Brian Kelly

MARX & ENGELS ON EMPIRE, INEQUALITY & RESISTANCE IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY IRELAND

Marx and Engels on Empire, Inequality and Resistance in Nineteenth-Century Ireland
Brian Kelly

~~~~~~~~~

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the founders of modern revolutionary socialism, showed a keen interest in developments in Ireland throughout the tumultuous period between the onset of famine in the late 1840s and the rise of the Land League thirty years later. From their vantage point in industrialising England, then (in their own words) the 'metropolis of capital, the power which [rules] the world market',[1] the catastrophic suffering of the famine years and the acute social distress that followed in its wake represented for them an essential corollary to England's unmatched industrial expansion. British economic and political supremacy went hand in hand with Irish underdevelopment, they argued: 'While Britain "flourished" Ireland moved toward extinction…a semi-barbarous, purely agrarian…land of poverty-stricken tenant farmers'. And with an ever-growing Irish emigrant presence in every significant industrial centre in Britain, the 'Irish Question' became for them a critical issue for the growing international working-class movement.

Engels had come early to an interest in Ireland through his survey of working-class life in industrial Britain, a work whose insights came to Engels through his long-term relationship with Mary and Lizzie Burns, 'child[ren] of the Irish proletariat',[2] as he later recalled. In *The Condition of the Working Class in England*—published in 1845, on the eve of famine in Ireland—he had already noted the influx of 'armies' of the Irish poor into the growing cities of industrial Britain. They had 'nothing to lose at home,

and much to gain in England': without them the 'rapid extension of English industry could not have taken place'.[3] Many of them ended up corralled into districts like Manchester's 'Little Ireland' or St. Giles in London, which concentrated in fetid conditions the 'poorest of the poor, the worst paid workers with thieves and the victims of prostitution[,] the majority Irish'.[4]

In this context, industrial employers stood to benefit from encouraging competition between desperate newly arrived immigrants and native-born workers: the wages of English worker was being 'forced down further and further in every branch in which the Irish compete with him.'[5] A quarter century later this competition had generated deep antagonisms, forming the basis for strains of anti-Irish bigotry that would survive well into the twentieth century. Marx noted in 1870 that 'every industrial and commercial centre in England now possesses a working class *divided* into two hostile camps', with a 'profound antagonism between the Irish proletariat and the English proletariat. The average English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers wages and the *standard of life*, [regarding] him somewhat like the poor whites of the [American South] regard their black slaves'.[6]

For Engels and for Marx, this antagonism imposed a profound responsibility on the most advanced elements in the British labour movement, and informed an approach that they would carry into their work in the First International throughout the years ahead. In addition to confronting bigotry against Irish immigrants within the ranks of the labour movement, they insisted a principled position meant breaking decisively with the British ruling class on its policy in Ireland. English workers, Marx insisted, could 'never do anything decisive here in England until it separates its policy [on] Ireland from, the policy of the ruling classes'. The '*national emancipation of Ireland*' was therefore 'no question of abstract justice or humanitarian sentiment, but *the first condition of their own social emancipation*'.[7] Their insistence that the 'Irish Question' had to be taken up in a forthright way inside the growing workers' movement in England was based on neither fantasy nor dogmatism. With the first indications of the horrors of famine becoming

apparent and 'starving Ireland…writhing under the most terrible convulsions', Marx and Engels saw in the rise of Chartism the potential for a vibrant, radical democratic alliance against their common enemies between workers on both sides of the Irish Sea. In Ireland, this held out the hope of a decisive break from the huckstering political style of Daniel O'Connell (and, after his death, of Westminster's so-called 'Irish Brigade'), whose repeal agitation had played upon the misery and desperation of the Irish poor to bargain with English parliamentary elites for a 'place at the table' for Ireland's growing Catholic middle class. If O'Connell 'were really a man of the people [and] were not himself frightened of [them]', if he were 'not a two-faced Whig but an upright, consistent democrat', Engels wrote, 'the last English soldier would have left Ireland long ago'.[8]

The alternative in the 1840s was an alliance with the Chartists—whose leader Feargus O'Connor was an Irish Protestant and stressed that the oppressed classes in both England and Ireland must fight together and conquer together or languish under the same burden and live in the same misery and dependence on their capitalist rulers. As Engels noted, it was O'Connor who led the charge against the Irish Coercion Bill in parliament at a time when the majority of Irish MPs looked the other way; in introducing a motion for Repeal of the Union, O'Connor had 'put himself at the head of the Irish party in a single bound'. As 'simple Whigs in their heart of hearts', Engels noted, Irish elected representatives 'fundamentally detest the democratic energy of Mr. O'Connor'.[9]

These auspicious political shifts were developing against the backdrop of more urgent, even catastrophic, developments in Ireland, however. Very quickly, the devastating effects of the failure of the potato crop were becoming clear. At the time, the completely irrational structure of Irish agriculture—reflecting the concentrated power of the large landowners and wider colonial subordination to British priorities—meant that the mass of Irish peasants were almost completely dependent on a single crop for daily nourishment: the onset of the potato blight meant that virtually overnight a large majority were facing into the very real prospect of death by starvation.

