but, police believed
this was now just a ruse to sustain morale. Albeit more in a social guise with the
decline of the military influence of the Irish Yankees, the movement continued to
sustain morale and identity, and, with it, tension. For fifteen years after 1867 the
council insisted on a permanent military detachment being maintained in Liverpool to
prevent 'Fenian danger'. Papers continued to be smuggled through Liverpool,
sectious prints circulated and concerts and raffles held to raise funds. Moreover
Fenians were still arrested and arms recovered. In response to criticism of the
respectable Irish for not trying to put the movement down, 'Un Jeune Irelandais'
recommended that the critic should try it himself, 'down Scotland-road or Marybone,
for instance, and let him tell us the result - if he should live to do so'. In 1872
revolvers were reported to be again circulating among the 'low Irish', and it was
rumoured that weapons and uniforms could be purchased in 'Paddy's market'. In
1879 Home Rulers were still called 'Fenians' by the *Mercury* and were still under
observation (including Home Rule councillors). In January 1881 the *London Standard*
reported that the mayor of Liverpool was sufficiently alarmed by fear of Irish risings
to call in the military. *Porcupine* denied this story and reported that Tories were
merely trying to wind up the situation to win support. But by the end of the month
the army reserve was called up, armaments guarded and naval vessels stationed on the
Mersey. Fenians bombed Hatton Garden Police Station, tried to bomb the Town
Hall and threatened to attack Major Greig's house. When two men were arrested in
connection with these incidents it was rumoured that 200 supporters were marching to
rescue them from Walton gaol. Warders loaded rifles and fixed bayonets but the
contingent never materialized.82 The Manchester Guardian observed that the affair has 'caused much excitement in Liverpool'.822 Witnesses were threatened in the subsequent trials,823 and the mayor was offered a Gatling gun for his personal protection.824 Tensions simmered throughout May and June with rumours of Fenians planning to blow up ammunition stores and bombs discovered hidden inside ships. By August it was reported that the Fenians had taken fright and consequently that the funds of the organization were in decline,825 but the police were left so jumpy that they attacked a judge's son whom they mistook for a Fenian.826 In 1882 police seized 20,000 copies of United Ireland printed locally827 and trouble was again anticipated on St Patrick's day.828 It was rumoured that the Phoenix Park murders had been planned in Liverpool, and Harcourt was urged to extend the terms of the Prevention of Crime Bill to here.829 In 1883 an Irish Yankee was tried for plotting to murder government officials in Liverpool,830 a suspected Irish "Invincible" was captured,831 and Dennis Deasy, among others, was arrested with dynamite in his possession and plans to blow up St Helen's town hall.832 Explosives were again recovered in 1884 and a Fenian arrested for possession of an 'infernal machine'.833 In 1889 alleged Irish "Invincible" Patrick Molloy was arrested in Liverpool.834

Neal observes that with the encouragement of Orangemen by 1885 'working class Liverpool was more divided than in the 1840s, when McNeile was at the height of his popularity'.835 In 1862 and 1875 Porcupine told nationalist agitators to go home if they disliked England so much,836 and in 1871 a correspondent ("A Great Briton") reiterated this theme, railing:

"If the Home Rulers want 'Ireland for the Irish', let them have it by all means, but let them also have all the Irish in Ireland. Fancy what a blessing that would be to England!837

'A British Philistine' supposed that most Irish didn't really understand Home Rule, and exploited Lawrence Connoly's admission that he would have received 1000 more votes had his electoral placards been printed in green paper.838 Porcupine itself had little more faith in the political intelligence of Irish voters.839 It proposed that ordinary Irishmen were 'led and bled for the gratification of adventurers who know how to
work upon their generous feelings and use them for their own ambitious ends', and complained:

The so-called Irish grievances are a downright nuisance, and that its time some means were taken to prevent noisy Irishmen from coming over here to shake their shillelaghs.\textsuperscript{40}

In 1872 Hugh Heinrich expressed frustration at the lack of nationalist co-ordination of the Newcastle Irish:

With this exceptionally large proportion of Irish to English in the town, their political influence, which ought to be great is extremely limited. I have it on the written authority... that "there is no other town in England of the same Irish population where the Irish have less political weight than in Newcastle"...there is a want of community of spirit - an absence of that sentiment which produces unity and the organization which is absolutely essential to make the crude elements of political force a power to be exercised with effect.\textsuperscript{41}

However although it never attained the notoriety of Manchester or Liverpool, Newcastle's Fenian movement was comparably large and active, and Heinrich's comment is deceptive. 'Where patriotism was concerned Newcastle stood prominent amongst the English towns', P. J. Power proclaimed in 1885.\textsuperscript{42} There was no part of England that had done more for the Irish national cause than the North of England, of which Newcastle was the centre', enthused John Barry in 1887,\textsuperscript{43} and 'Nowhere', Parnell reflected, 'had he found the exiles from Ireland more warm-hearted or more determined to do the best that in them lay for the welfare of their native land'.\textsuperscript{44}

In 1859 McAnulty became president of the Newcastle branch of the Brotherhood of St Patrick.\textsuperscript{45} At one of numerous meetings in support of Home Rule in 1860 Michael O'Hanlon (a leading light of the movement) contended:

that the English had no right to one yard of the land of Ireland, and as the people of England had done so much to aid that noble hero, Garibaldi, with ships of war, arms and money (in order to give Italy her independence) they ought to assist the people of Ireland by appending their names to their petitions to the British government, calling upon them to give the people of Ireland back their own Parliament.\textsuperscript{46}

Peter Flannaghan told a St Patrick's day crowd in 1862 that it was 'the duty of Every Irishman to do his utmost to secure the independence of his native country', and McAnulty reiterated these sentiments at a similar occasion in 1869.\textsuperscript{47} By 1863 the
I.R.B. was reported to be raising funds. Here too Fenians, like W. R. Haughton, armed, drilled and plotted. T. P. O'Connor recalled:

Tyneside was honeycombed with Fenians. After a day's exhausting labour in steelworks and shipyards, men spent half the night in dark cellars, planning, organizing, and getting the "stuff" - which meant rifles, revolvers, and ammunition - aboard harmless looking boats waiting at quays.

Popular open debate was conducted at the Clayton Street Irish Institute, the headquarters of the local Home Rule movement, where were launched the political careers of Tim Healy, John Barry, Lewis Barry, Henry Campbell and Edward Savage. Here regular councils by O'Donovan Rossa were heard, and, thanks to Healy, Newcastle was a venue for the oratory of the foremost names of the I.P.P. Lecturing in its crowded hall in 1878 O'Donnell proclaimed:

he wished that in every town, not only in Great Britain but in Ireland, such institutes as the one whose members he had the honour to address, were in existence...Irishmen would know better how to understand one another, and in understanding of one another, would learn how to be united. Not only would institutes of this class tend to make Irishmen understand one another better, and so encourage unity of action, but they at once afforded a centre of political agitation in the directer sense.

By 1865 Newcastle was reported to be already suffering 'Fenian Fever' after a spate of Irish nationalists had become involved in fights and riots. The Chronicle reflected, 'Fenianism, we believe, can number among its adherents a large section of the Irish population of Newcastle'. But it judged the movement to be futile, badly-led, and short-lived, and appealed not to let the government 'give to a riot the importance of a rebellion' and demanded a more constructive policy. In 1866 a St Patrick's Day rising was feared in Newcastle and consequently the city's arsenal was guarded. In 1867 local brigades were reported to be drilling and aggressively recruiting and arms were siezed. The shooting of Sergeant Brett provoked 'much excitement', and public alarm provoked the rifles in the city armoury to be disarmed. The Newcastle Irish planned to march to commemorate the Manchester Martyrs, and at this time there was much rumour of Fenians being sheltered in Newcastle.

During 1867 the local press demanded heavy sentences for Fenians and
'rejoiced in the verdicts' on the Manchester Martyrs. Joseph Cowen's usually sympathetic *Newcastle Chronicle* railed:

> English Liberalism...cannot grasp a hand which smells rank with the blood of her children slaughtered in the mere wantonness of fanaticism...unless Irishmen are prepared to renounce tactics which are rather tactics of savagery than civilization they must combat alone.

But it questioned whether political prisoners should receive capital punishment while England was guilty of wrongs to Ireland. After the executions the *Chronicle* questioned:

> The tragedy enacted at Manchester on Saturday morning naturally raises the question - what shall be done for Ireland? None of them belong to the order from which our criminal classes are recruited. Certain critics who delight in trampling on the fallen have described their assumed patriotism as only the last refuge of scoundrelism. The insinuation is outrageous in its injustice. Misguided, passionate and headstrong they doubtless were, but scoundrels they were not.

Any Irishman who got into trouble in the 1860s and 1870s was indiscriminately labelled a 'Fenian' by the Newcastle press, despite some apparent confusion about its meaning. Throughout 1867 there were fears of Fenian invasion from the south, rumoured 'Fenian outbreaks', and accusations against, and arrests of, local nationalists. Volunteers were armed, special constables enrolled, the militia put on alert, the coast guard readied for action. The *Chronicle* warned, 'large numbers of Irishmen are still madly bent upon any wild movement to which their leaders may summon them'. But by October hysteria was ridiculed:

> "There has been a fearful outbreak" of the Fenian villains, exclaim a crowd of old women of both sexes, - O dear no, but of panic and fright amongst a good few people in authority, whom we generally expect to find with their heads tolerably well set on their shoulders...in the north-eastern districts we hear of no 'movements' of an alarming character except among the police.

Clerkenwell re-invigorated alarm, and an explosion in Newcastle in December was immediately blamed on Fenians. The *Chronicle* called for calm:

> If the respectable Irish workman, who has no feelings save those of execration and abhorrence for the machinations of misguided countrymen, is punished simply because he is Irish, it needs no prophet to predict that the latter end of Fenianism will be worse than the beginning. Oppression makes a wise man mad, and the sense of injustice which such proceedings
would awaken could scarcely prove other than eminently calamitous. The proposition is, in fact, tantamount to the proclamation of a war of races, and therefore a virtual admission that to dwell together in unity has become hopeless. We neither share this hopelessness nor partake of the fears from which it springs; the cloud which has fallen upon the relations of the two nations will yet melt away, amity succeed rancour, confidence cast out suspicion, and hate yield to love. But if we expect confidence, we must exhibit it - to abandon ourselves to unreasoning suspicion is simply to awaken distrust...At present one more crime like that at Clerkenwell would produce most disastrous effects. No greater evils could fall upon society than a Fenian panic and an anti-Irish crusade; yet they are possible at any moment. Three or four reprobates in St Giles, or in the purlieus of Liverpool, or Glasgow, might bring the whole community of their countrymen under the ban of suspicion: a fear might be awakened which would listen to no reason.872

In January 1868 the Chronicle dismissed rumour that Fenians were to blow up St Nicholas's church and the Tyne Theatre, and scoffed at scare-mongering:

Nothing whatever has yet happened in this district to give the smallest pretext for panic. Nevertheless, a stranger at a distance, reading the astonishing statements that have lately been made public, would be driven to believe that Newcastle is the centre of a terrible conspiracy, that the inhabitants are paralysed with fear, that the whole town is in danger of sudden destruction. Designs have been attributed to the Fenians here which none but the maddest of the mad would ever think of executing.873

Cooter regards Newcastle as peculiarly tolerant.874 Indeed a series of articles were published in the Chronicle analysing the causes of Fenianism, sympathetic to the 'intolerable' circumstances and 'long existing wrongs' endured by the Irish people.875 While it urged Fenians not to alienate English radicals with their extremism and impatience, and belittled it as 'fevering, furious, feeble, foolish, and fanatical, from first to last', the paper reflected:

Its existence was not surprising; indeed there was very much reason in the political and social circumstances of Ireland to account for, if not to justify, plots and conspiracies...it would ill become Englishmen to find fault with Irishmen for resenting the Union which placed them on a level with negroes, and scheming for its repeal or even a total separation.876

Significantly there is no evidence of working class hostility during the Fenian scare and no manipulation of the issue in local politics, there being, Cooter insists, no popular animosity to exploit.877 By 1873 even the local press were bored with the
topic. The *Courant* complained:

In the enjoyment of comfort, and an abundance of the good things of English life, they do not all of them forget the political whine and cant to which they had been trained in the land of their birth...And so we have Irish political deputations, Irish political oratory, and Irish organizations on English soil, with a view to action on English elections. The whole thing is purely Irish. It is Irish life in England.87

Newcastle nationalists continued to be assertive in the 1870s and 1880s. In 1870 Newcastle Irish sung the 'Noble-hearted three' on St Patrick's day, Fenians negotiated, and of the sixteen consignments of arms distributed by Davitt one was destined for Manchester and five for Newcastle.89 Furthermore, when Davitt lectured in Newcastle, having embraced constitutional means, he was attacked by an angry mob, as Biggar suffered in Manchester.88 In 1886 John O’Leary advocated physical force in Newcastle,89 and in November 1898 the Irish celebrated a centenary banquet for the 1798 rising.89

While, as Lowe points out, the amnesty movement was unremarkable in Lancashire, in the north east there was enthusiastic participation by Irish and locals alike.85 In 1872 McAnulty presided over the ‘great Amnesty Demonstration’ on the Town Moor, attended by 30,000 people, demanding the release of Fenian prisoners.84 As Cooter remarks, this was undoubtedly orchestrated partly as a show of solidarity and confidence in response to Hugh Heinrich’s disparaging comments in *The Nation* only a week before.85 In 1874 another numerously attended amnesty meeting convened on the Town Moor, and in 1878 released political prisoners (including Davitt) were enthusiastically received at a demonstration in the Town Hall.86 Funds were raised on these occasions for the ‘Rossa Fund’ to aid political prisoners.87 In 1882 Coercion was violently condemned in Newcastle.88 While Liverpool may have been lax in this respect, Lowe underestimates Manchester. An Amnesty Association was established and meetings for political prisoners convened in 1878, 1879, 1889, 1890, 1893 and 1896, with a ‘great public procession’ and meeting on the football ground celebrating the visit of William O’Brien.89

After 1867 electoral strategies and the importance of getting people on the
electoral register were considerably more common themes at Irish political gatherings than insurrection.\textsuperscript{90} Ironically through furthering their opposition to British rule the Irish became integrated in English political conventions. In 1872 delegates of northern towns gathered in Manchester and Liverpool to debate how to make the Irish vote more effective, in the second instance debating before a meeting of 2,500\textsuperscript{91} and the following spring they reconvened under the auspices of Manchester Home Rule Electoral Association.\textsuperscript{92} In 1873 Newcastle established a similar organization.\textsuperscript{93} Manchester and Liverpool Irish were instrumental in the establishment of the Home Rule Confederation in 1873,\textsuperscript{94} and great demonstrations coincided with its convention in Manchester.\textsuperscript{95} It was no coincidence that the city was the headquarters of the Confederation until 1875.\textsuperscript{96} Of the five district councils initially established by the Confederation one represented Newcastle, where, in 1873 it held its annual conference, Butt bragging that this was symptomatic of 'a tremendous power here'. At the ensuing public meeting he warned 'If the Liberal party of England wished to keep the Irish vote upon their side they must defer to Irish feelings'.\textsuperscript{97} In 1874 Butt returned to Manchester for the annual convention, where he devised a canvassing system.\textsuperscript{98} Electoral tactics began to be carefully deliberated at public meetings,\textsuperscript{99} local branches of the Confederation being full of praise for the I.P.P.\textsuperscript{100} In 1874 Dr Commins succeeded Butt as president of the Confederation, and in 1875 its headquarters moved to Liverpool where its mouthpiece \textit{The United Irishman} was published.\textsuperscript{101} In 1875, 1876 and 1877 Parnell and Butt attended annual conventions of the Home Rule Confederation in the city.\textsuperscript{102} In 1876 the headquarters of the Confederation were moved to London to be closer to parliament and because of fears of the extreme influence of the Liverpool Irish.\textsuperscript{103} William John Oliver, honorary secretary of the Confederation, for a long time took a leading part in Liverpool elections.\textsuperscript{104} Throughout the 1870s and 1880s the north was fastidiously courted and canvassed by the I.P.P., the top brass of the party eulogizing local efforts on St Patrick’s day and prior to elections, and being enthusiastically received.\textsuperscript{105} Typical of the fare delivered on St Patrick’s day was John O'Connor Power’s address at Newcastle in 1879:

\begin{quote}
He wanted the Irishmen of Newcastle to ...continue the fight in
\end{quote}
the country (cheers). This could not be done without organizing and without discipline, but it could be done, and the appeal which he made to his countrymen in England on this subject was not an unreasonable appeal. They were not in so great a minority in Newcastle as they were in the House of Commons; and if they were willing to carry on the contest there, they ought to be willing to carry on the contest here (cheers). In saying that he ought certainly to congratulate the organization in Newcastle that on any national occasion, they had always made a dignified, determined, and respectable demonstration of Irish power (applause). 906

On these occasions emphasis was placed on the nationalist programme being 'tempered, constitutional and legitimate'. 907 In 1877 a 'demonstration on a large scale' was held in Newcastle Town Hall, under the presidency of John Barry, and attended by Parnell, O'Donnell and O'Connor Power M.P.s, to explain to a concerned Irish public the I.P.P.'s tactics of obstruction in parliament. 908 Similar meetings were convened in Manchester and in Liverpool, where there was enthusiastic support for parliamentary obstruction. 909 In 1878, reflecting their confidence in the parliamentary process, the local Home Rule Associations of Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle protested about their MPs absenting themselves from the Commons during important debates. 910

When the Land League was suppressed it provoked great excitement. 50,000 were reported to have attended a 'great open-air demonstration' in Liverpool at which Parnell took the platform along with priests, doctors, artisans and labourers. 911 When the National Land League replaced the Home Rule Confederation, Newcastle became the centre of the short-lived Northern Land League. 912 In 1881 branches of the League and Ladies Land League were established in Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle, the latter with inaugural addresses from Anna Parnell. 913 In 1881 Manchester's League formed an Irish Representation Association, 914 and April of that year witnessed an impressive display of support for Home Rule in Newcastle with a procession and meetings on the Town Moor (attended by an estimated 20,000) and in the Tyne Theatre, attended by Parnell and T. P. O'Connor. 915 In 1882 Manchester was host to the League's national convention, which discussed how to make the Irish in England electorally effective. Meetings coincided to aid evicted tenants and a public meeting
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In 1883 the Irish National League was formed with the express purpose of organizing the immigrant Irish to provide electorally effective backing for the I.P.P., with John Denvir as its general secretary. During the 1886 election John Barry was dispatched back to Manchester to organize the Manchester vote, and the city hosted I.N.L. conferences in 1889, 1896 and 1897. In 1894 John Dillon addressed the Manchester Irish on the work of the I.P.P. and the influence of the House of Lords. After Parnell split with the I.N.L. most provincial English branches opposed him, and thereafter the movement underwent a period of decline. Unusually in Newcastle, where Parnell had a peculiarly loyal following, upon the division, the number one branch of Newcastle I.N.L. gave a vote of no confidence in Parnell, his supporters walked out, and set up 'Number 1 Branch of the Parnell Leadership Committee'. Thus when the I.N.L. convened in Newcastle in 1891, Parnell had sufficient confidence in his support there to arrange a counter-demonstration. Though only a small proportion of the Liverpool Irish actually joined the I.N.L., William Redmond said that they were the most true to the cause of all the ex-patriots. In 1885 Liverpool I.N.L. continued to receive 'considerable' weekly subscriptions, and by 1890 there were allegedly 10,000 members in Liverpool, virtually a quarter of the total national membership. During the last years of the century the headquarters of the U.I.L. were moved from London to Liverpool during elections, and in 1900 the reunion of the I.P.P. was appropriately celebrated in the city.

