University of Southampton

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

History

The Polish Questions in British Politics and Beyond, 1830-1847

Milosz K Cybowski

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2016

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

History

Doctor of Philosophy

THE POLISH QUESTIONS IN BRITISH POLITICS AND BEYOND, 1830-1847

by Milosz Krzysztof Cybowski

The problem of the Polish Question, usually understood as the issue of Polish exiles' efforts to restore Poland to its previous glory and independence, remains overshadowed by much more visible topic of the Great Emigration that followed the fall of the November Uprising (1830-31). At the same time the problem of Poland, despite its continuous presence in British political and social life of the 1830s and 1840s, has so far remained outside the interest of historians of nineteenth-century British political and social history.

This thesis sets out to, on the one hand, broaden the study of the Great Emigration and Polish nineteenth-century history and, on the other, to introduce the subject of Poland, Polish independence and Polish refugees to British historiography. Central in the analysis presented below is the idea of the Polish Question, or, as will be argued, two Polish Questions: one associated with the problem of Polish independence, promoted at various times and with various intensity throughout the 1830s and 1840s; the other linked with the issue of Polish refugees in Britain.

The central problem analysed in this work is the impact of the two Polish Questions on British foreign politics and parliamentary debates, as well as the broader question of public interest, contemporary press and public opinion. By presenting developments of both questions in the context of contemporary British domestic and foreign politics, as well as social and economic changes of the period, this thesis shows the dynamics of the Polish Questions in Britain between the outbreak of the November Uprising and the beginning of the Springtime of Nations.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Declaration Of Authorship

I, Milosz Krzysztof Cybowski

declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

The Polish Questions in British Politics and Beyond, 1830-1847

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;

2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;

3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;

4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;

5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;

6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;

7. Either none of this work has been published before submission, or parts of this work have been published as: [please list references below]:

Signed:

Date: 23/05/2016

Acknowledgements

No writer works in a limbo and I would have not been able to finish this thesis without support, encouragement and distractions from many people. I can only hope that the final result of these long years is satisfactory not only for me, but also for everyone who was, in one way or another, involved in this work.

Work on this thesis would be impossible without support offered to me by Professor David Brown. I am really grateful for his enthusiasm and willingness to supervise this project. His suggestions and comments were essential in transforming this thesis into its final form. I also wish to thank my advisor Dr Jane McDermid, who always had her door open and who offered invaluable advice on different parts of my work. I would also like to thank Professor Joachim Schloer who kindly agreed to be the second supervisor of the final stages of this project.

I also wish to express special thanks to Dr Janusz Pezda, who agreed to supervise my archival work in Czartoryski Library in Cracow and who offered me invaluable help during the Polish phase of my research.

With the oversight of my main supervisor, editorial advice has been sought. No changes of intellectual content were made as a result of this advice. I would like to thank Krzysztof Kietzman for his editorial support.

None of my archival research would have been possible without kind support and invaluable help of archivists and librarians. I wish to express my thanks to people working in the University of Southampton Archive, Pałac Działyńskich in Poznań and in the Czartoryski Archive in Cracow.

Research in libraries and archives in London would be impossible without hospitality offered to me by my uncle, Jutek Hornung. I am indebted to my sister Daria for allowing me to stay in her flat in Poznań, and to her children for offering me a nice and challenging distraction from writing and researching. Temporary stay in Warsaw would not be possible without kindness and support of Mariusz and Tatiana Podgórski, who were also extremely supportive in the last stages of my work on this thesis. I would like to thank my colleague, Anna Mrozik, and my family, Zbyszek and Bożena Błaszczyk, for letting me stay with them during the initial stages of my research in Cracow.

Additional thanks should go to several of my friends (for reasons so varied and so numerous, that I could write another dissertation about them): Jola, Chip, Kamil, Juści, Rosie and Jonny. I am also indebted to Agnieszka Hałas, Beatrycze Nowicka, Joanna Kapica-Curzytek and other members of the editorial board of *Esensja*, who provided me with a stimulating environment to improve my writing skills and many helpful advices about academic life. Oby Nowy System Gratisów upominał Was jak najrzadziej. I cannot forget about my RPol friends, who provided me with yet another creative way of spending my time.

I owe great thanks to my parents, who supported me, both materially and morally, throughout the years of my work on this thesis. I would have not survived without your parcels full of books and kilograms of Polish sweets, jams and other bits that made my life in Britain more bearable.

Special thanks should go to the cats that helped (and sometimes prevented) my work on this thesis. I hope that Bastet takes care of you in cat heaven, Leia. And I hope that one day you will turn into a lazy lap-cat, Bonifacy.

Abbreviations

Names of organisations:

LAFP – the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland

PDS – the Polish Democratic Society (*Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*)

Names of the archives:

AGAD – Central Archives of Historical Records (*Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych*), Warsaw, Poland

BA – Broadlands Archive, Southampton, England

BKCz – Czartoryski Library (*Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich*), Cracow, Poland

BK – Kórnik Library (*Biblioteka Kórnicka*), Kórnik, Poland

NA – The National Archive, Kew Gardens, England

Introduction

Polonez Chopina (*Chopin's Polonaise*) by Teofil Kwiatkowski is a small, unassuming watercolour exhibited in the National Museum in Poznań, Poland. Hanging among the paintings presenting the Polish Napoleonic saga ranging from the deserts of Egypt to the frozen wastes of Russia, it is one among the small number of illustrations of the life of the Great Emigration. The painter captured one of the annual Polish Balls held in Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski's Paris residence, Hôtel Lambert in the second half of the 1840s.

Despite its title, the elderly Chopin is not the central figure of the painting. Sitting by the piano, surrounded by a group of ladies (among them the youngest child of Czartoryski), he seems almost marginal when compared with the dancing figures of the guests filling the canvass: knights, nobles and hussars representing the Polish past and Poland's former glory. In the very centre of the painting stands the lonely figure of Prince Adam Czartoryski; his Roman profile and long, toga-like attire creating an aura of power and respect. Dancers and members of Czartoryski's family (among them is Count Władysław Zamoyski, Czartoryski's nephew and closest supporter) keep their distance from the Prince. Left alone, he keeps thinking about the only thing on his mind ever since he left Poland in 1831: how to restore Polish independence?

The same question was asked by thousands of Polish exiles, who were forced to leave their homeland after the unsuccessful anti-Russian November Uprising (1830-31). In a movement that was later named the Great Emigration, thousands of Poles left the Kingdom of Poland and settled in the countries of Western Europe, hoping for a new European revolution and making plans toward a new uprising that would allow Poland to regain its independence and free it from the Russian (as well as Austrian and Prussian) yoke. The Great Emigration created a platform that allowed the Poles to promote the cause of their independence in Western Europe, with a particular interest in France and Britain, the two powers that created an ideological counterbalance to the autocratic regimes of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. One of the arguments presented in this work is that of the central role played by the Polish exiles in preserving, promoting and popularising the question of Polish independence in Britain. Understanding the ideological and political

developments of the Great Emigration (outlined in Part I of this thesis) is crucial in order to understand the ways in which the Polish exiles tried to influence British politics and public opinion.

Central to the development of both Polish Questions was the Great Emigration and the way in which Polish exiles, particularly those associated with Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, promoted the issue of Poland in Britain. From the arrival of Aleksander Wielopolski in London in January 1831 to the last pro-Polish events of 1847, Czartoryski's ideas dominated the way in which the problem of Polish independence was promoted and understood by British politicians and the British public opinion. Called either 'diplomacy without letters of introduction',[1] or 'paradiplomacy,'[2] Czartoryski's activities in exile, and particularly his contacts with British politicians, helped to popularise the cause of Polish independence in Europe.[3] The influence of the Prince and his supporters, who can be broadly characterised as monarchists, went far beyond the impact made by any other political party of the Great Emigration. Even the links between the Chartists and the Polish radicals in Britain, which started developing in the 1840s, never reached a similar level of understanding as the one which existed between the Polish monarchists and the pro-Polish groups in the previous decade.

Despite Czartoryski's recognition among European diplomats as the leading figure of the Polish exile and, indeed, the nation as a whole, within the Great Emigration itself he and his supporters remained in minority. The whole period discussed in this thesis saw the existence of other, more liberal political parties of the Polish exile, which attracted more members than the highly conservative and monarchist group centred around Czartoryski.[4] Ideas championed by the Polish National Committee (*Komitet Narodowy Polski*) in the

---

[1] H. H. Hahn, *Dyplomacja bez listów uwierzytelniających: polityka zagraniczna Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego 1830-1840* (Warszawa, 1987).

[2] R. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje 1831-1918'. *Historie polski w XIX wieku* (Warszawa, 2015), IV, pp. 160–168.

[3] For a more critical approach to calling Czartoryski's activities in exile 'diplomacy' see J. Skowronek, 'Dyplomacja czy polityka? Spory o charakter działalności Hotelu Lambert', Bułhak, H. *et al.* (eds.), *Z dziejów polityki i dyplomacji polskiej. Studia poświęcone pamięci Edwarda hr. Raczyńskiego Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej na wychodźstwie* (Warszawa, 1994), pp. 122-135.

[4] S. Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja 1831-1863* (Toruń, 2003), p. 127

early 1830s, the Polish Democratic Society (*Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*) in the later part of the 1830s and throughout the 1840s and the Union of Polish Emigration (*Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej*) in the first half of the 1840s all gained a much larger following among the Polish exiles than those of Czartoryski. Paradoxically, however, despite failing to attract support among his countrymen, the Prince was very successful in obtaining at least some degree of political recognition among British politicians and the British public opinion.

The picture would be incomplete without taking into consideration the political, social, and economic developments taking place in Britain in the 1830s and 1840s. As this thesis argues, one of the main problems the question of Polish independence encountered in Britain was the preoccupation of British political and non-political circles with other, much more pressing and difficult issues. At the time of the November Uprising British diplomacy was preoccupied with the revolution in Belgium and the potential annexation of Belgium to France and, despite the clear sympathy of the British press and several leading Whig politicians for the cause of Poland, distrust between France and Britain prevented both powers from any intervention.[5] Moreover, at that time the attention of the British public was set on the Reform Bill championed by the Whigs. Soon afterwards British attention turned towards the Eastern Question. By the end of the decade the difficult economic situation, as well as the lack of any events that could restore British preoccupation with Poland, led to a slow decline of interest in Polish independence. In the 1840s further economic problems and the accession to power of the Tories did not make the situation easier. Even the unsuccessful Cracow Revolution of 1846 failed to attract British attention at a time when the much more pressing issue of the repeal of the Corn Laws was discussed in and outside the Parliament.

Interestingly, the second Polish Question discussed in this work, namely that of the fate of the Polish refugees in Britain, did not suffer from similar drawbacks and British interest in the topic in question very rarely depended on contemporary political issues. In consequence, from 1834, when the problem of Polish refugees in Britain emerged, until

---

[5] Leon Sapieha to Aleksander Walicki, 7 January 1831. Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich (hereafter BKCz) 5310.

1848-9, when it started losing steam, British support for the cause of the Polish émigrés remained at a rather steady level. Differences in the annual income of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (funded in 1832 and, from 1834 onward, serving as the main organisation taking care of the needs of Poles in Britain) were usually determined by the changing situation of the Polish exiles itself rather than by the wider political or economic factors.

Historiography

The years that followed the November Uprising are widely known in Polish history as the time of the Great Emigration. For many years the political, ideological and cultural developments that took place abroad in exile overshadowed the events taking place in the homeland itself and, consequently, many historians have looked at Polish post-1830 history through the lens of the Great Emigration.[6] However, the most recent historiography moved away from that approach, offering, instead, more detailed insights into the history of partitioned Poland, with very limited attention given to the subject of Polish exile.[7] The peak of historical interest in nineteenth-century Polish history happened in the interwar period (when the nineteenth century played the role of 'modern' history) and postwar years (when, in the communist Poland, the same period was a much safer area of research than the twentieth century).[8] Many books and articles created in those years, particularly studies

---

[6] M. Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski* (Warszawa, 1948), I, p. 205. For studies regarding the fate of Poland after 1831 see for example more general works on Polish history, including Borejsza, Zdrada and Skowronek. For more detailed studies of particular partitions see for example works of Hagen, Jakóbczyk, Leslie and Rezler. J. Borejsza, *Piękny wiek XIX* (Warszawa, 2010); J. Zdrada, *Historia Polski 1795-1914* (Warszawa, 2005); J. Skowronek, *Od konspiracji do kapitulacji* (Warszawa, 1989); W. W. Hagen, 'National Solidarity and Organic Work in Prussian Poland, 1815-1914', *The Journal of Modern History*, 44 (1972), 38–64; W. Jakóbczyk, *Przetrwać nad Wartą, 1815-1914* (Warszawa, 1989); R. F. Leslie, 'Politics and Economics in Congress Poland, 1815-1864', *Past and Present*, 1955, 43–63; M. Rezler, *Wielkopolanie pod bronią 1768-1921* (Poznan, 2011).

[7] In the most recent study of nineteenth-century Polish history, the four-volume *Historie Polski w XIX wieku*, the subject of the Great Emigration appeared only in the last, fourth volume. See particularly R. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje 1831-1918'. *Historie polski w XIX wieku*, IV, pp. 115-228. Similar approach is presented in the majority of less academic works on history of Poland written in English (see below).

[8] For a summary of interwar works on nineteenth-century Polish history see Handelsman, 'Czasy porozbiorowe 1795-1918', *Kwartalnik historyczny*, 51 (1937), 303–26. See also S. Szpotański, 'Emigracja

by Temkin, Mikos, and Żmigrodzki, remain the most detailed works on the left-wing organisations of the Polish exile. Although recent decades have seen a decline of publications devoted to issues pertaining to the Great Emigration, works by Krzysztof Marchlewicz and Radosław Żurawski vel Grajewski have shed more light on social and political aspects of the Polish exile in Britain and Europe.[9] Marchlewicz's publications, thanks to his excessive use of British and Polish archives, offer very detailed analysis of the Great Emigration in Britain and contacts between Prince Czartoryski and British politicians in the aftermath of the November Uprising. Żurawski vel Grajewski's works, by concentrating on Polish sources, present a number of interesting case studies related to Prince Czartoryski's activities in Britain and beyond. However, in the majority of these studies the problem of Polish independence (very rarely appearing under the name of the Polish Question[10]) remains on the margins of the analysis of political and ideological developments taking place in exile, such as the creation of the first modern democratic

---

polska w Anglii (1831-1848)', *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 274 (1909), pp. 259–87, 541–62. Among the most important postwar works are Temkin's studies of Polish radical thought in exile, Kalembka's comprehensive monograph on the Great Emigration and several other studies devoted to different political groups of the Polish exile. See H. Temkinowa, *Lud Polski. Wybór dokumentów* (Warszawa, 1957); H. Temkinowa, *Gromady Ludu Polskiego (zarys ideologii)* (Warszawa, 1962). S. Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja. Polskie wychodźstwo politycznie w latach 1831-1862* (Warszawa, 1971); S. Mikos, *Gromady Ludu Polskiego w Anglii 1835-1846* (Gdańsk, 1962); M. Tyrowicz, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie. 1832-1863. Przewodnik bibliograficzny* (Warszawa, 1964); J. Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie (1832-1862)*, 2 vols. (London, 1983); B. Cygler, *Zjednoczenie emigracji polskiej* (Gdańsk, 1963).

[9] Among the most significant are works by Krzysztof Marchlewicz on the Great Emigration in Britain and several monographs of Radosław Żurawski vel Grajewski on Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski's politics after 1830. See K. Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały. Propolska działalność charytatywna i polityczna Dudleya Stuarta* (Poznań, 2001); Marchlewicz, *Wielka Emigracja na Wyspach Brytyjskich 1830-1863* (Poznań, 2008); Marchlewicz, 'Propolski lobbing w Izbach Gmin i Lordów w latach trzydziestych i czterdziestych XIX wieku', *Przegląd Historyczny*, 145.1 (2005), 61–76; Marchlewicz, 'Nadzór administracyjny i policyjny nad polskimi emigrantami politycznymi w Wielkiej Brytanii w latach 1831-1863', *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 61 (2004), pp. 61–77; Marchlewicz, 'Brytyjskie środowiska polonofilskie w dobie wczesnowiktoriańskiej', *Mazowieckie Studia Humanistyczne*, 2 (2002), 89–102. Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Działalność Księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego w Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1832)* (Warszawa, 1999); Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Wielka Brytania w 'dyplomacji' Księcia Adama Czartoryskiego wobec kryzysu wschodniego (1832-1841)* (Warszawa, 1999).

[10] Z. Jagodziński, *Anglia wobec sprawy polskiej w okresie Wiosny Ludów* (Warszawa, 1997). Kalembka, 'Wielka Emigracja a społeczeństwa i rządy europejskie. Uwagi wstępne' in Kalembka (ed.), *Wielka Emigracja i sprawa polska* (Toruń, 1980), pp. 3-17. W. Stummer , 'Rola Literackiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Polski w kształtowaniu brytyjskiej opinii publicznej w sprawie polskiej (1832-1856)' in Kalembka (ed.), *Wielka Emigracja i sprawa polska*, pp. 43-64.

party (the Polish Democratic Society),[11] the development of Polish socialist thought[12] or the activities of Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski and his supporters.[13] Among the most notable exceptions are the two aforementioned works of Radosław Żurawski vel Grajewski, in which the author presents Czartoryski's activities in the context of the Prince's main goal – the restoration of Poland. One of the aims of this thesis is to illustrate that the actions of Polish exiles in Britain were determined by that universal aim – regaining independence.

At the same time there is a wide range of books and articles discussing Polish-British relations in the nineteenth century, as well as more particular issues relating to the Great Emigration in Britain.[14] Among the most recent are *Dystans, współczucie i „znikomy interes"* by Marchlewicz[15] (discussing different ways in which British politicans and public opinion reacted to the subject of Poland and Polish independence throughout the nineteenth century) and a detailed analysis of Palmerston-Heytesbury correspondence from the time of the November Uprising by Żurawski vel Grajewski (shedding more light on the official

---

[11] See particularly Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie (1832-1862)*.

[12] See S. Mikos, *Gromady Ludu Polskiego w Anglii 1835-1846* and Temkinowa, *Lud Polski. Wybór dokumentów*.

[13] See for example A. Cetnarowicz, *Tajna dyplomacja Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego na Bałkanach, 1840-1844* (Kraków, 1993); J. Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833-1856)* (Warszawa, 1976); Willaume, M., 'Działalność polityczna Hotelu Lambert w Mołdawii i Wołoszczyźnie w latach 1840-1846', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 33/34 (1978), pp. 51–75. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Działalność polityczna księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii w srpawie belgijskiej (1838-1839)', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica* 66 (1999), pp. 5-20; 'Sprawa belgijska w działalności politycznej księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1833)', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica* 65 (1999), pp. 5-30; 'Hotel Lambert wobec wizyty Cara Mikołaja I w Londynie w 1844 r.', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica*, 70 (2001), pp. 133–47. Even Czartoryski's biographers looked at his post-1830 life through the prism of his political activities. See particularly Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, I-III and Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity 1770-1861* (Princeton, 1955).

[14] For the earlier studies see for example J. Feldman, 'U podstaw stosunków polsko-angielskich, 1788-1863', *Polityka Narodów*, (1933), pp. 7–47; T. Grzebieniowski, 'Anglia wobec sprawy polskiej', *Przegląd Współczesny*, (1938); Grzebieniowski, 'Ćwierćwiecze sprawy polskiej w Anglji', *Droga*, (1931), pp. 707–22, 818–32; O. Halecki, 'Anglo-Polish Relations in the Past', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 12 (1934), pp. 659–69; M. Handelsman, *Anglia-Polska, 1814-1864* (Warszawa, 1917).

[15] K. Marchlewicz, *Dystans, współczucie i „znikomy interes". Uwarunkowania brytyjskiej polityki wobec Polski w latach 1815-1914* (Poznań, 2016).

policy of Palmerston towards Poland and Russia during the Uprising).[16] There are also works on public side of British interest in Poland in the nineteenth century, though they remain far less accurate than those pertaining to the political side of the problem. The most serious attempt to analyse British public opinion and its reactions to the cause of Poland are the works of Wojciech Jasiakiewicz, but their quality is seriously undermined by some factual errors and a complete lack of chronology.[17] By looking at both political (ie. parliamentary and diplomatic) and, particularly, public aspects of the two Polish question, this work is the first study which offers such a detailed analysis of British press and public opinion in the 1830s and 1840s.

The subject of British interest in Poland in the nineteenth century received a lot of attention from Polish scholars. It is particularly visible in a number of works devoted to the issue of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland[18] and pro-Polish journals published in Britain in the early 1830s.[19] Two other works are of particular significance to

---

[16] R. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Sprawy polskie w korespondencji dyplomatycznej lorda Henry'ego Palmerstona z lordem Williamem Heytesburym w okresie powstania listopadowego', H. Chudzio and J. Pezda (eds.), *Wokół powstania listopadowego. Wybór studiów* (Kraków, 2014), pp. 187-206.

[17] For example Aleksnder Wielopolski did not go to Britain in Spring 1831, but already in December 1830; one can also have certain doubts about Jasiakiewicz's methodological approach in which he analyses British newspapers, quarterlies and more infrequent journals without any commentary on their specific character. W. Jasiakiewicz, 'The British Press and the November Uprising 1830-1831', *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici, English Studies*, 2, 1991, pp. 51-79; Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego w okresie 1830-1834* (Toruń, 1997). See also M. Janowski, 'Tematyka i konteksty brytyjskich zainteresowań Polską w latach 1831-1841', *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, (1989), pp. 111–130. On pre-1830 Polish-British relations see particularly W. Lipoński, *Polska a Brytania 1801-1831* (Poznań, 1978).

[18] K. Dopierala, 'Literackie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie', *Przegląd Zachodni*, 1985, pp. 63–77; J. Pomorski, 'Geneza, program i struktura organizacyjna Towarzystwa Literackiego Przyjaciół Polski', *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, (1978), pp. 157–82; W. Stummer, 'Literackie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie w latach 1832-1864' (unpublished PhD Thesis, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Biblioteka Instytutu Historycznego, 1977); Stummer, 'Rola Literackiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Polski w kształtowaniu brytyjskiej opinii publicznej w sprawie polskiej (1832-1856)' in Kalembka (ed.), *Wielka Emigracja i sprawa polska*, pp. 43-64. Marchlewicz, 'Brytyjskie środowiska polonofilskie w dobie wczesnowiktoriańskiej', pp. 89–102. See also Lewitter, L., 'The Polish Cause as Seen in Great Britain, 1830-1863', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, 28 (1995), pp. 35-61.

[19] I. Homola-Skąpska, '"The Polish Exile". Polskie czasopismo anglojęzyczne i jego redaktorzy', *Rocznik Historii Prasy Polskiej*, 23 (2009), pp. 7-22; L. Zieliński, 'Polonia or Monthly Reports of Polish Affairs', *Rocznik Historii Czasopiśmiennictwa Polskiego*, 4 (1965), pp. 43–58. The third pro-Polish journal, *The Hull Polish Record*, has not received any scholarly attention.

our understanding of British pro-Polish activities in the aftermath of the November Uprising. One is the aforementioned study of pro-Polish activity of Lord Dudley Stuart by Marchlewicz,[20] the other is the analysis of similar sentiments in life and poetry of Thomas Campbell.[21] Marchlewicz is the first Polish scholar who made an extensive use of Stuart's private papers from the Harrowby Manuscripts at Sandon Hall, shedding light on his relations with Prince Czartoryski, involvement in the activities of the LAFP and promotion of the Polish Questions in Britain. Teslar's article, though not as comprehensive as Marchlewicz's monograph, remains a significant illustration of Campbell's long-term interest in Poland which led to the creation of the LAFP in 1832. By looking at the early developments of the LAFP and, particularly, developments of pro-Polish sympathy in Britain throughout the 1830s and 1840s, this thesis aims to illustrate that despite its position, the Literary Association was not always in the centre of pro-Polish activities.

None of these developments would have taken place without presence, activity and determination of Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski. His and his family's links and interest in Britain can be traced back to the mid-eighteenth century and there are a number of important studies devoted to the impact of British politics and culture on Czartoryski.[22] Though not directly related to Czartoryski's activities in the post-1830 period, these studies help to explain centrality of Britain in the Prince's 'diplomacy' in exile.[23] To certain extent

---

[20] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały. Propolska działalność charytatywna i polityczna Dudleya Stuarta*. See also his entry on Lord Dudley Stuart in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Online edition, Marchlewicz, 'Stuart, Lord Dudley Coutts (1803–1854)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26701, accessed 4 Sept 2016].

[21] Teslar, J. A., 'Poland in the Poetry and Life of Thomas Campbell', *Antemurale*, XII (Rome-London, 1968), pp. 267–310.

[22] Z. Golebiowska, 'Podróż Izabeli i Adama Jerzego Czartoryskich do Wielkiej Brytanii (1789-1791)', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 38-39 (1983), pp. 129–46; Golebiowska, *W kręgu Czartoryskich: Wpływy angielskie w Puławach na przełomie XVII I XIX wieku* (Lublin, 2000); W. Lipoński, 'The Influence of Britain on Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski's Education and Political Activity', *Polish-Anglosaxon Studies*, 1, 1989, pp. 33-67. See also Lipoński, *Polska a Brytania 1801-1831*, pp. 15-81.

[23] The most direct expression of centrality of Britain in European politics was *Essai sur la diplomatie* written by Czartoryski in the 1820s and published in France in 1830. A. J. Czartoryski, *Rozważania o dyplomacji* (Kraków, 2011).

they also point at the significance of long-term relations between certain circles of Polish society and Britain.[24]

At the same time there is precious little material devoted to the issue of the Polish exile available in English, partially because of the lack of interest of British historians, partially because of the alleged limited significance of the Great Emigration in the British and European politics of the period.[25] Among the key works discussing this subject there are two scholarly, but rather outdated collections[26], as well as several books and articles by Peter Brock (to this day one of the few non-Polish historians who devoted their energies to researching the Great Emigration).[27] Although Brock's studies are still of some value (particularly thanks to his use of a number of local archives and has not yet been used by other scholars), his strongly Marxist approach to history of Poland and determination to discuss only radical groups of the Polish exile present slightly distorted picture of the Great Emigration. Brock's influence is particularly visible in several studies of Chartist internationalism by Weisser.[28] Parts of chapters 6 and 7 of this work try to challenge some of the assumptions made by Brock and Weisser.

In the majority of the more popular studies of the history of Poland available in English the history of Polish exile, and indeed history of the whole nineteenth century, is

---

[24] See for example P. J. Drozdowski, 'Echoes of the Polish Revolution in Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century English Literature (A Selection of Works and Voices: Part One)', *The Polish Review*, 38 (1993), pp. 3–24; Drozdowski, 'Echoes of the Polish Revolution in Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century English Literature: Part Two', *The Polish Review*, 38 (1993), pp. 131–48; N. Davies, '"The Langour of so Remote and Interest": British attitudes to Poland 1772-1832', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, new series, 16 (1983), pp. 79-90; Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, A., 'Sensacja – informacja – komentarz. Londyńska prasa informacyjna o polskich „rewolucjach" 1791 r.', *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 66 (2009), pp. 91-111.

