4 The emergence and submergence of Irish socialism, 1821–51

Vincent Geoghegan

D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghan. *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century.* Routledge: London, 1993, pp.100-123.

It will be argued in this chapter that there was a much more diverse and interesting range of socialisms in Ireland during the first half of the nineteenth century than the existing literature suggests. At the risk of caricaturing the standard account, we are usually presented with Thompson, Ralahine, sundry Irish Chartists and labour activists *in England*, working-class and trade union militancy, and various non-socialist thinkers who are included because of their social radicalism (Lalor, for example). This inadequate picture does, however, reflect the marginality of early Irish socialism. The various writers and movements discussed below have been easily missed because they were relatively isolated and peripheral, and left little in the way of historical traces. Alternative ideologies triumphed in history and historiography. Where, for example, artisan socialism sought to oppose O'Connellite nationalism, it was crushed, and effectively vanished from the historical record; or when *The Irishman* sought to combine socialism with radical nationalism it was absorbed by the latter and reduced to an insignificant footnote in the rise of nationalism. It is not therefore the claim of this chapter that a major historical force has failed to receive its due, but that an historically interesting phenomenon has been the victim of inadequate treatment. The concluding year in the title of the chapter is not arbitrary because the mid-century point marks the end of a particularly turbulent period of economic, social and political dislocation. Inevitably, this means that the Fenianisn/Socialism/First International relationship, which intervenes before the socialist revival in the 1880s, is not discussed. However this relationship has already received scholarly coverage elsewhere.[1] Our own discussion will deal with the following forms of socialism: Elite Socialism, Artisan Socialism, Socialism and Nationalism, and Christian Socialism.

ELITE SOCIALISM

We will not be dealing in this section with the two examples which usually take up all of the discussion on early Irish socialism – William Thompson and the Ralahine community. Whereas a disproportionally large amount

has been written on both of these, virtual silence surrounds other examples: this short chapter aims to cast light on previously dark areas, and thereby contribute to a broader picture. This is in no way to disparage these two outstanding achievements of early Irish socialism. Thompson (1775–1833)[2] was undoubtedly the greatest Irish socialist theorist of the nineteenth century. His distinctive blending of utilitarianism and socialism, his subtle analysis of the modalities of labour, and of the process of distribution and exchange, his critique of political and social exploitation, and his breadth of vision respecting alternatives, make him a socialist theorist of world stature. Similarly Ralahine (1831–33),[3] a product of the co-operation between an improving landlord, John Scott Vandeleur, the English Owenite Edward Craig, and the County Clare peasantry, was widely, and rightly, considered to be the most successful of the Owenite communities. A further omission will be any specific treatment of the early socialist feminism associated with Thompson and Anna Wheeler, again because they have been treated elsewhere.[4] The purpose of this section is to bring into the light early socialists ignored by the literature, thereby, hopefully, replacing an impoverished, distorted account.

The earliest forms of socialism in Ireland were developed by social and intellectual élites who saw themselves as benevolent agents of change, bringing social-scientific insight to bear upon the problems of the lower classes. When Robert Owen was invited to Ireland in 1822 by progressive landlords he found a sympathetic hearing in elite circles.[5] Although committed in the long term to the principles of self-sufficiency and self-government, the elite socialists claimed that existing intellectual and economic inequalities necessitated a more directive role in the short to medium term. This is particularly apparent in those variants which drew most heavily on Owen. Owen was committed to a social engineering approach, where the knowledgeable few brought about a transformation of the ignorant many. As such Owenism could easily merge with existing elite philanthropic traditions. However, even the more democratic socialism of William Thompson was still predicated on an initial need for intelligent leadership. Within these parameters extensive variations were possible. Two examples will be examined: Robert O'Brien and the Dublin Co-operative Society; and Henry MacCormac and the Belfast Co-operative Trading Association.

The Co-operative Magazine and Monthly Herald, a London-based journal, announced in its issue of April 1826 that a meeting 'of gentlemen favourable to the formation of a Co-operative Society' had recently (28 February) been held in Dublin. In the chair was Captain Robert O'Brien, RN,[6] who was then heavily involved with the Owenite community at Orbiston in Scotland, having invested money in the venture and moved from Ireland with his family to take part in the experiment. O'Brien's experience of Orbiston was not a happy one. The classic history of the community, Alexander Cullen's *Adventures in Socialism* (1910), describes

O'Brien as an 'autocrat . . . intolerant to those he considered beneath him'.[7] O'Brien objected to what he considered to be the open-door admission policy of the community, which had resulted in the importation of 'disreputable samples of humanity'.[8] He developed his critique in a long angry letter to the community magazine. The call in the community for 'equal distribution', which, he claimed, came from 'non-producers', was 'injustice and . . . fraud'. He repeated his attack on the 'most injudicious and indiscriminate admission of inmates', claiming that success required a union of developed personalities. He objected to the anti-Christian emphasis on natural religion, at the expense of revelation. He was appalled by the mismanagement of the educational facilities, and developed his long-held plan of establishing a fee-paying boarding school based upon Pestalozzian principles.[9] Such was the man who chaired the Dublin meeting.

It will come as no great surprise that the Dublin Co-operative Society, formed in 1827, was a genteel and select body. The role of the Society was that of 'collecting and disseminating information concerning the Co-operative System'; this was to be achieved by establishing libraries, 'by meetings for conversation', and 'by aiding in the establishment of Co-operative communities throughout the country'.[10] An accompanying document spoke of O'Brien's heart's desire, the possibility of a boarding school attached to a community, to which a 'nobleman' had offered to send his son, and 'procure the sons of seven other noblemen'. The eleven rules of the Society established a series of procedural, administrative and financial barriers to the admittance of the 'wrong' sort of person to the Society. In a statement of purpose published in the November issue of *The Co-operative Magazine and Monthly Herald*, the Society made clear that it sought improvements in the existing class system, not the overturning of that order. The Co-operative System was

> the only practical mode of removing permanently the poverty of the poorer orders, and of enabling others, of all ranks and means, to obtain more of the real comforts and enjoyments of life than they can at present procure, thereby relieving the wealthier orders from the mental pain they suffer, and from the weighty annual expense they are put to, by the prevalence of pauperism.[11]

It was not made clear how the communities were to be constituted, nor their relationship with the broader society. A feature of this document was the stress upon the Christian basis of co-operation. The early Christians 'lived in Co-operating Community', and the obligation to love their neighbour as themselves could only be achieved through co-operation.[12]

O'Brien was a distinctly autocratic and conservative example of early Irish socialism. His social theory did not imply equality, common ownership, nor any attack on the existing religious, social, and political hierarchy. Co-operation was the means whereby philanthropy could both

improve the lot of the poor and simultaneously promote the material and cultural interests of the enlightened minority. Doing good and doing well were entirely compatible.