Lowe writes of Liverpool, 'The critical mass of committed, activist voters existed only there'. In 1884 Liverpool Young Ireland Society had proposed Dr Commins as a Liverpool M.P., but it was the redistribution Act of that year which really made possible the election of the first and only nationalist to represent an English constituency. Throughout the build up to the 1885 election Parnell was active in Liverpool. While Home Rule was not a big issue in the rest of the country in 1885, here it dominated the election. In July a deputation of 2000 rate payers had invited Patrick Byrne to sit for Scotland division, and Justin McCarthy to sit for
Exchange. While Byrne was ousted in place of T. P. O'Connor, McCarthy was to withdraw to sit for Derry, while (leader of the Irish party) John Redmond was nominated for Kirkdale, and Parnell threatened that nationalists might challenge Bootle, West Toxteth and Abercromby. Byrne was insulted at O'Connor being proposed as candidate for Scotland and said that he would withdraw only in favour of Parnell, Dillon or Davitt, but it made sense that the president of the I.N.L., and the 'acknowledged leader of the Irish in Britain', should represent the only seat that it seemed likely that the nationalist vote could win. In September the I.N.L. appealed to Irish voters to register themselves as electors, and at a packed November meeting Parnell counselled the Irish on voting strategy. They were instructed to put 'local and personal considerations' aside, provoking jeers of 'Where is Dandy Pat now?' O'Connor won Scotland by 1350 votes and, despite recurrent accusations of absenteeism and neglect of local affairs, he remained its member with a substantial majority until 1929. In 1885 Conservatives did not even try to put forward a candidate in Scotland division, which Forwood described as 'as Irish as if... in County Tipperary'. O'Connor's victory was no great surprise, but it outraged the Unionist press. By 1886 O'Connor had become Parnell's second in command and remained in London throughout the election of the year. But John Redmond was sent to court the voters and O'Connor was again returned convincingly. Revealingly at the I.N.L.'s Liverpool conference of that year T. P. O'Connor proposed that the League ought not to concern itself with local politics, to the outrage of the body of the conference. In the 1895 election he visited Liverpool only briefly, where he was accused of neglect. As a result of this, and dissatisfaction with the Liberal alliance, his majority was halved. Accusations of neglect re-emerged in the 1900 general election and inspired Austin Harford's damaging challenge. In many ways O'Connor represented the stereotype of Irish political orientation (towards broad sweeping nationalist visions, as opposed to domestic social legislation) more than many of his constituents.

An 1826 Appeal to the Freeholders of Newcastle against Catholic Doctrines and Catholic Claims protested 'the churches have turned into political slaughter-
houses, and... the oath of rebellion has been administered by the priest at the hour of confession. but in the first half of the nineteenth century with the desire of the English-dominated Catholic hierarchy to attain respectability, clerical influence conversely more often aspired to de-politicize the nationalist Irish, discouraging demonstrations of separatist political orientation, and alternatively promoting (especially in the mid-1830s) affiliation to controllable and more politically bland holy guilds. Hibernian societies were deeply suspect and roundly condemned. In 1836 clerical policy became more specific, naming outlawed ribbon societies, and extending the interdict to any society with political aims whose members were bound to defend each other by physical force. Even Repealers could only get so far. The priest of St Patrick's, Liverpool, refused to allow a petition to be put at his church door in 1841, and his consequent complaint to O'Connell produced a rift between English and Irish Catholics.

In the first half of the century priestly support for Home Rule is therefore exceptional. The sole documented example of priestly nationalist initiative in early nineteenth century Manchester is Father Daniel Hearne, who espoused the Repeal cause appearing on platforms alongside O'Connell. In 1841, with a false rumour that the Chartists were going to burn Hearne in effigy, Repealers launched an angry attack. Newcastle similarly boasts few examples of 'political priests', although the links between Catholicism and nationalism may have been accentuated by the leanings of popular lay Catholic spokesman Charles Larkin and master of the Catholic boys' school Michael Kelly, 'an ardent Fenian', whom Cooter cites as the only 'dangerous Catholic leader in Newcastle'. Reverend Mr. Youens and prominent Catholics R. Sheil and Thomas Weld Blundell spoke at Liverpool Repeal meetings in the 1840s, and in 1861 the Liverpool Catholic Young Men's Society's conference complained of the wrongs done to Ireland, announcing, 'we have rights to be gained, we say, and wrongs to be rectified'. But in 1862 the Society's Dr O'Brien denounced the National Brotherhood of St Patrick as 'disreputable', with 'anarchical, infidel, and revolutionary' objects. In 1863 the Manchester branch suffered similar
condemnation and a clerical onslaught on the society in one week reduced its membership from 50 to 12. In 1865 the Liverpool Mercury reported that Catholic clergy were trying to put the movement down, in 1866 Liverpool Irish resolved 'to counteract the teachings and preachings of the Catholic clergy who denounce Fenianism', and Dr Hogarth addressed a pastoral in Newcastle commanding clergy to debar Fenians from the sacraments. Clerics condemned Fenian terrorism in the interest of inter-communal relations, and to the annoyance of Irish communities clergy tried to suppress Manchester Martyrs parades in all three cities.

Clergy feared to upset their English Catholic parishioners, a danger that was evident at an 1874 Liverpool Home Rule meeting where a heckler complained 'are we to subordinate our religion to the principle of Home Rule?' But the church also began to appreciate that it was at risk of constructing a barrier between itself and its (majority) Irish laity, and of turning the, away from the cities of their adoption. Thus, facing the evident failure of the initiatives of the 1830s and early 1840s, the 1870s began to see a significant reworking in relations between nationalism and Catholicism, the rank and file clergy progressively tending to derive their political orientation from their flocks. W. M. Walker proposes that 'It is possible that, in the reckoning of priests, Irish politics were non-political in a way that labour politics were not'. Murphy exaggerated in proclaiming 'every Popish priest is a Fenian head centre', but the martyring of Larkin, Allen and O'Brien was commemorated with distinct Catholic overtones. E. R. Norman observes that in Ireland the martyring of the Manchester three produced a huge outpouring of sympathy among the lower clergy, and it is likely that Irish clergy in England were similarly moved.

It was more important for bishops to appear neutral, and with less interaction with their flocks they were not as in tune with popular feelings as their priests. In October 1867 Bishop Turner of Salford preached a pastoral observing 'the sufferings and wrongs of Ireland are many and great', but he warned that the ends did not justify the means recently employed in Manchester. In 1874 and 1877 Vaughan declined invitations to Home Rule meetings, acknowledging sympathy for Ireland's problems
(which occasioned cheering), but admitting vaguely that he was not yet decided on the subject. Vaughan and Manning continued to regard Home Rule as an irritation, Bishop O'Reilly refused to be drawn, and Goss regularly denounced it, although in 1871, angry at hostility to the Irish in Liverpool, he threatened:

He would read up past history, and would endeavour to arouse them by describing the wrongs that had been inflicted on their country from the first day Englishmen set foot in it... Hitherto he had always preached unto them peace. He had told them to strive to accommodate themselves to circumstances - never to forget the love of country, but not to make themselves offensive to those amongst whom they lived; and when he found any political agitation exciting them he had addressed a pastoral letter to them... but if the Irish portion of his flock were singled out for special obloquy, he would put himself in the circumstance of the Irish people.

In 1892 Bishop Whiteside of Liverpool made the mistake of backing an English Unionist in a school board election. The Irish were outraged, and having accordingly been soundly bloodied in the election the Bishop never made any further comment on Irish politics until 1903 when he removed two clergy from Barrow, accusing them of having become over-involved in nationalist politics.

The increased nationalist vociferousness of the clergy is evident in the rift between Bishop Vaughan and his clergy in Manchester who, in defiance of is proscription, made themselves visible in the local nationalist movement. In 1879 he renewed the threat of excommunication, reconciling 700 Manchester Fenians with the church. After 1869 men like Alderman Daniel Boyle and Canon Patrick Lynch rose in prominence in Manchester nationalist circles. Many priests defiantly attended, were visible on the platforms, and spoke at Home Rule meetings in Manchester in the 1870s and 1880s, and in the 1891 North East Manchester by-election all but one priest was a self-declared nationalist. Vaughan knew that in not adopting a nationalist line he displeased the Irish, and his clergy. After the Phoenix Park murders he wrote:

I have in Synod forbidden all my priests to preside or speak at party political meetings and there has been a howl in consequence. The Irish national papers contrast the spirited Bishop of Nottingham with that tyrant at Salford who destroys all vestige of liberty in the brave and patriotic Irish clergy!!

When the priest who blessed the Manchester Martyrs memorial was transferred from
his Manchester parish, nationalists proclaimed that this was the Bishop's punishment. Clergy were noticeable in increasingly nationalist-orientated celebrations of St Patrick's day. Father McGrath canvassed for the nationalists in Liverpool Scotland division. James McSwiney, 'a fine old Jesuit priest and a good Irish nationalist', advocated the cause, and Father Nugent, though he would not become actively involved because of the movement's links with drink, sympathized, inviting A. M. Sullivan to Liverpool. Porcupine complained, 'Don't bring professional agitators over here to talk treason and unsettle people's minds'. The paper detected a nationalist tone at his temperance concerts and complained, 'We admire any man who tries to raise his fellow man from the mire of drunkenness; but we equally abhor him who, under false colours, prostitutes public support to political schemes'. Clergy attended, appeared on the platform at, and chaired nationalist gatherings in Liverpool. In 1880 the Orange faction accused clergy (falsely), as Forwood had done in 1868, of drilling the Irish to the poll in the Scotland ward election. But the church was still nervous of associating itself overtly with the nationalist cause and in 1882 Father Power of St John's (Kirkdale) complained of Land League electoral agents going door to door with church collectors. In Newcastle Cooter regards Home Rule's success as largely attributable to clerical sanction. The church was quiet on the subject of Fenianism (merely discountenancing participation in the planned 'Manchester Martyrs' parade and proposed subsequent public debate on capital punishment on account of the indelicacy of its timing, two days after the Clerkenwell explosion), but the clergy sat on the platform at Home Rule meetings, and fourteen Newcastle priests attended the Home Rule Confederation annual conference of 1873.

Such involvement, despite the emphatic renunciations of nationalists and the non-homogeneity of clerical affiliation, reinvigorated the cries of 'Home Rule means Rome Rule'. In 1862 the Newcastle Chronicle noted that 'an erroneous impression exists in this country, it is that the clergy in England as well as in Ireland, connive at Ribbonism, nay secretly encourage it'. Such impressions were nourished
by the likes of McNeile who that same year was denouncing Catholicism as nurturing Fenianism, \(^9\) and this later became a common theme amongst itinerant ranter preachers.\(^9\) Porcupine criticized 'bigoted divines doing their very best to open such sore and vexed wounds, as must invariably lead to dissension and strife',\(^9\) and such sentiments provoked the establishment of the Protestant Thousand in 1898, to combat clerical manipulation.\(^9\) But, if anything, clerical involvement probably served to moderate nationalism.\(^9\)

Most immigrant Irish nationalists were not insurrectionary, but surprisingly demonstratively loyal, making frequent public professions of loyalty to the Queen.\(^9\) The Manchester Guardian noted that in 1900 many responded kindly to her public declaration of thanks to Irish soldiers, and Manchester nationalists expressed gratitude for her visiting Ireland.\(^9\) They regarded the attainment of political respectability and adherence to constitutional means as the way forward,\(^9\) and sought,

by temperance in conduct and in speech to win the goodwill of their fellow subjects in England, for they knew that it was impossible for a small people like the Irish ever to obtain their liberty except by the favour of the people among whom they lived.\(^9\)

Trust was placed in British democracy,\(^9\) English hostility not decried, but attributed to ignorance and Conservative manipulation,\(^9\) and common grievances emphasised.\(^9\) On St Patrick's day 1861 Michael O'Hanlon told a Newcastle audience that the British wouldn't tolerate the Act of Union if they knew anything about it, 'but Government took care to have a sycophantic press'.\(^10\) Isaac Butt proclaimed that he wanted to convince all Englishmen of the reasonableness of nationalist aspirations,\(^10\) and Davitt (himself born in Lancashire) was an especially keen exponent of this theme.\(^10\) A. M. Sullivan and J. O'Connor Power spent a lot of time reiterating to audiences that Home Rule represented no threat to the British people.\(^10\) Overtures were made to the English working-class at the 1872 Newcastle Amnesty demonstration, and at the 1881 Land League conference convincing them was highlighted as the primary aim of William Crawford and Joseph Cowen.\(^10\)

The first half of the century witnessed a generally good working relationship
and mutual acknowledgement between Irish nationalism and English radicalism. English radicals campaigned for Catholic emancipation, tithe abolition, an Irish Poor Law, security of tenure and self-government. The National Union of the Working Class adopted repeal of the Act of Union as one of its objects in 1832, and in 1833 it confronted the government over the Coercion Act, leading to the calling a national convention. Among the objects of the Northern Political Union, as outlined in 1831, was abolition of 'that anomalous wonder' the Church of Ireland, and common victimization was a recurring theme in journals such as Beehive, Northern Star, The Cosmopolite, The Reformer, The Destructive, and, unsurprisingly, Doherty's The Voice of the People and The Advocate. Irish distress was frequently the subject of public meetings and the cause of generous subscriptions in all three towns. The Newcastle Chronicle, Liverpool Mercury, Porcupine, Liverpool Daily Post and Manchester Guardian had regular columns on Irish affairs and their editorials (in the case of the Guardian warring with the more conservative Manchester Courier, and the Mercury with the Liverpool Standard) criticized government policy and demanded redress of Irish grievances, which they identified as the product of misgovernment. In 1896 the Newcastle Chronicle was furthermore serializing John O'Leary's Fenians and Fenianism and Charles Gavan Duffy's My Life in Two Hemispheres. As Lowe points out, nationalists in the 1860s did not court public sympathy as they had in 1848, but this was none the less forthcoming. Stephen Fielding supposes that the English working class in the north-east were apathetic about Home Rule. He could not be more wrong. Newcastle radicals were particularly vociferous in their condemnation of coercion and demand for redress of Irish grievances, and by the mid 1880s such men as Adams, George Tweddle, and the ubiquitous Mr Day were convinced of the necessity for Home Rule. A public meeting in Newcastle in 1870 welcomed the Irish Land Bill and gave three cheers for Mr Gladstone and 'three groans for Mr Headlam' (the local MP introducing destructive amendments). Newcastle working class enthusiasm was noted at an 1872 Home Rule meeting, and at an Amnesty meeting that year trade unionists...
participated, working-class Englishmen professing their solidarity and 'belief in the brotherhood of mankind'. A lecture at the Mechanics Institute of the Republican Club in 1873 popularly advocated federalism, and Stephen J. Meany and J. O'Connor Power, speaking to by no means exclusively Irish audiences in the Nelson Street lecture room, declared, to their audiences' approval, the prospects for Home Rule to be encouraging. In 1881 a crowded meeting of town people was held in the Circus (Percy street) to 'place on record a 'protest against coercion and uphold 'the Constitutional Liberty of the Irish People', and at the Town Moor demonstration of that year McAnulty 'expressed the pleasure he felt in presiding over that great and influential meeting, composed of Englishmen and Irishmen. He was glad to see the union that existed between the two countries, which, he said, was owing to the action taken by Mr Parnell and Mr O'Connor...(Loud cheers)'. Processionists, marching from the central station, resplendent in national emblems, 'mustered in their thousands'. The Blaydon band played 'No Surrender' and the South Shields Brass Band 'the popular air 'God Save Ireland''. The *Newcastle Chronicle* enthused:

The public, who crowded not only the footpaths at both sides of the streets, but filled the broad thoroughfare as far as possible, and occupied every point of vantage accessible, enjoyed as fine a sight as there has been witnessed in Newcastle since the great Reform demonstration held on the Town Moor some years ago.....It was admitted by all that the procession had proved one of the most creditable and most successful demonstrations of the kind ever held in the North.

The Land League recruited (albeit with limited success, partly due to qualms about whether Home Rule was a labour question and the Land League a trade society) among Newcastle miners and at the 1881 Town Moor demonstration John Bryson (president of the Northumberland Miners Association) was among those numbered on the platform. In 1882 the Mutual Improvement Society protested against the coercion policy. Petitions for the release of Irish political prisoners from Newcastle in 1897 were signed by the mayor, magistrates and councillors. Interestingly Liverpool also had a Welsh nationalist movement, and in 1882 the Democratic Federation issued a petition signed by English, Scotch and Welsh only asking Parnell to contest the Liverpool election. On St Patrick's day 1889 it was reported that the
shamrock was not just worn by the Irish, but by friends of Ireland. Hulme Radical Association ardently campaigned for Home Rule in the late 1880s and established a Home Rule Union composed of poor 'Friends of Ireland'. In 1889 1200 Manchester working men attended a huge open-air anti-coercion demonstration, addressed by T. D. Sullivan, and the following year they participated in a procession upon the visit of William O'Brien. 'The demonstration was one more proof that the two democracies understand each other', acclaimed the Guardian.

Gladstone's conversion ultimately did much to legitimize nationalism, but this was not immediate, or absolute. Fenianism alienated the middle classes for there was a fear, especially given the events of 1848, that they would 'stir up' the working classes, and Irish nationalism challenged the rights of property and the status quo. Formal respectable opinion continued to regard the Irish as insufficiently responsible to govern themselves, and developed anti-Celtic racism to furnish this argument, as a debate on the issue in Newcastle's Bath Lane Hall indicated. As Foster illustrates, sympathy could often change rapidly to cynicism. Irish electoral capacity and the supposed sinister political manipulation of the Catholic clergy were exaggerated and feared. But Irish political affiliations played little role in day-to-day relations, and the middle class proscription of the Irish on such grounds could enhance working class solidarity. R. J. Cooter questions the extent of working class understanding of, and thereby sympathy for, the Irish cause, but evidence suggests that in the context of residentially integrated and inter-acting politically-aware communities, the Irish received, if not sympathy, at least toleration.
5. Cultural Distinction

The cultural implications of Irish immigration have, as Foster identifies, tended to be insufficiently appreciated. As they were not physically identifiable as later immigrants would prove, the presumption that the Irish could be recognized as a distinct group is dependent upon the supposition that they were conspicuous in their mores. The Irish were set apart from the population at large by religion (usually), language (often) and way of life, writes Walton. Historians have perceived a 'cultural distance' which was very difficult to bridge, and furthermore it has been presumed that failure to adopt and participate in 'English culture' in some way represented an affront. M. Hechter consequently proposes that Irish immigration caused the British working class to be 'divided sharply along cultural lines'. Correspondingly the adoption of 'native' culture is proposed by Hornsby-Smith as constituting 'assimilation'. Even a recent revision of inter-communal relations in Manchester concludes that the cohesiveness of immigrant communities was such that 'the Irish community was part of such working class areas but not quite of them'. Assessment necessitates a re-examination of the nature of, and maintenance of, Irish culture, of the extent of the resultant 'cultural difference', and of ambient response.