[25] Despite the fact that several of the aforementioned works were published in English, the majority of them (with the exceptions of Davies' and Lewitter's articles) should be, nevertheless, analysed as a part of Polish, rather than British, historiography.

[26] *The Cambridge History of Poland*, ed. by W. F. Reddaway, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1951). Kieniewicz (ed.), *History of Poland* (Warszawa, 1979).

[27] P. Brock, *Nationalism and Populism in Partitioned Poland* (London, 1973); Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism: A Study in Agrarian Socialist Thought from the 1830s to the 1850s* (Toronto, 1977); Brock, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', *The Journal of Modern History*, 25.2 (1953), 139–56.

[28] See particularly H. Weisser, 'Polonophilism and the British Working Class 1830-1845', *The Polish Review*, 12 (1967), pp. 78-96 and 'The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846', *The Polish Review*, 13 (1968), pp. 3–19

usually treated with far less attention than other periods or, following the tendency of the most recent Polish historiography, it is analysed only through the prism of the events taking place in Poland.[29] Norman Davies' *Heart of Europe* is perhaps the only exception. In his chapter presenting history of Poland under the partitions, the author offers an interesting, even if rather chaotic, outline of history of the Great Emigration.[30] Rather than following the usual chronological approach to the subject, Davies' analysis presents the Great Emigration and its political, as well as cultural, developments in the wider context of Polish nineteenth century history.

Furthermore, British historiography is almost completely devoid of any significant references to problem of Poland and Polish exiles. In the majority of studies of British foreign policy after 1815 the subject of Poland appears only in passing, usually in relation to other, much more significant, issues of contemporary European politics. Even the November Uprising, despite its undeniable impact on history of Europe, remains on the margin of British historical interest, with Robert Leslie's monograph being so far the only serious study of the event available in English.[31] Highly biased (Leslie wrote it from a vantage point of Marxist history, dismissing the whole uprising as 'a rash venture which had little chance of success'[32]), concentrating on the social and economic sides of the revolution, the book was not followed by any other studies of the Uprising, probably because of the lack of interest in the subject.[33] To this day, despite its age and shortcomings, Leslie's book remains a central point of reference to all English speaking scholars researching the subject of Polish nineteenth century history. Finally, despite the popularity of the Polish refugees in Britain in the 1830s and 1840s, Bernard Porter's study is the only one that touches, though very briefly, on the issue of their significance and

---

[29] See for example N. Davies, *God's Playground. A History of Poland* (Oxford, 1981); A. Zamoyski, *Poland: A History* (London, 2009). See also A. J. Prażmowska, *A History of Poland* (Basingstoke, 2004).

[30] Davies, *Heart of Europe* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 138-244 and particularly pp. 169-222.

[31] R. F. Leslie, *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830* (London, 1956).

[32] *Ibid*., p. vii.

[33] Leslie published two other studies about Poland, but only one of them discussed the subject of nineteenth century Polish history. See Leslie, 'Politics and Economics in Congress Poland, 1815-1864', *Past and Present*, 1955, pp. 43–63; Leslie, *The Polish Question. Poland's Place in Modern History*, Historical Association General Series, 57 (London, 1964).

position among other national groups of exiles.[34] Interestingly, even Porter does not look at the developments which took place in the 1830s, when the Poles were in the centre of British interest, but concentrates instead on their fate in the 1850s. A similar approach was presented in Marchlewicz's article published in English,[35] leaving the subject of the pre-1850s Polish emigration to Britain almost completely unknown to British scholars (despite Porter's brief overview of the position of the Polish refugees in Britain before 1848).

Methodology

This thesis is based primarily on archival documents relating to both the political and the non-political aspects of the Polish Questions in Britain. Among the most important Polish collections are the Czartoryskis' Library (*Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich*) in Cracow and the Kórnik Library (*Biblioteka Kórnicka*) in Kórnik near Poznań. Both archives hold vast collections of official and unofficial correspondence, as well as political and personal papers relating to Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski's and Count Władysław Zamoyski's activities in exile. The centrality of both Poles promoting both Polish Questions in Britain makes these collections fundamental in understanding Polish involvement in positioning the question of Polish independence and, to a much lesser extent, the problem of Polish refugees, as important factors in British politics. One of the problems with the vast majority of Czartoryski's post-1830 documents is that it is often impossible to establish which of his memoranda and other political documents, usually preserved only in drafts, managed to reach a wider audience. Despite the wide access to print, only a small number of the most important documents were printed, while others continued to be circulated in handwritten copies. Because of the unofficial character of Czartoryski's diplomatic activities, none of his memoranda can be found among official British documents pertaining to the problem of Poland. Instead, as the case of Palmerston Papers illustrates, communications from

[34] B. Porter, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge, 1979).

[35] K. Marchlewicz, 'Continuities and Innovations: Polish Emigration after 1849', in *Exiles from European Revolutions. Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (London, 2003), pp. 103–120.

Czartoryski and Zamoyski were always classified as unofficial.[36] Apart from Polish archives, which offer a valuable insight into Polish politics in exile, this thesis made use of a number of published collections of letters,[37] memoirs[38] and diaries.[39] They provided, on the one hand, information about the experiences of Polish exiles in Britain (Bartkowski, Niedźwiecki, Niemcewicz, Szyrmowa), and, on the other hand, further details about the political activities of Czartoryski, Zamoyski and their supporters (particularly Zamoyski's memoirs and Niemcewicz's diary).

Central to the British side of research were the Palmerston Papers, which are held at the Broadlands Archive in Southampton, and various collections held at the National Archive at Kew Gardens, London. Among the Palmerston Papers I discovered a number of previously unreferenced letters to and from Polish exiles (among them Czartoryski and Zamoyski), which shed some light on the Foreign Secretary's approach to the cause of Poland at different stages of his career. Apart from personal letters, Palmerston's official despatches and personal letters to and from British representatives abroad, particularly in St Petersburg, Vienna and Berlin, were of particular significance to the thesis. They were compared with official Foreign Office documents from the National Archive and *The Foreign and State Papers*,[40] showing, at times, differences between the official and unofficial attitudes of the British Government towards the question of Polish independence. This thesis is the first scholarly work which uses these sources in order to present a more detailed analysis of Palmerston's attitude towards Poland both during and after the November Uprising. Moreover, a detailed analysis of several debates in the House of Commons and House of Lords (based on the online version of *Hansard*) will be presented in order to show different ways in which British MPs reacted to the subject of Poland.

---

[36] See particularly the official memoranda regarding the cause of Cracow's independence. Czartoryski to Palmerston, 29 May 1840. Broadlands Archive (hereafter BA), PP/GC/CZ/13. Zamoyski to Palmerston, no date [1836]; 11 September and 8 December 1838. BA PP/GC/ZA/1-3.

[37] See for example L. Niedzwiecki, *Listy wybrane z lat 1832-1839*, ed. by S. Makowski (Warszawa, 2009).

[38] W. Zamoyski, *Jenerał Zamoyski, 1803-1868*, 6 vols. (Poznań, 1914) (hereafter *Jenerał Zamoyski*). J. Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia z powstania 1831 roku i pierwszych lat emigracji* (Kraków, 1967).

[39] J. U. Niemcewicz, *Dziennik pobytu zagranicą od dnia 21 lipca 1831 roku do 20 maja 1841 roku*, vols. 1-2 (Poznań, 1876). J. Szyrmowa, *Dziennik z lat emigracji*, ed. by K. Marchlewicz (Poznań, 2011).

[40] *The Foreign and State Papers* for the years 1830-1847 (hereafter *State Papers*).

Although some of these discussions have received the attention of Polish historians (by Żurawski vel Grajewski in his analysis of Czartoryski's activities in the early 1830s[41] and, on various occasions, by Marchlewicz in his work on Lord Dudley Stuart[42]), this thesis looks at them from the vantage point of the changing character of both Polish Questions, offering a more complex and detailed analysis than the one offered by the Polish historiography.

Beyond the problem of politics lies the complicated issue of the British public opinion, analysed through the lens of newspaper news articles and editorials, occasional reports from the public meetings, pro-Polish pamphlets, and records of annual meetings of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland.[43] Habermas conceptualized the bourgeois public sphere as 'the sphere of private people come together as a public,'[44] while the concept of 'public opinion', which developed in relation to both the public sphere and the bourgeois society, he considered far more difficult to define.[45] Indeed, when we look at the multitude of opinions and ways in which these opinions were expressed in nineteenth-century Britain, one can only agree with Dicey's claim that 'public opinion is, after all, a mere abstraction'.[46] As Boyce convincingly argued, 'public opinion has no less validity than expressions such as "the crown", "the church", "the army"'.[47] Instead of using the general term 'public opinion', this thesis tries to be more precise by breaking down this concept into different types of opinion, identifying the groups that expressed them and,

---

[41] Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Działalność Księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego w Wielkiej*, pp. 45-99.

[42] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*. Marchlewicz is also the author of a brief article presenting all pro-Polish debates which took place in Britain between 1831 and 1848. See Marchlewicz, 'Propolski lobbing w Izbach Gmin i Lordów w latach trzydziestych i czterdziestych XIX wieku', pp. 61–76.

[43] In analysing the activities of the LAFP this work concentrates on the official publications of the society, some private letters from Lord Dudley Stuart to Prince Czartoryski and Władysław Zamoyski published in Zamoyski's memoirs and, when it takes a closer look at Stuart's pro-Polish activity, it relies on Marchlewicz's biography of Stuart. Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*. It is worth noting, however, that references to the British friends of Poland appearing on the pages of this work do not always refer to the Literary Association or its members. There was a number of members of British public and political life who, despite their sympathy for Poland and the Polish exiles, never joined the Association and continued their pro-Polish work to certain extent independently.

[44] J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* (London, 1989), p. 27.

[45] *Ibid*., pp. 89-140, 236-250.

[46] Quoted after D. G. Boyce, 'Public Opinion and Historians', *History*, 63 (1978), p. 215.

[47] *Ibid*., p. 217.

effectively, arguing against the idea of a single, unified opinion on the question of Polish independence or Polish refugees in Britain. Opinions presented by the pro-Polish circles concentrated around the LAFP differed from those of the Chartists which, in turn, often had very little in common with what was written in the British press.

As the analysis of the metropolitan newspapers' responses to the question of Polish independence and the problem of Polish exiles in Britain will illustrate, differences between particular titles were usually associated with their political agendas and the character of their readers, with conservative papers such as the *Examiner*, the *Morning Post*, or the *Standard* being less enthusiastic than the liberal *The Times* or the *Morning Chronicle*, and certainly very distanced from the pro-Polish zeal expressed at certain times by the *Northern Star*. As it will be shown, it was not only significant what particular newspapers decided to report about events associated with both Polish Questions, but also whether they offered any editorial comment on them.[48]

Defining the Polish Question

The concept of a 'Polish Question' does not appear too frequently in either primary or secondary sources. When referring to the problem of Polish independence, Polish exiles usually talked and wrote about the cause of independence or 'their cause' (see below), even though the specific concepts behind that independence tended to vary. For Czartoryski and the Polish monarchists independence was equal to the restoration of Poland in the borders of the Kingdom of Poland,[49] while the Polish Democratic Society and the majority of liberal exiles openly championed the idea of independence within the pre-1772 borders. The term 'Polish Question' was never, however, used in reference to the Polish emigration itself, which was referred to as 'an exile' (*emigracja*, *wychodźstwo*), 'an expulsion' (*wygnanie*), 'a Polish exile' (*emigracja polska*) or, more poetically, 'a wandering'

[48] *Ibid*., pp. 221-222.

[49] Czartoryski, in fact, shared the universal dream of the restoration of the pre-1772 Poland. At the same time, however, he was far too skilled a politician to officially promote such a radical view, seeing the Kingdom of Poland as a safe measure that could give the Poles diplomatic and perhaps military support. See H. Żaliński, *Kraj. Emigracja. Niepodległość* (Kraków, 2006), pp. 106–109.

(*tułactwo*), or 'a pilgrimage' (*pielgrzymstwo*).[50] The 'greatness' of the Great Emigration was not 'invented' until Adam Lewak's publication of an essay titled 'Czasy Wielkiej Emigracji' ('Times of the Great Emigration'),[51] though the Poles were aware of the unique status of their experience. In one of the earliest pamphlets published in Paris, Maurcy Mochnacki called for the creation of 'a commonwealth of exiles [*rzeczpospolita wygnańców*]'.[52] A year later, in his appeal to the Polish exiles in France Prince Czartoryski pointed out that 'we, the exiles, a small part of [our] nation… can loudly defend our holy cause [of Polish independence]. It is our mission to enlighten all governments and all peoples about our grievances, our sufferings [and] our rights, to prove that our cause is their cause'.[53] From the point of view of Polish exiles there was only one cause (Polish independence), and their role was to represent Poland abroad and work towards regaining that independence.[54]

The idea of the Polish Question not as one, but as two different problems can be, therefore, considered as a purely theoretical concept based not on how the Polish exiles perceived themselves and their cause, but on how they and the cause of Poland were perceived in Britain.[55] When applied to the actions of Polish exiles aimed at regaining independence as a whole, the Polish Question was very similar to other national questions of the nineteenth century, such as the Greek Question and the Belgian Question, or even to

---

[50] The latter terms were introduced by Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz in his *Books of the Polish Nation and Pilgrimage* [*Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego*]. See A. Mickiewicz, 'Księgi narodu i pielgrzymstwa polskiego', *Wikisource* [https://pl.wikisource.org/wiki/Księgi_narodu_polskiego_i_pielgrzymstwa_polskiego accessed 17 May 2016]

[51] A. Lewak, 'Czasy Wielkiej Emigracji', in *Polska, jej dzieje i kultura od czasów najdawniejszych aż do chwili obecnej*, III (Warszawa, 1930), pp. 193–233.

[52] [M. Mochnacki], *Do rodaków bawiących w Paryżu* (n.p., n.d. [Paris, 1831?]), p. 1.

[53] Czartoryski to the Polish exiles (memorandum from 1832). BKCz 5272.

[54] Żaliński, *Kraj. Emigracja. Niepodległość*, pp. 102–120.

[55] Although in the majority of cases there was only one national question (i.e. Greek, Belgian, or Italian), the Polish Question was also linked with what Porter called 'the refugee question'. No other European nation fighting for independence was as strongly represented by its exiles' presence in Britain as Poland. Because the Polish refugees were the most numerous and the most permanent of all national groups in Britain, his fact attracted an exceptional amount of interest and support from the British society, treating them not as part of a wider refugee question, but as an independent cause that emerged from the question of Polish independence.

the less-defined Eastern Question (something that the Poles themselves were fully aware of).[56] Divisions among the Polish exiles, as well as the sometimes conflicting visions championed by different groups of the Great Emigration were, from the British point of view, irrelevant. Effectively, the political Polish Question was about the restoration of an independent Poland in some shape and form.

The second Polish Question was different, as it was not promoted by the Polish exiles. In fact, the second Polish Question pertained to the issue of the Polish exiles themselves, which constituted part of a much larger issue of political refugees in France and Britain, though in both countries their status was exceptional. This led to the development of what will be called the second Polish Question. This term pertains not only to the issue of how to accommodate the dozens and, from 1834 onward, the hundreds of Polish exiles who were arriving in Britain as part of a mass exodus that followed the fall of the November Uprising. Britain, as Bernard Porter observed, was 'a refugee's last choice rather than his first'.[57] In the case of many Polish exiles it was not even a choice; having been refused entry to other Western European countries (or, in the case of the most politically radical refugees, expelled from them) and unwilling to leave Europe for America, they were forced to seek refuge in Britain among the French, Germans, Italians, and other émigrés.

The question of Polish refugees in Britain involved different ways of obtaining financial support for the émigrés, the distribution of such funds, helping the refugees in finding work in Britain or in leaving the country, either for the Continent or for America; it also involved parliamentary debates and contacts with British politicians, as well as attempts to stop any further influx of Poles to Britain. In contrast to the question of Polish independence, the question of Polish exiles in Britain from the very beginning remained in the hands of the British friends of Poland (with the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland at the very centre of all activities related to this particular question). Although the Polish exiles in France and elsewhere in Europe remained interested in the fate of their

---

[56] See for example Czartoryski's memorandum comparing Polish, Greek and Belgian questions. *Note sur la question Polonaise Londres le 2 mai 1833*. BKCz 5281.

[57] Porter, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics*, p. 2.

compatriots in Britain, they had very limited chances of providing them with any support. It was the LAFP that organised pro-Polish events, gathered and distributed money, and kept that question alive for many years, with a very limited involvement on the part of the Polish exiles themselves.

Despite such differences, both questions were strongly intertwined. The problem of Polish refugees would not have existed if there had been independent Poland. The issue of Polish independence, in turn, became a significant political question of British politics thanks to the activities of Polish refugees.

The Main Argument

This thesis presents the role that both questions played in the British parliamentary and extra-parliamentary life of the 1830s and 1840s. By showing the developments of the question of Polish independence, dating back to the outbreak of the November Uprising, it will be argued that in the case of this Polish Question the Poles could rely on British interest and sympathy, but nothing else. The British Government was unwilling to intervene on behalf of Poland and despatches sent by Palmerston to St Petersburg during and after the Uprising were surprisingly mild in their tone. The situation became even more difficult in the aftermath of the Uprising. Despite the increasing British interest in Poland and the subject of Polish independence (fuelled by the presence of Prince Czartoryski and a whole range of different pro-Polish activities taking place across Britain), even pro-Polish debates in the House of Commons could not change the fact that from the British point of view there were far more pressing issues relating to international and domestic policies than the question of Polish independence.

From 1830 until 1847 the problem of Poland kept reappearing on the scene of British political life on different occasions (particularly in the second half of the 1830s in relation to the occupation of Cracow and in 1846-7 in response to another occupation and the annexation of that city to Austria), but it never became one of the major questions of British foreign policy. Two types of factors contributed to that situation. The first one was British domestic politics and various political, social, and economic problems of the 1830s and 1840s. From the question of the Reform Bill in 1831-2, through the domestic problems of the later part of the 1830s, to the economic troubles of the 1840s and the issue of the

Corn Laws repeal in 1846 – all these problems were far more significant for the people of Britain than the question of Poland, a country distant both geographically and politically. The second significant factor that made Polish independence an issue of limited significance was the general European politics of the period, particularly the growing distrust between Britain and France, which prevented the two liberal powers from acting together against the countries of the Holy Alliance. A number of diplomatic crises, from the revolutions in France and Belgium that preceded the November Uprising, through the two Eastern Crises of the 1830s, to the problem of the Spanish Marriages of the 1840s, preoccupied attention of British diplomacy in the period and prevented any significant increase of interest in the cause of Poland. Above all, however, it was clear to everyone in Britain that nothing could be done for Poland without risking a war with Russia.

Interestingly, similar considerations did not apply to the question of the Polish refugees. Firstly, the presence of the exiles in Britain, particularly when their numbers rose to several hundred in 1834, was usually noticeable enough to make members of British public interested in their fate. In other words, interest in the situation of Polish exiles did not depend on external events to the same extent as the problem of Polish independence. Secondly, the interest of the prominent Polish exiles such as Czartoryski and Zamoyski in promoting the problem of the Polish refugees and requesting financial or other support for them was very limited. They naturally applauded the numerous pro-Polish actions of the Literary Association, but were rarely actively involved themselves. The promotion of the question of Polish refugees, as well as the everyday care for their wellbeing, were left almost entirely in the hands of British friends of Poland.

Nevertheless, there were certain elements that linked both questions. On the one hand, the awareness that there was very little that could be done for the question of Polish independence made some parts of British society willing to compensate their inaction by showing support for the cause of Polish refugees. On the other hand, at times when the problem of Polish independence lost its appeal or simply laid dormant, awaiting an event that would once again make it significant to European politics (as between 1832 and 1836 and later, for almost a decade, between 1837 and 1846), regular charitable events organised by the LAFP for the benefit of the Polish exiles were a quiet and indirect reminder that the other Polish Question remained unresolved.

Structure

This thesis is divided into two Parts and seven Chapters. Starting with the regulations of the Congress of Vienna, which became the central element of the post-Napoleonic European order and balance of power, Chapter 1 discusses changes that took place across Europe from 1815 until the outbreak and the eventual defeat of the November Uprising. By situating the issue of Polish independence (at the time the only Polish Question that mattered) in the wider European context, the chapter argues that specific significant European roots and precedents were later used in shaping and promoting the cause of Poland in Britain. Chapter 2 presents the developments across Europe in the decade that followed the November Uprising, particularly the emergence of the Great Emigration, which became central to developments of the Polish Questions across Europe. Changes in European politics between 1841 and the end of 1847 are outlined in Chapter 3. Overall, Part I provides the reader with a broad historical background against which the evolution of the Polish Questions in Britain took place.

Part II of this thesis concentrates on the problem of Polish-British relations in the sixteen-year period that separated the defeat of the Polish Revolution and the outbreak of the Springtime of Nations. As Chapter 4 argues, the roots of the question of Polish independence and its most popular understanding in Britain can be traced to the activities of the Polish envoys sent to London. The President of the National Government, Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, was central to all Polish diplomatic efforts. His political ideas and attempts to present the cause of Polish independence as a non-revolutionary struggle for constitutional freedom became the core points behind the emergence of the Polish Question in Britain in the early 1830s and continued to influence interpretations of that problem for the decades to come. Chapter 5 presents a detailed account of the emergence of the second Polish Question, namely: the problem of Polish refugees in Britain. Thanks to the efforts of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, the new Polish Question continued to play a significant role in Britain even after political and popular interest in the subject of Polish independence started to decline. Consequently, the 'living' problem of Polish refugees served as a reminder of the still-unresolved question of Polish independence. The new decade did not promise any changes in the perception of both questions. With the

problem of Polish refugees mostly resolved by the generous extension of the Government Grant in 1838-9, and the lack of any international event that could popularise the issue of Polish independence in the same way as the November Uprising, both questions suffered a period of decreased interest in Britain. Attempts at fuelling British Russophobia as an element of pro-Polish propaganda presented in Chapter 6 were only partially successful. Finally, Chapter 7 looks in great detail at the events that followed the Cracow Revolution of 1846 and the annexation of Cracow to Austria, arguing that the years 1846-7 can be considered as a watershed moment in the British approach to both Polish Questions, a time when anti-Polish criticism manifested itself so strongly for the first time both in and outside the Parliament.

The main argument presented in this work is tied to the events that took place in Poland, mainland Europe, and Britain between 1830 and 1847. The first date is the year of the outbreak of the November Uprising which followed in the footsteps of the revolutions in France and Belgium. The arrival of the news of the Polish uprising in Paris and London, followed by the arrival of the first Polish envoys, marks the beginning of the presence of the question of Polish independence in Britain. The analysis ends in 1847, shortly before the outbreak of another wave of European revolutions, which became known as the Springtime of Nations. The significance of both Polish Questions ended in 1847, though both nonetheless remained present in Britain for many years to come. However, the outbreak of the Cracow Revolution in 1846 and the prolonged debates on that development in the House of Commons that took place throughout 1846-7 can be treated if not as a turning point, then certainly as an end of a certain stage of British interests in Poland and the Polish refugees.

PART I

In order fully to understand the unique character of the Polish Questions in Britain we have to take a closer look at the issues surrounding the history of Poland and Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century. Events that separated the Congress of Vienna of 1815 and the outbreak of the Springtime of Nations in 1848 played a crucial role in establishing and raising universal awareness of the Polish Questions in Europe. As a whole, Part I of this thesis aims at providing a detailed context behind the developments of the Polish Questions in Britain between 1830 and 1847.

Chapter 1 presents an outline of pre-1830 European politics, with particular attention paid to the Greek Revolution, which dominated international discussions in the 1820s. It also discusses the situation in the Kingdom of Poland in the years between 1815 and 1830, and events that led to the outbreak of the November Uprising. As will be argued, the ensuing anti-Russian revolution and the Polish-Russian war became major factors in the internationalisation of the question of Polish independence in European politics.

The unexpected defeat of the Poles and the sudden end of the Polish-Russian conflict led to a significant decrease of interest in the question of Polish independence in Western Europe. However, as Chapter 2 argues, the end of the November Uprising did not put an end to Polish attempts to internationalise the problem of Poland's independence. The emigration of several thousand Poles from the Kingdom to Western Europe, a movement that was called the Great Emigration by Polish historians, became the main element that served to preserve the name of Poland in Europe. By outlining the main ideological divisions between Poles in exile in the context of European politics in the 1830s, Chapter 2 discusses two ways in which Polish democrats and monarchists interpreted the Polish Question.

The resolution of the second Eastern Crisis in 1841 opened a new chapter in the history of European politics, putting an end to Polish hopes for a new war between the liberal West and the autocratic East. Chapter 3 takes a closer look at the changes that took place in Europe between 1841 and 1847, and the ways in which Polish exiles reacted to them. From the Polish perspective the most significant event of that period was the Cracow Revolution of 1846, the unsuccessful uprising that was meant to encompass all three partitions and lead to the restoration of Poland in its pre-1772 borders.

All elements of Polish and international politics discussed in the following three chapters had their impact on the ways in which the Polish Questions developed in Britain in the 1830s and 1840s. As will be argued in Part 2 of this thesis, both the Polish Questions and, their perception and importance relied as much on activities of the Polish exiles themselves as on international factors that were usually beyond their sphere of influence.

Chapter 1: The November Uprising and Europe (1830-1831)

The end of the Napoleonic Wars and the signing of the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna did not put an end to conflicts and disagreements between European powers. The Final Act, despite settling major differences and providing a political framework that was not seriously undermined for almost a hundred years, was by no means a perfect resolution.[58] Although it was not until 1848 when the first universal opposition to the post-1815 order found its expression in a number of revolutions that shook the Continent, signs of discontent were visible from the very beginning. As this chapter argues, the cause of Poland, which rose to international prominence with the outbreak of the November Uprising in 1830, can be compared with other national movements of that period, particularly with the question of Greek and Belgian independence.

Europe before 1830

Europe welcomed the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna of 1815 with a sense of relief. The final defeat and exile of Napoleon ended over twenty years of wars and conflicts that raged across Europe from Portugal to Russia.[59] Both the victors and the defeated had to face the new reality of post-Napoleonic Europe.[60] At the Congress of Vienna borders were redrawn, some of the old dynasties restored to their thrones, and the new balance of power established. With the five powers (Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia) temporarily united by the principles of restoration and the balance of power, it seemed that the new European order would last for many decades.[61] This sentiment was reinforced by the creation of the Holy Alliance, which primarily involved the autocratic regimes of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Although the Alliance was open for all Christian monarchs of

---

[58] Even the crises of the second half of the nineteenth century did not undermine the general determination of the major European Powers to uphold the Balance of Power and avoid any major conflict. The Crimean War did not turn into a major European conflict, the unification of Italy was similarly 'local' issue, while the Franco-Prussian war, despite its scale, failed to attract any military involvement of either Britain or Russia.

[59] E. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution. Europe from 1789 to 1848* (London, 1962), p. 99.

[60] P. W. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848* (Oxford, 1994), pp. i-ii, 575-582.

[61] B. Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy 1814-1914* (Philadelphia-New York, 1964), p. 39.