Marx and Engels located the source of the misery not in divine providence or peasant sloth—as many in the English ruling class contended—but in the curse of landlordism and the brutal plundering of Ireland's landless majority. 'The Irish people [are] held in crushing poverty ("the condition in which nine-tenths of the Irish country folks live"), from which it cannot free itself under present social conditions', Engels insisted. In particular, ever-increasing sub-division of the soil, which compelled tenant farmers—in prosperous times—to compete in eking out a bare subsistence on small patches of land even as it permitted landlords to extract rent at 'double, treble, and quadruple that paid in England', meant that many survived perpetually on the brink of disaster. Marx wrote some years later that these arrangements 'enabled a small caste of rapacious lordlings to dictate to the Irish people the terms on which they shall be allowed to hold the land and to live [or die] upon it'.[10]

In many ways, the misery brought on by the Famine did not end with the improvement of the potato crop by the mid-1850s, but continued—and even accelerated—in the decades that followed. Marx and Engels grasped better than most contemporary observers that the horrific devastation of the mid-century was but the ghastly opening act in a profound social and economic transformation that English capitalism would now inaugurate on the land in Ireland. This was, in short, a nineteenth-century version of what Naomi Klein has in our own time called the 'Shock Doctrine'—capitalist elites taking advantage of moments of profound social crisis to push through drastic social and economic changes that they were keen to implement. The famine historian Peter Gray writes that the period saw London

> grasping the heaven-sent 'opportunity' of famine to deconstruct Irish society and rebuild it anew. [Liberals] were prepared to play a deadly dame of brinksmanship in their campaign to impose a capitalist cultural revolution on the Irish. Their intention was not genocidal, nor was it grounded in any Malthuisan assumption of the necessity of Irish depopulation; rather it was the fruit of a powerful social ideology that combined a providentialist theodicy

of 'natural laws' with a radicalized and 'optimistic' version of liberal political economy. God and nature had combined to force Ireland from diseased backwardness to healthy progressive modernity.[11]

It was, of course, Ireland's landless majority and its tenant farmers who would pay the heaviest price for this leap into capitalist modernity. In Ireland by the mid-1850s, Marx noted, society was 'being radically transformed by an Anglo-Saxon revolution' through which 'the Irish agricultural system is being replaced by the English system—the system of small tenures by big tenures, and the modern capitalist is taking the place of the old landowner'. The aggressive continuation of free market dogma (*laissez faire*) into the post-Famine decades, the replacement of small holdings by large-scale agriculture, and especially the transformation of tillage into pastural land for grazing cattle and sheep for export to feed industrial England rendered the bulk of the rural poor a 'surplus population'. In an arrangement which consigned Ireland to 'provide not Irishmen with bread but English men with meat and butter', Engels noted, 'the destiny of the Irish people [is] to be brought across the ocean to make room [for] cows and sheep'. Marx noted that nutritionally the agricultural labourer was worse off in 1867 than s/he had been a decade earlier, and at the same time as rural Ireland was experiencing a sharp decline in population it witnessed an 'absolute increase in the number of deaf mutes, blind, insane… and decrepit inhabitants.'[12]