However what constituted the cultural determinants acting upon Irish immigrant society, is problematic to delineate. Indeed, what is 'culture' but an externally imposed generalization to define the expression of the collective influence of economic, social, religious, political and geographical characteristics? For example, the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor reported that the manners of Liverpool Irish who 'get forward' were indistinguishable from those of their Liverpudlian neighbours, raising the question of whether we mistake economically-dictated necessity for expressions of 'culture'? Moreover, in practical terms, what Irish cultural idiosyncrasies, and similarly, contextually, what working class culture in general, represented is equivocal. Subsequently distinct comparisons generally constitute the expression of polemic or prejudice, of the English 'respectable' variety,
as represented by Henry Mayhew, Culverwell, Hayes, J. C. Street, Cornwall-Lewis and witnesses before the 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor*, or of the Irish-national kind, as seen in the writings of Heinrick, Bogue and Denvir.¹⁰

Irish culture was not a static and easily definable entity, especially before the Famine, given the economic, geographical and religious non-homogeneity of early nineteenth century immigrants. Indeed some commentators take exception at the presumption of a definable concept of 'Irishness', rightly identifying that this is an externally ordained, generalized, exaggerated and frequently plainly inaccurate superimposition.¹¹ Before the Famine Ireland had not experienced substantial inter-regional migration,¹² and therefore different districts had distinct traditions and conventions, as faction fighting evinced. 'They keep up their provincial jealousies as much as if they were in Ireland', reported Liverpool witnesses in 1836. Indeed this was such a prominent feature of Liverpool-Irish life that Belchem regards it as the origin of the town's peculiar brand of sectarianism.¹³ Depending on the circumstances in which the individual was placed, local and regional loyalties could be more important than nationality.¹⁴ Thus in a large Irish population such as Liverpool's they constituted not a 'community' but a collection of communities, being heterogeneous ethnically, religiously and economically. Furthermore birth-place did not anyway necessarily enduringly determine an individual's mores. Immigrants comprised those who maintained a strong sense of exile,¹⁵ and, subsequently, a conscious and fastidious Irish self-identification (who devoted their lives in England to saving to return to Ireland,¹⁶ and who on failing in this ambition were buried emphatically as Irishmen¹⁷ - 'an Irishman is too proud of his country to deny it, though it may be some disadvantage to him to boast of it', wrote the *Liverpool Mercury*¹⁸), those who lapsed into a hyphenated identity, and those who came to England with positive motives and compromised their ethnicity in the pursuit of economic and social success. Indeed, contrary to the stereotypes, many had little affection for the 'homeland' and no desire to return.¹⁹ Furthermore, as D. H. Akenson, observes, if Victorian England was as anti-Irish as it is sometimes portrayed then there would have been a strong incentive
for immigrants to make themselves as English as possible. However, although Lowe’s concept of a ‘cohesive ethnic community’ seems therefore over-simple, emigration did define the English concept of ‘Irishness’, and stereotypes, generally constructed negatively as the antithesis of Anglo-Saxon civilization, developed with the expanding literature of anti-Celtic racism which thrived after the mid-century encouraged by the 1848 rising and ‘Papal Aggression’, and the subsequent personification of the Irish as the ‘internal ‘other’. These find expression in conservative sections of the local press and middle-class commentary. Together with political objections D. G. Paz supposes objection to the Irish being unEnglish in culture became increasingly important as the century progressed and society secularised; however, this argument cannot be reconciled with the supposed precept that with residence in England the Irish were progressively Anglicized.

‘Ethnic fade’ is as hard to define as it is to measure. Accordingly this is a subject upon which witnesses before the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor were very divided. While two Liverpool witnesses reported that the Irish strongly resisted assimilation, living like ‘a distinct colony’, five others regarded them as being absorbed. One witness reported that the children of Irish parents born in Liverpool were learning ‘the habits of the English’, while another insisted ‘those born in England retain their ancient habits unchanged’. Denvir wrote that ‘the children and grandchildren of Irish-born parents consider themselves just as much Irish as those born on “the old sod” itself’ (‘one is often quite as good as the other’) and emphatically delineates the Irish-by-descent as ‘Irishmen’. Pat O’Mara echoes Denvir’s experience, recollecting that he was brought up in an environment which ‘sternly Irishised’ him. J. A. Banks accordingly regards the Liverpool Irish as uniquely inhabiting an “enclave” in which an ‘Irish’ way of life was preserved impermeated by its urban English context, and Frank Neal, C. G. Pooley and Tom Gallagher regard the descendants of Irish immigrants as ‘absorbing the outlook and attitudes of the Irish’, and ‘just as likely to identify with an Irish culture’. In Manchester too Steven Fielding regards the Irish community, while not exclusive or homogeneous in its
interests and affiliations, as maintaining a pronounced sense of its own peculiarly Irish identity. W. J. Lowe concurs, illustrating the development of a 'distinctly Irish community life', in which those of Irish descent inherited Irish 'identity'. However, M. P. Hornsby-Smith and L. Ryan, assessing modern statistical information, determine Irish immigrants by the second generation to be 'substantially' assimilated. Commentators thus are indeed as divided on this subject as contemporaries evidently were, some identifying a 'melting pot' action, and others on-going 'cultural pluralism'. Obviously integration is a process which depends on the individual's inclinations, origins and the environment in which he is placed. Given the declining numbers of Irish-born immigrants resident in Manchester and Newcastle over the century, and consequently the diminishing contact with Ireland, the assumption of an on-going cultural distinction is dubious. Significantly, there is evidence that relations were not always wholly amicable between the Irish-born and the Irish by descent. As regards the question of ethnic fade Liverpool represents a different story. With on-going population traffic and the opportunity to maintain social and emotional links with Ireland, here Hibernian identity was permanently renewed.

Many historians have seen cultural tenacity as the inevitable outcome of a supposed clannishness and introversion, regarding immigrant communities as ethnic microcosms revolving around the Catholic church and the Irish pub, requiring 'socially-therapeutic' traditions. Denvir viewed Liverpool as effectively an Irish cultural colony, reflecting that there immigrants were 'not out of Ireland at all, but on a piece of the old sod itself'. Harris contentiously supposes moreover that those immigrants who settled in England (rather than further afield) were motivated in so doing by a desire not to sever 'cultural' links. There has always been a tendency to over-concentrate on those conspicuous elements who consciously and emphatically celebrated their ethnicity, at the expense of the rest. However, as segregation has been over-estimated, and as few had the time or education for the conscious exercise of the maintenance of ethnic heritage, the influence of the 'melting pot' instantly began to act upon immigrants. R. J. Cooter asserts that the Irish did not culturally
assimilate as they did not want to, and furthermore maintains that political and religious pressures reinforced Irish ethnocentricity. But the process was not necessarily a conscious one, and it is debatable how genuine this polemic variant of cultural self-identification was. As Colley remarks, self-identification and communal perceptions were coloured by the context in which the individual was placed. If ‘Irish culture’ is the product of submersion in the Irish environment, then surely it follows that the English-Irish background generates a different culture? External influences, together with the experience of emigration in itself and the sentimentality engendered by distance, rendered exile expressions of ‘Irish’ culture distinct from the original native version. Thus while immigrants may have loudly proclaimed themselves Irish, and may have keenly jumped to its defence (as at the 1847 meeting, called in response to a Manchester Guardian editorial), the way they expressed their ‘Irishness’ was progressively refracted through the norms of the society in which they had settled. This is evident, as J. Belchem illustrates, in comparison of the expressions of immigrant Irish in Britain and America in 1848, and those of the native Irish. Tom Gallagher writes that with the conscious fostering of ‘Irishness’ in immigrant communities the Irish-by-descent may have been more ‘Irish’ than their forebearers, but the authenticity of this ‘Irishness’ is debatable. Heinrich lamented the ‘want of community in spirit’ and the consequent cultural debilitation of the Irish;

Here there are elements of opposition in creed as well as in nationality which assail the Irishman at every turn and test his fidelity to the utmost, while - more sinister still - are the various social agencies which both in his hours of labour and relaxation insidiously surround his daily life and gradually insinuate themselves into his thoughts and his habits, with no counteracting influence but those derived from limited association with his compatriots and the inspiration which he draws from the public life and literature of his native land.

A hybrid culture and a fluid identity evolved, continually re-defined and re-worked jointly by city, class and ethnicity. As T. P. O’Connor so perceptively put it,

While retaining their ineffaceable national characteristics, their immutable convictions and indestructible aspirations - they have never the less taken on something of the British environment. And thus the Irishman in Great Britain, while remaining so thoroughly and fervidly Irish, has a certain psychology which makes a distinction between his point of view and that of his race elsewhere...And thus, then, the
Irishman in Great Britain occupies a curious middle place between the nationality to which he belongs and the race among which he lives.45

The transition from 'Irish' to 'English' culture was not, therefore, as straightforwardly evolutionary as there has been a tendency to suppose.

Neither religious nor political interests represent a genuine indicator of ethnic identification, as the motive behind affiliation to both is more complex. Conversely cultural identity was intermittently coloured and redefined by the self-interested manipulation of nationalism and Catholicism, as well as by hostile external influences. Accordingly O'Tuathaigh regards nationalism and Catholicism as the 'two main cultural props' of the community.46 Consequently by 1890 the *Manchester Guardian* described Catholicism as 'one of the Irishman's ways of asserting his individuality'.47 In contrast to the Jewish elite,44 Irish and Catholic leaders recognized assimilation not to be in their interests, and, after overcoming its initial reservations about its suddenly acquired mass of 'low Irish' brethren, the English Catholic church strove to make itself 'almost at one'49 with Irish identity. Belchem writes that in the second half of the nineteenth-century 'religion became the defining element in the culture of working communities',50 E. R. Norman asserts 'It was the Catholic Church which, in most cases, retained their sense of identity and integrity',51 and O'Tuathaigh is even more extreme: 'In short, the Catholic church was a crucial force inhibiting, indeed actively discouraging, the assimilation of the Irish immigrants in the working-class culture of the native majority'.52 Competing with less respectable procurers (emphatically the pub) the Catholic church recognized a great opportunity in the organization of social activities, and so in the second half of the century the church did indeed become the 'centre of associational life'.53 It threatened that if faith was abandoned, so too was ethnic integrity. Mayhew observed: 'It is this the tie of religion, working with other causes, [which] keeps the Irish in the London streets knitted to their own ways, and is likely to keep them so'.54 As religion, nationalism and culture fused church parades were accompanied by nationalistic airs and St Patrick's day celebrations became dominated by the Home Rule platform.55 Therefore cultural
expression, muted in the first half of the century, emerges loudly in the 1860s, expressing ironically, not exiles' sentimental longings, but evidence of a settled communal confidence and pride. However, though R. J. Cooter consequently determines it naive to acknowledge any diminution in Irishness before 1880 and regards the church's 'exploitation of Irish ethnocentricity' as fostering isolation, the cultural reinvigoration that these interested parties sought to instil was a polemic and inauthentic variant, sanitized by 'heavy doses of social discipline'. Thereby, in the repression of some of the more reproached aspects of Irish identity, for example in outlawing the uncontrollable Hibernian orders and replacing them with respectable Catholic Young Men's Societies, Friendly Societies and Institutes, repressing heavy drinking and violence and encouraging self-improvement, this influence in effect conversely encouraged eventual integration.

Mayhew drew a contrast between the social life of the London-Irish and natives, Frances Finnegan regards integration as hindered in York by the lack of opportunity and amenities for an integrated leisure, and W. M. Walker sees the Dundee Irish as experiencing 'an exclusive and intensive Irish community life', 'cut off' from the rest of the working class. Indeed in Newcastle, Liverpool and Manchester, with their networks of Irish pubs, literary and social clubs, debating and dramatic societies, confraternities and guilds, the potential existed (and was strongly endorsed by the Catholic church and nationalists, and initially encouraged by the development of independent self-help, kinship and employment networks) to conduct an exclusively and distinctly Irish social life. After 1867 the social functions of nationalism became especially important to maintain identity and morale. A reading room was set up by Manchester Land League, and the I.N.L., more frivolously, organized picnics. Liverpool I.N.L. held monthly concerts, regular dances and an annual ball and Denvir established the 'Emerald Minstrels', 'our object being the cultivation of Irish music, poetry and the drama: Irish literature generally, Irish pastimes and customs: and, above all, Irish nationality'. All classes and tastes were catered for, and in 1880 an exclusive Irish National Club was established for
middle class residents of Liverpool in the Washington Hotel.\textsuperscript{67} Newcastle nationalists were especially conscientious in providing stimulating and improving recreation. Newcastle's Irish Literary Institute was established in 1871 (thirteen years before Liverpool would establish an equivalent institution\textsuperscript{68}), with its library and reading-room, where, Hugh Heinrich wrote, 'Irish literature stimulates and fosters national feeling, and the members meet for social communion or political consultation',\textsuperscript{69} and in 1893 a Literary Society was set up. The Catholic church went to similar lengths. The nine branches of Liverpool's popular Catholic Young Men's Societies organized constant entertainment, including lectures on Irish history, music and culture, providing reading and amusement rooms and entering teams in billiard tournaments.\textsuperscript{70}

Indeed J. A. Banks regards such institutions as generating a cohesive and exclusive Irish community: 'What the example of Liverpool emphasizes is that it was exceptional for migrants to carry their way of life into a town in the sense of it remaining an abiding source of strength and separateness. Rather was it that the town's way of life became theirs'.\textsuperscript{71}

Collective nostalgia was consumed in Irish social clubs, and in participation in Irish games, as conducted on the Town Moor,\textsuperscript{72} or even in the inter-county pitched battles that were so frequent and infamous in Manchester and Liverpool in the 1820s-1850s.\textsuperscript{73} Churches and nationalists organized cycling, cricket and football clubs, although the popular folklore that Liverpool and Everton football clubs developed out of sectarian rivalry is, T. Mason insists, mythology. The followers of Everton tended to be Protestant and Liverpool Catholics, but the clubs split in 1892 because of rents not religious or ethnic divisions, and (unlike in the case of Glasgow's clubs), neither was established for a particular sectarian community.\textsuperscript{74} The Irish, according to Hugh Shimmin, had a grandstand at Aintree meetings and a marquee at Aintree carnivals.\textsuperscript{75}

Competing for Irish custom pubs offered 'ethnic' entertainment, welcomed fraternity meetings and remained the venue for nationalist gatherings. Hulme had the 'Daniel O'Connell Arms'\textsuperscript{76} and Liverpool, among others, the 'Bank of Ireland' and the 'Maid of Erin'.\textsuperscript{77} When the Irish landed at Clarence dock, Liverpool, they were
greeted by an effigy of St Patrick upon the wall of the pub:

Only one of hundreds of such places in the town which clustered thickest in the overcrowded slum districts, and afforded an easy and cheap means of escape from the nightmare of conditions which beggar description...they were the poor man's club, where the Irish could meet their friends and read the latest news of home.78

Irish nationality was perpetuated in music. A survey of newsagents in Manchester reveals that Irish ballads were popular sales in Irish areas of the town.79 In Liverpool Irish impersonator Dan Lowry ran a pub and music hall where Irish music was constantly performed.80 To get the Irish out of the pubs Father Nugent started his twice-weekly Evening Popular Concerts in 1865, which attracted such large audiences that a purpose-built hall had to be opened in 1875. 'I take care always to have a good Irish jig-dancer at least once a fortnight', he told a Select Committee.81 St Patrick's day was celebrated with 'selections of Irish music and song'.82 Both J. C. Street and the Newcastle Chronicle inquirer noted the incessant sound of Irish fiddles in Sandgate pubs,83 and Fielding observes that Manchester streets were full of Irish singers.84 Most churches had their bands, as did Liverpool's Total Abstinence League85 and Catholic Irish Institute.86 There was a Liverpool Catholic Young Men's Orchestra and brass band,87 Manchester had Gorton Irish National Brass Band,88 and there were numerous popular groups like Mr Watson's Newcastle quadrille band,89 Mr Burgess's Liverpool quadrille band90 and Mount Carmel drum and fife band.91 T. P. O'Connor romanticized, the colonists sang "McKenna's Dream", "The Kerry Eagle", "Napoleon's Farewell", "The Tanyard Side", and other come-all-ye's...Young men and women danced jigs, reels, and hornpipes on cracked stone flags to the "berr'l" of a tin whistle or the rasping of a fiddle in the corner, and old people talked of Erin's glories.92

Such forms of 'Irish culture' were not necessarily received negatively. Indeed there seems conversely to have been an ambient appreciation of it - an antecedent of theme-pub culture. In 1825 the Newcastle Weekly Chronicle reported the huge popularity of the romantic accounts of life in Ireland in Tales of the O'Hara Family.93 The Tyne Theatre and Opera House opened in September 1867 with a performance of
Dion Boucicault's musical drama 'Arrah-na-Pogue', which ran for a month and had an "iconic" status among immigrant Irish communities, performances of it being 'a sacramental celebration of Irishness". Indeed the Tyne Theatre seemed to rather specialize in Irish drama, presenting 'The Irish Tutor' in 1868, 'The Rath Boys' in 1871, 'Arrah-na-Pogue' again in 1872 (to 'crowded and enthusiastic audiences'), and in 1873 the theatre hosted an Irish drama evening at which opened Mr Falconer's (celebrated for his 'delineation of that peculiar humour for which the natives of the Emerald Isle are so famous') 'Killamey'. Thomas Davidson also recalled going to see Joseph Pilgrim's Irish musical review 'The Irish Tiger' in Newcastle. The popularity of Irish drama was even more pronounced in Liverpool. In 1822 Lefanu's comedy 'The Sons of Erin' was staged to raise money for famine victims, but by the 1860s and 1870s the refugees of a different famine had their choice of Hibernian theatrical entertainment. In 1861 Porcupine reflected:

With the so-called decline of the British drama has come the rise of the Irish comedy. It is quite up in stirrups; and from the juvenile and very low comedian, who stands, or rather dances, three feet nothing high in his pumps, at a "Singing Saloon", up to John Drew, the Prince of Irish comedians, nay, to Dion Boucicault himself, who nets his five-and-twenty thousands a year by one play - (a fact!) - Hibernian histrions now live, reign, and riot like Irish kings in "Tara's Halls".

Boucicault's 'Colleen Bawn' was performed in Liverpool throughout 1861, 'Arrah-na-Pogue' in 1865, 'Peep O' Day' in 1870, 'Eileen Oge' before enthusiastic audiences in 1872, and Mr Falconer's 'Innis Fallen, or the Men of the Gap' and 'Killamey' staged in 1873. Porcupine marvelled:

another instance of the extraordinary hold Irish drama has on the affections of English playgoers. Given an Irish rebel, a villainous squireen, a confiding colleen, and a rollicking peasant, and you can at any time command the attention of an audience for some hours. If you throw in a burly priest, the cast is comparatively complete.

'Eileen Oge' and 'Colleen Bawn' returned in 1875 and 'The Shaughraun' (more explicitly political that Boucicault's other plays) ran throughout 1876 and 1877. In 1882 'Colleen Bawn', 'a drama most acceptable to all Irishmen', played again before large audiences. Hugh Shimmin told of how popular this drama was amongst the
Liverpool working classes, and also reported the use of Irish characters in popular street theatre. Indeed it seemed that with an Irish theme a play was guaranteed to pull in the crowds in Liverpool.

Irish and English attended concerts of the ‘great favourite’ sentimental Irish ballad singer Catherine Hayes, and, the hugely popular diminutive warbler of Irish airs, ‘The Infant Sappho’. At Monsieur D’Albert’s annual Newcastle Ball the ‘Kathleen Mavourneen’ waltz was a favourite, and in Liverpool Irish songs were sung at the New Years Day Grand Concert and Ball of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants and the People’s Free Concert. Lectures on Irish music, literature, geography and history proved popular, and ‘Irish Evenings’, of songs and anecdotes, as presented by the Irish comedian Mr Webb in Newcastle in the 1820s, and, in Manchester and Newcastle in the 1840s, by Malone Raymond and Charles Lever (with his ‘Paddy’s Portfolio’), attracted huge enthusiastic audiences, of both English and Irish. Again this was consumed most enthusiastically in Liverpool, which was entertained by Charles O’Malley in the 1840s, by Mr Gallagher (with his portrayal of ‘Irish Life and Character’ which ‘never failed to interest and delight his generally crowded audiences’) and Malone Raymond (whose ‘Hour in Ireland’ produced ‘roars of laughter’) in the 1850s, and by Malone Raymond, once again, and Dan Bryant and E. Marshall in the 1870s. In 1873 a ‘strikingly successful’ ‘programme entirely devoted to Irish music, wit, and humour’ prompted Porcupine to reflect:

> how irresistible Irish humour, however untrue to the national character it may be, invariably proves, it seems strange that performances exclusively devoted to such never-failing sources of effective entertainment have been overlooked...the whole entertainment seems to exactly suit the taste of the audiences.

Cultural communions, as well as serving as an exclusive and retrospective role (allowing mutually satisfying and cohesive expression and affirmation of Irish identity through sharing habits, memories, affiliations, institutions and devotions, and stimulating concrete systems of mutual assistance and protection), also had a positive integrative role in that they, as Clarke identified in the context of America, ‘served as bridges to the broader society’, being ‘structures through which the general
community could have access to the Irish-American subculture', and they permitted
the distribution of power within the immigrant group, facilitated the spread of
information and the rational definition of collective goals, and acted as 'agencies of
social change'. But in Liverpool Pooley identifies that exclusive ethnic
entertainment was far less common and popular among the Irish than amongst other
immigrant communities in 1871, and by the end of the century the popularity of
ethnic-orientated leisure had further deteriorated. Unity progressively derived from
class and locality rather than ethnicity, street socialization bridging differences, as is
evident in the Manchester 'scuttling' gangs which by the 1890s were mainly led by
boys of Irish ancestry and took as their victims not the Irish, but the more
conspicuous, and territorially threatening, Jews.