Europe, it was for many decades associated with those three powers, being synonymous with Eastern despotism.[62] Neither France nor Britain joined them, a sign of growing discord between the liberal West and the autocratic East.[63] The fifteen years that separated the Congress of Vienna and the outbreak of 1830s revolutions were, despite the attempts of the authors of the Treaty, very far from being peaceful. Although disturbances in Germany and Spain, followed by the civil war in Portugal, and the Greek War of Independence against Turkey, did not undermine the general settlement of 1815, the ways in which the major European powers reacted to these events showed the widening liberal-autocratic divide of Europe.[64]

Of all of these struggles, the Greek Revolution was the most significant element of international politics in the 1820s.[65] The anti-Turkish revolt, which broke out in 1821, attracted European attention primarily because of the cruelties of both sides.[66] The cause of the Greeks was popular across Europe; many people sympathised with their struggle (including Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski,[67] who published his *Essay sur la diplomatie* under the nickname Philhellene[68]), while some (like George Byron[69]) voluntarily joined the

---

[62] *Ibid*., pp. 41–42.

[63] J. Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy 1782-1865: The National Interest* (London, 1989), pp. 144–160.

[64] As Schroeder argued, the Congress of Vienna should be considered as the main point in, what he called, transformation of European international politics. See P. W. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848* (Oxford, 1994), pp. i-ii.

[65] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 171. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 617.

[66] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy 1814-1914*, p. 68.

[67] Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski (1770-1861), Polish statesman, close associate of Tsar Alexander I, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia (1804-1806). During the November Uprising he served as the President of the Polish National Government (see below). For his pre-1830 career see particularly W. H. Zawadzki, *A Man of Honour. Adam Czartoryski as a Statesman of Russia and Poland 1795-1831* (Oxford, 1993).

[68] M. K. Dziewanowski, 'Czartoryski and His Essai Sur La Diplomatie', *Slavic Review*, 30.3 (1971), pp. 589–605. On Czartoryski's Philhellenism, see for example Zawadzki, *A Man of Honour*, pp. 287–293.

[69] George Gordon Noel, sixth Baron Byron (1788-1824), British romantic poet, who joined the struggle for Greek independence. See Jerome McGann, 'Byron, George Gordon Noel, sixth Baron Byron (1788–1824)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2015 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4279, accessed 17 May 2016].

fighting. Politically, however, neither Britain nor Austria (which, until George Canning's[70] return to the Foreign Office in 1822, remained the closest ally Britain had on the Continent) sympathised with the Greek cause, perceiving Russia to be the only beneficiary of the successful anti-Turkish struggle.[71] Despite Canning's recognition of the Greeks as the belligerents in March 1823, the Foreign Secretary's pragmatism, not very different from that of his predecessor, Lord Castlereagh,[72] determined the British approach during the first years of the conflict. Canning declined Alexander I's[73] suggestion for Anglo-Russian mediation and the Greek affair being resolved by way of another European congress.[74] Things changed only after the sultan's request for assistance from Mehmet Ali,[75] the governor of Egypt. The Egyptian army and navy under the leadership of Ibrahim Pasha[76] joined the fighting in 1825 and started turning the tide of the struggle in favour of the Ottoman Empire, forcing European governments to take a more active role in the conflict.[77]

In April 1826 Britain and Russia signed the Protocol of St. Petersburg, agreeing to seek ways to influence Turkey to grant the Greeks autonomy.[78] The Protocol was followed by the Treaty of London of July 1827 between Britain, Russia, and France, in which the

---

[70] George Canning (1770–1827), British politician. He succeeded Castlereagh as the Prime Minister and took and active role in determining British foreign policy during the Greek revolution. See Derek Beales, 'Canning, George (1770–1827)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2014 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4556, accessed 17 May 2016].

[71] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 171. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 637-639.

[72] Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh and second marquess of Londonderry (1769–1822), British politician Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister. See Roland Thorne, 'Stewart, Robert, Viscount Castlereagh and second marquess of Londonderry (1769–1822)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26507, accessed 17 May 2016].

[73] Alexander I of Russia (1777-1825), the Tsar of Russia and the King of Poland.

[74] M. Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'? British Foreign Policy, 1789-1914* (London, 1989), p. 67.

[75] Mehmet Ali of Egypt (1769–1849), commander of the Ottoman Army. He rose to the status of the Governor of Egypt and established a dynasty that ruled the country until the mid-20th century.

[76] Ibrahim Pasha (1789–1848), the eldest son of Mehmet Ali and his successor. He commanded the Egyptian Army during the Greek Revolution and in the 1830s he led Egyptians against the Turks (see Chapter 2).

[77] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 68.

[78] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 646.

powers decided to implement the earlier agreement.[79] The fleets of all three powers, sent to the Mediterranean to manifest their support for Greece, clashed with and eventually destroyed the joint Turkish-Egyptian fleet at the Battle of Navarino.[80] The sudden death of Canning in 1827 and the creation of a Conservative government led by the Duke of Wellington[81] prevented Britain from taking any advantage of the victory.[82] In April 1828 Russia, provoked by Turkey, began an offensive in the Balkans. The Russo-Turkish war, despite some temporary difficulties encountered by the Russian Army, concluded with the signing of the Treaty of Adrianople. The peace strengthened the position of Russia in southeast Europe and, at the same time, resolved the Greek Question by forcing the Ottoman Empire to accept Greek autonomy, which several years later was transformed into full independence.[83] In consequence, it was Nicholas I's[84] determination rather than involvement of Western European powers that led to a successful resolution of the problem of the Greek Revolution.[85]

After a period of peace that followed the 1815 settlement all major European Powers got involved in political discussions about the future of Greece, a fact which gave the Poles some hope for similar support for their own cause. It is, however, rather surprising how rarely did the Poles decided to refer to the cause of Greece during the November Uprising. Perhaps even more significant was the lack of determination to prolong the anti-Russian struggle that, in the case of the Greek fight against the Ottoman Empire, secured foreign support and intervention. As will be illustrated below, the

---

[79] The absence of Austria was dictated by Metternich's assumption that any joint action against Turkey would be, at the same time, anti-Austrian. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 650-651.

[80] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, pp. 175-177.

[81] Arthur Wellesley, first duke of Wellington (1769–1852), army officer, and Prime Minister. He commanded the British Army during the Napoleonic Wars in Spain and later in the Battle of Waterloo. In 1828 he became the Prime Minister. See Norman Gash, 'Wellesley, Arthur, first duke of Wellington (1769–1852)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29001, accessed 17 May 2016].

[82] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 179.

[83] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 78.

[84] Nicholas I of Russia (1796–1855), the Tsar of Russia (from 1825) and a younger brother of Alexander I.

[85] The result of the Eastern Crisis, as Jupp put it, 'came to an end on terms that were worse than [Wellington's] government had originally hoped, but better than it had feared'. P. Jupp, 'The foreign policy of Wellington's government', in C. M. Woolgar (ed.), *Wellington Studies*, 3 (Southampton, 1999), p. 154. See also Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 658-664.

November Uprising ended at the time when the British Government began to consider some type of pro-Polish intervention.

Poland Before 1830

One of the most pressing subjects discussed at the Congress of Vienna, seen in the number and the position of points relating to this question, was the fate of Poland.[86] Partitioned by Russia, Prussia and Austria in the late eighteenth century, after Napoleon's conquest of Central Europe Poland was resurrected in the form of the Duchy of Warsaw, a semi-independent state consisting of parts of the Prussian and Austrian partitions.[87] Its establishment was the result of active Polish involvement in the conflict on the side of Napoleon and at the end of the conflict it was becoming clear that the allied powers would have to make some concessions for the Poles in order to prevent them from rebelling against the established order. Of the first fourteen articles of the General Treaty of Congress signed on 9 June 1815, eleven (articles one to ten and article fourteen) dealt directly with issues related to the territories of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. By creating the Grand Duchy of Poznań, the Kingdom of Poland, Kingdom of Galicia, and the Free State of Cracow, it became the first international treaty that sanctioned the late-eighteenth-century partitions of Poland and the territorial gains of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. As the first Article stated, '[t]he Poles, who are subjects of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, shall obtain a representation, and national institutions, regulated according to the degree of political consideration, that each of the governments to which they belong shall judge expedient and proper to grant them'. More important, however, was the fate of the Kingdom of Poland, created from the semi-independent Duchy of Warsaw, which was 'united to the Russian empire, to which it shall be irrevocably attached by its constitution'.[88] Despite the fact that the Treaty's main purpose was to secure

---

[86] See for example Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 523-538.

[87] B. Grochulska, *Małe państwo wielkich nadziei* (Warszawa, 1987). See also M. Handelsman, 'The Duchy of Warsaw', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 236-256. J. Czubaty, *The Duchy of Warsaw, 1807-1815. A Napoleonic Outpost in Central Europe* (New York, 2016).

[88] 'The General Treaty of the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna, 9 June 1815'. *Wikisource* [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Final_Act_of_the_Congress_of_Vienna/General_Treaty accessed 17 May 2016].

the interests of the great European powers rather than those of smaller states,[89] Poles willingly accepted the new status of their lands and their own position as the subjects of Russia, Prussia, and Austria.[90] The fact that the Treaty promised them certain national liberties and freedoms certainly contributed to that consent. However, the guarantees of the international treaty did not stop the powers of the Holy Alliance from extending more autocratic rule over the Polish provinces.[91]

Of all parts of the partitioned Poland the Kingdom of Poland remained the centre of the political, cultural, and intellectual life of the country.[92] For various reasons the disappointments of the Poles living under Russian domination were far greater than those of Poles living under Prussian and Austrian rule. Firstly, the political existence of the Kingdom was a direct continuation of the Duchy of Warsaw, making it an almost direct descendant of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Secondly, Alexander I granted the Poles their constitution, which introduced limited freedoms (including a Parliament gathering every four years).[93] Moreover, the Tsar decided to keep the Polish Army separated from the Russian force, thus providing the Poles with another way of retaining their national spirit. Finally, Alexander I gave the Poles some hope for the extension of the borders of the Kingdom to include parts of the Lithuanian provinces annexed to the Empire after the second partition.[94] All these elements increased Polish hopes that through the developments taking place in the Kingdom of Poland even autocratic Russia would be reformed. That feeling was, however, very short-lived. From 1820 onward, Alexander I started losing his interest in the constitutional experiment of the Kingdom of Poland,

---

[89] A. Wood, *Nineteenth Century Britain, 1815-1814* (Harlow, 1982), p. 52. As Schroeder argued, the real decisions made at the Congress were 'the product of earlier actions taken to win the war'. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 576.

[90] W. Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe 1830-1831* (Warszawa, 1998), p. 9.

[91] On Prussian and Austrian partitions see particularly J. Feldman, 'The Polish Provinces of Austria and Prussia after 1815; the "Springtime of Nations"', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 336-364.

[92] J. Skowronek, *Od Kongresu Wiedeńskiego do Nocy Listopadowej* (Warszawa, 1987), p. 17. See also M. Handelsman, 'The Polish Kingdom', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 275-294.

[93] The constitution was introduced on 27 November 1815 and, at the time, was the most liberal constitution in Europe. Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 19.

[94] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 44.

leaving the ruling of the country in the hands of his brother, Grand Duke Constantine,[95] and the Imperial Commissioner Nicolai Novosiltsev.[96]

These two men became the symbols of anti-liberal and anti-Polish change in Russian policies towards the Kingdom. The former became the unconstitutional ruler of the Kingdom and the commander-in-chief of the Polish Army. Although Constantine married a Polish lady, Joanna Grudzińska,[97] became an MP in the Polish *Sejm* (lower house of Parliament), and considered himself a Pole,[98] his harsh military regime introduced in Poland, as well as continuous violations of the constitution, led Poles to despise his rule. Constantine's lack of interest in civil affairs allowed Novosiltsev to dominate internal politics of the country. For the imperial commissioner it was the best opportunity to introduce his anti-Polish politics, including the establishment of a secret police and the introduction of censorship.[99] With both Constantine and Novosiltsev becoming the *de facto* rulers of the Kingdom and with Alexander I losing his interest in Polish affairs, the dissatisfaction of Poles was steadily growing.[100] Despite numerous legal attempts to defend the constitution (undertaken by the Polish press and the Parliament), the marriage of Polish constitutionalism and Russian autocracy could not survive the test of time.[101]

The first secret political society in the Kingdom was created as early as in 1819, and the 1820s saw the development of a number of other clandestine organisations. The success of any of these groups was very limited – the majority were quickly discovered; their

---

[95] Grand Duke Constantine (1779–1831), the second son of Tsar Paul I, younger brother of Tsar Alexander I, and older brother of Tsar Nicholas I. He voluntarily gave up his pretentions to the Russian throne after marrying Joanna Grudzińska. After 1815 he became the commander of the Polish Army in the newly created Kingdom of Poland and, after death of General Józef Zajączek in 1826, Constantine became *de facto* governor of Poland.

[96] Nikolay Novosiltsev (1761–1836), Russian nobleman and close adviser of Alexander I. After 1815 he served as the imperial commissioner in the Kingdom of Poland.

[97] Joanna Grudzińska (1791–1831), Polish noble and second wife of Grand Duke Constantine.

[98] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 23.

[99] For a detailed study of Novosiltsev's activity in the Kingdom of Poland see F. W. Thackeray, 'N. N. Novosil'tsow, the Polish Years', *The Polish Review*, 28.1 (1983), pp. 32–46.

[100] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 19-21.

[101] *Ibid*., p. 10.

members imprisoned or exiled to Siberia.[102] The common element of all those organisations was that they were created by the young generation of Poles; people who did not experience the disappointments and sacrifices of the Napoleonic Wars.[103] It was not until December 1828, three years after the sudden death of Alexander I and the accession to the throne of Nicolas I, that the first serious conspiracy emerged. Its leader, Piotr Wysocki,[104] was a teacher in the Warsaw Officer Cadet School. While Polish officers and soldiers constituted the majority of its members, the organisation soon started to expand and began to include intellectuals as well as students among its ranks.[105] For some time the conspirators considered going forward with the uprising during the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-1829 and attempting to assassinate Nicolas I during his coronation in Warsaw in May 1829, but the lack of support for these ideas forced them to abandon the scheme and wait for a more suitable time.[106] One of the main problems of Wysocki's conspiracy was the fact that the plotters relied on the support of the so called 'elders of the nation', mostly conservative Polish statesmen, who were strongly against any disturbance or revolution (see below). It was the spread of the revolutionary spirit across Europe in the second half of 1830 and the growing risk of arrest that forced Wysocki and his associates to act.

The radicalisation of Polish youth in the Kingdom of Poland in the 1820s was the result of the diminishing hopes for successful cooperation between Poland and Russia on constitutional and liberal grounds. It gained momentum after the sudden death of Alexander I, the Decembrist Revolt, and the accession of Nicholas I in 1825. Although the new Tsar retained the status of the Kingdom and was crowned King of Poland in Warsaw in 1829, he was no more suited for the position of a constitutional monarch than his brother.[107] The conservative circles of Polish society retained their belief in a successful coexistence

---

[102] The most famous example was that of the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz and his fellow students from the University of Vilna. See Skowronek, *Od Kongresu Wiedeńskiego do Nocy Listopadowej*, pp. 37-41.

[103] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 21.

[104] Piotr Wysocki (1797–1875), Polish officer and leader of a conspiracy that led to the outbreak of the November Uprising.

[105] For a detailed account of Wysocki's conspiracy see W. Tokarz, *Sprzysiężenie Wysockiego i Noc Listopadowa* (Warszawa, 1980).

[106] Skowronek, *Od Kongresu Wiedeńskiego do Nocy Listopadowej*, p. 49.

[107] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 97.

between the Kingdom and the Empire, a vision that was not impossible when we consider the rapid economic and industrial development of Poland in the years following the Congress of Vienna. However, political and economic considerations could not stop the young conspirators from doing what they believed was good for their homeland.

Europe and Poland in 1830

Chronologically the first, but at the same time the most important, factor in European politics in 1830 was the July Revolution in France, or the so-called *Trois Glorieuses* (Three Days of Glory), which broke out in Paris on 26 July 1830 and put an end to the despised Bourbon regime that had ruled in France since 1814.[108] It was also the first major breach of the Treaty of Vienna,[109] but, as it soon turned out, not the last that was to take place that year. The French Revolution created a precedent that was strengthened by the swift recognition of the new monarchy by the British Government (in August 1830). In the eyes of the British Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, and his Foreign Secretary, Lord Aberdeen,[110] accepting Louis-Philippe[111] as the new ruler of more liberal France was the only way of preventing further disorder and a potential creation of a new French Republic.[112] The fact that it was a Conservative British government that first accepted the

---

[108] For more details about the July Revolution see for example D. H. Pinkney, *The French Revolution of 1830* (New Jersey, 1972).

[109] Or, as Schroeder argued, it illustrated 'how the same revolution could undermine the Metternich system and strengthen the international system'. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 666-667.

[110] George Hamilton-Gordon, fourth earl of Aberdeen (1784–1860), British politician, Prime Minister and scholar. See Muriel E. Chamberlain, 'Gordon, George Hamilton-, fourth earl of Aberdeen (1784–1860)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2010 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11044, accessed 17 May 2016].

[111] Louis-Philippe I (1773–1850), leader of the Orléanist party in France and King of the French from 1830 to 1848.

[112] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, pp. 83–4. Chamberlain, 'Gordon, George Hamilton-, fourth earl of Aberdeen (1784–1860)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2010 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11044, accessed 17 May 2016]. Although British acceptance of the July Revolution may be seen as differing completely from the conservative principles which governed Wellington's government foreign policy, Jupp illustrated that having a choice between non-intervention and intervention, the government preferred the former. See Jupp, 'The foreign policy of Wellington's government', p. 158. See also Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 668-670.

change of regime in France certainly influenced Austrian and Prussian decisions to do the same, though peaceful and conciliatory arguments used by French envoys also played a significant role.[113] Metternich[114] and Nesselrode[115] (the Foreign Ministers of Austria and Russia, who at the time of the outbreak of the July Revolution were both in Bohemia) agreed that no intervention in the internal affairs of France would take place unless the change of monarch would be followed by more aggressive international politics (understood as involvement in the affairs of Belgium or Poland).[116] Nicholas I turned out to be the only ruler reluctant to recognise Louis-Philippe as the king of the French, postponing this decision for several months.[117]

The outbreak of the revolution in Belgium served as an excellent illustration of one of the most well-known of Metternich's quotes that 'revolution [was] an essentially French disease'.[118] In 1830 it did not take too much time for the virus of liberty to cross the French border to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, a buffer state created at the Congress of Vienna to prevent any French expansion towards Germany.[119] In response to the French Revolution, Belgians rebelled on 25 August 1830, demanding greater freedoms and separate administration.[120] The Dutch reaction led Belgians to organise their own provisional government (26 September) and proclaim independence (4 October). In early

---

[113] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 84. Pinkney, *The French Revolution of 1830*, pp. 304–305. T. E. B. Howarth, *Citizen-King. The Life of Louis-Philippe King of the French* (London, 1961), p. 177.

[114] Klemens Wenzel Fürst von Metternich (1773–1859), Austrian diplomat and statesman, one of the most influential figures of post-Napoleonic European politics. He directed the international policy of the Austrian Empire until 1848.

[115] Count Karl Robert Nesselrode (1780–1862), Russian diplomat of German descent, director of Russian foreign policy from 1816.

[116] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 93.

[117] C. Grunwald, *Trois Siecles de Diplomatie Russe* (Paris, 1945), p. 186.

[118] Quoted after M. Rapport, *1848. Year of Revolutions* (London, 2009), p. 17.

[119] J. S. Fishman, *Diplomacy and Revolution : The London Conference of 1830 and the Belgian Revolt* (Amsterdam, 1988), pp. 19–21.

[120] The Belgian Revolution was the result of long-term grievances (relating mostly to economic and national problems) that complicated relations between the Netherlands and Belgium throughout the whole fifteen years between 1815 and 1830. The contemporary problems of 1830, such as the economic crisis and the revolution in France, strengthened Belgian demands for the reform. See Fishman, *Diplomacy and Revolution*, pp. 20–25.

October King William of Orange[121] asked the five great powers to intervene and resolve the problem of his rebellious province.[122] He hoped that they would not allow any further changes to the Treaty of Vienna, as the general feeling towards Belgium, at least in Britain, was very different from that expressed a few months before towards France.[123] Both Wellington and Aberdeen saw the problem of the Netherlands as the potential cause of a much wider European conflict, particularly when coupled with the possible threat posed by France.[124]

It was clear that in case of a war both Russia and Prussia would support the Dutch. For Nicholas I it was partly a family matter (as William of Orange was his distant relative), but what seemed far more important to the Tsar was fighting 'the general revolution… which threatens us if we are seen to tremble before it'.[125] The decision of Prussia was dictated by fears of French invasion and the annexation of Belgium, though Berlin preferred cooperation with Britain rather than with bellicose Nicholas I.[126] Austria, having less interest in that part of Europe, followed Prussia. It seemed that peaceful resolution of the problem was once again strongly dependent on British actions and the Conservative government of Wellington proved to be capable of steering the middle course between revolutionary (or liberal) demands of Belgium and the preservation of European peace. Various factors contributed to the resolution of the Belgian crisis: Wellington's realisation

---

[121] William I of the Netherlands (1772–1843), king of the Netherlands.

[122] It happened only after the unsuccessful appeal of William for a conference of the four signatories of the Eight Articles (Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia) in The Hague, an appeal that was coolly received by Wellington. However, what was at first considered the internal problem of the Netherlands turned into an international question after the unsuccessful Dutch attack on Brussels in late September 1830. Fishman, *Diplomacy and Revolution*, pp. 30–32.

[123] Not without importance were rumours brought from Belgium by the British, who left the country after the Revolution. G. W. T. Omond, 'Belgium, 1830-1839', in *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, 1923), II, p. 125. Chamberlain suggests that both Tories and Whigs were ready to accept Belgian independence from the very beginning. A similar opinion is expressed by Clarke. Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, pp. 70–71. Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 192.

[124] Omond, 'Belgium, 1830-1839', in *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*, II, p. 126.

[125] Quoted after Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 95.

[126] Chamberlain claims that 'at the outset both Russia and Prussia would have been prepared to use armed force to uphold the Vienna Settlement but they were distracted by a rising in Poland', but the course of the events was different. All five powers agreed to hold a conference in London some time before the outbreak of the November Uprising, and the very fact that negotiations started in London in November 1830 prevented any armed conflict over the Belgian Question. Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 71.

that there was no way of restoring balance in the Netherlands without major military conflict, the unwillingness of the July Monarchy to start a war in defence of Belgium, the indecisiveness of Prussian and Austrian governments; the inability of Russia to provide the Dutch with any military assistance and the universal realisation that the original scheme of the Netherlands playing a role of a buffer state between France and Germany would no longer work.[127] In spite of the agreement reached by the representatives of the five powers in London in November 1830, the Belgian Question remained one of the vital issues of European politics in the following years (mostly because of William of Orange's refusal to accept the resolutions of the conference).[128]

The final important factor in the international politics of 1830 was the 'Whig revolution' in Britain.[129] Shortly after Wellington and Aberdeen recognised the July Monarchy, agreed to organise the London Conference and began discussions about the future of the Netherlands, their Conservative government fell in a minor debate in the House of Commons on 15 November.[130] It was soon replaced by the Whigs under the leadership of the Prime Minister Earl Grey,[131] with Lord Palmerston[132] taking over the position of Foreign Secretary. Although nothing in the previous career of the ex-Secretary-

---

[127] Omond, 'Belgium, 1830-1839', pp. 126-7. Norman Gash, 'Wellesley , Arthur, first duke of Wellington (1769–1852)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29001, accessed 17 May 2016]. The failure of the special mission of General Diebitsch to Berlin and the Prussian refusal to join Russian armed intervention in the West put an end to any plans of Nicholas I to put an end to the revolutionary wave in France and Belgium. 'With territories bordering on France and Belgium, the Prussian government had no desire to see its lands become a battlefield'. Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 94. See also Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 671-674.

[128] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 671.

[129] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 184. Interestingly, also *Journal des débats* called the events that brought Grey to power the revolution. See for example *Journal des débats*, 10 December 1830.

[130] See House of Commons Debates, 15 and 16 November 1830. *Hansard*, Vol. 1, cc. 525-549 and 561-564.

[131] Charles Grey, second Earl Grey (1764–1845), British Whig politician and Prime Minister. E. A. Smith, 'Grey, Charles, second Earl Grey (1764–1845)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11526, accessed 17 May 2016].

[132] Henry John Temple, third Viscount Palmerston (1784–1865), British politician, Foreign Secretary, and Prime Minister. David Steele, 'Temple, Henry John, third Viscount Palmerston (1784–1865)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27112, accessed 17 May 2016].

at-War predestined him to that role, Palmerston proved to be a capable administrator who successfully steered British diplomacy through the troubled waters of contemporary European politics.[133] Palmerston, though certainly enthusiastic about the July Revolution in France, was far more concerned with keeping the balance of power and peace in Europe, and his priorities did not differ too much from those of Wellington and Aberdeen.[134] He was, nevertheless, perceived as a friend of European liberalism, leading some revolutionaries (including Polish envoys) to consider the new Foreign Secretary as their potential ally.[135]

All three elements played a role in preparing the ideological and political ground for the Polish Revolution, even if only the July Revolution in France was mentioned by the leader of the Polish conspiracy, Piotr Wysocki.[136] When analysed in its international context, the Polish Uprising was, therefore, very far from being 'a revolution in a non-revolutionary situation' (as Łepkowski called it).[137] Instead, it seemed to be a response to the events taking place in Western Europe,[138] even though the decision to start the revolution was taken after the arrests of several conspirators threatened the whole organisation.[139] Despite the lack of any official support from the 'elders of the nation', who were, in the conspirators' plans, to lead the revolution after its outbreak, Wysocki and his followers decided to start the uprising on the night of 29 November 1830.[140] Without any

---

[133] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 69.

[134] D. Brown, *Palmerston: A Biography* (London, 2010), p. 147.

[135] For Zajewski the news of the change of cabinet in Britain, which arrived in Warsaw on 28 November, was among the direct causes of the outbreak. Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 35-36.

[136] [Wysocki, P.] 'Wiadomość o tajnem towarzystwie zawiązanem w celu zmienienia rządu i ustalenia swobód konstytucyjnych w królestwie Polskiem; oraz działanie wojenne szkoły Podchorążych piechoty w nocy z d. 29 na 30 listopada 1830r.' in *Dodatek do Gazety Warszawskiej ner. 335*.

[137] T. Łepkowski, *Powstanie listopadowe* (Warszawa, 1987), pp. 1–19.

[138] *Ibid*. p. 7.

[139] *Ibid*., pp. 34-36.

[140] For more details about the conspiracy that led to the events of 29 November see for example Skowronek, *Od Kongresu Wiedeńskiego do Nocy Listopadowej*. Tokarz, *Sprzysiężenie Wysockiego i Noc Listopadowa*. See also Piotr Wysocki's own account: [Wysocki, P.] 'Wiadomość o tajnem towarzystwie…'.

long-term goals they considered themselves as a vanguard of the revolution, but not necessarily the representatives of the nation.[141]

The choice of starting, but not leading the uprising was to become the most tragic of all choices made by the Polish revolutionaries.[142] By leaving the leadership of the revolution in the hands of the reluctant leaders of the nation the conspirators lost the opportunity to make the uprising a national revolution and introduce any significant reforms (see below).