The massive outmigration initiated by the Famine now became fixed as a permanent feature of Irish working class life—especially in the hard-hit West of the country. In his 'Notes for a Projected History of Ireland', Engels wrote that the 'social revolution inherent in this transformation [the 'conversion of arable land to cattle raising'] would be far greater in Ireland than in England. In England, where large-scale agriculture prevails and where agricultural labourers have already been replaced by machinery [this] would mean the transplantation of at most one million' but 'in Ireland, it would mean the transplantation of four million: the extermination of the Irish people'. In an 1867 speech before German workers in London, Marx noted that 'more than 1.1 million people have been replaced with 9.6 million

sheep,' a development that was 'unheard of in Europe'.[13]

The immense inequality that these social hierarchies underpinned in Ireland, the extreme social dislocations generated first by mass starvation and then by forced immigration, required an immense repressive machinery to contain social unrest, and even with a bulging garrison of British soldiers and locally-recruited police, mid-nineteenth-century Ireland was prone to upheaval. On travels through Ireland in 1856, Engels found 'strong measures… visible in every corner of the country' but 'not a trace' of 'so-called "self-government"'. He declared that he'd 'never seen so many gendarmes in any country', with the constabulary 'armed with carbines, bayonets and handcuffs'. Returning more than a decade later he found a 'state of war noticeable everywhere', with 'squads of Royal Irish all over the place, with sheath-knives, and occasionally a revolver at their side'. In Dublin, he noted, 'there are soldiers literally everywhere'. Britain's colonial state in Ireland was little more than 'a tool of the landlords'.[14]

Their profound grasp of the *social and economic sources* of discontent in Ireland shaped their approach to various manifestations of Irish resistance over the entire period between the late 1840s and Marx's death in 1883: the Irish Question was, in their words, 'not simply a nationality question, but a question of land and existence'.[15] Here they marked off a very different interpretation to the version of Irish history often advanced by nationalists and republicans—of an uninterrupted, generational thread of struggle against British rule. In the context of their commitment to defending the principle of Irish self-determination within the workers' movement in Britain—a commitment from which they never wavered, even when circumstances made it an unpopular stance to uphold—Marx and Engels insisted on situating Irish resistance at every juncture in the concrete social and economic circumstances of the day. This made for a nuanced approach that placed the burden of responsibility for conflict where it belonged—on British and Irish elites—but which could at times also be sharply critical of the insularity and strategic blundering of Irish revolutionaries.

This shaped, for example, their attitude to the agrarian

secret societies that proliferated throughout late eighteenth and nineteenth century Ireland, and which provided lurid fodder for sensationalist accounts in the outraged British press. In a context where Irish landlords were combined for a 'fiendish war of extermination' against their tenants aimed at 'clearing the land of useless mouths', it was inevitable, they insisted, that the rural poor would fight back with any tools at their disposal. In hard-hit Connacht and Munster, Fenianism became deeply entrenched following the Famine. In the face of recurring attempts at coercion by Westminster, Engels insisted, such 'form[s] of resistance cannot be suppressed because and as long as they are the only effective remedy against the extermination of the people by the landlords': they 'will disappear only with the cause responsible for [them]'.[16]

But while defending them along these lines, Marx and Engels at the same time realised their real limitations: agrarian outrages registered not only the despair but ultimately the *powerlessness* of the rural poor to effect fundamental change. This was a 'feeble resistance', Marx wrote, 'powerless for anything beyond demonstrations of individual vengeance'. Engels made much the same point decades later: 'As regards [their] nature', he wrote, the secret societies were '*local* [and] *isolated*', and thus could 'never become a general form of political struggle'.