J. P. Culverwell identified Irish-Catholic self-identification in the reading
tendencies of the Manchester Irish;

He reads nothing but the Tablet, which is the only English Catholic newspaper, and occasionally an Irish paper... The literature of the female and juvenile portions of the Catholic population consists almost exclusively of devotional works, such as The Garden of the Soul, Key of Heaven, Following of Christ &c., &c.; and a penny Catholic weekly periodical has been commenced, attempting to combine general literature with Catholic orthodoxy.

From an early date immigrants were demanding a press to reflect their particular
interests. In 1824 committees from Manchester, Liverpool and Newcastle volunteered
to pay "rent" to support a Catholic 'Free and Independent Press', leading to the
establishment of The Truthbeller. In 1849 Irish schoolmaster and prominent
defender of Catholic interests W. F. Cleary established the Manchester Illuminator to
defend the community from the attacks of 'Stowell and his clique'. This was printed
until the early 1850s, but, while claiming to serve the interests of the local
community, its interests were overwhelmingly theological. In 1851 Catholics met in
Liverpool to establish a journal to defend themselves, and at the 1862 St Patrick's
day celebrations in Newcastle Peter Flannigan identified that what was needed to
'raise the social status of the Irish in this town' was Irish-Catholic reading rooms and
an independent press. Initially the incentive to establish an Irish press was
defensive, but later it reflected the ambitions and interests and the settled maturity of the community in its hyphenated identity.

The Irish immigrant press achieved its earliest success in Liverpool, where its development reflects the importance of Catholic and nationalist influences in shaping Irish social life. After three earlier attempts to establish a paper miscarried (including Justin McCarthy's Irish-manned Northern Daily Times), M. J. Whitty was summoned from London (where he edited the London and Dublin Magazine) at the request of a firm of publishers to edit the Liverpool Journal. In 1855 he set up his own Liverpool Daily Post. Several reporters from the Cork Examiner moved to Liverpool to work on the paper, including Justin McCarthy. As this was Liverpool's first penny-paper Whitty gained the sobriquet of 'Pioneer of the Penny Press'. In 1859 Stephen J. Meany (formerly of the Liverpool Journal, Daily Post and Freeman's Journal) established the Lancashire Free Press. By 1860 this had incurred debts. Meany therefore returned to the Liverpool Daily Post and the Liverpool Free Press became the Northern Press and Liverpool General Advertiser. In 1861 Father Nugent became its editor, assisted by John Denvir. The Northern Press tried to be free of party ties but had a distinctly Catholic flavour, covering local Irish and Catholic meetings, Irish news and supporting Home Rule. Through much of the 1860s its had a small circulation and precarious finances, but Denvir managed to reduce its price to 1d. making it within reach of every Irish family in Lancashire. In the early 1870s it was renamed the Catholic Times and, edited by Denvir, its writers included the nationalists James Lysaght Finigan, Father James McSwiney and The Nation's John Mc Ardle. By 1877 the Catholic Times was selling 25,000 copies per week, and by 1893 it had gone national vending 73,000 per week. Until 1897 it was financed by Liverpool priest Father John Berry, and thereafter it was sold to a syndicate including two more Liverpool priests (William H. Leeming and Alfred Jeanrenaud). In addition Father Nugent published The Catholic Fireside and The Catholic Family Almanac, and Charles Diamond the Catholic News. The Catholic church was thus very successful at monopolizing this area of Irish community life. Denvir left Liverpool in
the 1880s but continued to publish journals for the Irish in England, including *United Irishman, Irish Programme* and the *Nationalist.* The *Liverpool Mercury* also had an Irish editor, as is reflected in its dedicated coverage of Irish news and sympathy for the Home Rule cause. Moreover, the Irish community was not the only section of Liverpool society with its own press as at least two Welsh language papers circulated in the town.

Although Joseph Cowen's *Newcastle Chronicle* had nationalist sympathies and an interest in Irish affairs it was not until 1884 that Peter Flannigan's ambition was realised. In 1884 Charles Diamond (president of a Newcastle I.N.L. branch) established the virulently nationalist (other papers were more Catholic than nationalist) *Irish Tribune* in Newcastle which reported Catholic and Irish news from all over the country. In 1885 a special local edition was created, and by March of that year it achieved 20,000 subscribers. In the 1890s it became increasingly Catholic-influenced and more of a national paper, (being printed also in Liverpool and Manchester) a discrepancy which Diamond amended in 1896 with the establishment of the *Tyneside Roman Catholic News.*

By the 1860s several papers for the Irish and Catholic interest were being produced in Manchester, but none achieved sustained or extensive circulation. In 1888-9 Diamond founded the *Manchester Citizen* which he re-launched in 1893 as the *Manchester Catholic Herald.* J. Bohstedt writes that the *Herald* was 'a sort of Catholic *Northern Star*, holding the Catholic movement together and maintaining its spirit, and it did not always, therefore, please nationalists, as T. P. O'Connor complained in 1900. The Manchester Irish press failed to achieve the consistent circulation of its Newcastle or Liverpool counterparts, but the development of the Irish community press in English cities should not be regarded as a comparative measure of ethnic affiliation, as it depended generally on the existence of motivated benefactors as in Liverpool and Newcastle.

The distinctiveness of Irish nationhood held, though Catholicism might lapse, writes Waller. This is certainly reflected in the preservation of traditional Irish
burial rites, as Durey identifies. In both Liverpool and Manchester Irish immigrants led the cholera riots of 1832.\textsuperscript{145} Irish clashed with the authorities in Newcastle in 1841 in similar circumstances, and again in Liverpool in 1842.\textsuperscript{146} 'Burking' especially concerned Irish immigrants and John Doherty angrily publicized a case of suspected 'Resurrectionism' in Stockport.\textsuperscript{147} Inhibiting the removal of the sick to hospital was taken very seriously by the press and authorities, but even greater criticism was provoked by the continued celebration of wakes. In the 1847 typhus outbreak and the 1866 cholera epidemic the insistence on retaining bodies for wakes caused areas of Liverpool to be decimated by disease.\textsuperscript{148} Since the seventeenth century the Catholic church had condemned the rite and during the 1850s several Liverpool priests swore that this 'abuse' had died out.\textsuperscript{149} Bishops Goss and O'Reilly campaigned enthusiastically against wakes and a mortuary chapel was specially erected.\textsuperscript{150} But as late as 1879 they were reported in the Liverpool press.\textsuperscript{151} \textit{Porcupine} recollected:

In Liverpool, especially in the teeming Irish districts at the North and South ends of the town, these "wakes" became at one time such a shocking scandal, productive as they were of the most horrifying scenes of drunkenness and immorality, that the most stringent measures of the public, medical, and religious authorities were taken to put a stop to the "carnivals of death".\textsuperscript{152}

But, \textit{Porcupine} lamented, the practices continued in 1875, albeit only among those 'so steeped in ignorance and abandoned to drunkenness and brutality, as to be almost hopeless beyond the influence of their priests and religion in which they may have been baptised'.\textsuperscript{153}

Irish transposed the ancient rural tradition of celebrating saints' days to the English city. St John's eve, for example, continued to be commemorated with bonfires.\textsuperscript{154} But St Patrick's day became more than an occasion for ancient rites, and assumed a modern purpose. There had always been more than religion behind such festivals, and for exiles they became a true celebration of Irish nationality. St Patrick's Day did not have an explicitly religious character until the mid-century, and, indeed, until 1840 Catholics and Protestants marched together in Liverpool and Ireland.\textsuperscript{155} However the commemoration of St Patrick's Day is again not an unbiased indicator of
ethnic allegiance, and responses to it are not necessarily indicative of general attitudes to Irish immigrants. It was in Liverpool that it was earliest and most consistently observed, with regular large parades throughout the 1820s. In the first half of the century in Manchester it was celebrated in a sporadic fashion. Before 1846 the *Manchester Guardian* only records its commemoration on three occasions. Similarly in Newcastle St Patrick's Day 1801 was observed in the Duke of Cumberland Inn by about eighty 'respectable inhabitants of this town', who drank loyal toasts and displayed the Union flag, but thereafter it was not commemorated until 1846 when 2-300 Irish paraded through the town with bands of music. By the 1850s celebration became more regular, indicating growing community confidence.

In the 1830s in Liverpool the day was distinguished by violence. In 1835 Father Murphy called for processions to be abandoned 'if their annual return were to be characterized by such criminal and disgraceful conduct', which was 'likely to renew and perpetuate in the minds of the peaceable inhabitants of the town prejudices against themselves, their religion, and their country, which were happily subsiding'. After violence in 1835 the Mayor and letters to the *Mercury* appealed to clergy to discourage processions, and to organize something useful rather than provocative. Temporary success is reflected in positive comments made in the 1836 *Report on the State of the Irish Poor*. By 1839 they were processing again, albeit in an orderly fashion. In 1841 some 5000 Irish marched, provoking Orangemen to renew their parades. As a result of clashes in 1842 the authorities called on the Irish not to walk in July - a condition which they failed to meet. In 1845 despite the appeals of the clergy and the authorities the Hibernians were determined to process, producing a 'miserable display' and little trouble. Elsewhere by contrast the *Liverpool Mercury* praised a respectable dinner where it was proclaimed: 'May the Orange be united with the Green, and may they be blended in harmony and peace'. Both forms of celebration were repeated from 1846 to 1850. In 1851 the authorities tried again to stop party processions, but the Hibernians ignored cautions to the exasperation of the
Liverpool Mercury:

If the two factions could only consent to leave each other on St Patrick's day and the Boyne battle anniversary, in undisputed possession of the mutual right to make fools of themselves, the community at large would willingly tolerate the annoyance and nuisance, rather than resort to the ungracious act of curbing the liberty of the citizen. But this they cannot do...immense mobs of excited people congregate in the thoroughfares, ready to join in any mischief or any affray: and all this is to be tolerated in order that a set of impassioned bigots, who have not the slightest comprehension of what true religion is, may display their admiration of a dead king or a dead saint. Violence was not the only irritation. Parades also disrupted commercial life, driving merchants from the Exchange. But after 1851 processions are rarely mentioned, respectable dinner becoming the norm, and by 1867 the Liverpool Mercury could remark that there had been little trouble for several years, and only 'small boys in back streets marched now'. In fact it became something of a journalistic tradition to comment each year on how much better circumstances now were compared with the past. The Porcupine of 1862 was typical:

In days not very long past, it was the custom in Liverpool to celebrate the festival of St Patrick's Day in a manner far from commendable. Unmeaning processions were formed: long lines of men wearing party favours, carrying flags and banners, led by noisy brass bands, and followed by hordes of disorderly people, traversed the town and suburbs, much to the fear and annoyance of quiet and respectable people. The public-houses on the line of the route did a flourishing trade; and when the procession returned the members dispersed to their various club rooms, in some instances got drunk, had a fight on their way home, and frequently found their way to the Police Station. All this is altered now, and, we think, much for the better.

The celebration reflects social and cultural change within the community. Early revelry had a very wild character. Lowe observes that the last 'major, community wide' celebration of St Patrick's day in Liverpool occurred in 1868. However it does not die out, but rather it disappears from press interest as nationalism and Catholicism put pressure on the Irish to be 'respectable' making celebrations progressively less overtly provocative and more ideologically-driven. Manchester too witnessed brawls on St Patrick's day in the 1830s, but in 1846, 1848 and 1852 the Guardian remarked of its subdued commemoration, contrary to expectation and preparation. Here again Lowe interprets this as symptomatic of a decline in interest in the commemoration.
but rather it testifies to their clergy-driven assimilation to English standards of respectable conduct. By this time too the celebration was noted in Newcastle for respectability and peacefulness. In 1852 the *Chronicle* published Charles Lever's poem 'St Patrick's Birthday' to coincide with 'a grand procession of the sons of Erin', who paraded dressed in green with bands of music before 'an excellent crowd of spectators'. The day was, however, also marked by the usual 'Irish row'. In 1854 marchers collected £8 for Newcastle Infirmary. Similarly in 1855, 1856, 1861, 1862, 1865, 1869, 1879, 1881, 1884, 1885, 1887 and 1889 large respectable parades, concerts and meetings were organized.

The commemoration of St Patrick's Day became progressively more regimented and well-orchestrated, as it was hijacked as a vehicle for the nationalist movement and the Catholic church. In 1834 Doherty had criticized immigrants who complained that a Manchester Repeal Association meeting on St George's Field coincided with St Patrick's Day: 'If there was a man who would not forgo the pleasure of a tawdry procession...he was a rotten friend of the cause, and unworthy of the name of an Irishman'. When only 1000 subsequently did attend Doherty expressed disappointment in 'those Irishmen lured away by gawdy trappings and paraphernalia...from their important and patriotic duty'. But by the late 1860s St Patrick's Day had become an important vehicle for the nationalists. 1848, 1867 and 1882 saw trepidation of St Patrick's day becoming a focus for nationalist violence in Liverpool, in 1848, 1866 and 1867 in Manchester, and in 1866 in Newcastle, but fears were not realized. Nationalist addresses were habitually delivered on St Patrick's day from representatives of the I.P.P. and in 1900 the leaders of the U.I.L. were still travelling to Liverpool to participate in the celebration. In Newcastle John Morely and Joseph Cowen spoke on the same theme, 'Grand national concerts' were held in 1870 and 1871, and, in 1889, collections were made for the Parnell Defence Fund. By the 1860s clergy were using St Patrick's day celebrations as a means to demonstrate and further the 'respectablization' of the immigrant Irish, and in the 1870s mass meetings marked the day in the Manchester Free Trade Hall, organized
by Salford Diocese Temperance Association.\textsuperscript{192} In 1898 Irish dined in celebration of
the centenary of the 1798 rising,\textsuperscript{193} and, by contrast, in 1900, with the relief of
Mafeking and the Queen's subsequent public message of thanks to the Irish troops, the
day became 'an Imperial festival', the Irish response to which, the \textit{Guardian} reflected,
was mixed, depending upon the individual's nationalist credentials.\textsuperscript{194} Subsequently
the quiet private family commemorations and the drunken sprees became more
indicative of genuine personal cultural sentiments.

As the church sought polemically to redefine identity so too did nationalist
politics. The response to the Gaelic Revival, representing a call for de-Anglicization
and ethnic (and thereby political) self-assertion in reply to anti-Celtic racism at a time
of feuding within the I.P.P., provides an interesting reflection on immigrant self-
identification. In 1889 Irish national 'At Homes' were being organized in Liverpool to
promote the 'cultivation of Irish language and of Celtic literature',\textsuperscript{195} and later T. Burke
established an Irish Language Society.\textsuperscript{196} By the 1880s an Irish Literary Association
operated in Manchester\textsuperscript{197} and in 1900 this was augmented as branches of the Gaelic
League and the Gaelic Athletic Association were established, with the enthusiastic
support of the clergy. Gaelic evening-lessons were offered, and (keenly lauded by the
\textit{Manchester Catholic Herald}) Gaelic services held. But popular support was lacking,
and nationalists saw this as a luxuriant distraction from their real work. Only one
U.I.L. branch in Manchester held language classes and few members were active in
the city's Gaelic League. When the Revival emphatically failed in Manchester
activists accused their fellow Irish of having been corrupted by English ways.\textsuperscript{198} In
Newcastle the Gaelic Revival only strengthened already existing movements. While
the questionable success of the Gaelic Revival in England may be interpreted as
reflecting a decline in consciousness of, and desire for, a distinct cultural identity,
conscious culture had always been more the realm of the educated politically-active
middle-class Irish minority anyway (such as Eva Gore Booth's Manchester circle),\textsuperscript{199}
and most considered themselves to be no less Irish for their ignorance of Gaelic
syntax and lax participation in celebrations of Celtic heritage.
Church-designed schooling, directing cultural and social orientation, has been seen to foster both Irish identity and external alienation.\textsuperscript{200} National distinctiveness and separate cultural ties were not dissolved and effaced in a melting pot, but... perpetuated by education over generations', writes Waller.\textsuperscript{201} Consequently conflict was fostered between the young as is evident in Manchester's frequent school battles, such as those reported between St Patrick's and the Abbot Street Board School.\textsuperscript{202} Youth work (often sponsored by philanthropists, such as Edward Caulfield, who in the 1880s established St William's, Angel Meadow) also responded to a perceived threat to faith, and, in the militant religious-ethnic identification it encouraged, fostered gang violence.\textsuperscript{203} Significantly there was among the Irish a great support for denominational education,\textsuperscript{204} an abhorrence among Catholic authorities of Irish children attending secular schools ('Catholic children will go to Catholic schools - or nowhere', Vaughan pronounced),\textsuperscript{205} and a corresponding Protestant fear of the influence of Catholics in schooling.\textsuperscript{206} The education issue was especially provocative in Liverpool, where the Whigs' attempt in 1835 to secularize council education provoked a furious Protestant response. One of the first acts of the returning Tory council (1841) was to enforce the use of the authorized version of the Bible in Liverpool schools, thereby effectively expelling Catholic children from Council schools.\textsuperscript{207} The issue remained controversial in Liverpool, which consequently also eventually introduced separate denomination reformatories and industrial schools.\textsuperscript{208} With the 1870 Education Act school board elections in the city became sectarian battles.\textsuperscript{209} Educational concerns coloured political orientation here,\textsuperscript{210} and, far more than in Manchester or Newcastle, schooling nurtured combative mind-sets.

In 1884 Bishop Vaughan's Board of Inquiry estimated that over 2000 Irish children faced 'unusual danger to faith and morals' because of never having attended a Catholic school.\textsuperscript{211} Moreover Harris echoes an anonymous Manchester witness before the 1836 \textit{Report on the State of the Irish Poor} in remarking that lots of children were sent back to Ireland to be educated.\textsuperscript{212} However it seems unlikely that this was common among the mass of the population for whom children were vital economic
resources. But, though in 1867 28% of the children attending school in Manchester were in Catholic schools,\(^{213}\) only a minority of Irish children attended day schools. In 1853 Canon Kershaw calculated that only 4073 of 23,225 Catholic children were catered for in day schools.\(^{214}\) A considerably larger proportion did, however, attend Sunday schools.\(^{215}\) G. Baines estimated that in 1852 in Little Ireland the average amount of education received by each child of school age was four years and fourteen weeks.\(^{216}\) Surveying Vauxhall ward in the 1840s Abraham Hume found that only a third of the children were receiving any education.\(^{217}\) Between 1853 and 1871 the number of Catholic day school places in Liverpool nearly doubled to 15,000.\(^{218}\) Heinrich in 1872 assessed that 'the school accommodation is almost, if not entirely, equal to the requirements of the time'.\(^{219}\) But in 1870 only 6000 Catholic children went to school regularly on average, out of a population of 20,000.\(^{220}\) Newcastle Catholics were well provided for with schools\(^{221}\) and there was a lack of employment opportunities for children,\(^{222}\) so attendance levels were better here. But consequently neglect here thereby implies ethnic disorientation more than it does elsewhere.