A more sophisticated and radical analysis can be found in the work of Henry MacCormac MD (1800–86), a Belfast physician.[13] His professional work with the poor was the foundation for his critique of capitalism, and shock, pity and real anger shine through his attempts to make theoretical sense of such squalor and degradation. On a number of occasions he seemed to despair of ever fully conveying the true nature of what he has witnessed. 'I can find no language at all adequate', he says in *An Appeal on Behalf of the Poor* (1831), 'to express the various emotions of sympathy, sorrow, and even downright horror, which the spectacle of intense human misery has often excited in my breast, or to describe that misery.'[14] He does, however, attempt such descriptions, and provides harrowing little pen-portraits which anticipate those to be found in Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, published a decade and a half later. He speaks of a spiral of disease and death: of 'ragged and starving infants, unable to understand the cause of their distress . . . beside a sick or a dying parent';[15] and of a Belfast garret, 'where there was a woman lying on a little straw; [and] there was nothing else whatever in the place – either of fire, living being, utensils, or furniture'.[16] Anecdotal evidence reveals an exceptionally warm-hearted and sympathetic person[17] (whose sympathy also extended to animals).[18] The core of MacCormac's social and political writing is therefore this deeply felt humanitarianism; an outraged sympathy for the condition of the poor, developed in the course of his medical dealings with them.

His published writings are like transcripts of his attempts to think through the social problems of his time; to borrow a phrase, he conducts his education in public. In a postscript to his *A Plan for the Relief of the Unemployed Poor* (1830), he notes of this plan, with engaging honesty, 'but notwithstanding that the whole has been rewritten and repeatedly revised, I have not succeeded in expressing my views to my satisfaction';[19] he then proceeds to have a final go at it in the last two pages! He borrows widely, and explicitly, from the existing literature. In terms of his analysis of capitalism he seems to have been particularly influenced by Charles Hall's *The Effect of Civilization on the People in the European States* (1805), and by William Thompson's *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness as Applied to the Newly Proposed System of Voluntary Equality of Wealth* (1824); in terms of political theory, the work of Robert Owen held first place. But his work abounds with references to a wide range of social and political writers, including those he intends to read next!

MacCormac's critique is very sensitive to the nature of *division* in society. We might note, for example, his work on the division of gender, race, nation and sect.

He argues that the subordinate role of women is both an obstacle to the emancipation of the working class, and of society in general. He had read William Thompson's book on women, and was in no doubt about the oppression women experienced, referring to 'their present unjust and barbarous position in the moral and political scale of society'.[20] He calls for women to 'have the same voice in society which men have, and the same liberty to go and come, with equal independence of each other, and of the other sex'.[21] Although not free of all the general assumptions of the time (a belief in natural female dispositions and functions, for example), his analysis is an impressive attempt to recognize and understand the oppression of women.

After qualifying as a doctor in 1824, MacCormac spent almost a year in West Africa, where his brother John was a magistrate. Another brother, Hamilton, married a West African woman, and their children stayed with Henry MacCormac on their visits to Belfast.[22] He thus had knowledge of Africa and its peoples, and a real liking for them. His remarks on race occur in a discussion of slavery. Again his purpose is to overcome what he sees as unnatural, artificial divisions between people. He wishes to assert the unity of people, regardless of skin colour: 'nobody here will be hardy enough to assert that a man is not to be treated as a man because he is black, any more than we should think that a white horse is more of a horse than a black one'.[23] He argues that this is of more than marginal interest, for skin colour – like any other inessential distinction – must not be allowed to become a dividing factor in the working class. He condemns those who wish to affirm 'that the black mechanic is to be excluded from the same means of improvement, which are or should be possessed by his white brother; or else that he is incapable of benefiting by them'.[24]

He also has a strong sense of Irishness. Although committed to the United Kingdom, he is aware of Ireland's particular problems and potentialities. He is scathing towards Ireland's absentee landlords, whom he sees as a net drain on the resources of the country. Their appropriations have an effect right down the social chain: 'In Ireland especially, the abstraction of capital by absentees, has disabled the farmer and others from employing as many as they would otherwise.'[25] He also noted Ireland's economic backwardness, and the consequent cost of imports; a net outgoing of money 'for those articles which our deficient or imperfect manufactures do not permit us to produce'.[26] Ireland also has to pay its share of the public revenue. Unlike England or Scotland, Ireland has no poor laws, and therefore not even a threadbare safety-net for hardship. As a result, famine is an ever-present danger to the Irish poor.[27] It is hardly surprising, he argues, that the Irish working class is especially degraded: 'I cannot conceal the melancholy fact, from you, that taking them as a body, the Irish artisans and mechanics are far inferior in point of intelligence and acquirements, to those of many of the other nations

in Europe.'[28] He also demonstrates and deploys an Irish patriotism to urge his point, as in an address to Belfast mechanics in December 1829, where he speaks of 'my countrymen', of 'the bright spirits which our soil has produced', and of 'the ancient renown of Ireland, your country and your native land'.[29]

MacCormac identifies religious sectarianism as an unnecessary source of division among Ireland's poorer classes, claiming that he had witnessed 'individuals in the lowest stage of human existence abuse others, because they held a different set of religious opinions from themselves'.[30] In a discussion of possible alternative arrangements, he is at pains to guard against any sectarian feeling:

> Their religious instruction would be left to the care of their respective pastors, and at no time should any improper demonstration of party or sectarian feeling be countenanced. It is hardly necessary to state, that the possession of peculiar tenets should not make the least ground of improper difference in the treatment toward them. . . . Some of these poor people would . . . occasionally . . . show that they considered the possession of particular opinions a merit on their parts, and a source of triumph; but it is evident, that any improper demonstrations of the kind must be met by the proper remedies.[31]

MacCormac's theory of class is ill thought out, imprecise, and inconsistent. It is roughly based on productivity and wealth. Society is divided into producers and non-producers, and the latter category into rich and poor (the concept of poor non-producers is unusual within early socialism where the poor are usually deemed to be producers). He describes the existing social structure as 'those who eat, but do not work; those who eat and work; and those who are willing to work, but cannot obtain employment'.[32] Rich non-producers include 'bankers, merchants, shopkeepers and money-dealers';[33] the producers 'either cultivate the earth as labourers, fashion the articles which they get from it as artisans and mechanics, or else study, and practise the arts and sciences for the common good, or fill stations of trust and office';[34] the poor non-producers are the unemployed.

MacCormac sought to eliminate, or at least reduce, *professional* distribution, in favour of co-operative production and distribution. In the early 1830s his call is: 'let each man become a producer and distributer of wealth, as well as a consumer',[35] and in 1837 he asks: 'would it not be desirable that there were fewer distributors, and more producers?'[36] In both instances he is aware that widespread, comprehensive change will take some considerable time to occur, which, added to his concern for current suffering, meant that his *detailed* plans for social reform concern the short and medium term, and are directed at the disadvantaged sections of society.

In the early 1830s he particularly focuses on the poor non-producers,

the unemployed, the 'destitute', as he sometimes calls them. He proposes that from ten to a thousand of those who are able and willing should be established in a community, and there be taught enlightened working and living patterns:

> formed upon the principle of joint-production, joint-distribution, and joint-consumption, with equal rights, and attended with every apparatus that the present theoretical and practical knowledge of mankind can suggest, for facilitating the quickest, easiest and best modes of production, and the most efficacious methods of instruction, in fine, of the application of knowledge to happiness.[37]

At the economic level the goal is the co-operative raising of material standards, and at the human, the gradual cultivation of intellectual and spiritual potential. This is spelled out in great detail, down to the content of diet, and sorts of clothing to be worn. His hope is that the government will take the lead, though he is prepared to countenance a variety of initiatives.