The November Uprising: from the Outbreak to the Dethronement

The outbreak of the uprising was not a surprise, although many people in Warsaw did not believe that the conspirators would decide to act.[143] Lacking any official support from the Polish elites, and with a plan that was far too complicated to succeed, the soldiers and students walked across the capital in what seemed to be nothing more than a street riot. Very few things went according to plan. Conspirators failed to set the old brewery on fire, while their attack on the residence of Constantine, though successful, failed to achieve the main objective: the capture of the Grand Duke. Street fights between Poles and Russians took place in several parts of Warsaw and eventually all Russian forces withdrew from the city by the end of the night. On 30 November Warsaw was in Polish hands, but nobody was willing to seize power.[144] The conspirators' hopes that the 'elders of the nation' would join and lead the movement after the outbreak turned out to be too optimistic and unjustified. Although the Administrative Council under the presidency of Prince Adam Czartoryski quickly seized power, the main effort of this body was to contain the revolution and negotiate with Constantine rather than to lead the uprising. A similar approach was

[141] Only the future leader of the Patriotic Society, Maurycy Mochnacki, suggested that the conspirators should have created a revolutionary government before starting the uprising. Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 31.

[142] Limanowski, *Stuletnia walka narodu polskiego o wolność* (Lwów, 1894), p. 140.

[143] M. Cybowski, 'Czekając nieoczekiwanego', *Esensja* 10 (142) 2014, p. 159.

[144] For more detailed studies of the events of 29 November 1830 see J. Dunn, '"The November Evening": The Warsaw Uprising of November 1830', *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 16.3 (2003), pp. 126–35. See also Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 34-48.

expressed by General Józef Chłopicki,[145] the unwilling military leader who declared himself dictator of the movement.[146] Negotiations with Constantine dragged on, but the Polish leaders allowed the Grand Duke and all Russian forces to leave the territory of the Kingdom unopposed, while two Polish envoys (Minister Ksawery Drucki-Lubecki[147] and Jan Jezierski[148]) were sent to St. Petersburg to discuss the matter with Nicolas I.

In the meantime, the first meeting of the *Sejm* since the outbreak of the revolution (which took place on 18 December) recognised the national character of the movement.[149] Despite the immediate resignation of Chłopicki, the general remained the commander-in-chief of the Polish Army, while the National Government and the *Sejm* took over civil prerogatives. This division of leadership was to become fatal to the whole revolution. While tensions between the three main governing bodies (military leaders, the Parliament and the Government) did not paralyse the whole national effort, they were certainly among the most serious problems leading to the demise of the uprising.[150] They were the most visible in January 1831, when the news of Nicolas I's reaction to the uprising arrived in Warsaw.[151] Polish demands presented to the Tsar were rather mild, requesting the readdressing of various Polish grievances, stronger guarantees of upholding the constitution and the appeal to incorporate Volhynia and Lithuania to the Kingdom. Nicolas I, however, refused any reconsideration of his politics towards Poland and demanded total and unconditional surrender.[152] The failure of the reconciliatory politics was obvious and led to the resignation of General Chłopicki on 18 January 1831. On 25 January the *Sejm*, under

---

[145] General Józef Chłopicki (1771-1854), Polish general active during the Napoleonic Wars. After 1815 he returned to the Kingdom of Poland and retired from the army.

[146] Chłopicki, as one of the Napoleonic generals, was perceived by the conspirators as the best possible choice for the leader of the uprising. There were hopes that his dictatorship would resemble that of Tadeusz Kościuszko, the leader of the 1794 Insurrection, in introducing reforms. Limanowski, *Stuletnia walka narodu polskiego o niepodległość*, p. 146. S. Kieniewicz and H. Wereszycki, 'Poland Under Foreign Rule 1795-1918', in *History of Poland*, ed. by S. Kieniewicz (Warszawa, 1979), pp. 382–3.

[147] Prince Franciszek Ksawery Drucki-Lubecki (1778-1846), Polish politician and Minister of the Treasury of the Kingdom of Poland.

[148] Jan Jezierski (1786–1858), Polish officer and MP.

[149] M. Rostworowski(ed.), *Dyariusz Sejmu z r. 1830-1831* (Kraków, 1907), I, pp. 6-13.

[150] L. Gadon, *Książę Adam Czartoryski podczas powstania listopadowego* (Kraków, 1892), pp. 6–7.

[151] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 74–76.

[152] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 65-67.

the pressure of the Patriotic Society and the Warsaw mob, signed the act of dethronement of Nicolas I.[153] That event put an end to conservative attempts to restrain the revolution and opened the door for military conflict between Poland and Russia.[154] The success of the radicals was only temporary. Although they managed to transform the uprising from a relatively non-revolutionary movement seeking reconciliation with Russia into a struggle for national independence, they failed to dominate its politics. Instead, after that short-lived outbreak of radicalism of late January 1831, the leadership of the uprising soon returned to its conservative and conciliatory course. People such as Czartoryski, who considered the very idea of dethronement as 'calamitous and absurd',[155] and General Chłopicki continued to play a central role in shaping the uprising.

The Polish-Russian War and the Defeat of the Uprising

Military conflict began in February 1831, when the Russian army under the command of Field Marshall Ivan Ivanovich Diebitsch-Zabalkansky[156] entered the Kingdom of Poland with plans of a quick capture of Warsaw.[157] The first encounter between the Poles and the Russians took place on 14 February during the Battle of Stoczek, but the victory of the Polish cavalry was of miniscule importance and the main Russian force continued its march on the Polish capital. From 17 until 24 February the Poles and the Russians fought in a series of clashes near Warsaw, which were concluded in the Battle of Olszynka Grochowska (25 February). In the heavy fighting Poles stood bravely against the Russian Army, but were eventually forced to retreat towards Warsaw. For Diebitsch, however, it was a pyrrhic victory, which did not enable him to capture the Polish capital. Instead, at the beginning of March he withdrew his army seeking another opportunity for an offensive.[158]

---

[153] *Ibid*., pp. 84–86. For the debate on the question of dethronement, see Rostworowski, *Dyaryusz Sejmu z r. 1820-1831*, I, pp. 188-245.

[154] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 18.

[155] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, II, p. 91.

[156] Ivan Ivanovich Diebitsch-Zabalkansky (1785-1831), German-born soldier, Russian general, and Field Marshall.

[157] For the most detailed study of the Polish-Russian war see W. Tokarz, *Wojna polsko-rosyjska, 1830 i 1831* (Warszawa, 1930).

[158] W. Łopacinski, *Powstanie listopadowe* (Warszawa, 1921), p. 19. Łopaciński, whose perception of the uprising was dominantly military, considered the battle as a much more important event than the dethronement.

The Battle of Olszynka raised the spirits of the Poles, but it also had another significant consequence: General Chłopicki became wounded in the fighting and was replaced by a new military leader, General Jan Skrzynecki.[159] The Polish Army under Skrzynecki's command avoided confrontation with Russians and only under the pressure of the Government was it decided to continue the campaign.[160] This indecisiveness cost him dearly, leading, in late May 1831, to the first serious defeat of the Poles in the Battle of Ostrołęka. The moral impact of that defeat was much greater than its military consequences, marking the beginning of a serious discord between rank-and-file (always ready to sacrifice their lives for the fatherland) and officers (unwilling to risk and take action against the enemy).[161]

In mid-July the Russian army crossed the Vistula River unopposed, preparing for an attack on Warsaw from the west.[162] This development finally led the *Sejm* to dismiss Skrzynecki and elect a new leader, General Henryk Dembiński,[163] but it did not bring any change to the conflict. Military inactivity, as well as the lack of any social reforms introduced by the Government and the Parliament, strengthened radical moods in Warsaw, and culminated in the events of 15 and 16 August.[164] The Warsaw mob, under the influence of some of the members of the Patriotic Society, stormed prisons and hanged the Russian spies that had been incarcerated since the outbreak of the uprising. In spite of their evident success, the radicals failed to assume leadership, which showed the complete fiasco of all attempts to radicalise the revolution and introduce any significant reforms.[165] The Patriotic Society, torn between the idea of a dictatorship and a directorate, did not present any united

---

[159] Jan Skrzynecki (1787-1860), Polish officer active during the Napoleonic Wars, general of the Polish and Belgian army.

[160] Gadon, *Książę Adam Czartoryski podczas powstania listopadowego*, pp. 48–51.

[161] Limanowski, *Stuletnia walka narodu polskiego*, p. 172. Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe 1830-1831*, pp. 189-190.

[162] The major part of the capital was situated on the western bank of the river, with only one small district (Praga) located on the eastern bank. Had the Russians attacked from the east, the Poles would still have been able to defend the city after losing Praga and the Russians would have had to cross the river.

[163] Henryk Dembiński (1791-1864), Polish general active during the Napoleonic Wars.

[164] See Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 202-205.

[165] Łepkowski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 57.

policy.[166] Their indecisiveness was used by the military, signified by the rise to power of General Jan Krukowiecki.[167] The *Sejm* elected him for the position of military leader and the new President of the National Government (Czartoryski, who feared for his life, had left Warsaw soon after the outbreak of the disturbances[168]). Krukowiecki, despite the anti-revolutionary approach he had presented at the beginning of the uprising and his rather unfavourable position among other Polish generals, was the first person who took the military and civil powers into his hands.[169] Even the radicals seemed to accept the new leader, considering him a friend and a supporter of social reforms. However, from the election of Krukowiecki onward, the history of the uprising becomes a history of a gradual decline. After the departure of Czartoryski, the National Government ceased to play any significant role in the politics of the Uprising, while the *Sejm*, never particularly strong or active, in these final weeks was only a shadow of its previous self.

Krukowiecki's decisions proved no less fatal than those of his predecessors. Despite his promises, the new dictator failed to strengthen the capital's defences, sending additional troops to the eastern part of the country.[170] Distrustful of Warsaw citizens, he prevented them from organising into military units and creating barricades on the streets. The fate of Warsaw was to be decided on its outskirts. The siege began on 6 September. Despite the bravery of Polish soldiers and comparable losses on both sides, two days later Warsaw surrendered.[171] The decision was not justified from a military point of view: if the Poles were to continue their struggle against Russia, defending the capital should have been the key element of their strategy. However, once again the lack of belief in success expressed by the upper ranks of the Polish Army prevailed. It was hardly surprising that many generals and officers, instead of joining the remaining forces in their march towards Modlin

---

[166] *Ibid*.

[167] Jan Krukowiecki (1772-1850), Polish general active during the Napoleonic Wars.

[168] Gadon, *Książę Adam Czartoryski podczas powstania listopadowego*, pp. 137–163.

[169] Krukowiecki was also the general-governor of Warsaw and the honourable member of the Patriotic Society. Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 79.

[170] *Ibid*., pp. 211-215.

[171] Łepkowski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 65. In face of these losses Leslie's claim that the war ended 'without another battle of the magnitude of Ostrołęka being fought' seems a great oversimplification. Leslie, *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830*, p. 220.

(north of Warsaw), decided to stay in the capital. A month after the surrender, the Polish Army, led by its last commander-in-chief, Generał Maciej Rybiński,[172] left the Kingdom of Poland and capitulated to Prussia. In his last daily order, Rybiński stated that

> we put down the arms we raised in the holy cause of independence and integrity of our fatherland… Soldiers! Let us go where we have to go. Let us sacrifice everything apart from our glory that no power would ever take from us. And we will wait for our death with calm and conviction that we served well our fatherland.[173]

With these words, the last dictator and commander-in-chief said farewell to the soldiers he never led to battle. With these words, the Great Emigration began.

Polish Diplomacy and the Polish Question in Europe

The November Uprising, despite being surrounded by hostile powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, was nevertheless an event of European importance, struggling to gain support and recognition from Britain and France. Polish diplomacy during the uprising was more consistent than the revolution's internal policy and, thanks to the efforts of the President of the National Government, Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, it undoubtedly helped in popularising the question of Polish independence in Europe.

As one of the oldest European diplomats (at the time of the outbreak of the November Uprising he was already 60 years old) Prince Adam Czartoryski personally knew almost every important member of the large European diplomatic family.[174] The uprising forced him once again to action, to use his old contacts and relations dating back to the Congress of Vienna and earlier. Failing to influence the internal politics of the Uprising and lacking a strong character that would have predestined him to lead the revolution,[175] Czartoryski was forced to follow rather than lead and to constantly adjust his policies to the developing situation at home. This was particularly visible in regard to the dethronement of Nicolas I from 25 January 1831. Although Czartoryski opposed the dethronement, he

---

[172] Maciej Rybiński (1784-1874), Polish general active during the Napoleonic Wars.

[173] *Ostatni rozkaz dzienny Jenerała Rybińskiego wydany do Wojska Polskiego pod d[atą] 4 października 1831 przy przejściu tegoż wojska w granice Pruskie*. BKCz 5299.

[174] M. Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, I, p. 175.

[175] Gadon, *Książę Adam Czartoryski podczas powstania listopadowego*, pp. 6–7.

quickly adjusted to the new situation by preparing a new instruction to the Polish envoys in Paris, which explained and defended that development from the legal point of view.[176]

Besides internal problems, Polish diplomacy had to deal with the hostile attitudes of Prussia and Austria, which made communications between Warsaw and Polish envoys abroad particularly difficult.[177] Even if the issue was partially dealt with after the creation of the Polish Agency in Paris (which supervised the activities of all envoys and coordinated contacts with Poland) in March 1831, in the first (and the most important) months of the uprising Polish diplomats struggled with staying in touch with Warsaw.[178] Moreover, Czartoryski was not always able to choose the best people for the diplomatic work at hand, a problem that to a certain degree influenced the general outcome of all his efforts. Neither Aleksander Wielopolski,[179] sent to London in December 1830, nor Konstanty Wolicki,[180] sent to Paris in the same month, had any diplomatic experience.[181] Finally, instead of securing the sympathy (or at least the neutrality) of the neighbouring powers, Austria and Prussia, the Prince had more faith in the intervention and support of Britain and France, considering them the main guarantors of the Treaty of Vienna and powers that were more interested in preventing the annexation of the Kingdom by Russia.[182] The Western orientation of Polish foreign politics became a long-lasting element of Czartoryski's activities during and after the uprising, foregrounding the understanding and recognition of the problem of Polish independence as one of the European Questions of the period, but, at the same time, failing to obtain anything but words of sympathy (see Chapter 4).

The key elements of Polish foreign policy in the first two months of the uprising were political moderation and a strong reliance on the Treaty of Vienna. The Poles demanded 'a solemn execution of the treaties, development of the institutions that had been

---

[176] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 86.

[177] Sz. Askenazy, 'Zabiegi Dyplomatyczne Polskie, 1830-1831', *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 1902, pp. 446–461.

[178] Wielopolski to the Paris Legation, 19 March 1831. BKCz 5309.

[179] Aleksander Wielopolski (1803-1877), Polish noble and politician. He served as the first Polish envoy to London during the November Uprising.

[180] Konstanty Wolicki (1792-1861), Polish nobleman, politician, and industrialist. He voluntarily went to Paris to represent the cause of Poland during the November Uprising.

[181] Askenazy, 'Zabiegi Dyplomatyczne Polskie, 1830-1831', pp. 434–441.

[182] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 154-156.

guaranteed [by the Polish Constitution and the Treaty of Vienna] and fulfilment of the promises that were made and solemnly repeated [i.e. Alexander I's plans of incorporating parts of Lithuania to the Kingdom of Poland]'.[183] The Polish revolution was presented not as a rebellion against the established order, but as the only way of expressing Polish dissatisfaction with the Russian rule and voicing the demand for long-promised changes and reforms. On this basis Czartoryski tried to create the illusion of a legitimate revolution that was not only devoid of terror and demagogy, but which also did not want to make any enemies.[184] In this rhetoric, which relied heavily on the Treaty of Vienna, not only was the uprising made justified, but almost legal. Comparisons with the Greek Question (see above) and appeals to British and European liberalism were also used in an attempt to obtain recognition and support for the cause of Poland, presented as much more significant than any other national problem of the period.[185]

The events of 25 January 1831 put an end to all attempts to create a legitimate ground for European intervention, opening the second phase of Polish foreign policy. In one day Poland was transformed from a rebellious province of the Russian Empire into an independent kingdom seeking European recognition. The act of dethronement was an attempt to revolutionise the uprising and, in many ways, it disturbed the anti-revolutionary and legalistic foreign policy of Czartoryski. All his efforts to de-revolutionise the revolution failed and the President of the National Government was forced to adjust to the new situation. As he explained,

> it is necessary to assure the other countries that we will be always ready to listen to their advice and do whatever will be good for Europe; it is also necessary to convince [Europe] that our revolution is truly Polish, that its aim is to regain the existence and independence [*istność i niepodległość*] of our fatherland, and not to overthrow the whole social order or spread the seeds of anarchy.[186]

---

[183] *Instruction pour Mr le Comte Alexandre Wielopolski charge de la Mission d'Angleterre* from 12 December 1830. BKCz 5308.

[184] A. Nowak, *Między carem a rewolucją* (Warszawa, 1994), p. 46.

[185] *Instruction pour Mr le Comte Alexandre Wielopolski charge de la Mission d'Angleterre* from 12 December 1830. BKCz 5308.

[186] Quoted after Gadon, *Książę Adam Czartoryski podczas powstania listopadowego*, p. 17.

In this speech, presented at the meeting of the *Sejm* in the last days of January 1831, Czartoryski outlined his vision of foreign policy, in which legalism and the Treaty of Vienna were replaced by the belief in European support and the Polish willingness to comply with the decisions of other countries.

Needless to say, Czartoryski hoped that the question of Polish independence would receive similar attention to the problems of Greece and Belgium, and all his actions after 25 January 1831 were driven by the search for the European recognition of Polish grievances.[187] While this speech was hardly a break with Czartoryski's conviction in the necessity of moderation, he successfully adjusted his opinions to avoid a clash with the national and bellicose mood of the *Sejm*. The opening a new chapter in the uprising on 25 January 1831 also led to the further complication of the Polish international situation.

In his new approach Czartoryski also tried to show that an independent Poland was important not only from the point of view of European liberalism, but also as a serious political power securing the balance of power in Central and Eastern Europe. Though the President of the National Government still hoped for a joint intervention of France and Britain, he did not hesitate to look for other international alliances that could help Poland. At a time when a French annexation of Belgium was a serious danger to European stability, Czartoryski put forward the idea of close cooperation between Britain and Austria in forming a counterbalance to French domination in the West by creating a strong Poland united with Austria in the East.[188] These ideas, as Wielopolski reported from London, failed to make any impression on British politicians.[189] Britain and France started to express greater interest in the fate of Poland only after the news of the spring successes of the Polish Army suggested that no quick resolution to the Polish revolution would be possible.[190] Even if by summer the Poles lacked any serious successes, Western Europe recognised the fact that Russian power was seriously shaken and, should the Poles last until

---

[187] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 158.

[188] *Supplement a l'Instruction Pour Mr le Comte Wielopolski, envoyé en Angleterre, eu date du 25 février 1831*. BKCz 5308.

[189] Wielopolski to the Paris Legation, 19 March 1831. BKCz 5309.

[190] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 169–172. For a detailed comparison of the Belgian and Polish revolutions, and their impact on European politics, see particularly Zajewski, *Polska, Belgia, Europa. Wiek XIX* (Olsztyn, 2007), pp.78-96.

winter, some kind of intervention might have been possible.[191] This was a significant change from the rather critical perception of the Polish uprising presented in the first months of 1831 (see Chapter 4). While shortly after its outbreak the revolution seemed to seriously endanger the European balance of power and universal peace, by summer 1831 it appeared that ignoring developments taking place in Poland was no longer possible. Unfortunately for Poles, the Battle of Ostrołęka put an end to any hopes of winning the war against Russia. When European diplomacy began to consider an intervention on behalf of Poland, the Polish revolution was no longer capable of offering any resistance to Russian forces.

As will be argued below (see Chapter 4) the decision to send envoys to France and Britain, their contacts with the governments of Western Europe and (in the case of France) with liberal and radical opposition, as well as the continuous presentation of arguments aimed at convincing both powers to provide Poland with diplomatic or military support played a crucial role in developing a deeper understanding of Polish grievances in the West. Although the diplomatic efforts of Polish envoys failed to bring any intervention on behalf of Poland, they nevertheless prepared the ground for further developments of the Polish Questions, which took place after the defeat of the uprising.

Polish and Belgian Questions in European Politics

The outbreak of the November Uprising was certainly an event of primary European importance.[192] As *The Times* observed, not without a sense of relief, in December 1830, 'the occurrence of such an event [i.e. a Polish revolt against Russia], which is by no means improbable, would explain the cause of the Russian armaments, without supposing them directed against France, and would set the west of Europe for some time at rest from any fears of an anti-revolutionary crusade'.[193] Similar opinions appeared in French newspapers. The *Journal des débats* wrote that a Polish revolution may 'create new interests; and new interests may, in turn, create new duties', suggesting that France may be forced to take

[191] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 21 September 1831. BA, PP/GC/HE/152.
[192] J. Dutkiewicz, *Francja a Polska w 1831 r.* (Łódź, 1950), p. 36.
[193] *The Times*, 11 December 1830.

active part in the affairs of Poland.[194] However, despite such sympathy for the uprising, on a political and diplomatic level from the point of view of Britain and France the issue of Polish independence was only of secondary, if not tertiary, importance. Both countries remained much more interested in the fate of Belgium than Poland.

The Belgian Revolution became the subject of international diplomacy only after the Netherlands failed to quell the rebellion during the first months following its outbreak.[195] Despite some desperate attempts of the Dutch to exclude France from any discussions regarding Belgium (based on the widespread conviction that the revolution in Belgium was linked with the July Revolution in France and the importance of Belgium to French political interests in the region[196]), the involvement of the July Monarchy in the London Conference seemed the only appropriate solution, confirming its international position and preventing it from any military action in Belgium. The British Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, presided over the Conference after the fall of the Wellington government, enjoying the 'double' prestige as the host and the only Foreign Minister taking part in the discussions.[197] The other representatives included Prince Talleyrand[198] ('old Talley' as Palmerston called him[199]), the French special envoy who sympathised with the Polish cause and was well known for ignoring the instructions he received from Paris;[200] and Prince Lieven,[201] the Russian ambassador, whose wife remained on very friendly terms

---

[194] *Journal des débats*, 10 December 1830. The same news appeared in *Le constitutionel* one day later, though without any editorial comment. *Le constitutionel*, 11 December 1830.

[195] Fishman, *Diplomacy and Revolution*, p. 19.

[196] *Ibid*., p. 41.

[197] D. Brown, *Palmerston*, p. 147.

[198] Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754–1838), French diplomat, politician, and special envoy to the London Conference.

[199] Quoted after D. Brown, *Palmerston*, p. 150.

[200] Sapieha visited Talleyrand as early as December 1830 and the old Frenchman remained an active supporter and adviser of all Polish envoys who arrived in London. L. Sapieha, *Wspomnienia (z lat od 1803 do 1863 r.)* (Poznań, n.d.), pp. 116-118. J. Dackiewicz, *Synowie Napoleona. Aleksander Walewski* (Łódź, 1978), pp. 122–125.

[201] Christoph Heinrich von Lieven (1774-1838), Russian diplomat of Livonian origin serving as the Russian ambassador to London in 1812-1834.

with Prime Minister Grey (she had been his lover in the 1820s[202]), accompanied by a Pole, Andrzej Matuszewicz.[203] Austria was represented by Prince Esterhazy[204] and Baron Wessenberg[205]; and Prussia – by Freiherr von Bülow.[206] After the initial debates, the Conference agreed that, since the representatives of the same five powers created the union between Belgium and the Netherlands at the Congress of Vienna, they could also dissolve it.[207] A Protocol from 20 December 1830 became, thus, the basis for the future peaceful settlement of the Belgian Question, despite the problems faced by the Conference in the following year.

The Belgium affair was part of a much wider problem that troubled European politics since the Congress of Vienna: the problem of intervention and non-intervention. Although all powers agreed to adhere to the principle of non-intervention in their mutual internal problems, the issue of the involvement in affairs of smaller states was not so clear-cut in comparison.[208] The Belgian Revolution proved that, to repeat the oft-quoted *mot* by Talleyrand, non-intervention could mean the same thing as intervention.[209] In spite of the fact that none of the powers really intervened in the affairs of the Netherlands, the London Conference in whole, though officially seeking a peaceful resolution of the crisis, was itself an international intervention in the internal affairs of the Netherlands.[210] This intervention in disguise was possible only because the king of the Netherlands requested international

---

[202] Charmley also suggests that she had her say in the choice of Palmerston for the position of British Foreign Secretary. J. Charmley, *The Princess and the Politicians. Sex, Intrigue and Diplomacy in Regency England* (London, 2006), pp. 103, 194-198.

[203] Andrzej Matuszewicz (1796-182), Polish nobleman in Russian service. Sapieha left a very critical assessment of Matuszewicz (who tried to be more Russian than Russians) and his actions in London. Sapieha, *Wspomnienia*, pp. 113-114.

[204] Prince Pál Antal Esterházy de Galántha (1786-1866), Hungarian nobleman serving as the Austrian ambassador to London.

[205] Baron Johann von Wessenberg-Ampringen (1773-1858), Austrian diplomat, ambassador in The Hague. He supported Esterhazy at the London Conference.

[206] Heinrich Freiherr von Bülow (1732-1846), Prussian statesman and diplomat.

[207] Fishman, *Diplomacy and Revolution*, p. 86.

[208] Dutkiewicz, *Francja a Polska w 1831 r.*, pp. 22–28.

[209] D. Brown, *Palmerston*, p. 146.

[210] Although the situation changed in 1831, forcing Britain and France to intervene on behalf of Belgium, their action was the result of the Dutch refusal to comply with the resolutions of the London Conference. In other words, even their military intervention was not seen as breaking the rule on non-intervention that all powers agreed on.

mediation in solving the problem of Belgium, and also because all powers expressed their *désintéressement* in the affairs of the country on behalf of which they were intervening (with the official declaration of France expressed by Sébastiani as early as in early January 1831).[211] Non-intervention preserved European peace and the balance of power, the two principles that the British Government (and Palmerston in particular) deemed the most important.

Unfortunately for the November Uprising, the same principles that saved Belgium were unable to save Poland. Despite the detailed regulations of its status present in the Treaty of Vienna, there was very little doubt that the Kingdom of Poland was, and would remain, under the Russian sphere of influence. Nicholas I openly refused to accept any involvement of foreign powers in the affairs of the Kingdom, making clear that he considered the Polish revolution an internal problem of his Empire (see Chapter 4). The situation was, therefore, completely different from that in the Netherlands, where William of Orange officially requested the help of European powers in dealing with his rebellious subjects. Despite the initial difficulties and defeats suffered by the Russian Army in the Kingdom of Poland, Nicholas I was determined to quell the Uprising without any support from foreign powers. Moreover, while all European powers agreed that it was crucial for the balance of power to prevent France from extending too much influence over Belgium, no similar understanding was possible on the subject of Poland.