How 'Irish' was this education? As McLeod notes, the influence of schools as 'agencies of indoctrination' has been exaggerated,\(^{223}\) especially as for many this was their only religious contact. Several teachers numbered among prominent nationalists in all three towns,\(^{224}\) (including headmaster of St Cuthbert's grammar school, Newcastle, Michael Kelly, who was noted as an 'ardent Fenian', and the teacher at Liverpool Catholic Institute who was arrested for selling seditious prints) and Irish School Books were used in Liverpool and Manchester.\(^{225}\) But B. Collins observes that the church's defensiveness meant that schoolbooks contained little that acknowledged the Irish background of the majority of scholars.\(^{226}\) Indeed S. Fielding observes that the Catholic schooling in Manchester contrarily sought to Anglicize Irish children as loyal Catholics, to the annoyance of nationalists.\(^{227}\) Denvir recollected that 'there was nothing very Irish in the teaching' as Copperas Hill School, Liverpool, until it was later taken over by the Christian Brothers,\(^{228}\) and Pat O'Mara reiterates this conclusion at the end of the century.\(^{229}\) Moreover it is unwarranted to assume that educational
institutions were exclusive. Many Catholic schools had such good reputations that they attracted Protestant children, erratic attendance was a problem, and, furthermore, many Irish children attended ragged-schools and the clubs of rival religions. In the latter circumstance education acted as an agent of integration, not Catholic-Irish indoctrination. In Manchester's Industrial schools poor English and Irish were educated together. C. H. Richards explained, 'In them there is no sectarian feeling allowed whatsoever', and 'I do not remember, on any occasion, ever to have heard of any altercation between the children'. This was furthermore the case in Liverpool at least until the 1860s. Most Irish parents could not afford to send their children to school (415 were however permitted to attend the Manchester Catholic Charity Day School gratis in 1852), and many minors worked (although this was not necessarily a barrier as 47% of those attending St Augustine's and St Chad's combined this with working, many attended night-schools and some Irish employers established factory schools teaching from the Irish National School Books) or minded younger siblings.

Linguistic factors set apart the Irish and, it is suggested, were a source of alienation. Gaelic was the first language of many Irish immigrants, especially during the Famine crisis which exiled the rural, the uneducated, and the unequipped for emigration. The 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor noted that the use of Gaelic was declining, but in his 1850 survey of Liverpool Abraham Hume found that a surprisingly high 55% of Catholic families in St Stephen's District and 43% in Vauxhall were Irish-speaking. In 1839 Thomas Carlyle complained that the Irish 'speak a partially intelligible dialect of English', and in 1862 Punch disparagingly reflected of immigrants: 'when conversing with its kind it talks a sort of gibberish'. Engels remarked that it was common to hear Gaelic spoken in the poorer quarters of Manchester and J. C. Street reflected that in Sandgate 'A language is spoken you hardly know', Father Mathew administered the pledge in Manchester in Irish, and symbolically in 1848 Feargus O'Connor addressed the St Patrick's Day rally of Irish Confederates and Chartists in both Gaelic and English. In 1854 the Newcastle
Chronicle commented on the number of Irish appearing in court who 'could not speak one word of English', as the mayor himself encountered at a hearing:

"But we can speak Irish well enough", returned the mayor whose philosophical researches had drawn him into Hibernian acquaintances...A single question, however, to the woman, convinced his worship that the Irish language was something different from English spoken with a brogue.250

Both in England and Ireland the church encouraged its flocks to speak English. In 1861 St Mary's Catholic Young Men's Society, Liverpool, was, moreover, offering elocution lessons.251 However church authorities recognized the need to provide Gaelic-speaking priests. Indeed acquaintance with Gaelic was regarded as a necessity in Irish areas of Newcastle and succeeded in securing the adulation of laity.252 R. and J. Foran's preaching to their "admiring flocks" was "thronged from all along Tyneside".253 During the 1830s the Irish Society,254 the 'Irish Aid Society'255 and the 'Society for Affording Instruction to the Irish in their own Language',256 were operating among the Irish working classes in Manchester and Liverpool, distributing proselytizing tracts in Gaelic.257 Indeed Reverend A. Hume's survey of Liverpool prompted him to start learning Gaelic, although, interestingly, he noted that only one in a hundred of those who spoke Gaelic was Protestants.258

However, the extent of Gaelic speaking should not be exaggerated. By 1851 only 4.9% of the Irish population could not speak English and only 23.3% could speak Gaelic.259 Inter-communal contact, the encouragement of nationalist leaders such as O'Connell, and the necessities of employment rendered the use of Gaelic a declining phenomenon,260 and so there was minimal interest in the turn of the century efforts to revive it. As K. P. Corrigan suggests, abandonment of Gaelic was generally a calculated choice, the acquisition of English being regarded as a 'prerequisite of social and economic advancement in an expanding and increasingly urbanized world'.261 Linguistic difference was an important contributory factor towards the impression of the Irish as alien. But, though many, like Dan McCabe (born in Stockport and raised in Ancoats) retained conspicuous Irish accents,262 the importance of this should not be exaggerated in the context of migrant-swelled towns. Indeed
Pooley identifies that Welsh was also widely used in Liverpool. As D. H. Akenson points out the ability of the vast majority of Irish immigrants to speak English gave them an advantage over other immigrant communities. The provincial press reflects that Irish dialect was frequently a source of amusement to the English, but, as Porcupine reflects, while this was rarely more than harmless banter, it did provoke the Irish:

We may make jokes at their accent now and then, but if they were not so dreadfully sensitive and prickly, people would soon give over a kind of pleasantry which elicited no ebullition of amusing ill-temper.

Contemporary testimony suggests that demographic behaviour distinguished the Irish and was regarded as a cultural peculiarity. They generally marry early, and have large families: their wives are generally Irish', observed Rev. Vincent Glover of St Peter's, Liverpool. Contrarily in Ireland couples tended to marry late, waiting for dowry and inheritance, and Lees' studies in London reveal that with an independent income the Irish began to marry about the same age as natives. Alison, typically, reflected that the most striking characteristic of Irish peasants was 'their boundless habits of increase'. Pondering Liverpool’s high birth-rate in 1914 E. M. Elderton attributed it to its having an Irish community. However it seems that the notion of the Irish multiplying without restraint was a Malthus-inspired myth exploited by anti-Celtic racism, for evidence suggests that there is little foundation for this theory. Irish immigrants tended to be young adults, so an Irish immigrant community of a certain size would probably have produced more children than a native community of equal size, but there is little evidence that they produced more children per couple. In 1871 average Irish family size in Liverpool was 4.1, equalling the general figure for the town as a whole. L. Lees proposes that between 1851 and 1871 immigrant family size progressively declined until it was smaller than the non-Irish average, and it was generally lower than the domestic Irish average of 5.5. As J. Morris remarked, a misconception frequently arose from the fact that the Irish generally were forced by poverty to live in overcrowded circumstances. Cooter's examination of Wall Knoll and St Mary's Streets (Sandgate) reveals that the average number of
children per Irish family during the period 1841-71 was 2.7, the size progressively increasing, rather than declining with adjustment as was hitherto presumed. Comparing household surveys made of the two working-class Manchester districts of Police Division number two (1834) and of Chorlton-upon-Medlock (1854), Irish family size appears to be smaller than the average (3.95 as opposed to 4.8), but the number of lodgers is considerably greater in Irish households (6.6 on average, compared to 0.3). This is confirmed by Busteed's study of Little Ireland in 1841 where average Irish household size was 6.7 persons compared to non-Irish of 5.3, and Busteed and Hodgson's study of Angel Meadow in 1851 where Irish household size is 10 persons compared to non-Irish of 6.4. These finding are repeated in Liverpool where Lowe calculates that the number of persons per house was only fractionally higher for Irish occupants than non-Irish, but so too was the number of lodgers per household (indeed the number of lodgers per Liverpool household in general was distinctly greater than the national average for Irish immigrants, reflecting the peculiar housing shortages and poverty of the town). Even in 1871 nearly a third of Liverpool Irish households kept lodgers, and moreover it was very common for two Irish families to share a household (as again it was in general in Liverpool), especially in the immediate wake of the Famine. As it is difficult to distinguish family size from household size this is an area of controversy: although Lowe estimates that Irish family size in Liverpool was small due to a high death-rate and chronic housing shortage, Lawton's survey finds that the areas of Liverpool with high Irish population density had a high-birth rate. The notion that Irish families were non-nuclear can be confirmed more easily. The census enumerators books of 1841 and 1851 in Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle (contrary to MacDermott's suppositions) reveal an unusually high proportion of single heads of households. Hornsby-Smith regards demographic peculiarity as constituting a barrier to be overcome in the process of assimilation; however this is more a reflection of economic realities, than of cultural peculiarity.

Exogamous marriage represented possibly the greatest single agency of Irish
assimilation. It was not taboosed by English intellectual commentators. Indeed would-be anthropologists advocated 'intermarriage with the quicksilver Celt in order to alleviate Saxon cloddishness'. However in practice it was discouraged by the unusual gender balance of immigrants, by popular prejudice and by religious allegiances. In 1858 Bishop Hogarth lamented the rising numbers of mixed marriages in Newcastle. Despite the church refusing to accord the nuptial blessing to these unions, it continued to have to lament their increase in 1875. The Liverpool Catholic Family Annual of 1888 condemned intermarriage as 'unlawful and pernicious', the 1900 Diocesan census of Manchester labelled it 'most pernicious', 'unwholesome' and 'a curse', equally it continued to be discountenanced by Protestant authorities, and latterly, after the development of Celticism, by nationalists. Although mutual social pressures were influential, the level of intermarriage represents no clear indicator of community relations, and high levels of endogamy are identified amongst the other groups of common origin who peopled the city. Denvir wrote that Irish Catholics 'rarely marry outside their own creed and nationality', and this is confirmed as Pooley calculates that in general 75% of Irishmen and 79% of Irishwomen resident in Liverpool married within their own communities. Evidence from Manchester and Newcastle suggests these estimates to be too high as the century progressed, but in Angel Meadow in 1851 Hodgson and Busteed found 90% of married Irish having Irish partners. By comparison in Newcastle in 1851 71% of marriages involving an Irish partner were intramarriages, and, interestingly, of the 29% of intermarriages one quarter were to Scots. This is no real indicator of community relations, and was fostered by the unusually strong male bias of the Newcastle Irish community. Unfortunately parish visitation surveys of Liverpool are incomplete. R. Roberts recalled that in Manchester at the start of the twentieth century it was regarded as a social disgrace for a working class English girl to marry a 'low Mick from the Bog', and consequently that 'such unions seldom occurred'. Fielding reiterates this opinion, but Smith's survey of Dearsagate in 1851 finds 144 couples of two Irish people and 57 mixed marriages. In 1884 Bishop Vaughan estimated that 1500 Irish
children were in 'extreme danger' in Manchester as the result of mixed-marriages. By 1901 S. Fielding estimates that 39.4% of Irish-born women were marrying English-born men. These statistics are all of course for the Irish-born, and so figures necessarily exaggerate the extent of exogamous marriage. It remained more unusual to marry a partner of different faith than of different national origin, and with the Irish-by-descent categorized as English, exogamous marriage was far more common amongst second-generation immigrants.

P. F. Clarke presumes that the English responded to Irish cultural distinction with uncomprehending fear and suspicion. Harris conjectures that Irish immigrants 'tended to retain the habits and customs of people who didn't intend to remain', and were 'so unlike' their non-Irish neighbours as to render them 'uncomfortable with the proximity'. The first half of this statement is unlikely to be valid for Manchester and Newcastle, but perhaps represented the outlook of some Liverpool Irish. Jackson likewise presumed that inability of Irish immigrants to culturally detach themselves from Ireland directly hindered integration and fostered prejudice. Indeed Frank Neal regards cultural differences as constituting the primary source of resentment. Displays of Irish culture of new immigrants would indeed have seemed alien, and culture collectively identified the Irish. But, as John Belchem remarks, 'the Irish were not a single out-group facing a stable population', especially in Liverpool with its cosmopolitan and constantly changing population. Over the century both the remarkability of Irish culture (albeit at different rates in the three cities), and evidence of mass participation in it declines, and, moreover, Irish idiosyncrasies were eclipsed as the subject of public curiosity by those of the new more conspicuous immigrants. Pooley's survey of immigrant communities in Liverpool reveals that the Welsh and Scotch were distinctly more culturally cohesive than the Irish, and therefore more remarkable in 1871. Irish mores did not perforce alienate and socially handicap them as has been suggested, for the Irish did not inhabit isolated Gaelic theme-parks, and just as communal inter-action progressively coloured the nature of cultural expression, so too did it re-work the response to it.
Residential integration is perhaps the most obvious index of community assimilation, and accordingly its incidence has been distorted. The image of the 'ghettoized' Irish was sensationnally and expediently forged in J. P. Kay's reports on 1830s Manchester.\textsuperscript{1} The potent symbolic value of this model caused contemporaries\textsuperscript{2} and, with subsequent empirical difficulties, historians to perpetuate it,\textsuperscript{3} until it became synonymous with the Irish urban experience. Consequently E. P. Thompson's assertion that 'the Irish were never pressed back into ghettos'\textsuperscript{4} has been vehemently criticised.\textsuperscript{5} Those residing in 'ghettos' proved most interesting, and also conveniently the most easily identifiable, but this does not mean that they are representative.

Segregation is a problematic concept and it is difficult to test it either objectively or conclusively. Most studies still set out to demonstrate that it did exist and conclusions are very much dependent on what the author intends to demonstrate. As C. G. Pooley reflects, 'It is possible to manipulate spatial boundaries and definitions of clustering to produce almost any outcome'.\textsuperscript{6} Identifications of origins derived from the census are an imprecise indication of ethnicity. The census enumerator, the historian and the contemporary neighbour may not all agree in who they define as 'Irish', and in identifying only the Irish-born there is consequently a danger of distinctly underestimating concentration. Our sources are insufficiently subtle to illustrate the heterogeneity of Irish populations or indeed, likewise, that of 'native' society, and segregation that is psychological rather than purely physical is impossible to measure. Furthermore the census also only provides a static impression of residential distribution, and, it being available only once per decade, it is extremely difficult to examine community movements. Moreover, what defines segregation? John Foster regards streets as segregated where an Irish household had at least one Irish person resident in a neighbouring house.\textsuperscript{7} This definition is highly suspect, and, were it applied to Liverpool, would define virtually the entire town as an Irish ghetto.
Recent meticulous census studies have brought into question the incidence and extent of ethnic isolation. Segregation was never as complete, constant or remarkable as historians have suggested. 'Even the most notorious Irish towns' were of mixed ethnicity, though often of unmixed class', writes Fitzpatrick. Clustering is still identified at the micro-level in all three towns (as it indeed is for all the internal migrant groups which comprised the anything but homogeneous society of nineteenth century Manchester, Newcastle and Liverpool), because of the tendency of the Irish to reside with extended family, but these do not constitute 'ghettos' in the original sense of the word, and equally the notion that the ghetto was 'impermeable or permanent' (as suggested by K. O'Connor) is highly dubious. Indeed Hunt regards the fact that there were more clashes between Irish and natives than between Jews and natives as indicative of the latter community's greater segregation.

Any element of ethnic clustering is also chronologically limited, Irish society proving geographically and, to a lesser extent, socially fluid. Fitzpatrick, Pooley and Lowe conclude that the Irish 'diffused quickly', and examination of census enumerators' books for Newcastle for 1841 and 1851 confirms these impressions (see Fig. 6.5 and 6.6). Street transience made the existence of permanent Irish enclaves impossible, though economic circumstances meant that communities reproduced themselves in different locations. While Manchester's Little Ireland was physically decimated in the 1860s with railway construction and industrial expansion, Engels observes, 'The bourgeoisie pointed with pride to the happy and final abolition of Little Ireland as a great triumph...Little Ireland had not been abolished at all, but had simply been shifted from the south side of Oxford Road to the north side and it still continued to flourish'. At times of inter-communal tension, such as the late 1840s, early 1850s and late 1860s, Belchem, Foster and Kirk contend that the 'Irish community' (the term itself is dubious) defensively 'solidified and turned in on itself'. But it is unrealistic to presume that this involved wholesale movement of people. As the Irish recovered from the initial shock of the Famine and submersion in alien urban society, desire to cling together lapsed and individuals became submerged rather in a culture of
poverty. Never settled or stable, the Irish-by-descent lost some of the cultural distinctiveness that may have been an initial positive source of unity. Economic circumstances changed and with slum demolition 'communities' dispersed.

It has also hitherto been presumed that 'segregation' (interestingly the term is conventionally employed as opposed to self-segregation) is an entirely negative phenomenon, symptomatic of external hostility and clannish introversion, and thence Hornsby-Smith proposes that they could only be assimilated when residentially integrated. Werly sees the Manchester Irish as unwelcome outside their own territories, and cites Thomas Armitt to the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor: "it is like oil and water". Cooter supposes that many were nervous of leaving the community as, 'To face the Anglo-Saxon majority alone was only to encounter alienation. Kirk cites Irish encroachment on 'English' streets as one of the inducements to violence in Stockport in 1852 and Ashton and Stalybridge in 1868. Indeed J. Foster proposes that the degree of segregation correlates chronologically to community relations. However contemporary testimony reveals its causality to be infinitely more complex (thereby calling into question its value as an indicator of community relations). Dispersal was determined by the distribution of cheap housing far more than by the existence of sectarian strongholds. Primacy, especially for the Famine generation, was given to economic considerations (rent levels, proximity to the workplace, transport costs). The 1836 Report divulged that natives were 'unwilling to mix with them', but went on to revealingly disclose that they 'herd together in particular quarters or streets of the large towns, and thus associate constantly with each other, and have rarely any intercourse with the natives of the place, except those of the lowest class'. Thus segregation was economic and social rather than ethnic. In confirmation Pooley's detailed census survey of 1871 Liverpool demonstrates that the Irish were forced into segregation by economic circumstances far more than was true for the city's Scottish and Welsh communities. He plots the Irish geographically according to occupational status, demonstrating conclusively that while those in non-manual occupations were able to diffuse evenly, those in manual,
and especially unskilled occupations, were segregated by property prices and employment proximity.\textsuperscript{39} Chain migration fostered economic, social and institutional links;\textsuperscript{30} lack of previous familiarity with urban residence encouraged recent arrivals to cluster defensively together;\textsuperscript{31} and the more positive inducements of family, and religious and kinship bonds encouraged people from the same regions of Ireland to cluster together in particular areas.\textsuperscript{32} Interestingly Pooley, however, concludes that cultural determinants were far more important in the formation of Scots and Welsh clusters in 1871 Liverpool, economic necessity giving the Irish little choice in where they resided.\textsuperscript{33} Clannishness is not therefore in itself symptomatic of ethnic hostility and the same patterns are indeed reproduced by internal migrant groups.

Manchester

While Davis acknowledges that the traditional historiographical portrayal of the ghettoized Irish is a myth for Britain as a whole, he insists that it was valid in nineteenth century Manchester,\textsuperscript{34} where the image originated.\textsuperscript{35} Werly (who like Davis draws heavily on Kay, Engels and the \textit{Report on the State of the Irish Poor}) regards the Manchester Irish as concentrated in two 'clearly delineated ghettos'\textsuperscript{36} and Ryan's \textit{Biography of Manchester} presumed that they lived in 'distinctly marked' colonies.\textsuperscript{37} Gerard Connolly elaborates: 'Gathering in five or so districts, the two-best known and the more ghetto-like of which, Irish Town and Little Ireland, resembled wholly-owned Irish fiefdoms, the Manchester Irish from the outset led a life removed from the generality of local society, the object of some curiosity and of more than their fair share of gratuitous hostility'.\textsuperscript{38}

It is true that by the 1830s the colloquial names of 'Little Ireland' (only constructed in the 1820s), 'Irish Town' and 'Irish Row' were already well established.\textsuperscript{39} New Town (colloquially 'Irish Town') is frequently described as 'very largely Irish',\textsuperscript{40} while Little Ireland is portrayed as ethnically monochromatic: in 1832 the \textit{Guardian} described the area as 'inhabited chiefly, if not wholly, by them';\textsuperscript{41} the 1842 \textit{Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population} described it as 'almost
exclusively Irish, in 1847 the Manchester Courier described Little Ireland as 'a sort of Irish colony', and in 1852 Rev. L. Richardson said Little Ireland was 'almost an Irish Roman Catholic colony'. So well established was the name 'Little Ireland' that in 1850 it appeared on the Ordinance Survey of Manchester. The 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor insisted that the Irish like to keep themselves separate and that the English avoided mixing with them, and consequently concluded that most lived separately. Culverwell reiterated these suppositions in 1844, observing 'They congregate together, and form in the town a number of distinct communities', and 1854 C. H. Richards affirmed that they 'congregate a good deal in the same quarter'.