MacCormac set about establishing a co-operative society in Belfast. In an appendix to a published address at the Belfast Mechanics' Institute (1830) he noted that 'in conjunction with assistance' he had 'been able to induce a number of individuals (140) to act upon the suggestion', and that 'a literary friend' had 'consented to edit a small monthly miscellany for their instruction'.[38] From this journal, *The Belfast Co-operative Advocate*, Ireland's first socialist journal, we learn that the First Belfast Co-operative Trading Association was established in November and December of 1829.[39] MacCormac retained his links with this body. *The Voice of the People* reported that at the fourth quarterly meeting of the co-operative, held on 16 February 1831, 'Dr Macormac addressed the meeting, and urged the necessity of establishing schools for the education of the children of co-operators, and mutual instruction generally'.[40]

MacCormac's conception of co-operation is clearly different from that of O'Brien. His approach is much more humane and egalitarian, and is free of haughty disdain towards the poor. It is theoretically more complex, and sensitive to social divisions based not merely on class, but also on gender, race, nation and sect. Like O'Brien, however, and considerably more undeserved, he has suffered from historical neglect, with Thompson and Ralahine dominating the foreground.

ARTISAN SOCIALISM

If certain exponents of elite socialism have become invisible in the historiography of Irish socialism, this applies to the whole category of artisan socialism. Commentators on early British socialism have noted how working-class practice has tended to become eclipsed by the literary output of the 'prophets'.[41] In Ireland Owenite socialism has become

entirely associated with the plans and experiments of the elite socialists. However, in the pages of the Owenite journal *The New Moral World* during the early 1840s we have evidence of what we might call 'artisan socialism'. The sequence of material opens with a discussion, in February 1840, of a parliamentary interchange between Daniel O'Connell and Lord Morpeth in which the latter claimed that an attempt had been made to introduce socialism in Ireland, 'but that it had been immediately repressed'.[42] *The New Moral World* expresses surprise at this, claiming that it knows of no such attempt or subsequent suppression. In a remark which raises interesting questions about the status of the period of elite socialism, it stated that 'no social lecturer has yet been in Ireland, nor has the Association yet taken any steps to extend its operations to that island'. The context for the discussion also emerges in this item: 'Already an earnest desire is generated among some portions of the Irish people, to know what is meant by this new *ism*, about which their newspapers are full, and the occupants of their pulpits continually raving.' To substantiate this claim the paper cites 'a private letter from a highly talented and respectable friend, who is well acquainted with Ireland and its people, from which we learn that a movement is being made among the Socialists in Ireland, who have not yet openly declared themselves'. This correspondent cites a large Sunday School in Belfast where the teachers were lectured by a clergyman on the evils of socialism, and were warned against going to England at present as one of the ablest Sunday School teachers had recently defected to the socialists. This brief item introduces a number of features which recur in later evidence: silence on the period of elite socialism; an outburst of anti-socialist feeling in the press and the churches; the small size and quasi-clandestine nature of Irish socialism; the characterization of socialism as both anti-religious and alien (i.e. an English contagion).

It is from Dublin that we next hear of the progress of Irish socialism. In April 1841 a court heard a case, brought by a man who was to become the first spokesperson of Dublin artisan socialism – John Elliott. Elliott, a lithographic printer, had taken his Friendly Society, the 'Liberal Friendly Brothers', to court for effectively expelling him from the Society. This Society, 'composed exclusively of Protestants',[43] had done this because 'the complainant had lately been in the habit of promulgating "Socialist principles" '. In a cross-examination on the issue of oath-swearing, it emerged that Elliott was a Socinian Protestant, who denied the divinity of Christ and some of the Scriptures. To the question, 'Are you not now what is called a Socialist?' Elliott replied, 'Not altogether. I have read a great number of their tracts, and approve of some of them.' He persisted in this approach, reiterating: 'I partly believe in Socialism.' Elliott then addressed himself to those aspects of socialism he found congenial: 'It is my opinion that every one should assist in the amelioration of the condition of mankind, and for that purpose there should be self-supporting

institutions which would abolish poverty, vice, and lawyers (a laugh).' He further agreed that he did believe that there should be a community of interest and property, with 'each person to labour and work for the community, so that there would be no poverty'. He also accepted the proposition that there would be no need for monarchs and peers, but that he would not abolish the latter, as his aim was to 'bring the peasant up to the peer, and not the peer down to the peasant'. Magistrates, judges and laws would not be required, for 'the millennium would commence and man would be under the government of his understanding, and "intilligence". His "intilligence" would be the regulating principle of his 'mind and acting.' Elliott's response cut no ice with the court which found the 'exhibition' of 'the unfortunate man' 'disgusting and disgraceful', and dismissed the case.

In a letter to *The New Moral World* shortly after the trial, Elliott confirms the picture of himself as a fairly recent convert to socialism. He reported that 'my first acquaintance with Socialism was by reading some speeches of the Bishop of Exeter'.[44] Since the Bishop had only made these hostile speeches the previous year, Elliott's familiarity with socialism was indeed recent. He claimed that he had a poor opinion of socialism at the time, since it appeared to him 'a debasing, degrading, soul-destroying heresy', but that curiosity and a desire to refute the doctrine made him borrow, from a friend, Owen's ' "Book of the New Moral World" and his "Six Lectures at Manchester" ', in which he found 'facts and laws, so stubborn yet so harmonious, so strange yet so convincing, that I yielded a reluctant consent to reasoning so profound'. Elliott therefore confirms the belief of the Belfast clergy that as a body of ideas, socialism had been imported from across the Irish Sea. He also confirms the impression of the isolation of Irish socialism, noting that before his court case 'I knew very few in this city who entertained views favourable to Socialism', but that in the wake of his case a number of sympathetic people had sought him out. These people, 'disciples of the venerable Owen in this city, although very few, are men, in knowledge, in language, and in conduct, much above the average of their class'. Therefore the picture of a small, unselfconfident (if of above average cultivation), and beleaguered artisan group persists:

> I think if we had one person, in Dublin, sufficiently independent of the world, we would be able to muster some thirty or forty intelligent minds, favourable to our holy cause; but it unfortunately happens that none dare, without imprudence, give vent to the free expression of their convictions without risking the loss of employment; even I myself am not sure whether I shall get 'leave to toil'.

The dualism of ignorance and knowledge dominates Elliott's thinking. The multitude is ignorant of its true condition, the ruling groups are driven by prejudice, whilst Owenism provides the necessary freedom of

mind. His plea is therefore for 'our British friends' to send books, tracts and newspapers to help pierce through the gloom of ignorance. He declares that:

> I am now more of a Protestant than ever I was – I not only protest against Popery, but I protest against mystery, monopoly, and that rotten mythology which is, I believe, the only cause of the present degraded and debased condition of society.