* * *

The November Uprising was a result of the long-term grievances of the Polish nation, the violations of the constitution of the Kingdom of Poland by Russia, and years of disappointment with Russian policies towards the Kingdom. In its international context, it can be seen as an event of European importance that, according to some Polish historians, prevented Russian intervention in Belgium and, potentially, a new European war.[212] However, Poland was not and could not have been a second Belgium, despite Czartoryski's

---

[211] 'The king of the French gives Europe the example of a great disinterestedness and political loyalty'. Sébastiani to Talleyrand, 5 January 1831. De Broglie (ed.), *Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand*, IV (Paris, 1891), pp. 6-7.

[212] See particularly W. Zajewski, *Polska, Belgia, Europa. Wiek XIX* (Olsztyn, 2007), pp. 78-86.

attempts to link the subject of Belgium with the question of Poland (both during and after the November Uprising).[213] Political principles which saved Belgium could not save Poland. In the same way as the conspirators of 29 November looked upon 'the leaders of the nation' for guidance and the willingness to take over the torch of the revolution, the leaders (particularly Prince Czartoryski) hoped that European liberalism (represented by the governments of France and Britain) would save them from Russian vengeance. With the Belgian Question occupying all major European powers, the outbreak of the Polish uprising turned out to be a distant matter.

The bad timing of the uprising became evident shortly after its outbreak and, with the rest of Europe preoccupied with the affairs of Belgium, no significant support for Poland was possible.[214] However, this fact did not, and could not, prevent Polish diplomacy from continuous actions in France and Britain aimed at promoting the cause of Poland in the West. While the actions of Polish envoys did not bring any successful resolution to the question of Polish independence, they nevertheless helped in preserving the name and the problem of Poland in the West, a factor which, as will be shown below, became crucial in the establishment of the Great Emigration.

---

[213] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Sprawa belgijska w działalności politycznej księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1833)', pp. 5-30.

[214] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 98.

Chapter 2: Europe, Britain, and the Great Emigration (1831-1841)

If the November Uprising was an event of European importance, strongly intertwined with other European events of 1830 and 1831, the Great Emigration that followed had even stronger claims for international significance. As this chapter argues, through the whole decade the Polish émigrés who found asylum in countries of Western Europe (particularly in France, but also in Britain, Belgium and Switzerland) played a significant role in international politics. Not only did the international events of the 1830s make a serious impact on the Great Emigration, but also the Polish exiles themselves (particularly Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski and his supporters) influenced the European politics of the period.

This chapter presents two aspects of post-1830 European history. Firstly, it analyses the international situation in the aftermath of the revolutions in France, Belgium and Poland and the course European politics took in the decade that followed. Although all five great European powers worked hard to preserve the balance of power, ideological difference between the liberal West and the autocratic East became one of the major sources of tension. Despite the hopes of the Polish exiles, these issues did not lead to any serious clash or conflict that would undermine the settlement of 1815. Secondly, this chapter introduces the problem of the Great Emigration – an exceptional political exile of the Polish officers, politicians, intellectuals, publicists and, to much smaller extent, also rank-and-file soldiers that followed the November Uprising.[215] While the November Uprising became the major factor contributing to the emergence of the problem of Poland in European political life, it was the Great Emigration that preserved that awareness of the question of Polish independence. As will be argued later (see Chapter 4), the Polish Questions in Great Britain came to being and evolved in response to all three (European, British, and Polish) factors, which in turn influenced the way in which the problem of Poland became understood in

[215] For the most important works on the subject of the Great Emigration see particularly L. Gadon, *Emigracya polska: Pierwsze lata po upadku powstania listopadowego*, 3 vols. (Kraków, 1901). S. Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja 1831-1863*. J. Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja po powstaniu listopadowym* (Warszawa, 1987). For English histories of the Great Emigration see for example A. P. Coleman, 'The Great Emigration' and M. Gardner 'The Great Emigration and Polish Romanticism', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 311-335.

Britain and beyond. Outlining these intertwined and, sometimes, contradictory elements and policies is, therefore, crucial in understanding the Polish Questions and the ways in which they were shaped by the Polish exiles and the British friends of Poland.

Europe and the Defeat of the November Uprising

The fall of Warsaw 'produced profound emotion' in Paris.[216] Crowds gathered in the streets and boulevards, and people attacked the building of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.[217] It was not surprising that the French Government was accused of inactivity: early expressions of the Government's sympathy failed to bring any active support for the Polish Uprising.[218] Sebastiani's unfortunate quote about 'order ruling in Warsaw' led to widespread criticism of his foreign policy and appeals for decisive political action against Russian atrocities.[219] As Adolphe de Bourqueney[220] noted, 'France loves Poland, it feels sorry for it, it admires it, but what can it do for it?'.[221] Although France did not do a lot for Poland during its struggle against Russia (and, as was pointed out above, it used the Polish Uprising to distance itself from all revolutionary movements in Europe),[222] it was soon to become the centre of the Polish exile after the Uprising. Failing to protect Poland, the July Monarchy at least

---

[216] *Le Constitutionnel*, 17 September 1831.

[217] *Morning Post*, 20 September 1831.

[218] Despite Sébastiani's promise of support, also repeated by Talleyrand, as early as in January 1831 the French Government expressed its disassociation from the Polish Uprising to Russia. This development was possibly linked with British unwillingness to coordinate any pro-Polish intervention with France in late December 1830. For Sébastiani's promise of help, see Sapieha, *Wspomnienia*, p. 111. See also Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity 1770-1861*, p. 174-175. For French proposals of mediation see Palmerston to Heytesbury, 31 December 1830. BA PP/GC/HE/146. For the French abandonment of the cause of Poland see Heytesbury to Palmerston, 3 January 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/134. See also Sébastiani to Talleyrand, 5 January 1831. De Broglie (ed.), *Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand*, IV, pp. 6-7.

[219] In Polish historiography we find this quote in the first volume of Gadon's history of Polish Emigration, though Dutkiewicz proves that in fact the Sebastiani used different words in a completely different context. However, this did not stop some newspapers from giving an untrue quote. See Gadon, *Emigracja polska*, I, p. 115; Dutkiewicz, *Francja a Polska*, p. 139. See also *Le Constitutionel*, 17 September 1831.

[220] Francoise Adolphe De de Bourqueney (1799-1869), French publicist, writer and diplomat.

[221] Quoted after J. M. Knapp, *Behind the Diplomatic Curtain. Adolphe de Bourqueney and French Foreign Policy, 1816-1869* (Arkon, 2001), p. 60.

[222] The majority of French pro-Polish initiatives came from below. See M. Brown, 'The Comite Franco-Polonais and the French Reaction to the Polish Uprising of November 1830', *The English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), pp. 774–793. L. S. Kramer, 'The Rights of Man: Lafayette and the Polish National Revolution 1830-1834', *French Social Studies*, 14.4 (1986), pp. 521-546. R. E. Spiller, 'Fenimore Cooper and Lafayette: Friends of Polish Freedom, 1830-1832', *American Literature*, 7.1 (1935), pp. 56–75.

protected and took care of the Polish refugees that started streaming through its borders in late September and November 1831.[223]

Despite sympathy towards Poland, which was expressed by the British press throughout the whole period of the November Uprising, the reactions were not as strong as on the other side of the Channel. Throughout September *The Times* lamented the lack of any direct information about the fate of Warsaw: it was known that the Russian Army advanced towards the capital from late August, but for over a week there was 'nothing to remove the uncertainty, or relieve the anxiety, which prevails respecting the fate of that country'.[224] When more reliable news regarding the fall of Warsaw arrived in London (the first appearing in the *Standard* on 17 September[225]), it was welcomed with a sense of 'lively sensation'[226] and cautious disbelief. 'If Warsaw was well provisioned, as it was stated to be', suggested the *Standard*, 'the deliberate resolution of the army to abandon it, in any event, seems irreconcilable with what we have lately seen of the wisdom and gallantry of the Polish counsels'.[227] The news and the editorial published on the pages of this conservative newspaper, which had previously limited itself to rather infrequent information about the progress of the Polish-Russian war, can be considered the best proof of the universal importance of the fall of Warsaw.

Even if the anonymous correspondent of *The Times* claimed that 'in a country where the whole population rises in defence of independence… there can, properly speaking, be no capital; or, if there be, it is in the camp, where the defenders of the sacred cause are resolved to die or conquer',[228] it appeared obvious that the cause of Poland suffered 'a death-blow'[229] that was widely considered the beginning of the end of the Polish

---

[223] R. Bielecki, *Zarys rozproszenia Wielkiej Emigracji we Francji. 1831-1837. Materiały z archiwów francuskich* (Warszawa-Łódź, 1986), p. 7.

[224] *The Times*, 17 September 1831.

[225] *Standard*, 17 September 1831.

[226] *The Times*, 19 September 1831.

[227] *Standard*, 17 September 1831.

[228] *The Times*, 19 September 1831. There is good evidence to suggest that the correspondent was in fact Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, the Polish envoy residing at the time in London (see Chapter 4). In his conversation with Lord Grey at the same day he used similar arguments as those presented in *The Times*' correspondence. See Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 59–62.

[229] *Standard*, 17 September 1831.

uprising. It was not only the cause of Poland that suffered with the surrender of Warsaw, but also the prestige of the Polish Army and the myth that surrounded its continuous struggle against what was perceived to be the most powerful army in Europe. What seemed a single death-blow to the cause of Poland was, in fact, a double one.

Regardless of the difficult situation of the Polish insurgents (or perhaps because of it),

> the strongest manifestations of sympathy with the Poles have taken place [in London]. Grief, and indignation, and various other fine feelings, have displayed themselves at both extremities of the capital[…] There were but two modes whereby the people of this country could effectually have succoured the Poles. The first was by *compelling* the Government to take strenuous measures, in concurrence with France, for their safety from the attacks of Russia. The second was by liberal pecuniary subscriptions.[230]

It is impossible to say what type of manifestations there were in London, since *The Times* was the only metropolitan newspaper mentioning them. No information about them appeared in any contemporary account, suggesting that whatever happened in the British capital after the news of the surrender appeared in the press was rather small and insignificant event, particularly in comparison with what had been happening at the same time in Paris. While the problem of Poland became one of the rallying points for the French parliamentary opposition to the July Monarchy,[231] in Britain the cause of Poland was not so closely connected with contemporary politics. Consequently, while in France the fall of Warsaw became yet another reason to manifest pro-Polish sympathies, in London the same event, though met with surprise, led to a slow decline of public interest in the cause of Poland.[232]

Paradoxically, this was coupled with the growing attention paid to the affairs of Poland by the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston. In his despatch to Lord

---

[230] *The Times*, 20 September 1831.

[231] See particularly M. Brown 'The Comité Franco-Polonais and the French Reaction to the Polish Uprising of November 1830' and Kramer, 'The Rights of Man: Lafayette and the Polish National Revolution 1830-1834'.

[232] Even if, as Gleason suggests, the November Uprising contributed to the raise of British Russophobia, in contemporary accounts there is very little to suggest that the cause of Poland was perceived through the prism of the growing public distrust towards the Russian Empire. J.H. Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain* (Oxford, 1950), pp. 107–134.

Heytesbury, the British Ambassador in St Petersburg, sent there after the confirmed news of the surrender arrived in London, wrote that 'the time [has] now come when the Powers… *may* interfere in Polish affairs'.[233] It is very significant that Palmerston, having rejected French suggestions of joint mediation in December 1830,[234] changed his approach and appeared ready to cooperate not only with France, but also with Austria and Prussia. He was, at the same time, carefully avoiding the subject of the uprising and the intervention he proposed was to prevent Russia from retaliating against the Kingdom of Poland and making any changes to its legal and political status. As the Foreign Secretary instructed Lord Heytesbury, he was 'to express the confident hope of the English Gvt that no change will be made in the Polish Constitution',[235] a reminder that the instructions that had been sent to Heytesbury earlier that year had not changed.[236]

Both in private and official correspondence Palmerston presented himself not as a defender of the revolution, but as a defender of peace; someone concerned primarily with the restoration of the pre-revolutionary order in the Kingdom of Poland. Explaining his policy towards Russia and Poland in a long memorandum, he wrote that

> we declined to propose mediation and to send mediating squadrons to the Black Sea, and the Baltic; but we did so, in confidence that the Emperor would respect treaties, as well as we, and in telling him that we had declined, we distinctly stated that we could not with indifference see the Poles deprived of their advantages which had been secured to the by the Treaty of Vienna.[237]

Unfortunately, Palmerston's liberal logic could not have worked in the East, where Nicholas I refused any foreign intervention in the affairs of his Empire and was 'determined to act with that severity & rigour, of which we, & others, so loudly complained'.[238] The idea of intervention on behalf of Poland soon disappeared completely after Heytesbury reported in early 1832 that, according to his information, 'France considers the Polish

---

[233] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 21 September 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/152.
[234] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 31 December 1830. BA PP/GC/HE/146.
[235] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 21 September 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/152.
[236] Palmerston, to Heytesbury, 22 March 1831. National Archive (hereafter: NA) FO 417-2.
[237] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 23 November 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/153
[238] Heytesbury to Palmerston, 18 December 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/133.

question to be entirely settled, & that she will interfere no more'.[239] As will be discussed in Chapter 4, Palmerston's attitude towards Russia during and after the uprising, as well as his position at the head of British foreign affairs throughout the 1830s, made him one of the central figures of Prince Czartoryski's post-1830 politics. That centrality was not undermined by the Foreign Secretary's criticism of the uprising or his reluctance towards active British involvement in in the affairs of Eastern Europe.

The Great Emigration Emerges

Although for many foreign observers the unexpected surrender of Warsaw was the last act of the Polish-Russian war, the fact that the Polish Army left the capital in relatively good condition offered many opportunities for further resistance.[240] However, the *Sejm*, playing the role of the highest national power after Krukowiecki's decision to surrender the capital, instead of debating the problem of further resistance, devoted its proceedings to the question of how to preserve 'the national honour'.[241] The only way of preserving the moral strength of the nation was, according to the deputies, to avoid surrender to Russians and seek support abroad.[242] Together with the remaining members of the National Government, under the protection of the Cracovian corps of Ulans, the members of the *Sejm* left the Kingdom of Poland in late September 1831, crossing the border with Prussia and hurrying to France.[243] They were followed by the Army, which left the Kingdom on 5 October.[244] It was a political and ideological, rather than military, decision. That day, wrote one contemporary, 'should be called the day of the great mourning'.[245] It was also the first step

---

[239] Heytesbury to Palmerston, 3 January 1832. BA PP/GC/HE/134.

[240] It was one of the arguments used by Niemcewicz in his discussions with British politicians after the news of the fall of Warsaw arrived in London. See Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 59–62.

[241] M. Rostworowski (ed.), *Dyariusz Sejmu z r. 1830-1831*, VI, p. 703. The discussion was strongly influenced by the problem of national representation after the dissolution of the *Sejm*, referring, in many cases, to a similar debate that took place shortly after the successful defence of Warsaw in late February 1831. See Roztworowski, *Dyariusz Sejmu*, II, pp. 139-160.

[242] Łepkowski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, pp. 66–67.

[243] Zajewski, *Powstanie listopadowe*, p. 233.

[244] The main Polish Army was not the first to surrender in such a way. It had been preceded by other corps that had surrendered either to Austrians (Dwernicki in April, Ramorino and Różycki in September) or Prussians (Chłapowski, Giełgud, and Roland in July).

[245] Quoted in H. Żalinski, *Stracone szanse: Wielka Emigracja o powstaniu listopadowym* (Warszawa, 1982), p. 274.

of what was to be later called the Great Emigration. This mass exodus of Polish soldiers, officers, and politicians had been preceded by several groups that left the Kingdom of Poland earlier (including the infamous corps of Giełgud and Dwernicki[246]), but the core of the future Great Emigration was created by those who left the Kingdom of Poland with the main Polish Army in September and October 1831.

Crossing the borders with Prussia and Austria was just the first step of the long lasting Polish exile. Some contemporaries later claimed that the conclusion of the uprising 'plunged the whole Nation into the abyss'.[247] The abyss that was the result of the defeat caused 'not by [the enemy's] arms, but by the treason of the disgraced [*wyrodków zdrada*]'.[248] The exodus was led by politicians (the *Sejm* and the National Government, as well as many individuals politically active during the uprising). Unlike the soldiers (detained by the Prussian and Austrian military authorities), these civilians were free to go wherever they pleased. For many of them the main, and indeed the only, place to go was Paris.[249] Small numbers of Polish exiles (mostly liberals and democrats like Joachim Lelewel and Maurycy Mochnacki) arrived there in November and December 1831,[250] thinking that the first ones to establish themselves in France would rule over the Polish émigrés.[251] The early attempts at creating a party that would represent the Polish emigration as a whole already failed in 1831 – within a month two different committees came into being, but only one of them (the Polish National Committee [*Komitet Narodowy Polski*] under the leadership of Joachim Lelewel) survived.[252]

Several weeks later, with the arrival of Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski in London, a type of a new centre of power came into being. Czartoryski's noble background, political

---

[246] General Antoni Giełgud (1792-1831) commanded the Polish Army in Lithuania. After failing to make any decisive progress against the Russians in the area, he retreated and crossed the border with East Prussia, where he was killed by one of his soldiers. General Józef Dwernicki (1779-1857) commanded a Polish corps in the area of Volhynia, Podolia, and Ukraine. After several clashes with the Russian Army he retreated and crossed the border with Austrian Galicia.

[247] Quoted in Żalinski, *Stracone szanse*, p. 275.

[248] 'Rocznica 29 listopada' in K. Gaszyński, *Poezje* (Paryż, 1844), p. 139.

[249] Gadon, *Emigracya polska: Pierwsze lata po upadku powstania listopadowego*, I, pp. 119–120.

[250] Bielecki, *Zarys rozproszenia Wielkiej Emigracji we Francji*, pp. 7–8.

[251] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 82.

[252] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 15–16.

prestige as the former advisor of Tsar Alexander I, and diplomatic experience did not translate to his wide recognition as the official representative of Poland in exile, but at least opened doors to offices of British and French statesmen, something that Polish liberals and descendants of the radical Patriotic Society could never achieve. Czartoryski did not stay in Britain for long. After the initial failure of his attempts to obtain any significant support for the cause of Poland from the British Government he left London and settled down in Paris, and it was the French capital that served as the centre for his politics for the rest of Czartoryski's life (see Chapter 4).[253]

At the same time when members of the National Government and the Patriotic Society, as well as other prominent leaders of the uprising, started their struggle for power in Paris, the French Government had to face the growing numbers of military refugees. In order to deal with hundreds of soldiers and officers arriving in France,[254] the government created two special *dépots* in Avignon (for soldiers) and in Chateauroux (for civilians).[255] The division soon lost its importance when the authorities moved the responsibility for the exiles from the Ministry of War to the Ministry of the Interior (in April 1833).[256] This decision was followed by the transfer of the refugees to smaller places across France and, by the end of 1833, Poles resided in over a hundred different towns and cities, with no more than one hundred exiles in each.[257] The French Government perceived the Polish exiles as a potentially destabilising element and decisions to distribute the refugees across the whole country were aimed at lessening any danger they might have posed to the politically unstable situation in the country. This was also the reason behind the law that prevented any Poles from settling in Paris. Despite these changes, one element of French policy towards the Polish exiles in these early years remained steadfast: the problem of financial help for the Poles. Strikingly, not only French liberals advocated the issue of pecuniary

---

[253] For more details about Czartoryski's political activities in London see particularly Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Działalność Księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego w Wielkiej Brytanii*.

[254] For a detailed account of the arrival of Polish refugees in France see Bielecki, *Zarys rozproszenia Wielkiej Emigracji we Francji*, pp. 12–13.

[255] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 8.

[256] *Ibid*., p. 10.

[257] *Ibid*.

support, but also it received backing from conservatives.[258] With time, however, the Government regretted its initial benevolence and by 1834 started to refuse entry and financial support to new exiles reaching its borders.

Meanwhile, the position of Britain was completely different. British political and cultural ties with Poland were far weaker than those between France and Poland and, despite Czartoryski's deep belief in British support for the November Uprising, it never materialised. Even Czartoryski's arrival in London could not change the critical approach of the British Government to the cause of Poland (see Chapter 4). To the Polish exiles, Britain appeared a distant and unwelcoming land. While all Polish exiles willingly headed towards France, those who arrived in Britain did so by accident and most of them, after a few weeks' stay, left for France (for more details see Chapter 5). In consequence, Britain did not gain its status of the second largest centre of the Great Emigration until 1834.[259] Poles also sought refuge in other countries, particularly Belgium (where many of them entered the newly created Belgian Army)[260] and Switzerland,[261] but neither the numbers nor the importance of the groups that established themselves there were comparable with those in France and, in the later period, Britain.

The emergence of the Great Emigration and the establishment of Polish exiles in France and Britain in the early 1830s was an event of double importance. Firstly, together with the November Uprising, the Polish exile was a particularly significant occurrence from the perspective of Polish history, something that the refugees themselves seemed to be fully aware of. Secondly, by showing that the defeat of their anti-Russian struggle was not the end of the significance of the question of Polish independence, the exiles contributed to the preservation and development of the Polish Question in France and Britain.

---

[258] G. Noiriel, *Refugieset sans-Papiers* (Paris, 2012), pp. 38–40.

[259] M. K. Cybowski, 'First and Last Refuge: France and Britain as Centres of the Polish Great Emigration', in *John Bull and the Continent* (Frankfurt am Main, 2015), pp. 66–70. More details about the position of Britain among the Polish exiles will be presented in Chapter 5.

[260] See for example K. Kaminski, 'Polacy w Belgii w latach 1832-1863', *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 21.6 (1977). I. Goddeeris, 'The First Years of Belgian Alien Policy: Decentralization Measures and Government Relief for Polish Refegees in the 1830s', *The Polish Review*, 45.1 (2000), pp. 65–96.

[261] See for example F. A. Cramer, 'Polacy w Genewie w latach 1831-1839'. *Materiały do biografii, genealogii i heraldyki polskiej* (Warszawa, 2005), pp. 9–53.

Europe after the Defeat of the November Uprising (1831-1841)

1830 brought about the first serious change in international relations since the Congress of Vienna in 1815.[262] Although agreement between all five powers on the separation of Belgium and the Netherlands was dictated by political necessity, soon the ways of the liberal West (mainly France and Britain) and the autocratic East (Russia, Prussia, and Austria) started to separate. The Renewal of the Holy Alliance in Münchengrätz in 1833, followed by the creation of the Quadruple Alliance of Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal in 1834, were signs of growing discord.[263] However, successful British cooperation with Austria in bringing the war between Turkey and Egypt to an end in 1833, as well as the events of the later part of the decade, when Britain allied with all three powers of the Holy Alliance to end another Eastern Crisis, showed that the East-West ideological divide did not made any significant impact on British *realpolitik* (and, indeed, that fear of French expansion remained significant element of British foreign policy even decades after the Napoleonic Wars).[264] Political alliances of that period depended less on ideology and far more on national interests and attempts to retain the difficult balance of power, while the leading diplomats seemed to ignore ideological differences when it suited them.[265] That factor became one of the most difficult elements of the Polish politics in exile, Polish relations with Britain and France, and the Polish Questions in general. While the Poles did everything they could to undermine the existing *status quo*, not only the Holy Alliance, but even France and Britain, despite their occasional disagreements, worked to support it and avoid any major European conflict. And, as it was widely agreed among the Polish exiles, only a new conflict would help in restoring Polish independence.[266]

The main area where the interests of almost all five powers clashed during the 1830s was the Near East. At a the time when the Belgian Question was still being discussed

---

[262] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign*, p. 184. Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia*, p. 114.

[263] J. Droz, *Europe between Revolutions, 1815-1848* (Glasgow, 1988), pp. 235–236. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 724-725.

[264] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 712. See also O. J. Hammen, 'Free Europe Versus Russia, 1830-1854', *American Slavic and East European Review*, 11.1 (1952), p. 27.

[265] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 726.

[266] The earliest and the most significant expression of that Polish hope can be found in Adam Mickiewicz's 'Lithany' published in *Books of Polish Wandering and Pilgrimage*.

in London and when the Reform Bill was still far from being concluded in Britain (see Chapter 4), the Eastern Question regained its international importance after the rupture between Turkey and Egypt in 1832.[267] Once the Turkish army was defeated by Egyptians under the leadership of Mehmet Ali's son Ibrahim (who several years earlier had fought against the Greeks, see Chapter 1) in 1832 and Ibrahim's forces found themselves close to Constantinople, the Sultan decided to seek European support that could protect him and his empire.[268] With British attention almost entirely occupied with the still unresolved problem of Belgium, and France openly sympathizing with Mehmet Ali, it was Russia who proved to be the saviour of Turkey.[269] Although it appeared that Nicholas I's decisions were based on his attempt to preserve rather than destroy the Ottoman Empire, the Russian forces' arrival on both the European and Asian shores of the Bosphorus in February 1833 was certainly something that made European politicians rather uneasy.[270] Russian dominance over the Ottoman Empire was as dangerous as its alleged schemes for the partition of Turkey.[271] Palmerston was forced to adjust his foreign policy in the East and, in cooperation with Metternich, Britain and Austria persuaded the Sultan to seek peace with Mehmet Ali by offering him Syria and Adana.[272] The agreement, known as the Convention of Kutaya (April-May 1833), was followed by the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi (July 1833), this time signed between Russia and Turkey. The treaty allowed Russian ships to pass through the Straits from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, threatening the position of France and Britain in the region. Apart from its international importance, the crisis made a serious impact on Polish politics in exile, forcing Prince Adam Czartoryski to re-evaluate his foreign policy and shift his political interests from France and Britain to Turkey, Egypt and even beyond (see Chapters 4 and 5).

---

[267] R. B. Mowat, 'The Near East and France, 1829-1847'. *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 164.
[268] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 73.
[269] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, pp. 84–85.
[270] G. H. Bolsover, 'Nicholas I and the Partition of Turkey', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 27.68 (1948), p. 119. See also Clarke, p. 198.
[271] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, pp. 87–89.
[272] Mowat, 'The Near East and France, 1829-1847', p. 165.