But it is possible that these suppositions emerge from (as well as from economic, political and social agendas) unfamiliarity with these areas and uninvestigated opinions. As both Engels and Cooke-Taylor remark, there was little communication between socially specific districts and locality identities were more influential than any general sense of being Mancunian. Moreover other contemporaries denied that Manchester experienced ethnic spatial exclusivity. In the 1836 Report witnesses commented that the bulk of the immigrants lived mixed in with the 'natives' and in 1844 Faucher denied that there was any ethnic spatial exclusivity in Manchester - a theme echoed by Reach and Waters. Indeed the authenticity of Kay's original case study is distinctly questionable, given that in 1832 only 7% of Manchester's Irish lived in Little Ireland and in 1841 only 3%. Furthermore it has been highlighted that Kay's original principal stricture, that the Irish would drag down the morals and manners of the native working class, is inconsistent with the supposition that the two groups did not interact.

Census surveys, both undertaken by contemporaries and historians, query these testimonies. Manchester Statistics Society usefully frequently surveyed the city's ethnic composition, and Mervyn Busteed and Rob Hodgson have recently investigated Irish concentrations in Little Ireland and Angel Meadow in 1841 and 1851 respectively. While censuses feel more 'factual' than contemporary testimonies, it is important to remember that as snapshots they can be just as deceptive.
Busteed's census study of Little Ireland in 1841 reveals that of the 1,510 inhabiting the area 64% were Irish born, and a further 12% of two Irish parents. Five streets in the district were 90% Irish, and 83% of the Irish in the area inhabited streets over 76% Irish. Moreover 96% of the Irish lived in houses with an Irish majority. Thus, at this point the area indeed fits the ghetto model. But this is not necessarily representative for the entirety of the century. A Lecture upon the Sanitary Condition of Chorlton upon Medlock in 1854 talked of Irish leaving nearby Little Ireland after 1847 and coming to Chorlton, a survey of which indeed reveals a large proportion of Irish names. An 1840s survey of St Luke's parish (including some of Little Ireland) revealed a 31% Catholic population. Although five streets had a Catholic population of over 50% (Russell Street [62%], Furness Street [56%], Peel Street [50%], Back Rusholme Road [50%] and Lyon Street [50%]) and clustering is again evident within streets, no streets were monopolized, and they were not segregated within the area, only two streets in the district having no Irish inhabitants. In confirmation a 1853 Report on the Sanitary Condition of Certain Parts of Manchester observed of Little Ireland that 'The inhabitants of this locality are for the most part Irish, but not entirely so.' Unfortunately the 1851 census enumerators manuscripts for Little Ireland have been destroyed. In the mid 1850s a lot of slum property in Little Ireland was demolished for industrial expansion, and by 1861 very little of it remained. Thus Engels admitted in the 1892 edition of Condition of the Working Class that Little Ireland was a historical, not a contemporary, phenomenon. The ethnic and cultural exclusivity implied by the very name was simply no longer valid. Accordingly by the turn of the century Chorlton on Medlock was only 28% Catholic.

A survey of Manchester Statistical Society of 1834 revealed that even the infamous area around Oldham Road (Irish Town), 'a district inhabited by the working classes and by those of the poorest description', was only 43% Irish, which J. Butterworth confirmed two years later, estimating that the vicinity was only half Irish. An 1840s survey of St Michael's Ward (Irish Town) revealed that Angel Street was 71% Catholic and courts off Ashley Lane 62%, with considerable clustering.
evident within streets, but the area as a whole was only 49% Catholic, and no streets were monopolized. Two recent census surveys by Busteed and Hodgson have analysed Angel Meadow (part of Irish Town) in 1851, concluding that the Irish were becoming dispersed. Of the 10,995 inhabitants surveyed 4,735 are Irish-born (43%) and a further 807 born in England of 2 Irish parents (7%). This population is not exclusively distributed. Of the 89 streets 41 have an Irish majority, although 37 of these streets are concentrated in the same area. In this cluster of eastern Angel Meadow there was a core of streets over 75% Irish and a surrounding zone 50-74% Irish. In the northern and western areas of Angel Meadow there are several streets with less than 10% Irish population, but only six have no Irish at all. 84% of the Irish in the survey thus inhabited Irish-majority streets and 88% lived in houses with an Irish majority. Thus, while a significant element of segregation is evident it is not total or impenetrable (see Fig. 6.1). In 1871 Angel Meadow was still a third Irish, with certain streets with high Irish concentrations (in 1881 Old Mount Street was 68% Irish and Back Simpson Street 77%), and at the end of the century it was still 56% Catholic, but this hardly constitutes a ghetto, and most of the Irish in the city were dispersed into other areas.
Districts other than Little Ireland and Irish Town similarly witnessed a pattern of concentration at a macro-level but general submersion. A census of Miles Platting divulged it to be only 21% Irish in 1837. In 1840 a census by Joseph Adshead of hand-loom weavers families (it being a trade in which the Irish were over-concentrated and therefore not an unbiased indicator of population distribution) revealed those residing in Ancoats to be 50% Irish, New Town to be 73% Irish, Deansgate 51% and Portland Street 41%. J. H. Smith's examination of ten acres of Deansgate in 1851 echoes these conclusions in identifying among the 417 Irish-born people in this population of 1241 an 'apparent random distribution', 'far from rigidly segregated'.

Thus S. Fielding regards the concept of ghettoization as 'wholly inappropriate' for Manchester by the 1880s. The Irish did, however, remain overwhelmingly in the working class districts, and so in 1890 40% of Manchester's Catholics remained concentrated in seven northern parishes. Kay's image of them colonizing areas to the exclusion of natives was never valid and increasingly Irish were to be found in every district of the town. Interestingly Louis Hayes, Reminiscences (1905) recollect a 'Jewish colony', but makes no mention of any comparable Irish phenomenon.

Liverpool

Lowe observes that Liverpool was far more residentially segregated than Manchester. Indeed this is a common presumption among historians since the Irish here were sufficiently concentrated in Scotland division to elect a Home Rule MP. Frank Neal observes that while the term 'Little Ireland' was employed in other towns it 'had little meaning in Liverpool, where such areas were common'. This impression is furthermore enhanced by the territorialism which featured in disputes in nineteenth-century Liverpool, encroachment into a rival party's territory being a traditional provocation. Rather than Irish districts consolidating, Frank Neal observes that in the last quarter of the century certain streets were becoming increasingly Orange. Pat O'Mara wrote at the turn of the century 'The Catholic elements have their stronghold
in Scotland Road, along with goodly segments of the southern end of the Dock Road. In the South the Protestants have Clive Street and Ferry Hill, and in North Netherfield Road and Lodge Lane scattered bits grouped under the name of the Orange River. By the end of the nineteenth century Everton was 'the most partisan Orange area', Great Homer Street forming 'the acknowledged boundary' between the Catholics of Scotland division and the Protestants of Everton. However the impression of ethnic garrisons is misleading, for the details of disputes reveal that areas were by no means ethnically (or religiously) exclusive, troubles frequently commencing with one side victimizing the aliens.

In 1834 Charles Purnell, dock master of Liverpool observed that the Irish were 'very much disposed to congregate together in particular districts'. William Dillon and James Whitty told the 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor that there were several areas known in Liverpool as 'Little Ireland', notably Back Portland Street, and St Patrick's and St Peter's were noted for their large Irish populations. They live exclusively - 'like a distinct colony' reflected one witness. In 1844 W. H. Duncan estimated that Lace Street (Vauxhall) was 87% Irish, North Street 83% Irish and Crosbie Street 87% Irish. In 1847 the Manchester Guardian delineated Irish dominated areas of Liverpool as St Thomas District (several streets apparently were almost exclusively Irish), New Bird Street, Brick Street, Curtis Street and St Joseph's (almost exclusively). In 1875 Porcupine observed that most of the Liverpool Irish resided in Scotland and Exchange, and in 1880 the Mercury confirmed that Scotland ward was largely inhabited by Irish operatives. In 1877 the area around Lace Street was reported to be 'almost entirely inhabited by Irish labourers'. But even in 1836 William Dillon struck a note of dissent in cautioning that the 'English and Irish mix a good deal together', and Denvir reflected of his own childhood, 'Our street...was by no means what you would call an Irish street'.

Papworth, Pooley, Lawton and Laxton have conducted census surveys of the distribution and concentration of Irish population in Liverpool. In 1841 the Irish were concentrated in seven wards, 40% of them being in Vauxhall, Exchange, (both
in the dockside working class north-end of the city-centre) and Great George in the south, but they were also distributed all over the city. These were recognized 'Irish' areas but streets were rarely over 50% Irish. The census confirmed John Finch's 1841 survey revealing 45% of household heads in Vauxhall to be Irish-born. The area had earlier been known as 'Welsh Town', but by the 1840s it was emphatically 'Little Ireland'. The Second Report into the State of Large Town and Populous Districts (1845) surveyed the area of St Bartholomew's (overlapping Scotland and Vauxhall), the population of which is 51.7% Irish. But of the twelve streets in the district none were exclusively Irish and only five have an Irish majority (two of 90%, one of 72%, one of 60% and one 59%) so that four-fifths of the district's Irish population lived mixed in with non-Irish. In 1850 Abraham Hume surveyed Vauxhall ward again. His figures reveal that it was 43% Irish-born, but, though 19 of the 54 streets and courts were over 50% Irish, only one street was 100% Irish and only one had no Irish residents. Paul Laxton's maps reveal that between 1841 and 1851 the Irish population underwent concentration and dispersal, strongholds in Vauxhall, Exchange and Great George being intensified and entrenched and proportions increasing in St Paul's, St Peter's and Pitt Street Wards (see Fig. 6.2 and 6.3). Lawton's detailed census survey of 1851 confirms these findings. Rarely do streets have an Irish majority, but Bell Street (Great George) was 41.4% Irish-born, the area between Waterloo Road and Great Howard Street (Vauxhall) 59.7% Irish and the area of Dryden Street, Oswald Street, Scotland Road and Little Homer Street (Scotland ward and St Anne's) 27.8% Irish. By the 1850s Scotland Road was being called 'Little Ireland'. Examining these findings Lawton finds the Great George area one of permanent settlers who had arrived generally four to five years before, the Scotland Road area comprising many Irish who came to England eight to ten years ago and the dockside Vauxhall area comprising many single Irishmen in transit to America. This latter observation is significant as what may appear to the historian (and to the contemporary observer) as Irish colonies may actually have comprised clusters of individuals in transit. Lawton's plans also indicate an Irish presence of
some degree in most areas of the city, including wealthy areas where they comprised Irish servants and the prosperous merchant community around Abercromby square. Between 1851 and 1861 the central areas in general ceased their rapid 'Irishization' of the previous decade and the population dispersed to the more outlying and formerly medium-low concentration districts of St Anne's, Scotland ward and Toxteth. After 1861 concentrations in the central dockside areas increased again, as the non-Irish began to leave these older dilapidated areas. Thus Pooley's 1871 survey reveals the Irish apparently conforming to 'traditional 'ghetto' models', concentrated by poverty in the city's worst areas. Indeed the poverty of those inhabiting these areas was so extreme that 'not only were unskilled Irish segregated from skilled Irish but also...the unskilled Irish formed a community distinct from the rest of Liverpool's unskilled population'. Comparatively, although they also form clusters, the Scots and Welsh in Liverpool at this time were residing in higher-status and lower-density housing in Kirkdale and Everton. However there were also a significant Irish presence outside the synonymous and infamous central wards, and Pooley identifies skilled working-class Irish moving into Everton by this date (see Fig. 6.4). Seven of these enumeration districts were therefore over 50% Irish in 1871, but only 30% lived in these north-end areas associated with the Irish, the Great George Street concentration disintegrating and the majority being submerged, but it is interesting to note that there were certain districts which the Irish barely infiltrated including the more remote and largely Protestant working class Kirkdale and the better-off Abercromby division and in 1871 there was still one enumeration district with no Irish residents.

Though surveys thus reveal simultaneous concentration and dispersal, no area was monopolized by the Irish, and so Papworth argues that the terms 'ghetto' and 'colony' are inappropriate. Pooley concludes that 'there is little evidence that Catholic Irish were pinned back into ghettos', and even Lowe concedes that the concept of ghettoization is inappropriate. Liverpool was therefore not any much more segregated than Manchester, but the nature of the city's religious and political
distinctions meant that, despite the fact that working class Protestant and Catholics often lived side by side, there was more of a pervasive and long-standing sense of belonging to different communities. Bohstedt concludes: 'Physical contiguity did not prevent social and cultural segregation'.

Fig. 6.2 See P. Laxton, 'Irish in Liverpool'. Paper delivered at 1984 Loughborough Local and Regional History Conference.
Fig. 6.3 See P. Laxton, 'Irish in Liverpool'. Paper delivered at 1984 Loughborough Local and Regional History Conference.

Fig. 6.4
Newcastle

There is a great consensus among historians, despite the fact that most regard inter-communal relations in Newcastle as superior to elsewhere, that the Irish in the city were 'coalesced into sharply defined and exclusive areas'. This unanimity is largely derived from Cooter's relative monopoly in researching the area and his adamant insistence that they were ghettoized in Sandgate. Interestingly, however, Cooter regards this as a voluntary self-exclusion symptomatic of community cohesion rather than ambient hostility. That ghetto preceded any hostility rather than being the product of animosity, he writes. McDermott endorses these conclusion.

In 1812 Hodgson's Picture of Newcastle recorded Sandgate as 'chiefly inhabited by keelmen' native to the town. But by the 1840s contemporaries were chronicling the high Irish concentration in this area of cheap housing. Indeed in the 'Horrid War i' Sandgeyt the Chronicle saw an attempt to take the territory. Other areas synonymous with the Irish were Wall Knoll, Silver Street, Buxton Street, Gibson Street, Lime Street, Victoria Square and Mount Pleasant, which by 1850 was according to the Newcastle Chronicle 'now colonized by the Irish. The invasion has been so complete, that, among the numerous families in this quarter scarcely an English one is to be found. I found only two (and I believe that there are no more). In 1854 assistant overseer of All Saints George Grey reported his district to contain most of Newcastle's Irish.

In the absence of any detailed census study for the town, I have undertaken a geographical survey of the Irish-born derived from the census of 1841 and 1851 (see fig.6.5 and fig. 6.6). This study, calculating the percentage of Irish-born per street, reveals no concentrations in 1841 worthy of being called colonies. Although Irish concentrations exist in older dockside property in All Saints, the Irish are evenly distributed across the city, and their presence rarely reaches over 20% on any streets, and nowhere over 50%. Of the synonymous areas detailed above none achieved concentrations comparable with Manchester or Liverpool:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>% of Irish inhabitants 1841</th>
<th>% of Irish inhabitants 1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandgate</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Knoll</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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By 1851 concentrations had increased in All Saints West (The Side [32%], Coburg Stairs [66.7], Dark Entry [55.5], St Nicholas's Churchyard [23.2] and St Anne’s Street [29.6], were, in addition to those streets detailed above particular concentrations), but no streets were monopolized and concentrations remained comparably lower than were experienced in Liverpool and Manchester, while Irish continued to be evenly distributed across all other districts of the town. Confirming these conclusions, in 1885 Charleton noted of Sandgate that, while principally inhabited by Irish its population constituted a ‘mixed colony’.134

Thus the contemporary accounts and historical suppositions referred to above, even taking into account the augmentation of the impression of Irish presence by the inclusion of the English-born children of Irish parents, are greatly exaggerated. Thence this calls into question Cooter’s suppositions about the ethnic and cultural cohesion of this community.

**Key for Fig. 6.5 and 6.6**
Proportion of street populated by Irish:

- 0-2.5%
- 2.5-5%
- 5-10%
- 10-20%
- 20-30%
- 30-40%
- 40-50%
- 50-60%
- 60-70%
- 70-80%
- 80-90%
7. Racial Prejudice

The nineteenth century saw the development of a sophisticated anthropological etiquette of racial ordering and discrimination. With the emergence and spread of racial shorthand it has been presumed that the host community, despite obvious economic, religious, social and cultural diversities, lumped all immigrant Irish together, attributing to them the characteristics of journalistic and music hall caricatures, making ethnological distinction a new source of hostility on the street. Kirk surmises ‘ethnic animosities thus constituted a staple feature of working class life and the popular politics of the period’. The publication of L. P. Curtis’ investigation into anti-Irish racism reinvigorated interest in this area in the 1970s, but subsequent reassessment has brought into question Curtis’ portrayal of English attitudes.

Though he underestimates the importance of social snobbery in the formulation of this ‘science’, Curtis admits that anti-Celtic racism was essentially a preoccupation of the educated classes and as such it constituted part of the armoury defending property and position. That great champion of the status quo Disraeli protested: ‘this wild, reckless, indolent, uncertain and superstitious race have no sympathy with the English character’. Racism was thus seen to give an elevating, supposedly intellectual vindication to prejudice. Marx wrote ‘This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short, by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes’, but, despite his suspicions, there is little evidence that this was consciously propagated amongst the masses with any ‘divide and rule’ agenda. Kay, Mayhew and Engels all work with stereotypes of the Irish as innately debased and degenerate - ‘a less civilized race than the natives’. Carlyle, though sympathetic to Irish political demands, subscribed to racial discrimination, comparing Saxon ‘decent manhood’ favourably with the ‘Celtiberian' immigrant’s ‘wild Milesian' ‘squalid apehood' and ‘savagery’. D. G. Paz points out that racial physical differentiation of the Irish was not really valid,
especially not in comparison to the white-black racism that Curtis seeks to equate it with, but, whether distinctions were real or not, Victorians perceived them. Mayhew employed the cartoonists' short-hand in his description of the London Irish, with their 'low foreheads and long bulging upper lips', 'physiognomy best known as "Irish"' and 'short petticoats and large feet', as did Engels in Manchester ('the explorer may safely count upon meeting chiefly those Celtic faces which one recognizes at the first glance as different from the Saxon physiognomy of the native'), and the Manchester Guardian, Liverpool and Manchester Couriers, Porcupine and the Newcastle Chronicle make similar observations. The 1836 Report on the State of the Irish Poor is a catalogue of middle-class stereotypes and its over-use by historians has consequently produced the impression that the racial approach was more pervasive than it perhaps actually was. Punch indulged in racist images, in the aftermath of discussion regarding Darwinism, for comic effect, but their impact was hardly benign. In 1862 it observed:

A creature manifestly between the gorilla and the negro is to be met with in some of the lowest districts of London and Liverpool by adventurous explorers. It comes from Ireland, whence it has contrived to migrate; it belongs in fact to a tribe of Irish savages; the lowest species of the Irish Yahoo. When conversing with its kind it talks a sort of gibberish. It is moreover, a climbing animal, and may sometimes be seen ascending a ladder with a hod of bricks. The Irish Yahoo generally confines itself within the limits of its own colony, except when it goes out of them to get its living. Sometimes, however, it sallies forth in states of excitement, and attacks civilized human beings that have provoked its fury.

The somewhat superior ability of the Irish Yahoo to utter articulate sounds, may suffice to prove that it is a development, and not, as some imagine, a degeneration of the Gorilla.