By the first half of 1842 Elliott could refer to fifty-two names on the socialist class roll, though he admitted that only between sixteen and twenty members attended the weekly meetings. Following the example of O'Connell they collected a penny a week per member to help buy books and pay the rent of the meeting room. Some also contributed sixpence a week to try to obtain a house.[45] Sympathetic Owenites in Britain had sent them reading material, but the new goal was to get the Central Board to send over 'some fearless, talented, and independent missionary to break the ice of public attention'.[46]

Towards the end of 1842 a new voice is heard amongst the socialist artisans of Dublin, that of Michael Groves, who eventually referred to himself as secretary, and informed *The New Moral World* readers that Elliott was now president of their small group. This period sees an acceleration in socialist activities and an increasing engagement with other ideological strands, notably Chartism, O'Connellite Repealism, orthodox Catholicisim, and Orangeism.

Groves appears to have injected new energy into the campaign. It is still true, he admits, that 'Socialism is but little known here.'[47] He confirms the artisan basis of the group – 'our class is composed of working men' – but adds that some inroads have been made into other classes: 'there are others of the superior classes favourable to our cause, who remain private'. Groves's strategy was to gain public attention for socialism. He thus argued the merits of Owenism in a couple of debating societies, and introduced a street collection for funds. Already one senses trouble is brewing with the O'Connellites, for Groves introduced Owenite arguments into a series of debates on Repeal of the Union, and saw the street collection as a way of using the O'Connellite methods to generate funds for a worthier cause.

Open hostilities with the O'Connellites broke out in December 1842. The socialists decided to hold a public meeting to propound their principles on 18 December 1842.[48] The meeting was effectively hijacked by the O'Connellite master tailor Thomas Arkins, who had cut his teeth in the service of O'Connell breaking up Chartist meetings some years earlier.[49] Arriving with a hostile mob, he used the meeting to launch a fierce attack on socialism. He detailed a familiar eclectic range of charges – blasphemy, social disorder, alien origin – but gave them an interesting twist. Thus he called upon the common Christian faith of both Protestants

and Catholics to reject the 'infidelity' of the socialists. In playing the 'alien' card he used a device that was to be used extensively by O'Connell himself, namely to imply that socialism and Chartism were inextricably linked: 'It was perfectly clear that the Socialists and Chartists went hand in hand. . . . Irishmen would never tolerate English Chartists or Socialists to inflict the curse of their presence on their lovely land. (Loud cheers)'. Other speakers developed different lines of attack, with one suggesting that the socialists 'have a house' in Carlisle 'where they say there is about 500 of them living in unlimited intercourse'. In the face of threatened violence the socialists withdrew.

Arkins's equation of socialism with Chartism put the latter in a quandary, and forced them to spell out their relationship to socialism. The Chartist printer W. H. Dyott, in a dignified letter to the *Freeman's Journal*,[50] sought to make a theoretical distinction between Chartism and socialism:

> Chartism which I advocate . . . contemplates no social change but what will be effected through the present form – amended – of the British constitution. Socialism, on the contrary . . . looks upon Chartism as equally futile with any other *political* nostrum of the present day, as a remedy for the evils under which society groans. It affirms that those evils spring from the *competitive* and struggling system under which we live, and it propounds the *community* or *co-operative* principle in its stead. . . . My object is to show that there is neither relation nor connexion, but on the contrary, hostility and repulsion between the two systems.

In another letter Dyott similarly asserted that 'to be a Chartist and a Socialist is altogether impossible'.[51] This is not however the full story. There was clearly some level of personal warmth between Dyott and the socialists. Dyott made a number of favourable remarks about the character of the socialists, whilst Elliott called Dyott's first letter 'straightforward and manly' and said that he would 'prefer such a mind as his to a thousand brainless brawlers'.[52] Dyott also allowed the socialists to hire a room from him as well as having had commercial relationships with them, printing their placards and selling their tracts and books. Dyott clearly had some sympathy with the critique of the socialists, and sought in his correspondence to refute a number of the charges made against them. No doubt there was also a shared sense of adversity against the likes of Arkins – Dyott is particularly vehement in his attack on the strong-arm methods of the opponents of socialism. A further complicating factor in this complex set of patterns is that although Arkins was an O'Connellite, Dyott classed O'Connell as a supporter of the Charter. As we shall see shortly, O'Connell angrily turned on Dyott. Unfortunately we possess no remark made by a Dublin socialist on the nature of Chartism.

O'Connell himself, in public meetings, now launched a broadside

against socialism.[53] He was quickly followed by the Catholic hierarchy. O'Connell had not always been an opponent of Owenism. When Robert Owen gave a series of public lectures in Dublin in 1823, O'Connell was in the audience. Subsequently the Hibernian Philanthropic Society was established to promote Owenite communal experiments. In a letter of 10 May 1823 O'Connell wrote: 'I shall become a subscriber to Owen's Society. He *may* do some good and cannot do any harm.'[54] Thus at this period Owenism appeared quite compatible with O'Connell's beliefs. In the early 1840s this was no longer deemed to be the case (not that O'Connell now mentioned the earlier flirtation!). O'Connell's attack was not, however, a sober defence of liberalism against the alternative doctrines of the socialists, but rather an inflammatory and tendentious reiteration and development of the 'religious' and xenophobic charges of Arkins. He asserted that the socialists belonged 'to the poorer class of Orangemen', were dupes of the Tories and the English, and sought 'to conciliate the poorer classes of Protestants in the towns by their abuse of the Catholic priests'. They played on the undoubted grievances of the Irish people, and sought to usurp the place of the real force for change – the Repeal Association. Furthermore, they incited people to murder and sedition, and were informers to boot. O'Connell also made a distinction between support for the Charter and Irish Chartism. Supporters of the Charter would find everything they wanted by supporting Repeal. Dyott, on the other hand, was condemned as an apologist for socialism, and all socialists were condemned as Chartist. The clergy of the country were to be warned of the dangers of the infidel doctrine of socialism. O'Connell's attack was taken up by the Archbishop of Tuam.[55] Socialism was the most recent manifestation of the English Protestant attack on Catholic Ireland, 'one of the latest and most destructive of those infidel sects, of which the English schism has been the prolific parent'. However, 'the truly conservative vigour of the Catholic faith' amongst the Irish poor would not simply sweep away socialism in Ireland but would, via the Irish in England, lead to the 'second conversion' of that country itself.