All European powers looked at the Turkish-Russian treaty with distrust, but Nicholas I quickly dismissed the worries of his fellow autocratic allies at a conference that took place in Münchengrätz in September 1833.[273] Although that renewal of the Holy Alliance was certainly a significant step in separating the East and the West, relations between France and Britain were much more complicated than those between Russia, Prussia, and Austria.[274] While both powers cooperated in their attempt to resolve the prolonged Belgian affair, deciding on armed intervention and blockade of Dutch ports in 1832,[275] their position towards the Eastern Question was completely different. France favoured Mehmet Ali and his dreams of replacing the Sultan, while for the British Government the preservation of the Ottoman Empire, after the failure to act in its defence in 1833, became one of the defining elements of foreign policy in the East.[276] These differences did not prevent France and Britain from creating the Quadruple Alliance, which was aimed at the creation of a liberal counterbalance to the autocratic Holy Alliance.[277] The problems of the Iberian Peninsula prevented the new liberal alliance from playing any significant role in European politics, but, at the same time, it helped in normalising French-British relations in the aftermath of the London Conference, even if only for a short time.[278]

In the meantime, to Czartoryski's dismay, France and Britain failed to cooperate in what was the only political crisis associated with Poland in the post-1831 decade – the problem of the occupation of Cracow. At the Congress of Vienna Cracow was made a Free State, strictly neutral, under the protection of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, its three neighbours.[279] Despite the numerous interventions in the internal affairs of the city in the two decades that followed, none of them became a subject of international interest and scrutiny until 1836. In February that year, in response to the assassination of an Austrian spy in Cracow, the three protecting powers decided to intervene in the affairs of the city in

---

[273] *Ibid*., p. 167. Bolsover, 'Nicholas I and the Partition of Turkey', p. 119. Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, pp. 100–101. J. Skowronek, *Od konspiracji do kapitulacji*, p. 9.
[274] Mowat, 'The Near East and France, 1829-1847', pp. 168–169.
[275] Omond, 'Belgium, 1830-1839', p. 154.
[276] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 202.
[277] *Ibid*., p. 199.
[278] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, pp. 72–73.
[279] J. Feldman, 'The Polish Provinces', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 342-344.

a more active way than before, using the assassination as an excuse to demand the expulsion from Cracow of Polish refugees, who had sought refuge in the city after the November Uprising.[280] The Senate of the Free State was ready to comply with these demands, but, finding the Polish response to their demands unsatisfactory, the protecting powers decided that military occupation of Cracow would offer much more security to their own interests in the area. A direct break of several articles of the Treaty of Vienna, the occupation failed to serve as a uniting factor of British and French policies.[281]

If we consider 1836 as the year when Britain and France failed to work together for the promotion of liberal principles in Europe by allowing Russia, Prussia and Austria to occupy Cracow, a few years later both countries almost openly clashed in the second Eastern Crisis in this decade.[282] This time, when the hostilities between Turkey and Egypt broke out in 1839, it was Palmerston who led the diplomatic offensive in the East, trying to come to terms with France and Russia.[283] However, the bellicose policy of the French Government, as well as its official support for Mehmet Ali, made cooperation with France impossible.[284] Since the disintegration or the partitioning of Turkey was not an option, Palmerston decided to cooperate with the Northern Powers in order to preserve the Ottoman Empire, leaving France diplomatically isolated.

Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia signed the Convention for the Pacification of the Levant in July 1840, followed by British bombardment of Acre in November that year. Eventually, after Thiers[285] was replaced by Guizot[286] as the French Prime Minister, all five powers agreed to adhere by the Straits Convention, which was signed in July 1841. Russia

---

[280] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 35.

[281] For more details about the international status of Cracow, see Chapter 7.

[282] The question of Belgian independence, which remained unresolved until 1830 and returned to the attention of European politics in 1838-9, was yet another proof of British and French inability to cooperate successfully. Czartoryski's attempts to bridge the gaps between both countries proved unsuccessful. See Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Działalność polityczna księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii w sprawie belgijskiej (1838-1839)', pp. 5-20.

[283] D. Brown, *Palmerston*, pp. 214–219. Mowat, 'The Near East and France, 1829-1847', p. 174.

[284] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 74.

[285] Adolphe Thiers (1797–1877), French politician, statesman, and historian. He served as the Prime Minister of France in 1836 and as the Minister of Foreign Affairs from March to October 1840.

[286] François Pierre Guillaume Guizot (1787–1874), French politician, statesman, and historian. He served as the Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1840 to 1848.

did not renew the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi and the powers agreed that no warships would be allowed to enter the Straits in peacetime.[287] Diplomatically, the way in which Palmerston dealt with the crisis can be considered as a great success, but victories abroad were balanced with defeats at home and two months after signing the Straits Convention Melbourne's[288] government resigned.[289] For Polish exiles and the cause of Poland the second Eastern Crisis was a mixed blessing, particularly after the break between France and Britain. Not knowing which power would come out of the conflict successfully, Czartoryski's diplomatic efforts made sure that Polish representatives were present both in Turkey and in Egypt.[290]

While the five great powers worked hard to preserve the existing *status quo* in Europe, various groups of revolutionaries tried to undermine the existing balance of power and promote the interests of smaller nations that had been ignored since the Congress of Vienna. Groups such as the *Carbonari* and Young Europe (created by Giuseppe Mazzini), as well as less organised movements, especially those in Germany, were particularly active in the earlier part of the decade, when the revolutionary fervour of the 1830 uprisings in France, Belgium, and Poland gave many people hope for another European revolution.[291] The revolutionary enthusiasm in Germany in 1832 was so great that Poles were welcomed 'almost as demi-gods'.[292] Close ties between Polish and other national movements led to failed uprisings in Frankfurt (April 1833), and a more successful Polish support of the Swiss liberal movement and the Savoy expedition (undertaken together with Italian,

---

[287] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, pp. 206–207.

[288] William Lamb, second Viscount Melbourne (1779–1848), British Home Secretary (1830-1834), and Prime Minister (1834-1841). Unlike Grey, Melbourne was far less enthusiastic about Poland and throughout the second half of the 1830s it was Palmerston rather than the Prime Minister who remained in the centre of Czartoryski's and Zamoyski's activities in Britain. See Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 7 September 1838. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 19. As Mitchell argued, Melbourne's role as a Prime Minister was to operate 'as a facilitator of politics', not to act as a policymaker. See L. Mitchell, *Lord Melbourne, 1779-1848* (Oxford, 1997), p. 157.

[289] Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?*, p. 76.

[290] Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Wielka Brytania w 'dyplomacji' Księcia Adama Czartoryskiego wobec kryzysu wschodniego (1832-1841)*, pp. 183–184.

[291] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 5–8.

[292] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 5.

German and Swiss democrats) in early 1834.[293] That last event put an end to European hopes for universal revolution and, despite the fact that Polish and Italian refugees in France and Britain remained close allies, their ways started to part in the aftermath of the Savoy expedition.[294]

Political Evolution of the Great Emigration

After the first years of ideological and political conflicts that divided the Great Emigration (see above), around 1834 the Polish exile entered a period of stabilisation. From the chaos of the first post-November years two groups emerged and for many years remained the central representatives of Polish interests abroad: the Polish Democratic Society (*Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*) and an unofficial alliance of more conservative-minded émigrés gathered around Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski (in Polish historiography this group is often referred to as Hotel Lambert, from Czartoryski's residence on the Ile Saint Louis in Paris[295]).

The Polish Democratic Society was one of the first Polish political parties to emerge in the aftermath of the November Uprising.[296] At first, the founding fathers of the organisation, all of them young and previously active in the activities of the Patriotic Society,[297] joined the Polish National Committee, but their disappointment with Lelewel's leadership led to the secession of the most radical members of the Committee who on 17

---

[293] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 21–28.

[294] Despite the rather too optimistic assessment of Polish-Italian relations presented in L. Jurek, *Polish Risorgimento. Visions of the Modern Polish Nation and Their Italian Foundations* (Frankfurt am Main, 2012), pp. 63–76. See also K. Morawski, *Polacy i sprawa polska w dziejach Italii w latach 1830-1866* (Warszawa, 1937), pp. 39-55.

[295] Czartoryski did not purchase the Hotel Lambert until 1842 and none of his followers used the name of the residence as the equivalent of the whole group. In 1836 a group of Czartoryski's associates created a secret group called the Monarchic Society of the Third May (*Towarzystwo Monarchiczne Trzeciego Maja*) and sometimes its name was used to describe the Prince's group. In general, however, despite Czartoryski's centrality to the whole movement, his followers were only loosely connected, resembling more a royal court surrounding Czartoryski than a political party.

[296] For a more detailed study of the Polish Democratic Society see J. Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie (1832-1862)*, 2 vols. (London, 1983).

[297] A. Kraushar, *Klub Patryotyczny Warszawski w czasach powstania listopadowego (1830-1831)* (Lwów, 1909). On the roots of the Polish Democratic Society see also Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*, I, pp. 1–82.

March 1832 created the Polish Democratic Society.[298] The Society worked 'for restoration of the power of resurrected Poland in the democratic spirit', opposing those 'who were used to their privileges'.[299] The aims and political creed of the Society were expressed more fully in its funding act signed by twenty two exiles. Not only did they advocate the cause of the people (*lud*) (as opposed to the cause of upper classes), criticising the course of the November Uprising and its failure to deliver any social change, but they also presented the cause of Polish independence as a European problem.[300] For many Polish exiles the ideas and demands outlined in the founding act seemed very radical and, at first, the Democratic Society did not look very different from a number of other ephemeral organisations of the early period of exile. There was nothing exceptional in it, apart from its radicalism and the youthful fervour of its members. None of these elements was a guarantee of a long life and political success.

In the first period of its activity (1832-1836) the Society concentrated on organising itself and becoming actively involved in the affairs of the Great Emigration. In 1832 it published *Protestation against the Treaties from 1772 to 1815 that Tore Poland into Pieces* [*Protestacja przeciw traktatom od 1772. do 1815. rozszarpującym Polskę*], protesting (indirectly) against Czartoryski's policy in exile, which used the Treaty of Vienna (and, consequently, the territorial limits of the Kingdom of Poland) as the reference point in the struggle for Polish independence.[301] Despite their secession from Lelewel's Committee, the

---

[298] Disappointment with Lelewel's leadership should be considered as a sign of growing maturity of young exiles and liberals. Although during the Uprising members of the Patriotic Society considered him an ally in their liberal struggle, Lelewel's actions as the leader of the Polish National Committee and his attempts to steer a middle course between radicals and conservatives in order to make the Committee a representative of the whole exile, forced the young democrats to search for their own way of promoting liberal and democratic principles. See Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*, I, pp. 83–125.

[299] *TDP do Polaków* (Paryż, 1832), pp. 1-2.

[300] 'Akt założenia [Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego z dniach 17 marca 1832 roku]', in W. Łukaszewicz, and W. Lewandowski, eds., *Postępowa publicystyka emigracyjna: wybór źródeł* (Wrocław, 1961) (hereafter: *Postępowa publicystyka*), pp. 197-202.

[301] *Protestacja przeciw traktatom od 1772. do 1815. rozszarpującym Polskę* ([Paris?], 1832). A similar approach was presented in the *Declaration of relations of the Polish Democratic Society and its members with the present Polish exile* [*Deklaracja względem stosunków Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego i jego członków z obecną emigracją polską*], where the Society claimed that it 'did not refuse anyone the possibility of political action for [the benefit of] the Polish cause, but only if [they] work in their own name for the nation, rather than in the name of nation without having its [i.e. the nation's] consent'. See

democrats allied with the Polish National Committee in preparing the *Act of the Year 1834 Against Adam Czartoryski, a Representative of Polish Aristocracy* [*Akt z roku 1834 przeciw Adamowi Czartoryskiemu wyobrazicielowi system polskiej arystokracji*], a document signed by over three thousand Polish émigrés and representing the greatest success of Polish liberal circles in exile in the 1830s.[302] Significantly, despite its active involvement in exile politics, the creation of a unique democratic ideology (that was fully expressed in the so-called *Great Manifesto* of the Polish Democratic Society from 1836, which also marked the second period of its history[303]), and its growing political strength until the latter part of the 1830s, the Democratic Society remained relatively uninvolved in promoting the cause of Poland in Europe. Having matured several years after the initial, post-1830 revolutionary enthusiasm swept across Europe and having rejected political involvement similar to that of Czartoryski and his representatives, the Society remained strongly disassociated from European politics.[304] The situation started to change in the latter part of the decade, when the democrats decided to pursue more active action in the homeland and to develop a conspiracy that was to lead towards a new uprising.[305] These actions gained momentum after 1841, when it became clear that and the diplomatic conflict between both powers over the Eastern Question undermined Czartoryski's hopes for their diplomatic support for the cause of Poland.

Unlike liberal groups that came to being in exile, Prince Czartoryski and the Polish monarchists remained devoted to their main course of political action based on informal diplomacy and the prestige of Czartoryski himself. Instead of developing a complex ideology, they concentrated on working towards regaining independence. This idea of 'first to be, then how to be' was outlined in great detail in one of the earliest conservative journals, *Feniks*. Only after the restoration of Poland was complete, 'the nation, enlightened

---

'Deklaracja względem stosunków Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego i jego członków z obecną emigracją polską'. *Postępowa publicystyka*, p. 207.

[302] *Akt z roku 1834 przeciw Adamowi Czartoryskiemu wyobrazicielowi systemu polskiej arystokracji* (Poitiers, 1839). For the background of the publication see Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*, I, pp. 301–320.

[303] 'Manifest Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego', *Postępowa publicystyka*, pp. 438-448.

[304] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 48–49.

[305] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie Emigracje 1831-1918'. *Historie Polski w XIX wieku*, IV, pp. 152–154.

by the sad experiences of its past and aware of its present needs, would grant itself laws and make [Poland] free, strong and happy'.[306] In other words, talking about the future of Poland was of secondary importance to the actual attempts to regain independence. This point of view had very significant implications for the Great Emigration and the Polish Questions in general.

Although Czartoryski's interests during the 1830s shifted from Western Europe to the East following the first Eastern Crisis, the main elements of his politics remained unchanged. Throughout the whole period, diplomacy, involving contacts with the leading figures of European political life, remained the main way in which Czartoryski attempted to promote the cause of Poland from London to Constantinople. As it will be shown below (see Chapter 4), the initial attempts to promote the cause of Poland in Britain and France, despite their eventual failure to obtain any official support, established Czartoryski at the centre of Polish 'diplomacy without letters of introduction'.[307] Because of his status, experience, and aristocratic background Czartoryski was accepted, though always unofficially, as the representative of Poland in exile – even though this position was widely criticised by liberal Polish émigrés. Czartoryski successfully introduced the subject of Poland and the Polish Question to Western politics, making sure that in the course of the 1830s neither British nor French interest in this issue disappeared (see Part II). In consequence, many aspects of the European understanding of the problem of Poland were based on Czartoryski's views, meaning that the opinions of other groups of Polish exiles were mostly ignored.

* * *

The decade that followed the 1830s revolutions in France, Belgium, and Poland was a period when politics of European powers, despite continued division between the liberal West and the autocratic East, strove to defend the existing balance of power. Neither the revolutionary wave of the early 1830s, nor the Eastern Crisis of the latter part of the decade

---

[306] *Feniks* (Paris, 1833), III, pp. 5-6.

[307] See Hahn, *Dyplomacja bez listów uwierzytelniających: Polityka zagraniczna Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego 1830-1840*.

changed the fact that peace and stability were valued higher than ideological and political gains. This did not stop Polish exiles from trying to influence the European balance of power, but in all cases their attempts to destabilise international politics failed to yield any significant results.

Inasmuch as the November Uprising was a response to the events taking place across Europe in 1830, the Great Emigration came into being and evolved in the context of political changes taking place across Europe at that time. The initial hopes for conflict between the West and the East drove the Polish exiles to France and Britain. After the initial disappointment with European politics and the early ideological efforts of the Great Emigration, two main groups emerged that dominated the rest of the history of the Polish exile. On the left the Polish Democratic Society assumed the role of the representative of a liberal vision of the future of Poland. The Society demanded the restoration of Poland to its pre-1772 borders and perceived the main way of fighting for independence not in diplomacy, but in a universal revolution that would include all suffering nations of Europe. This optimistic vision of a European brotherhood of nations suffered a serious blow after none of the revolutionary actions in which the Polish exiles were involved succeeded. In consequence the Democratic Society turned to ideological work and, at the end of the decade, began to prepare the independent revolutionary movement in Poland, abandoning its hopes for a universal struggle of nations.

Czartoryski, who united more conservative-thinking émigrés under his unofficial banner, presented a much more realistic view by championing the restoration of the partial independence of Poland within the borders of the Kingdom of Poland. His continuous references to the Treaty of Vienna, as well as his reliance on high politics and diplomacy, helped to preserve the political importance of the cause of Poland in Europe. However, Czartoryski's approach did not remain unchanged and after the initial lack of success in London and Paris, he turned his attention to the East, considering Turkey and the Middle East as the main areas where the future of Europe would be settled in a proxy conflict between Russia and the West.

Despite sharing the realities of the exile, by the end of the 1830s the Polish Democratic Society and the Polish monarchists supporting Czartoryski not only worked towards the restoration of two different Polands, but also kept promoting different Polish

Questions. That problem (as will be shown in Chapters 5 and 6) had a profound impact on the ways in which the question of Polish independence and its understanding developed in Britain in the following decade.

Chapter 3: Years of Stabilisation and Revolution (1841-1847)

1841 marked a serious change in European politics; one which was not without significance for the Great Emigration and, particularly, the policies of Prince Adam Czartoryski. Despite the successful resolution of the Eastern Crisis by Lord Palmerston, successes abroad failed to impress on British voters and the Whigs lost 1841 General Election. A large majority allowed the Tories under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel to create a strong government that was to rule Britain for the following five years. The new Foreign Secretary, Lord Aberdeen, strongly contributed to the restoration of good relations between France and Britain. At the same time his policies also involved improving relations with other European powers – including Russia. Overall, the international situation in the first half of the 1840s looked much more peaceful and secure than in the previous decade.[308]

Contrary to the spirit of this European stabilisation, the Polish exiles continued to work hard in order to undermine good relations between the powers and revive the previous divisions between the East and the West. Prince Czartoryski and his followers, though supportive of Aberdeen's friendly approach to France, could not agree to the British cooperation with Russia. They tried to take advantage of problems in the Balkan Peninsula in order to stoke British Russophobia and make the Government change its pro-Russian attitude. At the same time, completely ignoring the international situation, the Polish Democratic Society worked on preparing another uprising, which was to break out in all three partitions. These efforts led to unsuccessful disturbances in Wielkopolska (Prussian partition) and a short-lived revolution in Cracow and Galicia in 1846. Despite the fact that the news of the uprisings arrived in Western Europe after the movement had already been supressed by the Austrian forces, the subject of Cracow remained one of the vital issues of European diplomacy for months to come. However, regardless of the sympathy expressed by British and French public opinion, and lengthy debates on this subject in the House of Commons (see Chapter 7), the annexation of Cracow by Austria in late 1846 was widely accepted as a *fait accompli*.

---

[308] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 764.

While in the 1830s the Great Emigration tried to follow the political and revolutionary trends of contemporary international relations, after 1841 both monarchists and democrats, faced with unwilling governments and a non-revolutionary situation across Europe, worked independently to change it. As will be argued below, the real impact of the Great Emigration on the European politics of the 1840s was much more limited that in the previous decade.

Europe and the East in the Aftermath of the Straits Convention (1841-1846)

The Straits Convention of 1841, which was signed by all five European powers, defused the danger of another European war and resolved, though only temporarily, conflicting interests of the great powers in the East. The resolution of the Eastern Crisis was one of the last successes of Lord Palmerston as the Foreign Secretary in Melbourne's Government.[309] After the 1841 elections and the decisive victory of the Conservatives, he was replaced by Lord Aberdeen (who had previously served as a Foreign Secretary under Wellington in 1828-1830). When Aberdeen assumed office in late 1841, he had to deal with a number of problems Britain faced across the world. There was a border conflict between British possessions in Canada and the United States, wars in China and Afghanistan and, in the later period, also crises in Morocco and Tahiti.[310]

In Europe the situation looked much better than elsewhere. Contrary to the unstable policy of Palmerston, Aberdeen was determined to maintain good relations with both France and Russia despite his distrust of both powers.[311] Working with France on keeping Russia out of Constantinople, Aberdeen also cooperated with Russia to prevent any rise of French influence in the Mediterranean. Two other European powers, Austria and Prussia, were considered to be, at least in Britain, far less significant diplomatic players. Frederick William IV's visit to London in 1842 could not change the fact that Prussia was hardly a

---

[309] Taking into consideration Melbourne's lack of interest in the policies of his ministers, and the way in which Palmerston considered the Foreign Office as his personal fiefdom, the resolution of the crisis should be considered even more as Palmerston's success than, for example, the resolution of the Belgian question in the early 1830s. See L. Mitchell, *Lord Melbourne*, p. 162.

[310] Chamberlain, *Lord Aberdeen. A Political Biography* (London, 1983), p. 297.

[311] Clarke, *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, p. 213.

great European power.[312] Austria, on the other hand, still played a central role in maintaining the balance of power between Russia in the East and France in the West, even if Aberdeen claimed that it was 'incapable of any vigorous and enlightened policy'.[313] In consequence, it was France and Russia that remained in the centre of British European politics for the following five years.

The improving relations between Britain and Russia were, to a certain extent, the result of the Straits Convention (see Chapter 2). By resolving the Eastern Crisis, the treaty effectively put an end to Russian dominance over the Ottoman Empire (the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, which expired in 1841, was never renewed). This development was a clear indication that Russia, as well as Britain, was determined to uphold Turkish position in the East and, despite Russia's occasional attempts to extend its power over the Balkan states, Nicholas I saw more benefits in preserving European balance of power and peace than in undermining it.[314] This did not stop Russia from getting involved in the internal politics of Serbia, but that minor incident could not change the general understanding between all major European powers.[315]

In France the replacement of Thiers with the historian and anglophile François Guizot in the position of the Foreign Secretary opened a new, even if short-lived, chapter in French politics. Guizot's scholarly inclinations matched those of Aberdeen, and the good relations between both ministers opened up a new era of cooperation and understanding between both nations.[316] This new *entente cordiale*, though at times strained by various minor disputes over European and world politics, became the main element of the new British Government's foreign politics. Good relations between both powers were confirmed by Queen Victoria's visit to France in 1843 and Louis-Philippe's visit to Britain in 1844.

---

[312] Chamberlain, *Lord Aberdeen*, p. 305.

[313] Quoted after Chamberlain, *Lord Aberdeen*, p. 302.

[314] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 92.

[315] Polish publicists, particularly those associated with Prince Czartoryski, were very critical of the improving relations between Britain and Russia. See particularly R. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Kupcy i arystokraci. Szkic do wizerunku Anglików w prasie obozu monarchiczno-liberalnego Wielkiej Emigracji (1833-1848), in P. Matusik, K. Marchlewicz, *Swoi i obcy. Studia z dziejów myśli Wielkiej Emigracji* (Poznań, 2004), pp. 115-116.

[316] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 765-766.

The question of Spanish Marriages was perhaps the best example of French political and diplomatic recovery in the 1840s.[317] Although by 1846 the *entente* was already seriously shaken, it was Palmerston's return to the office which led to a complete collapse of the alliance.[318]

From the Polish perspective the improvement in relations between France and Britain was a promising sign. At the same time, however, the concurrent improvement of British-Russian relations was welcomed with less enthusiasm. Not surprisingly, Czartoryski tried to undermine the good understanding between Britain and Russia by using the Serbian affairs as an illustration of Russian expansionism and danger (see below). This could not, however, change the fact that the first half of the 1840s was a period when the major differences between all five European powers lay dormant. As will be illustrated below, even the occupation of Cracow in 1846 proved an insufficiently significant factor to undermine that peaceful coexistence.

The Great Emigration: Towards Another Revolution (1841-1846)

The second half of the 1830s was a period of the ideological stabilisation of the Great Emigration, a time when out of the chaos of years 1831-1834 two main centres of political and ideological power (the Monarchists under Prince Czartoryski and the Polish Democratic Society) emerged. From the beginning of the 1840s both groups became involved in the affairs of Europe and Poland. The decade between the occupation of Cracow in 1836 and the final annexation of the city to Austria in 1846 lacked the same intensity as the first years of the exile.[319] However, political evolutions and struggles continued, particularly among the liberal groups, wherein the position and strength of the Polish Democratic Society was not fully established until 1846. In the first half of the 1840s the main enemy of the democrats was the liberal Union of the Polish Emigration (*Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej*), a group which had been functioning since 1837 and which presented a new attempt to unite the whole Great Emigration under a single liberal

---

[317] L. Guymer, 'The Wedding Planners: Lord Aberdeen, Henry Bulwer, and the Spanish Marriages, 1841-1846', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 21.4 (2010), pp. 549–573.
[318] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 770-771.
[319] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 163-164.

(albeit not entirely democratic) banner.[320] Nevertheless, the Polish Democrats and their counterparts, the monarchists gathered around Prince Czartoryski, dominated that period of the history of the Great Emigration. With their ideology and means of action clearly defined, these two groups made the most significant contribution to the internationalisation of the problem of Poland in mainland Europe and, to lesser extent, also in Britain. As was mentioned above (see Chapter 2), their versions of the Polish Question were very different. While the Democrats championed the idea of unity between all three Polish partitions and a struggle leading to the recovery of pre-1772 territories, the visions of Prince Czartoryski were far more moderate and limited to the recovery of autonomy or independence within the borders of the Kingdom of Poland. Different ideas led to different, though not necessarily conflicting, means of trying to implement them.

The Eastern Crisis of 1840 and its resolution, which for a short time alienated British and French interests, bringing Britain closer to the countries of the Holy Alliance, dealt a serious blow to Czartoryski's vision of the restoration of Poland. To him, as well as to his supporters, regaining independence was possible only in the event of a major European conflict between the liberal West and the autocratic East.[321] Regardless of this drawback, Czartoryski quickly adjusted to the new situation and turned even more attention to the situation in Turkey. He considered the Ottoman Empire as the main enemy of Russia in the East, one which would become a potential ally of a future Polish uprising.[322] Consequently, in order to extend greater influence over the Ottoman Empire, Czartoryski established a special diplomatic agency in Constantinople. Directed by Michał Czajkowski,[323] the agency oversaw all anti-Russian actions of the Polish monarchists in the East.[324] In the first half of the 1840s Czartoryski paid particular attention to developments taking place across the Balkans, and tried to promote Turkish interests and counter Russian

---

[320] Cygler, *Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej*.

[321] S. Kalembka, 'Koncepcje dróg do niepodległości i kształtu Polski wyzwolonej w myśli politycznej Wielkiej Emigracji', in *Rozprawy z dziejów XIX i XX Wieku przygotowane dla uczczenia pamięci Profesora Witolda Łukasiewicza* (Toruń, 1978), pp. 40–41.

[322] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 59.

[323] Michał Czajkowski (Sadyk Pasza) (1804-1886), Polish writer and political activist. He served as Prince Czartoryski's envoy to Italy and then to Turkey.

[324] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje', pp. 137–141.

influence across the whole peninsula, particularly in the Danubian Principalities (Moldova and Wallachia), Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria.[325] In this period, despite the visible shift in the monarchists' interests, Czartoryski did not abandon his pro-Western sympathies and continued to try to influence both British and French politics (see Chapter 6). However, the lack of any significant event that could make the question of Polish independence a matter of European importance forced him to seek other ways of promoting the cause of Poland.

The monarchists' preoccupation with diplomacy and high politics did not mean, however, that they completely ignored the situation in the homeland. Contacts with Polish aristocrats, though certainly making the lives of Czartoryski's envoys to Poland easier, failed to bring them under the monarchists' banner.[326] There can be no doubt that many people in Poland dreamed of and quietly supported the ideas of the restoration of Poland, but their willingness to get involved in any revolutionary action was limited. After meeting with several Poles in Munich, in 1843 Władysław Zamoyski complained that 'the lack of faith in regaining independence with our own power dominates… [they all believe] that there is nothing to be done for the cause [of Poland] until some external power would not help us'.[327] Zamoyski's disappointment was a sign of the changing approach to the problem of Polish independence among the Polish monarchists in exile. Although they still believed that a new uprising could take place only in the 'propitious circumstances', Poland still needed 'its own strength' to succeed.[328] The fact that Czartoryski's supporters living in Poland came mostly from aristocracy made his attempts to organise an active conspiracy working towards a new revolution particularly difficult. At the same time democratic unwillingness to wait for the right international situation made the Polish democrats the leading force behind the preparations for a new uprising in Poland.