This was the context in which Engels and Marx greeted with enthusiasm the emergence of the Fenian Brotherhood (the IRB) from the mid-1860s onwards. Founded by the Young Irelander John O'Mahoney in 1858, Fenianism caught hold among Irish immigrants serving in Union Army ranks during the American Civil War. In Ireland it held out the possibility of giving political form to broad disaffection after the ravages of the Famine, representing a break not only with the church-approved agitation of the Catholic middle classes under O'Connell, but also with the cathartic but atomised local score-settling of the agrarian societies. In outlining what was 'distinctive' about Fenianism, Marx emphasized that 'the movement took root…only in the mass of the people, [among] the lower orders'. Where every previous movement since 1798 had 'followed the aristocracy or middle-class men, and always the Catholic churchmen', the Fenians were distinguished

by their 'opposition to lawyers and scheming politicians', their opposition to the Catholic hierarchy, 'who were traitors', and the cleavages that they were encouraging between the 'agricultural labouring class' and substantial farmers. In their declaration for republicanism, separation of church and state, 'the product of the labour to the labourer, and the possession of the soil to the people', the Fenians represented, in the view of the First International, 'the vindication by an oppressed people of its right to social and political existence'.[17]

Engels came to know Fenianism at close range, in part because his long-term relationship with the sisters Mary and Lizzie Burns, second-generation Irish immigrants who were both deeply involved in republican circles in Britain. He and Mary—a 'Manchester factory girl…pretty, witty and altogether charming'—lived together until her death in 1863, and she is likely to have escorted him around working-class districts in Manchester and Salford while researching for *The Condition of the Working Class in England*: one study reckons that if Engels 'had been on his own, a middle-class foreigner, it is doubtful he would have emerged alive, and certainly not clothed.' Following Mary's death, Engels and Lizzie became intimate, sharing a house in Manchester that served as 'a meeting place and a safe house for Fenian activists'. Her biographer recalls Lizzie as 'freedom-loving, uncorseted, fiercely political and sparkling with fun', an estimate shared by Eleanor Marx, who described her as 'illiterate [but] true, honest and in some ways as fine-souled a woman as you could meet.' These qualities left a deep impression on Eleanor, who maintained a keen interest in Ireland for much of her own activist life, and who signed their correspondence 'FS'—for 'Fenian Sister'.[18]

Their defence of Fenianism became not only urgent but increasingly difficult in a context where the British establishment was engaged in an aggressive propaganda campaign aimed at discrediting its enemies in Ireland, and where, by the late 1860s, a campaign of repression began to see hundreds of suspected Fenians in Ireland and England rounded up and sentenced to harsh treatment in English jails. Anyone familiar with the 1980-81 hunger strikes in the North of Ireland will be struck reading through

Marx and Engels' writings on the Fenian prisoners at the parallels between prison struggles more than a century apart. The authorities did their best to break the Fenian prisoners, subjecting them to a harsh regime and denying them political status, provoking heroic resistance from within the prisons themselves. Marx condemned the prison regime, which rested on torture and saw the Fenians 'dragged from one prison to the next as if they were wild animals'. His daughter Eleanor[19] lauded the audacity of Gunner Hood, a young Irishman serving in the British ranks who, when sentenced, threw his cap in the air and shouted 'Long Live the Irish Republic!'—a gesture that earned him 'an extra two years in prison and fifty strokes' with a cat-o-nine tails at the hands of 'two strapping blacksmiths'.[20]

By 1870 some twenty suspected Fenians had either 'died or gone mad in the prisons of humanitarian England', Eleanor reported. She campaigned tirelessly on behalf of O'Donovan Rossa, and it's with her that almost the entire credit rests for exposing his shameful mistreatment and forcing his release. Karl Marx compared the execution of the Fenians' 'Manchester Martyrs' in November 1867 to 'the fate of John Brown at Harpers Ferry', declaring that the episode 'opened up a new period in the struggle between England and Ireland'. He condemned the 'pious Gladstone', who had been outspoken about conditions in Russian prisons before coming to power but who now oversaw a regime that Marx insisted was worse: 'Political prisoners are not treated anywhere so bad as in England', he charged.[21]