From Michael Groves's indignant response to these charges,[56] we can learn of the emerging socialist critique of both O'Connellite Repealism, and of religion. Groves appears to share Owen's strictures on religion, namely that it is based on ignorance. He therefore takes the Archbishop's attack to be a sign of fear that socialism would 'dispel the darkness and ignorance in which alone the priesthood flourish'. He thinks Ireland is particularly deeply mired in such ignorance, plaintively explaining to his British readers that socialists in Ireland 'encounter a fierce and powerful opposition, and prejudices much stronger than you ever experienced in England, among a people ardently devoted to their superstitions and their priests'. Groves was indignant at O'Connell's claim 'that we were all Orangemen'. He used the opportunity to give the first evidence in his

correspondence of the religious breakdown of the Dublin socialists, and to condemn Orangeism: 'We are composed of Catholics and Protestants, about an equal number of each, and have never had anything to do with Orangeism. We have added three members since the attack, all Catholics.' O'Connell is attacked on a number of levels. He is portrayed as an arrogant bully holding 'unlimited sway over his stupid and deluded followers', who uses lies and incites violence against the socialists. His political project is also attacked. Ireland 'under his management . . . is in a worse condition now . . . than when he began'. Most importantly Groves takes an anti-Repeal stance against O'Connell, referring to the latter's 'proposals or attempts to divide the countries by a repeal of the Union'. Groves uses two different approaches, one stressing O'Connell's anti-English sentiments, the other his class sympathies. Thus O'Connell is said to be motivated by hatred of England, and it is this which 'is the real cause of his agitation for repeal'. Groves also argues that 'it would be easy to shew that all his arguments, to prove that Ireland would be benefited by repeal or separation, are false'. O'Connell's claim that an Irish nobility and gentry spending their fortunes in Ireland would lead to general wealth for the country is denounced as nonsense, since the English poor have not benefited from their own grandees. The 'superior humanity of the Irish nobility and gentry' is belied by the low wages they have paid their labourers 'before and after the Union'. Groves condemns O'Connell's politics as an attempt to promote the base interests of the rich Catholics, and even includes Catholic Emancipation in this: 'The only value in his boasted emancipation and corporate reforms, was to enable rich Catholics to share with rich Protestants the unearned revenues of office, and they have already proved themselves quite as greedy.'

Groves expressed a desire to return to this topic in a later letter. Alas this was the last item of correspondence from him. Only one further letter from the Dublin socialists appears in *The New Moral World*.[57] This is a short melancholy note from John Elliott dated 21 August 1843, noting the death by consumption of a young member, Peter Crighton, aged 22. There are no further letters from the artisan socialists of Dublin.

As with O'Brien and MacCormac, emergence gives way to submergence: irrelevance to contemporaries, invisibility to successors. Unlike the elite socialists, however, the artisan socialists had their entire project, their very political existence, forgotten. A distinctive voice is therefore lost, for, although their general theoretical perspective is drawn from the 'prophets' of Owenism, they were forced by the local context to develop this base to cope with the complexities of Irish life. They were thus developing increasing theoretical sophistication as they grappled with, for example, O'Connellite Repealism and orthodox Catholicism.

SOCIALISM AND NATIONALISM

Between the silence of the artisan socialists and the end of the decade the catastrophe of the Famine occurs, and, at the ideological level, the development of radical nationalism. In 1849 and 1850 we see the first sustained effort in Irish history to combine socialism and nationalism. Emerging out of the Irish Democratic Association and its newspaper, *The Irishman* (publisher, Bernard Fullam),[58] this attempted synthesis could plausibly claim to be the earliest ancestor of Irish socialist republicanism. Its historical context is the defeat of insurrectionary nationalism in 1848. In one sense it is firmly grounded in the most radical wing of Young Ireland. Until September 1849 *The Irishman* was edited by the young poet, Michael Joseph Brennan, a former associate of Mitchel and editor of *The Irish Felon*, whose participation, with Lalor, in the failed rising of 1849, resulted in his flight to America. Subsequently the journal saw itself as carrying the torch of Mitchel and Lalor, who were themselves seen as continuing the project of Tone and Emmet. But it moves beyond the radical rural redistributionism of Lalor into the new theoretical and political territory of socialist nationalism. This is not to say, however, that *The Irishman* created this synthesis out of thin air. One can clearly see in 1848, in journals such as the *Irish Felon*, the *Irish Tribune* and *The Irish National Guard*, a growing sense of the importance of the urban working class for the success of the national revolution. *The Irishman*, however, pulls the disparate strands together into a coherent theoretical whole.

A particularly clear expression of this new synthesis can be found in a leading article, 'Social Democracy', in *The Irishman* at the end of 1849,[59] which provided an historical account of the origins of radicalism. In medieval and early modern times 'blind outpourings' against God and King, driven by 'sheer necessity' had manifested themselves in Jack Cade's revolt, the Peasant War in Germany, and so forth. In eighteenth-century France, hunger again stimulated revolt, only this time 'Frenchmen invoked the genius of Liberty.' After much further struggling liberty was triumphant. In this new period humanity became self-conscious, because liberty was no longer founded on 'impulse' or 'blind instincts'. The victory of liberty proved inadequate, however, because it was only partial freedom. The social dimension of freedom was recognized: 'social liberty must be had, or political is useless. What use the rights of a freeman if we be the slave of the capitalist or the taskmaster?' The phase of political liberty therefore gave way to a new one: 'Communism, Socialism, Red Republicanism, sprang up to meet the difficulty.' *The Irishman* views this phase as still problematic. It is a step forward but must not be viewed uncritically:

> Perhaps better modes might have been possibly devised, less objectionable and more practical. . . . Still they were the voice of nature – the

> protest of suffering against injustice. Half instinct, half reason, they were the first efforts of men trying the path that led to the remedy of an unthought-of evil. . . . It is the hammer that must break down every roughness and inequality, till man be socially as well as politically on an equal with his fellow.

At the risk of reading too much into this one could argue that a claim is being made here that historical forms of socialism have lost a vital 'liberal' dimension, and that a more adequate form of socialism requires the reintroduction of this temporarily displaced item. The *Irishman* was also aware of the opprobrium socialism invited in Ireland: phrases such as 'the principles we have suggested will be branded as Communist and anti-social' occur in a number of places in the journal. The European revolutions of 1848 added to the general demonology of socialism. Mitchel himself in his *Jail Journal* wrote that 'Socialists are something worse than wild beasts.'

The question of Ireland is now introduced into *The Irishman*'s analysis. Ireland is moving steadily towards political independence, but this in itself is not sufficient. Without social change independence is an illusion: 'she must have more than that, or independence itself will be but a tinselled plaything, a dyed garment stretched over the back of misery'. Ireland must undergo a social revolution if true independence is to be acquired. *The Irishman* develops the notion of Social Democracy to conceptualize the social aspect of the Irish revolution: 'We must become *Socially Democratic*, as well as politically so . . . no great benefit can be derived from struggling for half a victory; Ireland must be thoroughly and radically revolutionised in all her social relations.'

The analysis now explicitly puts water between itself and earlier theories of rural redistribution. Resolving the 'Land Question' is clearly vital, but it is only one part of the solution, necessary but not sufficient:

> It is idle to talk of confining our views to the adjustment of the land question, the firm establishment of the occupier, and the debasement or annihilation of the agrarian aristocracy. All these are necessities, solid in themselves, and essential to our independence. . . . But we must go farther.

The further stage involves a head-on confrontation with the emerging capitalist class. This is the modern strong class, eclipsing the decaying landed aristocracy – it is the new aristocracy. *The Irishman* is sensitive to the ideological aspects of capitalism's power. The new aristocracy grows up 'partially unobserved' and is 'infinitely more formidable, because apparently more consonant with reason and sound principle'; furthermore 'the crooked maxims of a heartless political economy, elevate such a man into a demigod, a philanthropist, a patriot'.