In the late 1830s, after numerous ideological debates, the Polish Democratic Society emerged as the best-organised and the most numerous organisation of the Great

---

[325] See for example A. Cetnarowicz, *Tajna dyplomacja Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego na Bałkanach 1840-44*. M. Willaume, 'Działalność polityczna Hotelu Lambert w Mołdawii i Wołoszczyźnie w latach 1840-1846', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 33/34.4 (1978), pp. 51–75.

[326] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje', pp. 156–158.

[327] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 12 November 1843. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 314.

[328] *Mowy Xięcia Adama Czartoryskiego, od roku 1838-1847* (Paryż, 1847), p. 15.

Emigration. After moving its headquarters from Poitiers to Versailles in 1838, the PDS began establishing links with the homeland, particularly with the Prussian and Austrian partitions.[329] As the Democrats had argued in their Manifesto of 1836, the cause of Poland remained a European problem, but their ways of resolving this problem were different from those offered by Czartoryski. Instead of looking at European governments in hope of their support, they championed the idea of independent military uprisings in all three partitions, coupled with the immediate resolution of issues pertaining to land and peasantry, which would provide the risings with the support of Polish peasants.[330] 'There are in Poland all elements required to regain the independent and democratic existence', the democrats argued and contrasted Czartoryski's trust in 'the Governmental debates' with Poland's 'natural allies… [and] honest cooperation of the people [of Europe]'.[331] After years spent in exile, the Polish democrats did not lose their radical fervour and their actions in the 1840s were the best sign of their relentless pursuit of Polish independence. For several years after 1838 it remained unclear which path the Democrats would take, but from 1843 onward the influence of Wiktor Heltman[332] and Ludwik Mierosławski[333] pushed the Society towards more decisive action at home.[334] Regardless of the warning messages sent by the democratic envoys about the complicated situation in both the Prussian and Austrian partitions,[335] the leaders of the Democratic Society decided to carry on with the plan of organising a new uprising within a few years.[336] Clearly, the democrats' disappointment with Polish involvement in other national revolutions in the early 1830s (the unsuccessful risings in Italy and Germany) made them more willing to trust their own strength and work towards Polish independence without looking to the rest of Europe. Mierosławski's outlandish ideas of creating a national army from inexperienced and untrained volunteers of

---

[329] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje', pp. 152–155. Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 190–191.
[330] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 185.
[331] 'Manifest Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego', *Postępowa publicystyka*, pp. 446-447.
[332] Wiktor Heltman (1796-1874), Polish émigré, politician and democrat, one of the leaders of the Polish Democratic Society.
[333] Ludwik Mierosławski (1814-1878), Polish émigré and officer, member of the Polish Democratic Society, and planned leader of the new Polish uprising.
[334] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje', p. 154.
[335] Zdrada, *Wielka emigracja*, p. 68.
[336] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 194–195.

Wielkopolska and Galicia, and plans for reconquering these provinces before turning against Russia in the Kingdom of Poland were highly unlikely to succeed.[337] Furthermore, Mierosławski himself lacked any credible military experience to lead the uprising.[338] Finally, the trust of the exiles in the revolutionary situation greatly overestimated Poland's readiness for another revolution.[339]

Because of the more intense agitation and larger social base, the Polish Democratic Society's influence in Poland was greater than that of the monarchists (who, despite some changes in their approach, still considered work in the homeland as secondary to diplomatic efforts across Europe). Their involvement in the events in Poland began in the late 1830s, and soon it began to be apparent that the situation was much more complicated than any exile could have predicted. In the Prussian partition, which had become a centre of Polish political and cultural life after the November Uprising, liberal conspiracies had come into being a long time before the Democratic Society started expressing its interest in organising a new revolution. Clandestine organisations in Poland refused to submit to democratic policies coming from the exile and, in consequence, the Democrats were forced to adjust to the demands of local radicals.[340] The divisions between the various groups of conspirators in Poland proved much more difficult to overcome. Besides local liberals sympathising with the Society (gathered around the Committee directed by Karol Libelt[341] in Poznań), other people (particularly Edward Dembowski[342]) were expressing a much more radical approach. With time, the young radicals started to dominate the movement, demanding social changes and reforms. By 1845 hopes for a new uprising across the Prussian and Austrian partitions were coupled with fear of revolutionary changes expressed by

---

[337] Zdrada, *Wielka emigracja*, p. 72.

[338] At the time of the November Uprising Mierosławski was only 16 years old, but he succeeded in becoming the only serious, though self-imposed, military authority in the ranks of the Polish Democratic Society. Skowronek, *Od konspiracji do kapitulacji*, pp. 42–43.

[339] '[Przemówienie L. Mierosławskiego 29 listopada 1845]', *Postępowa publicystyka*, p. 547.

[340] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 70.

[341] Karol Libelt (1807-1875), Polish political activist and insurrectionist (he took part in the November Uprising). Libelt established links with the Polish Democratic Society and cooperated with Polish émigrés in preparations to 1846 uprising in Wielkopolska (the Prussian partition).

[342] Edward Dembowski (1822-1846), Polish radical activist and writer. He organised and led Polish conspiracy in Galicia (the Austrian partition).

aristocrats and landowners, who started to move slowly towards a more hostile approach towards the revolution. At the end of 1845 preparations for the uprising entered the last phase and the leaders of the Polish Democratic Society started to arrive in Poland.[343]

In contrast to the early years of the Great Emigration, which were dominated by Prince Czartoryski's activities, the first half of the 1840s saw the strengthening of the position of the Polish Democratic Society among the Polish exiles and its active involvement in preparations for another uprising in Poland. Czartoryski's reliance on the international situation suffered a heavy blow in 1840, when Britain, considered the main ally among European liberals, began a successful cooperation with Russia in resolving the Eastern Crisis. Czartoryski considered the divergence between Britain and France, and the unexpected alliance between Britain and the Holy Alliance, as 'the most complicated and the darkest' period in the history of the Great Emigration.[344] The difficult condition of European politics and the monarchists' inability to influence events in Poland were used by the Polish Democratic Society to extend their influence over the homeland and get involved in active preparations for a new uprising. The democrats' cooperation with young Polish radicals residing in the Prussian and Austrian partitions successfully revived Polish hopes for independence. Unfortunately, the preparations for the new uprising were based more on goodwill and wishful thinking than on facts and calculations. In effect, the uprising, which was meant to cover all three partitions and lead to the restitution of Poland to its pre-1772 borders, resulted in great failure and became proof that even after fifteen years of emigration Polish radicals and democrats lacked the necessary political skills.

The first half of the 1840s saw the continuation of internal divisions within the Great Emigration, but, simultaneously, with maturity and experience came a new approach to the problem of Polish independence, which was presented particularly by the Polish Democratic Society. Disappointed with previous actions aimed at the restoration of Poland, the Democrats abandoned their ideas of European revolution and an alliance of peoples for independent action with the intention of uniting all Poles scattered across the three partitions. Although, as will be shown below, the effects of these changes proved very

---

[343] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie emigracje', pp. 152–155.
[344] *Mowy Xiecia Adama Czartoryskiego, od roku 1838-1847*, p. 13.

disastrous, the change was very significant in the contexts of the Great Emigration and European politics alike.

The Cracow Revolution and Its Impact on Europe and the Great Emigration (1846-1847)

Democratic plans for an uprising that would cover all three partitions did not survive the confrontation with reality. Mierosławski, who arrived in Wielkopolska in late 1845, was arrested by Prussians in February 1846.[345] Soon the Prussian police imprisoned many other conspirators, successfully destroying the national movement in Wielkopolska and preventing any serious uprising there. In the Kingdom of Poland, after the news of Mierosławski's arrest arrived, the conspirators decided not to carry out the plan of military action.[346] Only in Cracow and Galicia did the news from Wielkopolska not discourage the Polish patriots. On 19 February an uprising, led by Polish landowners, broke out in Galicia, and two days later the Poles clashed with Austrian forces in Cracow, forcing them to retreat from the city.[347] Reactions to both events were very different: despite temporary successes in Galicia, the conspirators met with the fierce and brutal opposition of local peasants in a number of risings directed against local landlords and nobles. In Cracow the development of events appeared more promising. On 22 February the newly organised National Government published the Manifesto, appealing to all citizens for support of the revolution and promising democratic and land reforms.[348] Soon, however, the Government was replaced by a dictator (Jan Tyssowski[349]) and the radical ideas promoted by the new power estranged many moderate patriots.[350] Instead of acting decisively against the Austrians, the leaders concentrated on the internal issues of the revolution, losing momentum and, effectively, forfeiting the opportunity to export the national uprising outside Cracow. On 2 March 1846 Tyssowski resigned. Two days later, accompanied by 1500 insurgents, he

---

[345] B. Limanowski, *Historja ruchu rewolucyjnego w Polsce w 1846 r.* (Kraków, 1913), pp. 151–153.
[346] *Ibid*., pp. 231-243.
[347] *Relacja wypadków zaszłych w Krakowie i Galicji, od dnia 18 lutego po 25 kwietnia 1846* (n.p., n.d.), p. 16.
[348] *Manifest Rządu Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej do Narodu Polskiego* (Kraków, 1846).
[349] Jan Tyssowski (1811-1857), Polish politician and leader of the Cracow Revolution of 1846.
[350] *Relacja wypadków zaszłych w Krakowie i Galicji, od dnia 18 lutego po 25 kwietnia 1846*, pp. 17-19.

surrendered to the Prussians.[351] His surrender marked the end of the Cracow Uprising before the events of its outbreak had even reached Western Europe and Polish exiles in France and Britain.

This ten-day revolution, overshadowed by the tragic events in Galicia, the failure of the uprisings in other parts of Poland, and its own inability to pursue any decisive action, became the most important event in post-1830 Polish history. It was also a triumph of Polish democracy over more moderate and conservative forces of the Union of the Polish Emigration (*Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej*) and the monarchists. Striking as it may be, after the news of the outbreak of the revolution arrived in Paris, Prince Czartoryski and his supporters expressed their willingness to submit to the National Government in Cracow, recognising it as the highest national power.[352] Using his influence in France and Britain, Czartoryski started to work towards obtaining a loan for the new government[353] and to promote the cause of Poland in both countries, despite the particularly difficult situation in British politics, almost entirely preoccupied with British economic problems (see Chapter 6). After the fall of the democratic revolution in Cracow became a fact, the monarchists turned against the Polish Democratic Society, accusing its leaders of being responsible for the failure of the whole movement, contrasting the anarchy of democracy with the unity and rightfulness of a constitutional monarchy.[354] A personal matter was added to the ideological differences between both parties after the Austrian Government decided to sequester Czartoryski's estate in Sieniawa.[355] The temporary triumph of the Cracow Revolution, despite its eventual failure, also became the turning point in the history of Polish democracy. Many Polish émigrés became strongly impressed by the actions of the Polish Democratic Society. The failure at home led to success in exile, leading many

---

[351] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 288–289.
[352] *Ibid.*, p. 293.
[353] For more detail see particularly BKCz 6537.
[354] J. Miller-Kossowski and S. L. Gaiewski, *Kopja Dziennika Rządu Rewolucyjnego, z czasów ostatniego Powstania w Krakowie, 22 Lutego 1846 Roku i relacja o zaszłych wypadkach* (Paryż, 1846).
[355] Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity*, p. 254.

liberals to abandon other liberal groups and parties in order to join the Democratic Society.[356]

The events in Cracow were watched with deep interest and concern in France and with less attention in Britain, where the Government was still more concerned with the troubling internal situation and the famine in Ireland than with international politics. Interestingly, the 1846 revolution attracted a lot of attention from the Chartists, whose interest in the cause of Polish independence had been very limited in the previous years. Parliamentary and public interest in the short-lived Cracow Revolution did not even reach the same levels as the interest in the November Uprising. Only when Russia, Prussia and Austria used the revolution as an excuse for the occupation of Cracow and, eventually, the incorporation of the Free State to Austria did Britain and France react with much more vigour. However, as will be illustrated in Chapter 7, even the lengthy debates in the House of Commons could not lead to the Free City of Cracow regaining its independence. The West, as well as the Polish exiles, were therefore forced to accept the incorporation of Cracow as a *fait accompli*.[357]

* * *

The international situation in the 1840s was completely different from that in the previous decade, offering very little opportunities for any international conflict that would help the Poles in regaining their independence. For Polish democrats, it marked a step forward from almost entirely theoretical undertakings of the 1830s towards more active involvement in the problems of Poland. For Prince Czartoryski and his supporters, the shift was not that serious. While the monarchists continued their involvement in European high politics, they nevertheless started to acknowledge the necessity of establishing themselves in the homeland. However, the limited social base the monarchists could rely on at home made their real impact on developments taking place in Poland very limited.

The international significance of the Cracow Revolution never reached levels comparable with those of the November Uprising. Before the news of its outbreak reached

[356] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, pp. 296–267.
[357] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 792-793.

London and Paris, the rising had been quelled by united forces of all partitioning powers and no political or moral support could have changed the renewed occupation of the Free State of Cracow. Although the final incorporation of the city to the Austrian Empire in the late 1846, perceived by Western liberals as yet another breach of the Treaty of Vienna, resulted in a much stronger reaction in Britain and France, it did not change the fact that none of the Western powers were willing to do anything about the problem of Cracow.

PART II

Having outlined the international background on which the Great Emigration, and, consequently, the Polish Questions, developed throughout the 1830s and 1840s, this part of the thesis looks at the details surrounding the emergence of the Polish Question in Great Britain. As will be argued, the initial interest in Poland caused by the outbreak of the November Uprising, despite a certain decline after the fall of Warsaw in September 1831, continued to influence the British public opinion, the parliamentary debates, and the Government. In the years 1831-1833 the key role in preserving the cause of Poland as one of the vital issues of European, and thus also British, politics was played by Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski. His arrival in London in December 1831 opened a new chapter in the history of the Polish Question in Britain, strengthening its political angle and intensifying discussions on the issue in both the Parliament and beyond it. One of the most significant among the extra-parliamentary pro-Polish activities of the period was the creation of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (LAFP), a unique organisation with the aim of promoting the cause of Poland in Britain. Unlike a number of local organisations (created in places like Hull, Birmingham, Edinburgh, and Sheffield), the LAFP remained active for many decades, contributing to the development of the Polish Question throughout the 1830s and 1840s.

That the LAFP proved more than capable of defending and developing the Polish Question, even without any direct support of Czartoryski, became clearly visible from 1834, when large numbers of Polish refugees arriving in Britain forced all pro-Polish activists to reassess their approach to the issue. As Chapter 5 argues, the organisation played a central role in the changing the understanding of the Polish Question, a development which occured in the later part of the 1830s. With Czartoryski's attention turned towards the rest of Europe, it was the LAFP that kept the problems of Poland and the Polish exiles alive.

Chapter 4: The Polish Question in Great Britain: The Formative Years (1831-1833)

From the time of his arrival in Britain in June 1832 Władysław Zamoyski was an observant witness of Prince Adam Czartoryski's activities in that country.[358] Among the many observations and quotes included in his memoirs, one is particularly important in understanding Czartoryski's politics in exile in that period. For the Prince, the main aim of all pro-Polish activities, motions, and petitions was 'to have the rights of Poland engraved on the walls of [European] Parliaments'.[359] As Czartoryski himself put in an appeal to his fellow émigrés in late 1832, 'it is our mission to enlighten all Governments and people, [to tell them] about our sufferings, our rights and to prove that our cause is their cause'.[360]

This chapter takes a closer look at the emergence of the Polish Question in Great Britain in the two years that followed the defeat of the November Uprising, paying particular attention to the activities of Prince Adam Czartoryski, his supporters (Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz and Władysław Zamoyski), and the pro-Polish circles that manifested themselves through the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland and other societies across Britain. As will be argued, Czartoryski's understanding of the Polish Question as an issue pertaining to the Treaty of Vienna, limited to the status of the Kingdom of Poland, though rejected by liberal and democratic groups of the Great Emigration, heavily influenced British politics and the British public opinion. By the end of 1833 his pro-Polish propaganda led to the universal understanding of the Polish Question within the diplomatic limits of the 1815 treaty; and this approach dominated all British considerations of the status of Poland in the next decades. Although Czartoryski had to fight with the influence of Polish democrats in France, Britain remained entirely 'monarchist' in its political and public interpretations of the problem of Polish independence. Despite several attempts at

---

[358] Of the six-volume memoirs of Zamoyski, volumes three to six present his life and activities in exile, becoming an invaluable source material for Czartoryski's policies in the post-1830 period. See *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III-VI.

[359] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 26.

[360] *Odezwa do Polaków w Emigracji*. BKCz 5443. The appeal was probably circulated among the Polish exiles in France.

influencing the British understanding of the subject of Poland, the Polish Democratic Society and other liberal parties failed to make any significant impact in this regard. To all people who sympathised with Czartoryski's moderate approach, the democratic demands for restitution of Poland in the pre-1772 borders had to sound even less possible than the restoration of the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland.

In the early 1830s the development of the Polish Question in Britain went through several stages. At the time of the November Uprising the differing approaches of politicians (particularly Lord Palmerston) and the public opinion (expressed in the course of several pro-Polish meetings, as well as in the press) were the most visible. After the fall of the Uprising and the arrival of Czartoryski in London in December 1831 the Polish Question was transformed into a more-defined and better-understood aspect of European politics. As will be argued, rather than a closed period that ended with Czartoryski's departure to Paris in 1832, the months he spent in Britain should be treated as a first step in his continuous attempts to convince British politicians to take a greater interest in the cause of Poland.[361] Moreover, the personal contacts established during that early period (with the best example being Lord Dudley Stuart) remained a very significant element of Czartoryski's diplomacy in the following decades.

Interestingly, regardless of the Polish preoccupation with high politics, contacts with leading Whig politicians, and the parliamentary debates, pro-Polish feelings prevailed among the public opinion, leading to the creation of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (LAFP) and a number of other Polish societies across the country. British pro-Polish interest evolved independently from the influence of the Polish exiles – around them, albeit not always with them. In consequence, by the end of 1832 the Association started losing its momentum. Its reorganisation, which took place in mid-1833, coupled with the involvement of Lord Dudley Stuart, made the new LAFP much closely associated with Czartoryski and the political aims of the Polish monarchists. Although far from being

[361] On the one hand previous works on the subject, particularly two monographs and various articles by Żurawski vel Grajewski, tended to concentrate on particular sides of Czartoryski's activities in Britain. On the other hand, political biographies of Prince Czartoryski (particularly works by Handelsman and Kukiel) treat his activities in Britain only as a part of much wider 'diplomacy' of conservative wing of the Great Emigration.

completely dependent on Czartoryski, the LAFP remained under the political influence of the Polish monarchists for the next two decades. The independent, though strongly intertwined public and parliamentary activities of the early 1830s assured that 'the knowledge of Poland started to become popular, political gatherings started to discuss our cause, [and] public opinion took a lively interest in the problem of Poland'.[362] The cause of Polish independence promoted by Czartoryski remained the only Polish Question that attracted British attention in that period. Although it changed in the later part of the 1830s, as will be illustrated in the following chapters, the status of the question of Polish independence for many years remained the main rallying point for all British friends of Poland.

Origins of the Polish Question in Britain

In the first decades of the nineteenth century it was France, not Britain, that was widely perceived as an ally of Poland and the main supporter of Polish independence in Europe. Cultural and historical ties, particularly the active involvement of Polish forces in the Napoleonic Wars, which resulted in the restoration of Poland under the semi-independent Duchy of Warsaw, made Polish relations with France much stronger than with any other European country.[363] After the defeat of Napoleon Poles switched their allegiance to Tsar Alexander I, who presented himself as an enlightened and liberal ruler,[364] but pro-French sentiments remained deeply rooted in the Polish national consciousness . The fifteen years separating the signing of the Treaty of Vienna and the outbreak of the November Uprising saw very little political or ideological contact between Poland and France, but the July Revolution made a significant impact on Polish patriots, who considered the events taking place in France and Belgium as the beginning of a new pan-European revolution (see Chapter 1). As demonstrated in Chapter 2, for the French public opinion the fate of Poland was one of the vital issues of European liberalism. The political considerations of Louis

---

[362] K. Sienkiewicz, *Położenie księcia Adama Czartoryskiego, wojewody, po upadku rewolucji 1831*. BKCz 5296.

[363] See for example B. Grochulska, *Małe państwo wielkich nadziei* (Warszawa, 1987); J. Czubaty, *The Duchy of Warsaw, 1807-1815*.

[364] Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, p. 44.

Philippe and his ministers could not change the fact that strong pro-Polish sentiments kept manifesting themselves in France throughout the 1830s and 1840s.

At the same time Polish relations with Britain, though not insignificant, were much less visible.[365] Despite a certain interest in the fate of Poland present in Britain in the last decades of the eighteenth century and at the time of the Congress of Vienna,[366] post-1815 Poland attracted very little attention of British public or politics, mostly because of its lack of international significance. In the same period, despite the progress of industrialisation in the Kingdom of Poland (which used many British inventions, relied on British technologies and help of British specialists), very few Poles remained interested in British culture or politics (among them the most well-known among the Polish Anglophiles, Prince Adam Czartoryski and Krystyn Lach-Szyrma[367]). More widespread interest in Britain had a rather limited impact on the Polish political and intellectual circles of the time. For Britain, the years following the Treaty of Vienna were a period of numerous internal problems. Peace brought European stabilisation, but also an economic downturn to British farmers and manufacturers. The first years after the Congress of Vienna were characterised by social unrest, including machine-breaking, radical riots, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act, the passing of a Seditious Meetings Act and, perhaps the most symbolic of all, the Peterloo

---

[365] On analysis of Polish-British contacts in the period before the November Uprising see W. Lipoński, *Polska a Brytania 1801-1831*.

[366] See for example Wicklum, M. E., 'Britain and the Second and Third Partitions of Poland' (unpublished PhD Thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, 1999). See also Davies, '"The Langour of so remote an interest": British Attitudes to Poland, 1772-1832', pp. 80-85; Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Sensacja – informacja – komentarz. Londyńska prasa informacyjna o polskich „rewolucjach" 1791 r.', pp. 91-111.

[367] Krystyn Lach Szyrma (1790–1866), Polish writer and academic, professor of the University of Warsaw. W. Adamska, 'Przyczynki do działalności kulturalno-literackiej Krystyna Lacha Szyrmy', *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 23 (1961), pp. 101-107; W. Chonacki, and J. Dąbrowski, *Krystyn Lach Szyrma, syn ziemi mazurskiej* (Olsztyn, 1971). Czartoryski's Anglophilia was the effect of his family's interest in Britain dating back to the mid-eighteenth century. The Prince himself visited Britain on a few occasions before the outbreak of the November Uprising. See for example Z. Golebiowska, 'Podróż Izabeli i Adama Jerzego Czartoryskich do Wielkiej Brytanii (1789-1791)', Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska, 38-39 (1983), pp. 129–46; *W kręgu Czartoryskich: Wpływy angielskie w Puławach na przełomie XVII I XIX Wieku* (Lublin, 2000). See also Lipoński, *Polska a Brytania 1801-1831*, pp. 15-81.

massacre in Manchester in 1819.[368] As was illustrated above (see Chapter 1), such developments did not stop Britain from taking an active part in European politics, but certainly limited public interest in international politics. In terms of British interest in the fate of Poland, certain elements of pro-Polish sympathies existed in both political and cultural life, dating back not to the glory of the Napoleonic Wars (when Poles, as the allies of Bonaparte, were British enemies), but to the last years of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[369] In his famous *Pleasures of Hope* Thomas Campbell[370] devoted several lines to the fall of Poland during the third partition, celebrating the figure of Tadeusz Kościuszko,[371] the leader of the anti-Russian uprising of 1794. Kościuszko himself visited Britain shortly afterwards on his way to the United States. Accompanied by his aide, Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz,[372] the Polish hero became a real *cause célèbre*. One of the results of his short stay in Britain was the inspiration he gave to Jane Porter. Her *Thaddeus of Warsaw* (1803), a romantic novel where '[t]ruth and fiction [were] blended with much propriety',[373] served as another way of popularising the Polish hero and the cause of Poland.[374] The fact that by 1831 the book had ten editions was a sign of its remarkable success.[375]

The fall of Wellington's Government in November 1830 and the rise to power of the Whigs under Prime Minister Earl Grey, with Lord Palmerston taking over the position of Foreign Secretary, created an important context for British political interest in the fate of Poland. While it did not necessarily mean that the new government would offer the Polish

---

[368] See for example J. Marlow, *The Peterloo Massacre* (London, 1969). N. McCord and B. Purdue, *British History, 1815-1914* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 18–28. R. J. White, *Waterloo to Peterloo* (London, 1957).

[369] For an interesting study of British approach to the partitions see M. E. Wicklum, 'Britain and the Second and Third Partitions of Poland' (unpublished PhD Thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, 1999).

[370] Thomas Campbell (1777–1844), British poet.

[371] Tadeusz Kościuszko (1746-1817), Polish patriot and military leader of the anti-Russian uprising of 1794.

[372] Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz (1758–1841), Polish classicist poet closely associated with the Czartoryski family.

[373] Quoted after J. Porter, *Thaddeus of Warsaw* (London, 1831), p. iii.

[374] See for example T. McLean, *The Other East and Nineteenth-Century British Literature. Imagining Poland and the Russian Empire* (Basingstoke, 2012), pp. 66–87; Golebiowska, Z., 'Jane Porter - angielska admiratorka Tadeusza Kościuszki', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 56 (2001), pp. 7–15.

[375] Porter, *Thaddeus of Warsaw*, p. xix. The eleventh edition of the book was published in December 1830, shortly after the news of the outbreak of the November Uprising arrived in London. See *The Morning Post*, 23 December 1830.

Revolution any significant support, both Grey and Palmerston (and, indeed, many other leading figures in the Government and the House of Commons) personally expressed their profound sympathy and goodwill towards the Polish anti-Russian struggle. Polish envoys to Britain did everything to use that sympathy and channel it into more open political support, but the complicated international situation in Europe and the even more problematic perilous question of the Reform Bill in Britain.[376]

The Polish Questions: Year One

1831 was the first year when the Polish Question in Britain developed. The process began when the first news of the November Uprising reached London in late December 1830 and early January 1831 and ended with the arrival of Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, who helped to channel all pro-Polish sentiments existing in Britain into better-organised and better-prepared actions. As will be shown later, Czartoryski's involvement made a serious impact on the understanding of the Polish Question. His (or, more generally, the Polish exiles') perception of the issue was significantly different from that expressed by the British friends of Poland. Consequently, as early as in late 1831 two contrasting approaches to the Polish Question, or, as it will be argued, two different Polish Questions existed in Britain. At first, however, the main and the most obvious understanding of the Polish Question was that of Polish independence. As was suggested above (see Chapter 1), initially the November Revolution was nothing more but a rebellion of Poles against the abuse of Russian power in the Kingdom of Poland. Within several weeks the uprising gained the status of a 'national' uprising (as confirmed by the *Sejm* in December 1830), which further strained relations between Poland and Nicolas I. Finally, when in January 1831 the majority of the members of the *Sejm* voted for the dethronement of the Tsar, it became clear that rebellion turned into a national war that would end only with the success of the Poles or the complete subjugation of the Kingdom by the Russians.