But except in the mid-century the reading public was hardly bombarded with such images. Moreover the purity of racial objections is questionable, influenced by social and economic considerations and political polemics, and accordingly these images were rarely aired by the press for their own sake, there usually being a political, religious, social or economic agenda. Much of this was furthermore simply an embellishment of class prejudice, the "low Irish" being socially substandard to all but the lowest English. To the middle-classes Irish residential and occupational
segregation enhanced impressions of their inferiority, but these distinctions were hardly likely to influence those who shared the slums. For my part, I should much rather be exposed to the savages of New Zealand than to a community composed of the worst specimens of humanity to be found in the wynds of Glasgow, the cellars of Liverpool, and the Angel Meadows of Manchester, pronounced Cooke Taylor, illustrating that middle-class observers regarded the working class in general as a 'race apart'. Indeed the characteristics habitually ascribed to the Irish were those attributed to the working class in general, that is to say everything that the 'civilized' classes believed distinguished themselves from the labouring masses. It is interesting to compare the treatment of the Irish in Manchester with the superior toleration of the generally wealthier, thriftier and more independent and 'respectable' Jews. Significantly, as Williams identifies, 'other immigrant groups were in every case more affluent, less numerous and less vulnerable than the Irish'. By the 1880s the emergence of a large Jewish working class in Manchester was, however, provoking the re-emergence of some familiar critiques - the Manchester City News observed their 'crowded, dirty, polluted, insanitary, and indecent' tailoring workshops in which 'swarms' of 'ethnic' 'invaders' competed 'unfairly' with the native work force, provoking clashes on the streets. Interestingly this provoked communal leaders to implement an Anglicization programme to promote conformity to English social and cultural norms, just as the Catholic church had endeavoured.

Curtis writes that by the mid-century scientific racism was 'finally assembled and re-produced for a mass reading public which was by then ready to believe almost anything of a derogatory nature about the Irish people'. J. Saville concurs, identifying 'a widespread conviction, a matter of belief and faith, that the English and the Irish, the Saxon and the Celt, were divided by clear-cut racial characteristics as well as religious and cultural factors'. In Charles Kingsley's Alton Locke two Chartists discuss that the Irish are a nation of savages, but this says far more about the author (who habitually referred to the Irish as the 'white chimpanzees') than popular response. The cheap gutter press, more a mirror of
attitudes than a moulder of them, as Paz points out, pandered to its audience. Thus
analysis of the popular papers distributed by Abel Heywood's in Manchester and
Shepherd's in Liverpool (Lloyds romances, *Family Herald* and the more expensive
*Eliza Cook's Journal* and *Working Man's Friend*) reveals much about attitudes. The
emerging response is mixed and is expressed in religious and cultural more than
'racial' terms. Where racial stereotypes are employed it is not with consistency and
so the emerging impression is ambiguous, contradicting Joseph Cowen's lament that
'our illustrated papers seldom portray an Irish peasant in any other character except
that of a scoundrel, a skulk, or a coward'. Most of the stories with 'ethnic' focus do
concentrate on the Irish (which in itself implies a popular attraction to these
romanticized images of Hibernian life), but they are by no means the only group to be
stereotyped. The cheap press has no interest in the origin of these images presuming
Irish character derives from centuries of ethnological inheritance rather than
environment. However portrayals are not necessarily negative. Indeed there is much
heroic glamour in many of these fantasies. The 3, 1/2 d. press has a wider perspective
and, moreover, shows elements of Irish character as stemming from centuries of
English political oppression and religious persecution. It was not just the educated
who were party to stereotypes. Even the illiterate were exposed to the prevailing
simian cartoon images of the Irish, and the working classes of Liverpool, Manchester
and Newcastle would have been familiar with the stage Irishman. When *Arrah-na-
Pogue* was performed in Liverpool *Porcupine* observed: 'We recognize in their talk all
the idiosyncrasies peculiar to the original Hibemian - the reckless impulsiveness,
thoughtless generosity, savage devotion, and totally illogical faith'. Denvir regarded
this traditional portrayal of the Irish as an 'objectionable' phenomenon. But Gilley
draws attention to the fact that images were generated in part by how the Irish viewed
themselves. Many of the stage Paddies were Irish and the stereotype was enhanced
by the street ballads the Irish themselves penned and sung. The Irish joke was a well
established tradition by the early nineteenth century, in which O'Connell indulged,
and, common in the local press, was generally innocent, good-humoured and even
Consequently, as Foster highlights, the stereotypes are contradictory; Paddy is cunning and has the gift of the gab, but is ignorant, is indolent but laborious, agitated and volatile but submissive.  

The extent to which 'scientific racism' effected everyday contacts is controversial. Curtis writes, 'anti-Irish prejudices constitute one of the longest secular trends in English cultural history', but Gilley feels the English were far more likely to object to the Irish on religious, cultural, political or economic grounds, essentially, 'rejection of English values' (as Curtis indeed admits), than the sense of them as an alien race. He writes, 'they suffered as Catholic republicans, not celts; and they could pass the so-called barrier of 'race' by a change of idea, apostasy to imperialism and Protestantism'. Several witnesses in 1836 affirmed: 'There is no national prejudice against them, the dislike of them arises from their habits and character'. Marx is often quoted, reflecting that the Englishman's attitude to the Irishman was 'much the same as that of the "poor whites" to the "niggers" in the former slave states of the U.S.A.; but on account of 'religious, social and national prejudices' rather than racial prejudice. Ethnicity rendered them collectively identifiable, and it is possible that a fundamental racial discrimination generated a disproportionate highlighting of all Irish failings. It is impossible to deduce which came first. At the level of immediate relationships people were treated as individuals rather than as units of 'Irishness', but more remote judgements derived from a collective impression, which necessarily depended upon presumptions regarding national character. Thus, with a fairly monochromatic portrayal being generated from many quarters, an immigrant might be a respectable Protestant but he would encounter situations in which he, as it were, was 'tarred with the same brush'. Suggesting that 'racist' response derived from economic, social and political experience rather than being an ethic taught to the working class en masse, experiences differ in the three cities. Perhaps naively Manchester is proclaimed 'cosmopolitan', Cooter typically acclaims Newcastle as 'singularly lacking in the conventional extremes of racial and religious bigotry', while of Liverpool it is lamented, 'Racial hatred was ingrained in the city's history'. Racial
prejudice is seldom expressed at a popular level in anything other than hybrid form, and accordingly the Irish sought political and religious rights, not racial equality.\textsuperscript{46}

Gilley and Paz insists that in his effort to portray the Irish as Britain's 'colour problem', an idea with appeal to Liberal American historians, Curtis grossly exaggerates the extent to which the nineteenth century English working class were educated in scientific racism and to which the Irish were conspicuous.\textsuperscript{47} 'Scientific racism had little if anything to do with mid-nineteenth-century views about the Irish', concludes D. G. Paz.\textsuperscript{44} But collective criticism was by no means necessarily an intellectual or educated response, and, as Miles and Foster point out,\textsuperscript{49} stereotypes existed since Irish and English first came into contact. The cumulative impact of exposure requires consideration, for, although no notable specifically racial attacks on the Irish can be identified, racial thinking must have contributed to the background of hostility and reinforced cultural, economic, social and religious objections. Furthermore the working classes were far from immune to social snobbery themselves, and so while inter-marriage may have been censured by educated observers as objectionable for corrupting Anglo-Saxon blood with a racially baser variety, proletarian elitism castigated the Irish as the lowest of the low. This impression was reinforced by Irish poor economic performance, crime statistics and public health problems. A. M. Sullivan lamented the prejudice of the skilled English labourer:

\begin{quote}
In their eyes, the Irishman's lack of mechanical skill, and his utter ignorance of civilized wickedness are equally heinous, and equally brand him an inferior. To complete the antagonism, the Irishman's language is to them a foreign tongue, his religion is, in their eyes, a jibe and a reproach. Everything tends to place him in the position of the bondsman and the serf.\textsuperscript{50}
\end{quote}

D. MacRaild concludes that 'stereotyped responses to the emergence of Irish settlements in Britain remained pretty much unreconstructed even down to the Edwardian period'.\textsuperscript{51} However Paddy on the contrary is a transient image, his features changing according to current circumstances. Accordingly Curtis' perspective is distorted not only because he only acknowledges those anthropologists who conform to his model, but by the fact that he consequently employs material overwhelmingly
from the late nineteenth century. At the height of the Famine when conspicuously alien people were swarming into Liverpool and Manchester there probably did exist a xenophobic gut objection, based on their conspicuousness, and these sentiments, as Joyce supposes, were exploited by the hostile political establishment in Liverpool, which continued to receive immigrants in their most 'raw' and unassimilated state. In 1883 Arthur Forwood recollected that with 'The inroad of strangers...a race prejudice sprang up, which time has not obliterated', and which he was not without responsibility for sustaining himself. In 1893 he declared that the Irish were 'certainly foreign in many of their ways to the ideas and principles of his hearers'. H. J. Hanham writes that the town lived 'in an atmosphere of white-hot religious and racial passion, kept up by the press and the clergy of all denominations'. Comparatively such distinctions probably ceased to be aired elsewhere after the hysteria of the late 1860s. Interestingly Paz reveals that Irish stories in the popular journals distributed in Manchester became increasingly rare after the mid 1850s suggesting that they became less of a subject of curiosity and thus that perceived racial differentiation was becoming increasingly unimportant. In confirmation of this William Thorp's 1871 lecture to St Paul's Literary and Education society on 'Poor Foreigners' in Manchester made no reference to the Irish.

In the early century Paddy was often merely an innocent figure of fun, but as the Irish became politically assertive he became more sinister. Nationalism, like Catholicism, made the Irish seem like the 'internal 'other', encouraging racial treatment. Belchem writes:

> The volume and nature of anti-Irish propaganda underwent significant changes once the events of 1848 demonstrated Irish "apartness". Paddy appeared in new and defamatory guise, denied his former benign and redeeming qualities. Unable to conform to British political and cultural norms, he was depicted as racially inferior.

The Liverpool Mercury protested 'There is a taint of inferiority in the character of the pure Celt which has more to do with his present degradation than Saxon domination'. But, reflecting alarm at the current climate, it soon reconsidered: 'There are good Irishmen and there are bad Englishmen...All idea of conspiring against the Irish
because they are Irish...is to be depreciated as wicked and, indeed, foolish. At the height of the No-Popery agitation of the 1850s the Liverpool Herald ranted that ‘the lower order of Irish papists’ had ‘no care for anything but self-gratification that would degrade the brute condition’, and the Mail concurred that the Irishman ‘does not think as the Englishman, or Scotsman and Welshman does, because he is so saturated with traditional falsehoods’. Bogue lamented the lack of mutual ‘understanding’ between the English and the Irish:

The Irish are still as truly “aliens” in race, in religion, and in feeling, from the great mass of the British nation...The Catholicity of the Irish, no doubt, magnifies and increases this national prejudice against them; but the prejudice itself existed when the two people were Catholic. It is a prejudice of race, not of religion, and it has its foundation in a natural difference of temperament, character and disposition...Thus they become to each other like men who are speaking in unknown tongues. Each party fails in his attempt to make the other comprehend his meaning, and each departs more and more strengthened and confirmed in his hereditary prejudices.

Suggesting the current climate of opinion the Newcastle Chronicle interpreted the ‘Horrid war i’ Sandgeyt’ as a racial conflict, though other coverage suggests in was provoked by a Protestant ranter. In 1852 Mr O’Hanlon complained before a Newcastle audience: ‘in this country...Irishmen were looked upon as an inferior race (Hear, hear)’. By the height of Fenianism O’Day writes that Racial hostility was at fever pitch in many northern towns. After the Manchester Martyrs affair the Guardian sighed, ‘What else is to be expected of the Irish?...there is at least truth enough in the famous dictum that they are “alien in blood, language and religion” to prepare us for hearing of the occurrence of many scenes among us with which our eyes are unfamiliar’. Examining the Lancashire press in 1868, Greenall reflects:

There was a long tradition of anti-Irishness in Lancashire. One observer declared just after the election that Lancashire was as Liberal as Yorkshire, except on one issue: Ireland. The Irish in Lancashire, he declared, are the ‘poor whites’, and ‘nowhere is the illiberal notice “No Irish Need Apply” more fully carried out in the social and political relations of life...Lancashire has contracted towards the Irish much of the feeling which actuates the Orange Protestants in Ireland’.

It is no coincidence that the 1860s witnessed the popularization of the press ‘simianization’ of the Irish. In 1872 Father Burke lamented that, ‘the average
Englishman despises the Irishman, looks down upon him as a being almost inferior in nature. Many exponents of anti-Celtism believed that the Irish were unfit to govern themselves, and their arguments were adopted by opponents of Home Rule, including Liverpool's Tory working class. In 1877 a Manchester priest complained at a Home Rule meeting that 'attempts were no doubt frequently made to blacken the character of the Irish people', the British press being embroiled in 'a great scheme of conspiracy by which they endeavour to bring the Irish name into disrepute and to sew discord and hatred between the English and the Irish peoples'.

In England's Dealings With Ireland (1887), R. S. Watson reflected that many attributed 'the present difficulty' to 'the supposed fact that the Irishman of today is a celt'. By 1890 the Liberal Guardian was feeling reconciliatory and appealed: 'Irishmen may be different from Englishmen, and in some respects no doubt they are, but they are much nearer to Englishmen in habit of mind, in manners, and in outlook upon life generally than they are to Frenchmen or Germans. It is absurd and monstrous that the two races should have misunderstood each other so long.' By 1895 it confirmed that Unionist argument seemed to depend on blackening the Irish character. Curtis regards Victorian commentators and cartoonists as undertaking this 'simianization', but, as Foster points out, this was a long-standing formula to justify Britain's treatment of the Irish. Furthermore this was enhanced by nationalists who sought to justify self-governance by emphasizing England's lack of historical right to command the Irish race. In 1872 Hugh Heinrich described Irish immigrants as 'a nation within a nation... a foreign and peculiar element resident among a people different in habits, tastes, religion and sentiment'. By 1873 meetings of Manchester Home Rule Electoral Association styled themselves as 'a gathering of Celts in this city of the stranger'. This became increasingly sophisticated and popular, the Gaelic revival exalting their own racial and cultural superiority in opposition to 'Anglo-Saxonism'. As it turned out Celticism was of considerably longer duration than Anglo-Saxonism.

Comparing the fate of the Irish in Scotland and America, Tom Gallagher observes that the Irish were disadvantaged in the former location by being the only
immigrant group of any size in the nineteenth century. He presumes that in a multi-
ethnic community the Irish were more prepared to assert themselves, to compete and
defend themselves, and supposes that in such an environment they also enjoyed the
advantage of not being the obvious target of blame. By comparison in rapidly
growing English industrial cities and ports the Irish were not the only non-indigenous
group, and moreover tended not to be the only non-English community, especially as
the century progressed, and of immigrants they tended to be the least alien. It is true
that as these societies became increasingly multi-ethnic so focus on the Irish
diminished, but even when this was not the case Gallagher underestimates the
assertiveness of Irish immigrants in the face of direct hostility.

The historian is compelled to a large extent to employ the shorthand of
stereotypes and ethnic definition, albeit that this may involve applying false
generalizations, but in presuming contemporaries responded to the Irish in racist
terms we risk applying an anachronistic and inappropriate modern interpretation. The
very word 'racism' is, after all, a twentieth-century coinage. The question of racial
objections encounters all manner of semantics and complexities of definition, and
moreover, as O'Tuathaigh remarks, the application of an ethnological interpretation
often inspires imprecise and overly-emotional judgement. Racism essentially
constitutes an emotional gut reaction but it is necessarily expressed in terms of the
characteristics of its subject which in themselves constitute economic, political
religious and social critiques, making it difficult for the historian to isolate racist
expressions except by undertaking the empirically problematic task of measuring the
accuracy of supposedly factual testimonies. Moreover some of the supposedly racist
criticisms of the Irish had a basis in economic, social, cultural, religious and political
fact, and as such do not constitute prejudices. Not only is it hard to say at what point
prejudice becomes racial prejudice, but, additionally, this form of objection was
generally expressed in day-to-day discrimination rather than proclaimed in riots
which makes it even more hard to identify.
8. Conclusion

Even the most revisionist historian would not dare to deny that the Irish in nineteenth century England represented an unpopular intrusion. But research suggests that the standard portrayal of them as 'the largest unassimilated section of their society, as a people set apart, rejected and despised', living 'a life of incessant combat among a people who hated them', requires qualification and clarification.

Anglo-Irish relations in the north of England have a distinct chronology and complexity. Neither the Irish, nor the societies in which they settled, were homogenous and all shades of opinion existed on both parts. They were not consistently disliked by every native of the north as economically, politically, religiously, culturally, socially and racially threatening and alien. Rather different sections of society objected to them at different times and for different reasons. Expressions of hostility generally emerged sporadically with external encouragement, rather than there being a swelling internal antipathy. But their collective failings generated a negative characterization, aided and abetted in no small part by the political and social establishment, especially in Liverpool. Indeed one of the most important emerging themes from this study is that attitudes derived not from what the Irish did, but from perceptions of what they did. Thus while incidences of them lowering wages, acting as strike-breakers, constituting a peculiar social problem, brawling, rollicking and breeding, pestilent and indigent, being threatening and embittered nationalist terrorists and priest-driven ardent and unbending Catholics are rare, stereotypes were believed and propagated. Moreover nationalists and Catholic apologists had an interest in depicting the Irish as oppressed and suppressed, and so both sides have perpetuated extreme portrayals, generating a sensational history.

No single history of Irish immigration can be constructed. Rather there is a myriad of disparate and even contradictory histories. This study illustrates the danger of generalization, there being diversities of experience between all three cities, and
within all three cities. Thus it is a nonsense that Manchester continues to be presented as typical of the experience of Irish immigrants in Britain as a whole. But research also demonstrates that extreme contrasts are usually invalid. While Liverpool may have indeed been the least welcoming venue of the three, day-to-day relations were not as austere here as some studies have suggested, the habitually cited examples of English-Irish conflict generally constituting Orange-Green clashes. Evidence from Newcastle is even more strikingly contrary to its conventional portrayal (widely reiterated but single-handedly generated by Cooter) as singular in its embracing of the Irish. Experiences differed in the three cities because of disparities in the economic, social and religious type and size of the immigrant community, and contrasts in the relative maturity of local economies and the attitudes of political and religious oligarchies, both of which, even in a single city, varied chronologically. The relative importance of context and type of immigrant is unquantifiable, but, while the former has traditionally been emphasized, immigrants being assumed to represent an undifferentiated homogenous mass, hopefully this study illustrates that the latter is as, if not more, important in accounting for diversity of experience.
## Abbreviations used in Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LM</strong></td>
<td>Liverpool Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LWM</strong></td>
<td>Liverpool Weekly Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC</strong></td>
<td>Liverpool Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MG</strong></td>
<td>Manchester Guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NWC</strong></td>
<td>Newcastle Weekly Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NDC</strong></td>
<td>Newcastle Daily Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IESH</strong></td>
<td>Irish Economic and Social History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHS</strong></td>
<td>Irish Historical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEcH</strong></td>
<td>Journal of Economic History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEccIH</strong></td>
<td>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JSSL</strong></td>
<td>Journal of the Statistics Society of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NWLHSB</strong></td>
<td>North-West Labour History Society Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THSLC</strong></td>
<td>Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIBG</strong></td>
<td>Transactions and Papers of the Institute of British Geographers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRHS</strong></td>
<td>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCL</strong></td>
<td>Liverpool Central Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCL</strong></td>
<td>Manchester Central Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCL</strong></td>
<td>Newcastle Central Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWRO</strong></td>
<td>Tyne and Wear Record Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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395. M117/1/5/1-28 City of Manchester, convictions for vagrancy and prostitution, MCL; MG, 13 September 1828, 18 April 1835, 21 June 1836, 16 January, 12 May, 21 July 1847, 18 November 1848, 14 February 1849, 30 April, 21 June 1851, 26 February 1853; LM, 28 August 1840, 13 January, 4 May 1847, 1 February 1848, 20 February 1849, 31 May 1850, 16 July 1850; NWC, 19 March 1825, 9
February 1828, 3 January 1829, 27 July 1831, 11 April 1840, 25 January 1845, 4 August 1848, 1 September 1848, 22 December 1848, 12 October, 30 November 1849, 15 October 1852, 6 February 1857, 7 May 1859; NDC, 1 September 1860; George Forwood complained of Liverpool: 'This town, as you, Sir, so well know, is much infested with this species of beggars: namely, Irishwomen and children'. See Report from the Select Committee on the Laws relating to Irish and Scotch Vagrants, 1828, p. 218; Report on the State of the Irish Poor, pp. 10, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, 27, 48, 62; Reid, Report on the State of Newcastle, p. 90; Report of the Select Committee on Settlement and Poor Removal, 1847, pp. 458, 464; Returns of the Number of Irish Poor Relieved out of the Poor Rates in 1848, p. 54; Report from the Select Committee on Criminal and Destitute Juveniles, 1852, vii, p. 350; Report of the Select Committee on Poor Removal, 1854, pp. 369, 390; Report from the Select Committee on Poor Removal, 1854-5, p. 61; The 1866 Poor Law Board report on Vagrancy notes that while in 1851-3 there were about 15 Irish Vagrants to every English one in Manchester, in 1866 this proportion was about 3 or 4 to 10. See Poor Law Board Report on Vagrancy (1866), p. 154; HO45/1080B Alfred Austin's Report to the Select Vestry 28 January 1847; Mayhew, London Labour, vol. 1, p. 112; As the local press identified much of the Irish begging was professional. See Neal 'Criminal Profile', pp. 180, 181, 182; In 1855 Irish-born represented 63.2% of arrests for Vagrancy in Liverpool. See L. Letford and C. G. Pooley, 'Geographies of Migration and Religion: Irish Women in mid Nineteenth-Century Liverpool', The Irish World Wide: History, Heritage, Identity, 4, p. 108; Lowe, Irish in Mid Victorian Lancashire, p. 102:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy, proportion of Irish convictions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