The analysis distinguishes between the position in England and that in

Ireland. England is deemed to have a more developed capitalist economy. Although the 'case is less apparent in Ireland' it is, however, 'not less black or ruinous'. Relative underdevelopment makes exploitation more naked and intense: 'The rights of labour, are even less regarded than in the English factory, or mine, or farm. Our petty tyrants oppress on a grander scale. They make up for the fewness of the objects by the intensity of the infliction.' Independence without social revolution will merely leave the Irish people at the mercy of these native exploiters: 'This must be corrected, or nationality and independence will be but the dream of a drunkard. What will be the advantage of escaping from the wholesale tyrant, if we leave ourselves in the hands of a host of paltry oppressors.'

The clarity of this presentation should not blind us to the ambiguities of the general project. The very term 'general project' can mislead, for the Irish Democratic Association was a fairly broadly-based organization, most of whose supporters were far more interested in nationalism than socialism. Furthermore even amongst the radical elements (besides Fullam this included Andrew English, Honorary Secretary of the Association, and Thomas Moffet, Chairman of the Association Committee), views differed and evolved. The intellectual core of the Irish Democratic Association and *The Irishman* was predominantly an educated middle-class group[60] whose ideological roots lay in radical liberal-democratic nationalism, and whose central concepts were liberty, democracy and nation. One is conscious of a struggle to fashion a new perspective out of this vocabulary. They were aware of socialist theorizing – *though not of any Irish predecessors* – but had very little sympathy for the specifics of traditional schools such as Owenism, Fourierism or Saint-Simonianism. They were most sympathetic to the modern continental forms associated with the revolutions of 1848, but here again there was comparatively little direct borrowing. Thus liberal-democratic nationalism is constantly intruding. In the case of liberalism, for example, an editorial of 12 January uses social contract theory to demonstrate that Irish people owe no allegiance to England, and that Ireland has 'fallen into the state of nature'; the numerous references to the 'rights of man' should also be noted. This liberal-democratic nationalist vocabulary variously dovetails, coexists, contradicts and obscures some of the other concepts developed to cope with deep theoretical and political problems. There is undoubted tension between the concepts of 'man', 'working class', 'the masses', 'the people', 'the Democracy' and 'the nation'. It is not clear, for example, who the revolutionary agent is. At times a strict class analysis categorically rules out any help from the aristocracy, the landlords, manufacturers, shopkeepers, and even (temporarily) farmers,[61] and the refurbished Davisite slogan of 'Ourselves Alone' is deemed to refer to 'the Democracy', whilst on other occasions members of all classes are seen to be capable of backing the national struggle. Within 'the Democracy', the

role of the progressive middle class is ambiguously presented, sometimes as an indistinguishable part of an undifferentiated whole, sometimes as a distinct ally of a leading working class, and sometimes as a superior educational force *vis-à-vis* the working class. On occasions 'Orangemen' are called 'volunteer mercenaries of an alien tyranny' who would become 'armed fratricides to keep their trampled country for ever in chains'; at other times the hand of friendship is extended to our 'Orange brothers',[62] and 'our great project' is described as uniting 'men of every class and religious persuasion in the resuscitation of our common country'.[63] The problems of distinguishing and reconciling 'class' and 'nation' which bedevil later socialist republicanism are prefigured here.

There is a degree of vagueness and lack of clarity as to how the social and political aspects of the revolution are to be co-ordinated in practice. The working class of Ireland is to be assisted in its struggle against capital, but there is no theory of how a struggle against capital in Ireland feeds into a struggle for national independence. The overarching conception appears to be that the primary task of the working class is to work for national independence, and that an independent Ireland will then grant them the necessary social freedom. On the question of land, for example, *The Irishman* states quite bluntly: 'It is idle to think of adjusting the land question before we have asserted the independence of Ireland. Then, and not till then, we shall decide whose is the soil.'[64] This is a two-stage theory – independence, then social revolution – lacking any notion that the weakening of Irish capital will play a material role in the independence of Ireland. Independence itself is not to be won by parliamentary means, for Parliament is a class-based and, post Union, alien institution. They are circumspect about the precise means, though their constant references to police in their meetings indicate the context of their tactics.[65] It does seem that they believed that armed strength, at the appropriate moment, would be the engine of independence. They hoped for the assistance of both the British and European working class, appealing to them to 'help us twine together the banners, green and red, in one thick cord, to bind down for ever, the demon that has oppressed us'.[66]

The Irish Democratic Association itself, after an impressive start – thousands attending its meetings, branches in many parts of Ireland, England and Scotland – fizzled out in 1850. Publication of *The Irishman* was suspended in May 1850 due to financial problems; after a brief resurrection in August of that year it was finally closed down. The fact that *The Irishman* ultimately resurfaced as a non-, even anti-socialist nationalist paper is indicative of the milieu in which the Irish Democratic Association radicals operated. As with later attempts to synthesize socialism and nationalism, the former was constantly in danger of being swallowed up by the latter; of having its social dimension eliminated, or subordinated, or tailored to the needs of nationalism. The large meetings held by the Irish Democratic Association more often echoed to the call

for the return of the exiled martyrs than they did to the call for social democracy. The distinctive *socialist* aspect soon disappeared and the predominant memory created, such as it was, was of a recherché *nationalist* sect.

The Irishman provides a rich and interesting body of ideas. The most notable aspect of its brief life is undoubtedly the attempt, admittedly problematic, to synthesize socialism and nationalism. It made the crucial move from the nationalist rural redistributionism of Lalor to a broader, socialist and nationalist critique of urban and rural capitalism. It clearly did not emerge out of a vacuum – these types of ideas were clearly developing in these revolutionary years. But *The Irishman* marks the first sustained effort to work out the theoretical parameters of such a synthesis. In this sense it can, with some justification, be called the creator of the earliest form of Irish socialist republicanism.

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

November and December of 1851 saw the birth and death of Ireland's first Christian Socialist journal, *The Christian Social Economist*. It was the creation of a Catholic priest, Thaddeus O'Malley.[67] O'Malley was born in Garryowen, County Cork in 1796. After ordination, and educational work in America, he became Rector of Malta University. On returning to Ireland he threw himself into the various political controversies of the day, and also did sterling work on the Central Relief Committee during the Famine. He was constantly falling foul of the Church hierarchy in both Rome and Ireland, and was twice suspended from the priesthood. He died in Dublin in 1877. In the revolutionary times of 1848 O'Malley contributed 'The Working Man's Bill of Rights' to the radical nationalist paper *The Irish National Guard*, where he is described as 'the workman's tried friend'. Although the 'Bill of Rights' combines elements of nationalism, socialism and democracy, it is of a very different character from the synthesis developed in *The Irishman*. The theological grounding of O'Malley's approach is apparent in the very first point of the Bill: 'God has given this fertile land to the people, who under his providence are born on it, for their plentiful sustenance – and what God has given no man or set of men shall take away, or any part thereof.' From this he argues that the land may only be held by 'Irishmen' or by persons adopting Ireland as their home and 'residing habitually in it'. In the fairly detailed programme for rural regeneration O'Malley displays an abiding feature of his socialism, a desire for moderate consensual change. Thus absentee landowners will only lose their property through due process of law, and will be compensated. Boards bringing together the various rural classes will establish prices. O'Malley is particularly keen to help the agricultural labourers, 'they who are the real producers of the whole', and argues for a minimum wage, housing provision, a garden rent free,

etc. For those who have no work he proposes a national body, 'The Administration of Public Succour', to provide work and help labourers to become independent farmers. This body will also have the responsibility of promoting 'the comforts, and enjoyments, and intellectual culture of the whole body of the working classes'[68] through the provision of public fountains, baths and libraries. His moderate approach is also apparent in his suggestions for industry. Trades are to be regulated by committees of employers, workers and neutrals; minimum wages are to be set, though more skilful workers can apply for higher rates; a ten-hour day is to be established for skilled workers (eleven for unskilled), and overtime paid above this. As with the rural provisions, 'The Administration of Public Succour' will act as a safety net. O'Malley was also sensitive to the rights of women in employment:

> These regulations . . . shall apply in all their force, and in every particular, to female employers and female workers, or to male employers of workwomen . . . – that is to say, females . . . shall be protected by regulations, in the drawing up of which they must themselves be parties.

Unfortunately this enlightened approach did not extend to the franchise, from which women appear to be excluded.

In his own journal, *The Christian Social Economist* (first issue 22 November 1851), we can see O'Malley developing his Christian Socialist perspective. It does seem that he had quite a sophisticated knowledge of contemporary socialism, particularly French varieties, and was well aware of the deep divisions between different schools: 'each of them has . . . his own theory not only different from, but even in essentials, opposed to the others'. He acknowledges that ignorance and fear shroud the issue of socialism in Ireland: 'never, perhaps, was there a confusion of ideas, so utterly confounded as that which prevails, in the mind of this country upon the subject of Socialism'.[69] Explicitly basing himself on a distinction made by the Archbishop of Paris, he distinguishes true from false socialism. The first element he finds true is the longing of socialism for 'such large practical reforms as will greatly improve the social condition of the masses'. 'In this sense', he argues, 'we are all Socialists', all that is, except 'those miserable few (alas! are they but few?) who never give a thought to any one, or anything but themselves.' Secondly, he commends the socialism embodied in co-operative labour schemes, which he sees as the workers' equivalent of the capitalist joint-stock company. Where he takes issue with existing socialism is in what he takes to be its scientific and religious pretensions. The 'scientific Socialists', he argues, not only underestimate the obstacles to change, but are insensitive to the value of some of these obstacles:

> They would derange and upset, and reconstruct, *all at once*, the whole

> complicated system of human society, without regard to the invincible obstacles opposed by old laws, old institutions, old customs, old manners, old ingrained habits of thinking, of feeling and of acting.

This in turn leads it 'to assume the lofty dogmatism of a new religion'. O'Malley also partly concedes the perennial charge levied against socialism in Ireland – that it is an atheist doctrine. He talks of '*socialistic* writings of a mischievous tendency', which are 'deeply stained with the hue of infidelity', and whilst 'insidiously flattering the poor man's world hopes, destroy his religious faith'. That this is not deemed to be a condemnation of all forms of socialism is clear in his statement that it is not possible to find 'the germs of a purer and a nobler socialism than those scattered in every page of the Christian's Gospel'.

O'Malley terms his own true socialism 'Christian Social Economy'. Its goal is to have 'the laws regulating the society . . . imbued with a Christian morality', thereby attacking the 'pagan spirit' which treats working people 'as if mere beasts of burthen, or two-armed machines of iron or wood'. In a characteristically ecumenical manner he cites as a fellow believer in a practical social morality 'that able man of whom the English Protestant Church of our time might well be proud, the late Rev. Dr Arnold'. The choice of Arnold is also interesting for another reason; although seeing himself as a friend of the workers, O'Malley takes a rather lofty, school-masterly tone towards them. Thus, for example, in an attack on what he takes to be the fatalism of the people, he waspishly refers to 'that stupid desponding tone . . . which is everlasting whining – "'tis fate, 'tis fate, 'tis fate, a wayward fate – 'tis Providence itself that wills our misery, 'twere vain to struggle with it".' He conceives of himself as an impartial referee between the contending classes, an 'interpreter' or 'mediator'. As with the 'Bill of Rights' the tone is moderate and consensual. A call is made for 'a calm and measured method, which proposes to make the most of the materials at hand, and which, in its step-by-step progress, may, perhaps, arrive sooner at the desired goal than the more adventurous teaching of the too rapid logicians'. Furthermore 'the rich and the poor should be alike persuaded that there is a *solidarity* of interests between them'. He poses his own vision of the future against what he takes to be the crude levelling conception of communism, and proposes a

> Social order . . . which makes room for the happiness of all, not upon the same flat level, as is idly dreamt of in the communistic philosophy, but, more agreeably to all the great analogies of nature, in an infinite variety of gradations, according to the infinite variety of individual tastes, and aptitudes and capacities.[70]

His nationalism is also very different from that of *The Irishman* since he firmly repudiates separatism in favour of a federalist solution: 'an Irish

Parliament elected *exclusively* for the enactment of purely Irish measures, and constructed so as *not* to interfere with the free action of imperial legislation. . . . This is the great principle of federalism.'[71]

O'Malley, besides producing Ireland's first Christian Socialist journal, is also of interest for his attempt to craft a fairly conservative socialism which would be more in tune, as he conceived of it, with the nature of Irish society and history. He thus confronts the equations in which socialism equals infidelity, and unrealistic, catastrophic change. Rooted in Irish Catholicism, but with a critical and fairly latitudinarian disposition, he is concerned to show both what is possible and what is valuable in Ireland.

These then are some of the socialisms to be found in the first half of the nineteenth century in Ireland. Such a short chapter can necessarily only scratch the surface. Each of the four forms of socialism discussed would repay a considerably more detailed examination. There are undoubtedly other forms to be explored which are not even mentioned here. None could be deemed a success: elite socialism was confined to a rather narrow social group and could only point to the ephemeral success of Ralahine as an example of a practical achievement; artisan socialism led a brief, almost fugitive existence amongst a very small number of Dublin artisans; the Irish Democratic Association, although it initially attracted some public support, rapidly collapsed, and O'Malley's *The Christian Social Economist* could only manage six issues. Each group appears to have been ignorant of their Irish predecessors: the artisan socialists make no mention of the elite socialists, and the socialists at the end of the 1840s make no reference to either of the earlier two – there is no sense of a native tradition to draw upon. The reasons for their failure to make ideological, political and social progress would require a separate chapter in itself. Descriptively all we can say here is that socialism was quite unable to challenge effectively the grip of established ideologies – conservatism, liberal nationalism, orthodox Catholicism, and Orangeism. Historical 'failures', these socialisms have almost disappeared from the historical account, resulting in the patchy historiography of Irish socialism to which we referred at the beginning of the chapter – submerged in both history and the historical record. Not only are these ideas interesting in themselves, they also need to take their place in a new comprehensive history of Irish socialism.

NOTES

I would like to thank the following for their comments on earlier drafts: Bob Eccleshall, Richard English and Gregory Claeys.