In a situation where British authorities were intent on demonizing the Fenians, Marx and Engels' commitment to Irish self-determination within the worker's movement was increasingly difficult to uphold. Nevertheless, they campaigned openly for principled solidarity between the radical working-class democracy in England and the Irish resistance. It has to be added that at times the militarist antics of the Fenians themselves made this a more difficult task: their attempt to rescue prisoners by blowing through the walls of Clerkenwell Prison just a month after the Manchester hangings destroyed a neighbouring workers' district and resulted in a gruesome civilian death toll. Where just months before, Clerkenwell Green had seen a protest attended by 25,000 in solidarity with the Fenian prisoners, the bombing now gave the authorities a powerful lever for rooting out such sympathy among the English working class. 'The London masses', Marx wrote to Engels, 'who have shown great sympathy for Ireland, will be made wild by it and driven into the arms of the government party. One cannot expect the London proletarians to allow themselves to be blown up in honour of the Fenian Emissaries.'[22]

Politically, they were sharply critical of the insularity and parochial outlook that dominated Irish republicanism. After all their efforts on behalf of O'Donovan Rossa, for example, upon arrival in the United States after his release he denounced the radicalism and 'violence' of the Paris Communards. The betrayal outraged Marx: 'If any man was obliged [to] the International and the French Communards', Marx wrote to a friend, 'it was he, and you have seen what thanks we have received at his hands.' Just as O'Connell had done his best to insulate the Irish masses from any infection by the Chartists, so too for many republicans 'the whole labour movement is pure heresy and the Irish peasant must not on any account be allowed to know that the socialist workers are his sole allies in Europe'. After British authorities suppressed the Fenian press, Engels noted a growing Catholic-tinged conservatism of *The Irishman*, which aimed to fill the void by feigning radicalism and 'play[ing] at supporting the "convict felons"' while insisting that 'Ireland remains the *sacra insula*, whose aspirations must on no account be mixed up with the profane class struggles of the rest of the sinful world.'[23]

Faith in mass action provided a basis for optimism, however, and not merely resignation to the status quo in Ireland. Engels' enthusiasm was revived by a series of mass protests in London in 1872, when Irish workers—so long marginalized within British opposition politics—took a leading role in defying a government ban on mass mobilisations. 1100 suspected Fenians had been arrested between 1866 and 1868 under the anti-terror law of the time, and when further coercive measures were tabled, Irish workers responded with open fury. Engels noted the significance of the new turn towards mass protests, and credited London's Irish working class with 'hav[ing] saved the right of the people of London to

hold meetings in parks when and how they please'.

> Last Sunday [3 Nov 1872] two enormous
> processions with bands and banners
> marched toward Hyde Park. The bands
> played Irish songs and the *Marsellaise*;
> almost all the banners were Irish (green
> with a gold harp in the middle) or red...
> This is the first time an Irish demonstration
> has been held in Hyde Park; it was very
> successful and even the London bourgeois
> press cannot deny this. It is also the first
> time the English and Irish societies of our
> population have united in friendship. These
> two elements of the working class, whose
> enmity toward each other was so much
> in the interests of the government and the
> wealthy classes…are now offering one
> another the hand of friendship.[24]

As British repression took its inevitable toll and their organised presence began to disintegrate, Marx and Engels insisted that while they remained an important element as a kind of pressure group in Irish affairs, in the absence of a wider upheaval in Ireland itself the Fenians could do little more than 'scare John Bull'. Though England 'grows noticeably weaker on the outskirts of his Empire,' Engels wrote, it could 'still easily suppress any Irish rebellion so close to home.' The only scenario in which a guerrilla campaign in Ireland might enjoy some modest success was one in which Britain became embroiled in a war with one or more of its rivals—an argument borne out in 1916.[25]

The only viable alternative to the conspiratorial tradition in Irish politics, Marx and Engels argued, lay in mass action by the working classes. This was the basis of their enthusiasm for Fenianism's potential at its birth, and though traces of the 'lower orders' tradition re-emerged intermittently throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century—most forcefully in the Land War of the 1880s—immediate prospects for a serious challenge to the class and imperial hierarchies dominating Ireland, which had seemed ripe in the late 1860s, abated until renewed agitation over the land question produced a new round of intense conflict. In the 1880s, again, many of the unresolved strategic challenges reappeared: the relationship between a movement driven forward by the 'lower orders' but dominated by propertied men close to the Church and insistent on blocking fundamental reform; the difficulty of breaking from the conspiratorial mode, with its emphasis on 'spectacular' acts of individual terror (like the 1882 Phoenix Park assassinations) and turning decisively toward mass mobilisation.