396. M117/1/1/3-39, M117/1/2/1-45, M117/1/7/1-27, City of Manchester, Records of Convictions, MCL; MG, 9 April 1831, 30 June 1832, 22 February, 5 April 1834, 18 March, 29, 30 April, 12 July 1836, 12 August 1840, 30 October, 6 November 1841, 30 April, 1842, 20 July 1844, 8 April 1846, 17 March, 30 October 1847, 18 October, 11 November, 9 December 1848, 28 February, 4 July 1849, 9 February 1850, 30 April, 31 May, 21 June, 12 July 1851, 1 September 1852, 25 June, 7 September 1853, 14 June, 5, 8, 29 November 1854, 21 April, 16 May 1855, 1 January 1856; LM, 1 February, 18 April 1848; LWM, 11 June 1865; NWC, 9 November 1811, 19 April 1817, 3 October 1818, 13 November 1824 9 July 1825 11 February 1826, 20 January 1827, 15 November 1828, 22 August 1835, 27 May 1837, 11 April 1840, 5 December 1840, 6 February 1841, 27 August 1842, 28 January 1843, 30 October 1846, 22 January, 9 April, 21 May 1847, 21 April, 23 June, 14 July 18 August, 1, 15 September, 22 December 1848, 19 January, 2 February, 9 March, 27 April, 4 May, 12 October, 14 December 1849, 16 April, 25 June, 8 October 1852, 6 May, 16 September 1853, 31 March, 5 May, 24 November 1854, 2 February, 15 June 1855, 21 March, 18 July 1856, 6 February, 10 July, 25 September 1857, 2 April 1858, 7 May 1859, 29 November 1862, 3 January, 4 April, 6 June 1863, 4 June 1864;
Manchester

Larceny, proportion of Irish convictions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>20-25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-century</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

397. M117/1/5/1-28 City of Manchester, Records of Convictions for Vagrancy and Prostitution, MCL; M9/70/1/2 City of Manchester, Watch Committee Minutes Draft, MCL; Report on the State of the Irish Poor, p. 76; Reid, Report on the State of Newcastle, p. 90; Newcastle Chronicle, Inquiry p. 33. It recorded that in Sandgate, ‘the proportion of prostitutes to the whole female population is little more than one in seven, and the male population rather more than one to six…Prostitution is emphatically the traffic of the district’; Lowe, Irish in Mid Victorian Lancashire, pp. 102, 103:

Manchester

Prostitution, proportion of Irish convictions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-century</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

398. M117/1/3/1-2 City of Manchester, Records of Convictions for drunkenness, MCL; Newcastle Courant, 6, 13, 20 July 1866; NWC, 18 February, 18 November 1843, 24 September 1847, 28 September, 14 December 1849, 25 March 1853, 12 May 1854, 18 April 1856, 9 April 1864, 30 June 1866, 29 October 1872; NDC, 26 July 1859, 9 April 1864, 5 December 1865; LM, 3 April 1835, 25 September 1840, 20 March 1849; LWM, 20 March 1875, 27 March 1879, 20 March 1880, 14 July 1883; MG, 13 December 1854, 17 February, 30 June 1855, 7 April 1863; Report on the State of the Irish Poor, pp. 62, 73, 74, 75, 76; Fordyce, Local Records, iii, p. 2; Richardson, Local Historians Table Book, p. 411; Neal, English-Irish Conflict in the North East, pp. 30, 32; Lowe, Irish in Mid Victorian Lancashire, p. 102.


Manchester and Salford District Provident Society, 1833.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impostors recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Report on the State of the Irish Poor p. 53.)
400. NWC, 9 November 1811, 5 March 1814, 31 January 1829, 21 February 1829, 30 June 1848, 14 May, 15 October 1852, 25 November 1853, 25 April 1863, 12 March 1864; NDC, 24 September 1862, 15 May 1866; LM, 15 March 1816; MG, 17 February, 31 December 1855; Report on the State of the Irish Poor, p. 19; Interestingly J. E. Handley finds that this was also common among the Irish in Scotland. See The Irish in Scotland, p. 268.

401. Report of the Select Committee on Drunkenness, 1834, viii, pp. 388, 685, 694; Report on The State of the Irish Poor, pp. xxxviii, 62, 64, 67, 73, 74, 75, 76; Report from the Select Committee on Railway Labourers, 1846, p. 633; Gaskell, Manufacturing Population, p. 140; Gaultier, The Origins and Progress of the Malignant Cholera, p. 36; Faucher, Manchester in 1844, p. 28; Fordyce, Local Records, pp. 2, 204; Richardson's Local Historians Table Book, pp. 219, 299, 411; A. O'Day (ed.), A Survey of the Irish in England (1872), p. 120.


403. Dowling called them 'the most reckless, violent set of people that can be imagined'. Report from the Select Committee on Railway Labourers, 1846, pp. 632, 633.


405. MG, 21 May, 17 December 1825, 11 August, 11 December 1827, 5 January, 13 September, 18 October 1828, 11, 23 April, 9 May, 5 September 1829, 2 January, 6 March, 20 March, 17 April, 17 July, 31 July, 18 September, 25 December 1830, 8 January, 2, 9, April, 23 July, 22 October 1831, 21 April, 12 May, 23 June, 14 July 1832, 22 October 1835, 29 April 1836, 16 September 1837, 30 June 1838, 26 October 1844, 20 August 1845, 7, 21 March, 19 August, 30 September, 17, 24 October 1846, 21 July 1847, 27 May, 19 July, 8 November 1848, 4 July, 26 September 1849, 23 March, 11 August, 6 November, 7 December 1850, 6, 23 August, 24 September, 22 November 1851, 14 January, 21 April 1852, 5 January, 23 April, 1 June, 6 August, 1, 19 October 1853, 2 September, 18 October, 13 December 1854, 17 February, 21 April, 16, 19 May, 30 June, 10 July, 17 August, 17 September, 18 October 1855, 22 August 1856, 26 February, 8 December 1857, 18 February 1858, 12 March 1864, 22 October 1867; NWC, 18 April 1829, 1 May 1830, 7 December 1833, 27 May 1837, 12 February, 22, 29 August, 12 September 1840, 6 November 1841, 30 April, 3 September, 17 December 1842, 18 February, 15 May, 27 July, 11, 18 November 1843, 11 May 1844, 1 February, 26 April, 11 October 1845, 7 May, 27 August, 24 September, 12 November, 31 December 1847, 28 July, 13 October, 22 December 1848, 19 January, 10 August, 28 September, 7 December 1849, 20 June, 18 July, 31 October, 28 November 1851, 13 February 1852, 2, 16 April, 4, 9, 18 June, 23 July, 31 December 1852, 14 January, 15, 22 July, 12 August 1853, 20 January, 17 March, 12 May, 27 October, 3 November, 29 December 1854, 23 March, 22, 29 June, 30 November 1855, 18 April, 29 August 1856, 27 February, 20 March 1857, 28 May, 4 June, 30 July, 6, 13 August, 24 December 1859, 4 February 1860, 26 April, 13 September 1862, 14 February, 27 June, 4 July, 8 August 1863, 30 April 1864, 30 June 1866;
MDC, 3 June, 26 July, 2 August 1859, 10 October 1860, 9 April 1864, 5 December 1865; LM, 25 June 1819, 7 March 1834, 6 February, 3 April, 17 July 1835, 11 March 1836, 28 July 1837, 25 September 1840, 18 July 1845, 17 July 1846, 16 March 1867; LWM, 22 March 1856, 27 September 1862, 17 July 1865; Porcupine 30 March 1861, 18 October, 22 March 1862, 12 March 1864, 12 August 1865, 16 March 1872, 18 July 1874 ('The less enlightened among them... have no objection to a fight at any time'), 6 November 1875; Report on the State of the Irish Poor, pp. 19, 22, 25, 26, 27; Shimmin, Liverpool Life, 'The Aintree Meeting'; Bryson, 'Riotous Liverpool', pp. 124, 131; In 1855 the Irish represented 40.3% of arrests for assaults. See Letford and Pooley, 'Irish Women in Liverpool', p. 108; J. K. Walton, Lancashire. A Social History 1858-1939, p. 192; S. P. Bell, Victorian Lancashire, pp. 160, 163; Neal The Birkenhead Garibaldi Riots of 1862, THSLC, 131, 1982, p. 87.

406. MG, 6 March 1830.


409. D. M. MacRaild, Culture, Conflict and Migration: The Irish in Victorian Cumbria, p. 18.

410. 352MINJWAT/1/5 Minutes of Watch Committee reports of 5, 28 July 1849, MCL.

411. MG, 21 May 1825, 2 January, 20 March 1830.

412. NDC, 16 May 1851.

413. NWC, 16 May 1851.

414. NWC, 17 March 1854.

415. Lowe, Irish in Mid Victorian Lancashire, p. 40. In the 1860s they still represented around 25% of arrests in this category; MG, 13 December 1854, 19 May, 9, 13, 17 August, 17 September 1855, 22 August 1856, 8 December 1857; NWC, 24 September 1847, 13 October 1848, 28 September 1849, 16 May, 31 October 1851, 2 April, 31 December 1852, 15, 22 July 1853, 23 March, 22 June 1855, 28 May 1859, 4 February 1860, 26 April, 13 September 1862, 14 February, 27 June, 4 July 1863; Faucher noted that the Irish were 'perpetually in a state of agitation', Manchester in 1844, p. 28.

416. LC, 14 February 1855.

417. See chapter 3.

418. LM, 20, 22 February 1855, 19, 27 January 1867; LWM, 16, 20 January 1867; LC, 14, 20, 21, 28 February 1855; 352POL/2/4 Head Constables reports to Watch Committee, report 27 January 1867; Of the 106 people arrested during the 1855 riot 83 were Irish. Augustus Campbell bemoaned: 'A number of idle and disorderly persons took advantage of the occasion to cause a riot in the town, and a tumultuous mob assaulted and pillaged some bakers shops'. See Report from the Select Committee on
Poor Removal, 1854-5, xiii, Appendix number one, p. 312; Jones, 'Liverpool Bread Riots', pp. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 55; Bryson, 'Riotous Liverpool', pp. 125, 126, 133; Lowe, Irish in Mid Victorian Lancashire, pp. 40, 99.


421. Ibid., p. 878; Second Report of the Select Committee on Intemperance, 1877, xi, p. 792; Bennett, Father Nugent, pp. 44, 45, 46; Neal, 'Criminal Profile', pp. 172, 178.


423. Report on the State of the Irish Poor, pp. 10, 18; Bennett, Father Nugent, pp. 44, 45, 46; Neal 'Criminal Profile', pp. 176, 177, 178, 187; Bell, Victorian Lancashire, pp. 157, 158.


426. Ibid., q. 109.


429. MG, 20 March, 30 October 1830, 28 April, 23 June, 24 November 1832, 7 February, 26 December 1835, 18 July, 30 September 1840, 11 September, 26 October 1844, 24 October 1846, 20 October 1847, 7 June, 12, 29 July, 8 November 1848, 6 August 1851, 7 July, 11 August 1852, 1 February, 7 October, 13 December 1854, 30 June 1855, 18 February 1858; NWC, 7 December 1833, 27 May 1837, 12 February 1840, 11 May, 13 July 1844, 8 February, 17 May 1845, 30 April, 6 August, 24 September, 1 October 1847, 27 April, 6 July, 7 September 1849, 22 October 1852, 22 July 1853, 12 May 1854, 29 June 1855, 25 April 1863, 4 March 1882; NDC, 19 May 1859, 10 October 1860, 16 September 1865; LWM, 21 March 1874, 14 July 1877, 25 August 1883; LM, 7 March 1834, 6 February, 17 July 1835, 28 July 1837, 4 April 1845, 8 November 1853; In 1846 Liverpool's Constable Dowling lamented that 'They assist each other, and attack the authorities, whoever they may be'. See Report from the Select Committee on Railway Labourers, 1846, p. 633; HO45/46 ff. 22, 23 Manchester Police Report, 5 June 1841; In 1855 the Irish committed 37.7% of attacks upon the police. See Letford


433. MG, 24 May 1843.

434. MG, 20 August 1845.


436. Manchester Watch Committee Reports, vol. 4, pp. 43, 44-6, 57-8, 60-1, 71, 193, 204; Chief Constable’s Reports, Manchester, 1868, 1869; Manchester Watch Committee Minutes, vol. 2, 6 May 1862, p. 289; Kidd and Roberts, *City, Class and Culture*, p. 37.


438. The Manchester police were 25% Irish in 1845 and 10% in 1865. But of the 275 Irish recruited between 1858 and 1869, an unrepresentative 54% were Protestant. S. J. Davies, ‘Classes and Police in Manchester, 1829-1880’, Kidd and Roberts, *City, Class and Culture*, pp. 34, 38.

439. *Ibid.*., p. 34.

By contrast the 1851 census of Newcastle showed that there were only two Irish police constables in the city. See Census Enumerators Books.

440. MG 1 August 1835.

441. Manchester Watch Committee Minutes, 5 April 1833; Bryson, ‘Riotous Liverpool’, p. 112.


444. 352MIN/WAT/1/3 Minutes of Watch Committee, 9, 30 November 1844, 10 November 1845, LCL; LM, 7, 28 April 1843; Bryson, ‘Riotous Liverpool’, p. 116.

445. Seven constables accordingly resigned from their lodges. 352MIN/WAT/1/3 Minutes of Watch Committee 27 April, 31 August 1844, 27 March 1852, LCL.


449. Bryson, ‘Riotous Liverpool’, p. 120.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number in police</th>
<th>Number of Irish-born in police</th>
<th>% of Irish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frank Neal interestingly suggests that the 1862 Birkenhead Garibaldi riot degenerated into a fight between the police and the Irish. Moreover whilst special constables were sworn in their services were not called upon for fear that they would indiscriminately attack the Irish. See Neal, 'The Birkenhead Garibaldi Riots of 1862', pp. 87-111.


453. LWM, 6 November 1869.


455. NWC, 8 April 1882.


458. A moral tale sold in Liverpool Paddy and Thomas showed the errors of a drunken Irishman, who duly got his come-uppance; Porcupine, 14 October 1871, 28 June 1877; Redford, Labour Migration, pp. 159, 60; O'Day, 'Revising the Diaspora', p. 188; 'Much attention, both serious and frivolous, has been devoted to the heavy-drinking Irishman, to the drunken 'Paddy', beloved of the popular press and music hall'. See E. Malcolm, Ireland Sober, Ireland Free: Drink and Temperance in Nineteenth Century Ireland, pp. 322, 334; Charles Kingsley's Irish conform to stereotype. See Alton Locke, p. 219; J. A. Hilton, Catholic Lancashire, p. 93; Walton, Lancashire, p. 255; Gerard Manley Hopkins was exasperated by the unreformable Liverpool Irish - "the drunkards go on drinking". See Waller, Democracy and Sectarianism, p. 25; Neal, 'Criminal Profile', p. 175; Neal, The Birkenhead Garibaldi Riots', p. 87; Dillon finds the same phenomenon in Leeds. See The Irish in Leeds, 1851-61', Publications of the Thoresby Society, Liv, 1973, p. 14.

459. See NDC, 28, 29 October 1872; Newcastle Chronicle, Inquiry, p. 10; T. Wright complained of the drunkenness prevalent among the Manchester Irish. Report from the Select Committee on Public Houses, 1854, xiv, p. 385; Street, The Night Side of Newcastle, p. 6; Carlyle, Chartism, p. 18.
460. See Archives of The English Dominican Province, August 1860, cited in A. Archer, The Two Roman Catholic Churches, p. 52.

461. Doherty described drink as "an expensive and demoralizing habit", and was active in Manchester Catholic Temperance Society. See Kirby and Musson, The Voice of the People, pp. 336, 338-9, 448; ‘Drink, more than poverty, has been the curse of the Irish’: J. Denvir, The Irish in England, p. 299; O’Day, Survey of the Irish in England, pp. 28-9, 120; Nationalists asserted that heavy drinking was deliberately encouraged by the English to weaken the Irish people. See Malcolm, Ireland Sober, Ireland Free, p. 332.


463. 352POL/2/3-5 Head Constables Reports to Watch Committee, especially 353POL/2/4 reports of 15 December 1866 and 15 February 1867, and 352POL/2/5, Report of 13 January, 11 February 1868, LCL.


465. Report of the Select Committee into Drunkenness, 1834, pp. 388, 694; Denvir acknowledged that the Irish behaved differently to the English when drunk: 'Being naturally demonstrative, they put themselves in evidence when under the influence of intoxicants, where the Englishman would go and sleep off the effects'. See The Irish in Britain, p. 253.

466. Report on the State of the Irish Poor, pp. 19, 20, 24, 27, 28, 31, 38; See also Shimmin, Liverpool Life, 'Homes of the People, continued.'


470. Lowe, The Irish in Mid Victorian Lancashire, p. 128.

471. Ibid., p. 37.

472. Porcupine, 13 November 1875.


476. MG, 25 March 1846.

477. NWC, 21 March 1856.

478. MG, 11 August 1827, 18 October 1828, 2, 16 January, 29 May 1830, 1 January, 12 November 1831, 28 January 1832, 13 April 1833, 8 November, 13 December 1834, 3, 24, 31 January, 17 October, 21 November 1835, 2 January, 19 March, 15 October 1836, 4 November, 9 December 1837, 23 May, 13 June 1838, 6 February, 19 October, 9, 27 November 1839, 28 March, 10 June, 15, 26 August, 2 December 1840, 7, 28 April 1841, 28 January 1843, 28 July 1847, 13 January, 17, 21 March 1849, 16 July, 20 August 1851; Gaskell, Manufacturing Population, pp. 125, 126; Faucher, Manchester, p. 48; Report of the Select Committee into Drunkenness, 1834, p. 700; Report on the State of the Irish Poor, pp. 19, 20, 27, 48, 50, 74, 75, 76, 77; Illicit distillation was very common in Ireland in the 1820s and 1830s. See Malcolm, 'Ireland Sober, Ireland Free', p. 323.
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485. NWC, 13 May 1837, 10 December 1842, 12 April 1845


488. See R. Balls, 'Attitudes towards Drinking in Irish Culture', in D. J. Pittman and C. R. Snyder (eds.) Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns, pp. 157-87; R. Stivers, A Hair of the Dog: Irish Drinking and

489. 1821-1901 only twice did Irish per capita spirit consumption exceed that prevailing in the UK as a whole. After 1861 consumption was consistently slightly below that of the UK. Irish per capita figures for beer consumption do, however, generally exceed those for the UK. See E. Malcolm, 'Ireland Sober, Ireland Free', pp. 323-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% abstainers</th>
<th>% heavy drinkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish men</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish immigrant men</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English men</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish women</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish immigrant women</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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