1 See: S. Daley, *Ireland and the First International*, Cork, Tower Books, 1984; J. W. Boyle, *The Irish Labor Movement in the Nineteenth Century*, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1988, ch. 4.

2 Thompson's works include: *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth* (1824), New York, Kelley, 1963; *Labor Rewarded*, London, Hunt & Clarke, 1827; also see: R. K. P. Pankhurst, *William Thompson*, London, Watts, 1954; G. Claeys, *Machinery, Money and the Millennium*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1987, ch. 4.
3 See: R. G. Garnett, *Cooperation and the Owenite Socialist Communities in Britain, 1825–45*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1972, ch. 4; V. Geoghegan, 'Ralahine: Ireland's lost utopia', *Communal Societies*, 9, (1989), 91–104, and 'Ralahine: an Irish Owenite community (1831–1833)', *International Review of Social History*, XXXVI, 3, (1991), 377–411.
4 See: W. Thompson, *An Appeal of One-half the Human Race, Women*, London, Virago, 1983; B. Taylor, *Eve and the New Jerusalem*, London, Virago, 1983.
5 R. Owen, *Report of the Proceedings at the Several Public Meetings Held in Dublin*, Dublin, J. Carrick & Son, 1823.
6 *The Co-operative Magazine and Monthly Herald*, 1, 4 (April 1826).
7 A. Cullen, *Adventures in Socialism*, Clifton NJ, Kelley, 1972, 258.
8 ibid.
9 ibid., 258–62.
10 *The Co-operative Magazine and Monthly Herald*, 2, 4 (June 1827).
11 ibid., 2, 11 (November 1827).
12 ibid.
13 Some details of MacCormac's life can be found in I. Fraser, 'Father and son – a tale of two cities'. *The Ulster Medical Journal*, XXXVII, (1968), 1.
14 H. M'Cormac, *An Appeal in Behalf of the Poor; Submitted to the Consideration of Those who take an Interest in Bettering their Condition*, Belfast, S. Archer, J. Hodgson & M. Jellett, 1831, 15.
15 ibid., 13.
16 'Co-Operation, Association Joint-Agency, Co-Partnership Mutual-Assurance', *The Belfast Co-Operative Advocate*, 1 (January 1830), 13.
17 Fraser, 'Father and son', 12, 11.
18 H. M'Cormac, *A Plan for the Relief of the Unemployed Poor*, Belfast, Stuart & Gregg, 1830, 22.
19 ibid., 31.
20 H. M'Cormac, *On the Best Means of Improving the Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes; Being an Address, Delivered on the Opening of the First Monthly Scientific Meetings, of the Belfast Mechanics' Institute*, London, Longman, Rees, Orme, Browne & Green, 1830, 12.
21 ibid., 13.
22 Fraser, 'Father and son', 4–6.
23 *On the Best Means*, 11.
24 ibid.
25 *An Appeal*, 5.
26 *A Plan*, 29.
27 *An Appeal*, 6.
28 *On the Best Means*, 9.
29 ibid., 9–10.
30 *A Plan*, 17.
31 ibid.
32 ibid., 7.
33 H. M'Cormac, *The Philosophy of Human Nature in its Physical, Intellectual and Moral Relations; With an Attempt to Demonstrate the Order of Providence in the Three-Fold Constitution of our Being*, London, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longman, 1837, 118.

34 *On the Best Means*, 10–11.
35 *An Appeal*, 18.
36 *The Philosophy of Human Nature*, 118.
37 *An Appeal*, 22.
38 *On the Best Means*, 23.
39 *The Belfast Co-operative Advocate*, 1 (January 1830), 15–22. This journal in fact seems to have come out in January 1831, not 1830 as printed. A letter from James Kennedy, Corresponding Secretary of the First Belfast Co-operative Society, to the Glasgow Co-operative Society, dated 'December 21st 1830' and published in the *Herald to the Trades' Advocate, and Co-operative Journal* (January 1831) says that the first number of the journal 'will appear, we expect, next month'.
40 *The Voice of the People*, 26 February 1831. *The Lancashire and Yorkshire Co-operator* (May 1832) gives an account of 'the Second Social, or Anniversary Meeting' which 'consisted of about two hundred persons, about one half of which were females, and, with the exception of a few, they were all of the working or mechanical classes'. MacCormac is not mentioned.
41 See A. Durr's chapter 'William King of Brighton: Co-operation's prophet?' (and S. Yeo's introduction to it), in S. Yeo (ed.), *New Views of Co-Operation*, London, Routledge, 1988.
42 *The New Moral World*, 22 February 1840.
43 ibid., 24 April 1841.
44 ibid., 29 May 1841.
45 ibid., 5 February 1842.
46 ibid., 12 March 1842.
47 ibid., 5 November 1842.
48 For various accounts of the following see *The New Moral World*, 7 January 1843.
49 For Arkins see: F. D'Arcy, 'Dublin artisan activity, opinion and organisation, 1820–1850, unpublished MA thesis, University College, Dublin , 1968, Appendix XVI.
50 Reprinted in *The New Moral World*, 7 January 1843.
51 *Freeman's Journal*, 28 January 1843.
52 *The New Moral World*, 7 January 1843.
53 ibid., 4 February, 11 February 1843.
54 M. O'Connell (ed.) *The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*, Shannon, Irish University Press, 1972, 2, 471.
55 *The New Moral World*, 18 March 1843.
56 ibid., 11 March, 22 April, 27 May 1843.
57 ibid., 2 September 1843.
58 A few interesting memories of *The Irishman* and the Irish Democratic Association can be found in R. Pigott, *Personal Recollections of an Irish National Journalist*, Dublin, Hodges, Figgis, 1882, 30–40. Piggot, who was a young journalist on the paper, describes the Irish Democratic Association as 'a combination with aims almost entirely socialistic and revolutionary' (31).
59 *The Irishman*, 29 December 1849.
60 Pigott says that Fullam 'had the able aid of a number of young students of Trinity College' on the paper. Pigott, *Personal Recollections*, 30.
61 *The Irishman*, 9 March 1850.
62 ibid., 18 May 1850.
63 ibid., 2 March 1850.
64 ibid., 12 January 1850.
65 Pigott says that *The Irishman* 'went as far in the direction of advocating Mitchel's policy as it was safe to do in those days. I believe there is little

doubt that the proprietor was obliged to give a pledge to the Viceroy that the paper would not teach revolutionary doctrines, before it would be permitted to appear' (*Personal Recollections*, 31).

66 *The Irishman*, 6 April 1850.

67 For the scanty biographical details on O'Malley see: J. Crone, *A Concise Dictionary of Irish Biography*, Nedeln/Liechtenstein, Kraus Reprint, 1970, 193; D. Gwynn, *Young Ireland and 1848*, Cork, Cork University Press, 1949, 119; D. Kerr, *Peel, Priests and Politics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1982, 148, 167–9.

68 *The Irish National Guard*, 29 April 1848.

69 *The Christian Socialist Economist*, 22 November 1851.

70 ibid., 6 December 1851.

71 ibid., 27 December 1851.