The absence of a potentially powerful urban working class that might have given a lead to smallholders and the most oppressed of the rural poor in Ireland in the 1880s deepened these strategic dilemmas. In the Land War, Fearghal Mac Bhloscaidh argues, 'the moneyed interests of an emergent Catholic bourgeoisie briefly aligned with the radical objectives of the rural poor. A series of bad harvests precipitated a social revolution, where shared insecurity [led] small and large tenants, amongst them substantial commercial graziers, to demand an overhaul of the existing land system'. The leading Galway Fenian, Matthew Harris, characterised the 'alliance of the large and small farmer in the Land League as "the union of the shark and the prey"'. This social revolution 'atrophied', Mac Bhloscaidh concludes, under 'the hegemony of grazier, gombeen and curate [of] the Home Rule Party'. Michael Davitt lamented 'the counter-revolution…the complete eclipse, by a purely parliamentary substitute [under Parnell], of what had been a semi-revolutionary organisation'.[26]

Late nineteenth-century Ireland remained extremely volatile, therefore—combining intense poverty and deep disaffection at the bottom with a relatively weak organised working class, all operating in a context in which middle-class nationalists managed to assert their dominance over land agitation and in which Britain could still bring substantial repression to bear. The social power necessary for shifting things fundamentally simply did not exist within Ireland at the time. In the end, the Land War attempted to combine parliamentary wheeling and dealing with a revived application of the 'weapons of the weak' that had marked the traditions of the agrarian secret societies earlier in the century. 'All that [was] left to Ireland', Engels observed in 1882, was 'the constitutional way of gradually conquering one position after the other'.[27]

A century and a half on from the emergence of a

'lower orders' movement in the ranks of the Fenians, the landscape of revolutionary politics and the potential for change in Ireland have been altered significantly. Britain is no longer the 'metropolis of capital' or the hub of a vast colonial empire but a relatively minor player in a global economy that has extended the inequalities witnessed by Engels in the streets of Manchester to every corner of the earth. In the South of Ireland, the grifters and parasites who leaned on the Catholic hierarchy and exploited the misery of Ireland's poor for their own gain no longer traipse back and forth to Westminster but work from home, presiding over a society that upholds the same free market dogma that brought such catastrophic suffering during the Famine. Partition extended the stain of sectarian division—empire's most conspicuous legacy in Ireland—into the 20th and now the 21st centuries, and fastened inequality on both sides of the border.

North and South, our rulers criminalise and abuse the desperate refugee and migrant populations compelled to wander the globe just as famine emigrants were compelled to do in an earlier century. But there are other important changes: throughout the period when Marx and Engels surveyed conditions here, Irish society remained overwhelmingly agricultural, with the rural poor either scrambling for the emigrant ship or too desperate to mount the kind of challenge that might overthrow the system that upheld such stark inequalities. A century and a half later that situation no longer prevails: Irish workers North and South have the potential to remake society and vindicate those who resisted in far less favourable circumstances.

NOTES

[1] Karl Marx to Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt (9 April 1870), available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_04_09.htm.

[2] Quoted in Henderson, W.O. (1976) *The Life of Friedrich Engels*, p.567.

[3] Engels, F. (1845) *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/ch06.htm.

[4] Ibid., https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/ch04.htm.

On Engels and Ireland, see the excellent piece by Newsinger, J. and Byers, S. (2020) 'Friedrich Engels and the Irish Lever,' *Tribune*, 5 August, available online from: https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/08/friedrich-engels-and-the-irish-lever.

[5] Ibid. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/ch06.htm.

[6] Marx to Meyer and Vogt, op. cit, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_04_09.htm; Marx, Confidential Communication (28 March 1870), in LI Golman and VE Kunina (eds.)(1972) *Ireland and the Irish Question: A Collection of Writing by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, p.162.

[7] Marx to Ludwig Kugelman (29 Nov 1869), in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, p. 280; Marx to Meyer and Vogt, op. cit.

[8] Engels, F. 'The Commercial Crisis in England—The Chartist Movement—Ireland' and 'Letters from London,' in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, pp.44, 35.

[9] Engels, F. (1848) 'Feargus O'Connor and the Irish People' (9 January) and 'The Coercion Bill for Ireland and the Chartists' (8 January), in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, pp.35, 46.

[10] Engels, *Condition of the Working Class in England*: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/ch12.htm; Marx, K. (1853) 'The Indian Question—Irish Tenant Right', 28 June, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1853/07/11a.htm#:~:text=England%20has%20subverted%20the%20conditions%20of%20Irish%20society.&text=And%20thus%20England%20created%20those,and%20to%20live%20upon%20it.

[11] Gray, P. (1999) *Famine, Land and Politics: British Government and Irish Society, 1843-1850*, p.331.

[12] Marx, K. (1855) 'Ireland's Revenge', 16 March, available online from: http://marxengels.public-archive.net/en/ME0865en.html; Engels, F. (1870) *Notes for a History of Ireland*, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/history-ireland/ch01.htm; Marx, K. (1867) 'Outline of a Report on the Irish Question to the Communist Educational Association of German Workers in London', 16 December, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867/12/16.htm.

[13] Engels, *Notes for a History of Ireland*, op. cit.; Marx, 'Outline of a Report on the Irish Question', op. cit.

[14] Engels to Marx (23 May 1856), in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, p.84.

[15] Marx, 'Outline of a Report on the Irish Question', op. cit.

[16] Marx, K. (1859) 'The Excitement in Ireland', *New York Daily Tribune*, 11 January, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1858/12/24.htm; Engels, F. 'Preparatory Material for the History of Ireland,' in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, p.212.

[17] Marx, 'Outline of a Report on the Irish Question', op. cit.; Marx to Engels (11 Dec 1869) available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1869/letters/69_12_10-abs.htm; International Working Men's Association (1867) 'Minute Book', 19 November, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/iwma/documents/1867/november.htm.

[18] Holmes, R. (2014) *Eleanor Marx: A Life*, p.88; Dash, M. (2013) 'How Friedrich Engels' Radical Lover Helped Him Father Socialism', *Smithsonian Magazine*, 1 August, available online from: https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-friedrich-engels-radical-lover-helped-him-father-socialism-21415560/; Irving, S. (2010) 'Frederick Engels and Mary and Lizzy Burns,' *Manchester's Radical History*, available online from: https://radicalmanchester.wordpress.com/2010/03/15/frederick-engels-and-mary-and-lizzy-burns/.

[19] Marx's youngest daughter, Jenny Julia Eleanor Marx, went by the names Eleanor and Jenny, and was known within the family by her nickname 'Tussy'.

[20] Marx, K. (1870) 'The English Government and the Fenian Prisoners', 21 February, available online from: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/02/21.htm; Marx, J. 'Articles by Jenny Marx on the Irish Question', 27 February, in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, pp.380-1.

[21] 'Articles by Jenny Marx,' op. cit.; Marx, K. 'Notes for Undelivered Speech on Ireland, ca. 1866-1868' and Marx, K. 'On the Policy of the British Government with Respect to the Irish Prisoners', in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, pp.120-3, 157.

[22] Marx to Engels, 14 Dec. 1867, available online from: https://marxists.architexturez.net/archive/marx/works/1867/letters/67_12_14.htm. On the Fenians, the Clerkenwell Explosion, and its effect on opinion in Britain, see Basketter, S. (2017) 'The Clerkenwell explosion, and why the Fenians mattered", *Socialist Worker UK*, 2 December, available online from: https://socialistworker.co.uk/art/45766/T

[23] Marx to Friedrich Adolf Sorge (29 November 1871) and Engels to Marx (9 December 1869), in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, pp.299, 284.

[24] Engels, 'Letters from London' (14 Nov. 1872), in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, pp.307-8.

[25] Engels to Eduard Berstein (9 Aug 1882), in *Ireland and the Irish Question*, p.335.

[26] Mac Bhloscaidh, F. (2020) 'Marx in the service of Metternich', *Blosc*, 16 January, available online from: https://blosc.wordpress.com/2020/01/16/marx-in-the-service-of-metternich/.

[27] Engels to Eduard Berstein, op. cit.