There were two main factors that prevented the rise of the cause of Polish independence to primary significance in Britain during and shortly after the November Uprising and, contrary to Jasiakiewicz's assumption, Poland never became 'the main issue'

[376] See particularly A. Fraser, *Perilous Question. The Drama of the Great Reform Bill 1832* (London, 2013).

for British press.[377] The first was the issue of the Reform Bill, which became the main issue championed by Grey's Government after it came to power in November 1830. The Bill was aimed at resolving the problem of the unequal distribution of seats in the House of Commons, the issue of rotten boroughs, as well as extending the franchise. It attracted great interest from all sides of British society and the public opinion.[378] After the general election, many difficult debates and divisions in both houses of Parliament and the threat of creating unlimited numbers of new peers in the House of Lords, the Reform Bill finally received the royal assent on 7 June 1832.[379] For over a year and a half it occupied the minds of almost everyone in Britain.

The second important issue of contemporary British politics, though one with far less impact on public opinion than the Reform, was the problem of Belgian independence. Throughout 1831 the London Conference and negotiations between all five European powers were events of international significance. The positive resolution of the problem of the separation of Belgium from the Netherlands (agreed upon as early as in December 1830) was a key element of the European balance of power and, as was suggested in Chapter 1, from the British perspective it appeared as far more important factor behind European stability and the balance of power than the Polish Uprising.[380] Regardless of Palmerston's personal sympathies, the fear of French expansion was much more real for Britain than the threat of the Russian conquest of Europe.[381] With public opinion almost entirely concentrated on the problem of the Reform, and with British diplomacy working hard to resolve the question of Belgian independence, the issue of Polish independence,

---

[377] See Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*,p. 16.

[378] 'The Refom Act of 1832' [http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/houseofcommons/reformacts/overview/reformact1832/ accessed 17 May 2016].

[379] Michael Brock, 'William IV (1765–1837)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29451, accessed 17 May 2016].

[380] D. Brown, *Palmerston*, p. 154.

[381] For the most recent analysis of Palmerston's attitude towards Poland, based on his official correspondence with Heytesbury, see Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Sprawy polskie w korespondencji…', *Wokół powstania listopadowego. Wybór studiów*, pp. 187-206. For the classic, though slightly outdated study of British political and non-political approaches to Poland during the November Uprising see Dutkiewicz, *Anglia a sprawa polska w latach 1830-31*.

despite the universal sympathy it attracted, could not count on any significant British support. As Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz dryly noted in his diary shortly after his arrival to London, 'here the people… are rather indifferent to the matters that do not directly concern them'.[382]

During the November Uprising

As early as in December 1830 Lord Palmerston informed the British ambassador to Russia, Lord Heytesbury that he declined to intervene on behalf of Poland in cooperation with France because 'to offer such interposition between a Sovereign & his revolted subjects, in the outset of the quarrel, & before anyone can tell what may be its issue, would give just offence & set a very inconvenient example'. Palmerston's perception of the Uprising as a rebellion against the rightful power did not change after the dethronement and until the end of the Polish-Russian struggle he kept considering the revolution as an internal affair of the Russian Empire. Moreover, he refused to consider the Polish Question as something equal to the Greek or Belgian Questions until 'there should appear little or no prospect that the Sovereign could reconquer his former subjects'.[383] This point of view was further strengthened by Heytesbury's report, which informed that that 'any proposal to mediate, whether from France, or from any other Power, would be received, I am convinced, with high indignation, and lead to no beneficial result'.[384]

There was certain a ambiguity in the official British approach to the subject of Poland. On the one hand the question of Polish independence did not play a significant role in contemporary European diplomacy, being widely considered as an internal affair of Russia.[385] On the other hand he kept reminding his ambassador that 'His Majesty's Government are of opinion that any change which would have the effect of incorporating Poland with the Russian Empire, and of destroying its separate administration and constitution, would be a breach of the Treaty of Vienna'. Moreover, the British Government 'could not admit that the revolt of the Poles, and their casting off the authority

---

[382] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, p. 37.
[383] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 31 December 1830. BA PP/GC/HE/146.
[384] Heytesbury to Palmerston, 21 January 1831. *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Poland, 1831-32*. NA FO 417-2, p. 1.
[385] D. Brown, *Palmerston*, p. 154.

of the Emperor and King, could afford to the Russian Government any grounds for departing from the stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna'.[386] The Foreign Secretary had no doubts that the struggle in Poland would be won by Russia. His main concern was, therefore, not the struggle itself, but its aftermath; and the changes to the status of the Kingdom of Poland that Nicolas I wanted to introduce. Consequently the only Polish Question Palmerston and British politicians were willing to discuss was entirely associated with the Treaty of Vienna and the existence of the Kingdom of Poland within the borders of the Russian Empire and under Russian hegemony.

The British public opinion and press were far less specific in their approach to Poland and the Polish Question.[387] The majority of metropolitan newspapers informed their readers about the main events taking place in Poland, often relying on German, Belgian and French papers (see Chapters 1 and 2), but very rarely venturing to discuss Polish matters in their editorials. One of the very few exceptions was the publication of a letter in the *Morning Chronicle* on 7 January 1831. The letter, sent from Warsaw and prepared, most probably, by one of the Polish radicals opposing the policies of the National Government, presented the Polish Uprising as a struggle for independence. As the author concluded, unless European powers support their fight, they 'will learn that the last of the Poles has given himself [sic] to death, and that even the name of this brave people is about to perish in order that the powers of darkness and the throne of absolutism may rise upon the ruins of the rampart of civilisation'.[388] It is doubtful whether this attempt to present a more radical and revolutionary interpretation of the events taking place in the Poland made any significant impact on the British approach to the November Uprising. In many respects the British press' reactions to the Uprising was similar to that expressed four decades earlier: although there was certain interest in the events developing in Poland, far more significant was the situation in France and Belgium.[389]

---

[386] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 22 March 1831. *Correspondence*. NA FO 417-2, p. 2.

[387] See Jasiakiewicz, 'The British Press and the November Uprising 1830-1831', pp. 51-79.

[388] *Morning Chronicle*, 7 January 1831.

[389] Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Sensacja – informacja – komentarz. Londyńska prasa informacyjna o polskich „rewolucjach" 1791 r.', *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 66 (2009), pp. 103-104.

The Times became the most active promoter of the cause of Poland. The newspaper was able to offer articles and correspondence from Poland and Germany thanks to 'its own speedy methods of obtaining news, particularly foreign news'.[390] More important, however, was *The Times*' willingness to advocate the cause of Poland in its editorial. From early January 1831 the newspaper kept expressing its pro-Polish sympathies, wishing the Poles 'success in the name of justice, and of humanity, and of liberty'.[391] In contrast to political considerations of the time, there were very few references to the Treaty of Vienna in the press coverage of the Polish Revolution. From the very beginning, *The Times* seemed ready to accept the fact that the Uprising was a national movement. Nicholas I's manifesto, in which the Tsar demanded the unconditional surrender of the Poles, left them 'no alternative but unconditional submission, or military execution'; and the paper encouraged the Poles to 'display their wounds and sufferings to Europe… [and] arm their whole population, and invite all the Polish nation to join them; and then we may look forward to the shock with some confidence in the success of the cause'.[392] One month later, when the preparations for military struggle between Poland and Russia were underway, the paper wrote that 'it must delight every lover of civil freedom and national independence to hear of the noble spirit with which Poland is preparing to meet the storm, which is ready to burst upon her on the side of Russia'.[393] All these editorials, coupled with numerous detailed reports about the situation in the Kingdom of Poland, left no doubt that *The Times* was not only deeply interested in the fate of Poland, but almost openly supported a completely different Polish Question than that discussed between Palmerston and Heytesbury: not the question of the restoration of the pre-1830 status of the Kingdom, but that of Poland's full independence from the Russian yoke.

It was not until the publication of a letter from a certain 'Britannicus' in March 1831 when the matter of the Treaty of Vienna was introduced on the pages of *The Times* in relation to the question of Poland. 'Who can tell what bloodshed and misery England might

---

[390] J. R. Wood, 'The Times (1785-)', L. Brake, M. Demoor (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (Gent, 2009), p. 627.
[391] *The Times*, 1 January 1831.
[392] *The Times*, 13 January 1831.
[393] *The Times*, 18 February 1831.

have averted… by a timely, vigorous, and decisive appeal to the part she was called upon to act, in seeing that a treaty, to which she stood bound as a high-contracting party, was fulfilled to its utmost letter?' wondered Britannicus,[394] allowing the newspaper to publish details regarding the settlement of the Polish Question at the Treaty of Vienna in the same issue.[395] A month later, however, *The Times* dismissed the importance of the 1815 settlement by claiming that

> however friendly we are to the cause of the Poles, and however ardently we desire their success, the obligation of British interference, in our view, depends more on principles of humanity than on the stipulations of treaties… [W]ile we thus deny the positive obligation imposed on England or France by treaty to support the Poles in their present struggle against Russia, we admit, in its fullest extent, their duty to interfere by representation or remonstrance, on the general principles of humanity and justice, binding at all times, and reinforced in this case by a solemn recognition of their validity on a very important occasion.[396]

Pro-Polish sympathy expressed by *The Times*, along with its dismissal of the importance of the international treaties as a basis for pro-Polish intervention, were not enough to influence British diplomacy and lead the Government and the Foreign Secretary to change their approach to the problem of Poland.

Pro-Polish sympathy in Britain also found other expressions. On 31 January 1831 a public meeting took place at the Rotunda, Blackfriars Road in London, which hailed 'with enthusiasm and delight, the insurrection of the patriot Poles against perfidious usurpers and cruel opressors… and offer[ed] up prayers for their triumphant deliverance from Foreign Bondage'. As the gathered people hailed the Poles as 'the vanguard of the heroes of Liberty', there was no mention of the Treaty of Vienna.[397] In March 1831, some time after the arrival of Aleksander Wielopolski to London (see below), a public dinner was held at the Crown and Anchor to express British sympathy for the cause of Poland. Although it involved several MPs and more politically active members of British society, the meeting's understanding of the Polish Question was still very distant from relying on the Treaty of

---

[394] *The Times*, 21 March 1831.
[395] *The Times*, 21 March 1831.
[396] *The Times*, 21 April 1831.
[397] [Account of the meeting]. BKCz 6635.

Vienna as the main factor. After Hobhouse's speech the gathered people rose to drink to 'the Independence of Poland, violated by fraud, may it be restored by valour, and cemented by liberty'. The meeting gradually drifted away from the subject of Poland towards other liberal causes of contemporary Europe (France, Belgium and Italy), highlighting the European dimension of the Polish Question. The question which, according to participants of both meetings, had much more in common with the universal rights of nations than with international treaties between European powers.[398]

The presence of Polish envoys in London did not bring about any serious change to either the political or the public understanding of the Polish Question. Of the three official representatives of Poland in Britain (Aleksander Wielopolski, Aleksander Walewski[399], and Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz) only the last one was successful in influencing British public opinion. Wielopolski failed to use pro-Polish sympathies manifested at the dinner in March 1831 in order to strengthen the position of the Polish Question.[400] Instead, the cause of Poland seemed to lose some of its appeal in the months that followed. As suggested above (see Chapter 1), the main point of Polish diplomacy in the first months of the Uprising was to promote a pro-Polish understanding of the Treaty of Vienna in France and Britain. This aim, therefore, required that the Polish envoys establish relations with politicians and governments rather than public opinion. Even if Palmerston regularly refused to accept the Polish envoys' credentials (as he said to Wielopolski, he could accept them as travelling Poles, but not as the representatives of the Polish Government[401]), he seemed ready to listen to their explanations. Unfortunately for Poland, the willingness to listen did not mean that Palmerston would readily adopt the principles promoted by the Polish envoys. This proved particularly difficult after the dethronement, when the strongly legalistic approach was replaced by nationalist principles, turning the Kingdom of Poland from a rebellious

---

[398] *Morning Chronicle*, 10 March 1831. *The Times*, 10 March 1831.

[399] Aleksander Colonna-Walewski (1810–1868), illegitimate son of Napoleon Bonaparte, Polish diplomat and politician.

[400] Despite his limited success, Wielopolski received a promotion after his return to Poland in April 1831. See a letter from the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs [to Wielopolski?], 21 April 1831. Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (hereafter: AGAD) 630.

[401] Wielopolski to Czartoryski, 11 January 1831. BKCz 5310.

province to a country fighting for independence. Palmerston remained unmoved by these changes, while the British press did not seem to notice them at all.

There was also another element that differentiated the political considerations of Palmerston and the enthusiastic support offered by *The Times* and public opinion. The tone of official despatches, as well as that of private letters, sent to St Petersburg left very little doubt that the Foreign Secretary did not believe in the success of the Polish Revolution. In March 1831 in both official and private communications to Heytesbury Palmerston seemed convinced that the Russian victory was only a matter of time.[402] This approach started to slowly change as far along as in September, but even then the Cabinet was unable 'to come to any decision as to the particular steps [Britain] may take'.[403] At the same time the British press and British public opinion remained very optimistic about Polish chances. Even in September, when the negotiations between the Poles and Russians were underway, *The Times* commented that 'should a treaty of peace appear impossible, on terms honourable to Poland, a dreadful slaughter must ensue. Fifty thousand of the best troops of Europe, distinguished by a state of discipline, and animated by great enthusiasm, will not allow their capital to be taken, and their fellow-citizens massacred, without a terrible resistance'.[404] It was one of the most direct indications of *The Times*' belief in not only moral, but also military prowess of the Polish Army, which, even at that perilous time, should have been capable of defeating the Russians.[405]

The disappointment of British public opinion that followed the fall of the November Uprising (see Chapter 2) was a serious factor in the gradual disappearance of interest in the problem of Poland in the British press. The end of the Uprising was almost universally perceived as the end of the significance of the problem of Poland in international politics and not, as Lewitter argued, an opening of a new political issue.[406]

---

[402] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 22 March 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/147. Palmerston to Heytesbury, 22 March 1831. *Correspondence*. NA FO/417/2, p. 1.

[403] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 21 September 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/152.

[404] *The Times*, 8 September 1831.

[405] A slightly different interpretation is offered by Jasiakiewicz, but even he agrees that in general British press was sympathetic towards the Uprising. See Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*, pp. 11, 28.

[406] See Lewitter, 'The Polish Cause as Seen in Great Britain, 1830-1863', p. 40.

After the November Uprising

The surrender of Polish the capital marked the beginning of the second chapter of British pro-Polish sympathies. After many detailed accounts of the siege, fighting and surrender, the newspapers lost their interest in Poland. The fall of Warsaw was almost universally considered as the sign of the final defeat of the Polish Revolution. Rumours about the potential continuation of the struggle were cited, but treated with deep disbelief. With the diminishing interest of the British press, the last months of 1831 was a time when the activities of the last Polish envoy to Britain, Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, became one of the key elements that helped preserve the Polish Question in Britain. Two of the most important developments of the post-Uprising months were the growing interest in the cause of Poland expressed by several recognised members of British political and cultural life and the universal acceptance of the Treaty of Vienna as the main reference point in all diplomatic discussions about Poland.

The fall of the November Uprising did not influence the British Government's approach to the problem of Poland to a large degree, but the success of Russia in quelling the revolution made British communications regarding Poland even weaker than before. While *The Times* demanded official and bold remonstrances, all that Palmerston could offer were observations presented 'in the most amicable tone'. As he argued, the British Government was convinced that Nicholas I 'would use his victory… with the moderation and mercy congenial with the high-minded and generous sentiments which are well known to animate the mind of His Imperial Majesty'.[407] In personal letters Palmerston was far less flattering, claiming that it was impossible for the Government 'to sit silent and passive' when the Treaty of Vienna was violated by Russia. Britain, he pointed out, was 'just as much entitled to have a voice upon the interpretation of the treaty' as Austria and Prussia. However, British policy towards Russia and Poland was based on the false assumption that 'the Emperor would respect treaties'.[408] All of Palmerston's arguments were strongly and decisively rejected by Russia. As Heytesbury explained, 'the peaceable co-existence for any long period, and under the same sceptre, of absolute government in Russia, and

[407] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 23 November 1831. *Correspondence*. NA FO/417/2, pp. 8-9.
[408] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 23 November 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/153.

constitutional liberty in Poland, would be impossible'.[409] Neither Palmerston's reliance on the Treaty of Vienna, nor the fact that France shared the British determination to uphold the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland,[410] could change the Russian policy of the complete subjugation of Poland and Poles in the aftermath of the Uprising. Interestingly, references to the Treat of Vienna were not limited to British diplomacy.

The Treaty, previously disregarded as an insignificant element of the British approach to the question of Polish independence, reappeared in the columns of *The Times*. The newspaper was forced to admit that the failure of the Uprising left the Poles with only one option: a return to the pre-1830 situation: 'we trust that the European Governments… will urge on his Imperial Majesty a general amnesty, and the re-establishment of the Kingdom of Poland, with all its privileged and rights, as guaranteed by the Congress of Vienna'.[411] Several days later the paper looked with some hope at reports from French and German papers in regard to the planned Russian policy towards Poland, 'allow[ing] us to suppose that the semblance of a *kingdom of Poland* will still be kept up'.[412] Having failed to obtain official support for Poland during the November Uprising, *The Times* turned to defending the official rights of the Kingdom stemming from the Treaty of Vienna. In consequence the paper's interpretation of the Polish Question came very closely to that expressed by Palmerston.

The unexpected fall of Warsaw and the decline of the November Uprising left British newspapers with a shortage of significant or thrilling events to write about. *The Times*' continued campaign in defence of Poland remained the only expression of pro-Polish sympathy in late 1831. Other expressions of sympathy, which were rather infrequent during the Uprising and never united by a common figure or organisation (as it happened in France with the Comité Franco-Polonaise, see Chapters 1 and 2), became even scarcer. The presence of Niemcewicz, who did everything he could to invigorate pro-Polish circles in the second half of 1831, should be considered a central figure in preserving the question of Polish independence in autumn that year.

---

[409] Heytesbury to Palmerston, 2 January 1832. *Correspondence*. NA FO/417/2, pp. 11-12.
[410] Palmerston to Heytesbury, 23 November 1831. BA PP/GC/HE/153.
[411] *The Times*, 7 November 1831.
[412] *The Times*, 12 November 1831.

The most successful achievement of Niemcewicz in those months was the restoration of Thomas Campbell's interest in Poland, a development which in early 1832 led to the creation of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (see below). Campbell's relations with Poland dated back to the late eighteenth century and his famous poem *Pleasures of Hope*. The work had become a great success soon after its publication.[413] In the lines widely known as 'The Fall of Warsaw' (which constituted part of the poem), Campbell had condemned the partitions of Poland, the bloody massacre of Polish civilians by Russians, and the fall of a Polish national hero, Tadeusz Kościuszko.[414] The work established Campbell's position as a friend of Poland. Campbell's friend and biographer claimed that the affairs of Poland were 'the ruling passion' of his life,[415] but there is very little evidence of his interest in Poland in the years separating the publication of the *Pleasures of Hope* and the defeat of the November Uprising.[416] Although Campbell was hailed as 'the staunchest friend [Poland] had in England',[417] his position and pro-Polish sympathies were not widely known during the Polish-Russian struggle. Only after the meeting with Niemcewicz in October 1831 did Campbell begin to consider taking a more active role in promoting the cause of Poland. This was also when the idea of pro-Polish association came to his mind.[418] However, these developments of pro-Polish sympathies lacked any political agenda. In contrast to Palmerston and *The Times*, Campbell's ideas

---

[413] Geoffrey Carnall, 'Campbell, Thomas (1777–1844)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4534, accessed 17 May 2016].

[414] *Poetical Works of Thomas Campbell* (Edinburgh, 1837), p. 27. Kościuszko, contrary to the suggestion made by Campbell in his poem, did not die; he survived the fall of Warsaw, was captured and imprisoned by Russians and finally released. On Kościuszko's role as the Polish national hero see A. Barszczewska-Krupa, *Kościuszko. W kręgu mitologii narodowej* (Łódź, 1995). On links between Campbell and Poland see J. A. Teslar, 'Poland in the Poetry and Life of Thomas Campbell', Antemurale, XII (Rome-London, 1968), pp. 267–310.

[415] W. Beattie, *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III (London, 1849) (hereafter: *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*), p. 75.

[416] On one occasion in 1804 he was offered a chair at the University of Vilna, which he declined due to 'his interest in the regeneration of Poland'. Carnall, G., 'Campbell, Thomas (1777-1844)'. Beattie presents a slightly more complicated picture of that choice in the second volume of his biography; see *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, II, pp. 1-23.

[417] Campbell to unidentified recipient, 31 July 1831. *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III, p. 87.

[418] Campbell to unidentified recipient, 18 October 1831. *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III, p. 101.

regarding support for Poland and Poles were based entirely on moral rather, than political or ideological, grounds.

In that period Campbell was the most prominent, but certainly not the only sympathiser of the cause of Poland in London. Several vague talks were held about the creation of a pro-Polish society, an idea inspired by the developments in Paris.[419] The result was, however, very limited, and prominent figures of British political life (like Sir Francis Burdett[420]) were reluctant to get involved.[421] Niemcewicz's diary is the only source that provides very vague information on the creation of the pro-Polish committee at the end of November 1831,[422] leading some Polish historians to assume the existence of such an organisation.[423] There is, however, no other evidence that would prove its existence and the lack of involvement of any recognised figure in these early organisational attempts was perhaps the main reason for their failure.[424] As will be shown below, it was only after Thomas Campbell started his active work towards the creation of a pro-Polish society when these universal sympathies became successfully channelled into the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland.[425]

---

[419] Pro-Polish circles in Paris organised two committees, the French and the American. Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, p. 114. For more details regarding the French committee, see M. Brown, 'The Comite Franco-Polonais and the French Reaction to the Polish Uprising of November 1830', pp. 774–793.

[420] Sir Francis Burdett (1770–1844), British liberal and radical politician.

[421] Niemcewicz, pp. 118-121.

[422] *Ibid.*

[423] L. Zielinski, *Emigracja polska w Anglii w latach 1831-1846* (Gdańsk, 1964), p. 8. M. J. E. Copson-Niećko, 'Pro-Polish Agitation in Great Britain, 1832-1867' (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London, 1968), p. 363.

[424] Zieliński refers to four individuals who were, allegedly, involved in the creation of this organisation: Adolph Bach, Hunter Gordon, Andrew Kirwan and Arthur White. Zielinski, *Emigracja Polska w Anglii w latach 1831-1846*, p. 9. Interestingly, a similar account of events is presented by Eileen Currain in her short biographies of Kirwan and Gordon. See Curran, E., 'Biographies of Some Obscure Contributors to 19th-century Periodicals' *Victorian Research Web* [http://victorianresearch.org/Obscure_contributors.html, accessed 17 May 2016].

[425] Interestingly, the main works devoted to history of the LAFP tend to pass in silence over these early developments, concentrating, instead, on the well-documented, post-1832 activities of the organisation. Among the reasons behind that silence may be the well-established assumption of the involvement of Niemcewicz and Czartoryski in the creation of the organisation and very strong reliance on Polish, rather than British, primary sources. See Dopierala, 'Literackie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie', pp. 63–77; Pomorski, 'Geneza, program i struktura organizacyjna Towarzystwa Literackiego Przyjaciół

Prince Adam Czartoryski and the Polish Question

Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, the former President of the Polish National Government and the director of Polish diplomacy at the time of the Uprising, arrived in London in late December 1831. At the same time the growing numbers of Polish exiles arriving in Paris turned the French capital into the political centre of the Great Emigration (see Chapter 2). While the Polish democratic leaders who arrived in Paris in late 1831 struggled to establish themselves in the centre of the forthcoming wave of exiles, Czartoryski's choice of London seemed to be an attempt to create a political counterbalance to their activities.[426] In Paris General Karol Kniaziewicz[427] and Ludwik Plater[428] (people with 'good heads, Polish hearts [who were] truly attached to Prince [Czartoryski]'[429]) regarded the Prince as the representative of the Polish nation. They followed Czartoryski's instructions and continued their political activities after the fall of the Uprising.[430] At the same time in London the cause of Poland lacked any strong representation, despite the presence and activities of Niemcewicz. It was up to Czartoryski to fill that vacuum and restore British interest in the Polish Question.

Czartoryski's choice of London rather than Paris was dictated primarily by political considerations. The London Conference was still debating the Question of Belgium and Czartoryski hoped that this gathering of leading European diplomats could be influenced and, after finalising the problem of Belgium, the conference would turn to resolving the

---

Polski', pp. 157–82; Stummer, 'Rola Literackiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Polski w kształtowaniu brytyjskiej opinii publicznej w sprawie polskiej (1832-1856)', pp. 43-64.

[426] Zamoyski encouraged Czartoryski to create a centre of power opposite to that in Paris and to use his authority to present his interpretation of the November Uprising before 'those madmen [i.e. Polish liberals]… convince the Governments that our cause is inseparable from Jacobinism'. Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 10 December 1831. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, II, pp. 472-476.

[427] Karol Kniaziewicz (1762-1842), Polish general and politician; he took part in the Napoleonic Wars and, after Napoleon's defeat, settled in Paris. During the November Uprising, together with Plater, he organised the Polish Legacy in Paris, which oversaw Polish diplomatic activities in Western Europe.

[428] Ludwik Plater (1775–1846), Polish politician and representative of Poland in Paris during the November Uprising.

[429] Sienkiewicz to Zamoyski, 6 April 1832. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, II, p. 525.

[430] The Polish legacy in Paris, which had been established soon after the outbreak of the Uprising and received support of such figures as Lafayette, later was transformed into the central Polish diplomatic agency that controlled envoys in other countries. With General Kniaziewicz and Ludwik Plater, it was well represented. See Dutkiewicz, *Francja a Polska w 1831 r.*.

subject of Poland.[431] Aware of the sympathy of the French public opinion towards the cause of Poland, the Prince considered winning over Britain as the prime objective; one which would eventually lead to a joint Franco-British intervention that had not materialised in the previous months.[432] Moreover, London was also far more politically stable than revolutionary Paris, where only a year before the July Revolution had overthrown the Bourbons and established a new monarchy. Czartoryski perceived Britain as the mediator in European diplomacy (it was, after all, the host of the London Conference) and the strongest liberal power, whose parliamentary system, free press and public opinion would be central in promoting the Polish Question and influencing the reluctant Government to intervene in the Polish affairs.[433] As early as in October 1831 Czartoryski made up his mind as to the main points of his post-Uprising politics.[434] Upon arrival in London, he put these plans into action.

For the first months of his stay in Britain Czartoryski focused on discussing the Polish Question with leading British politicians. Even before the New Year Czartoryski met with Talleyrand (called by Zamoyski 'the only ally' of Poland among the Western Governments[435]), Palmerston, and Grey, presenting them with his own interpretation of the Treaty of Vienna and the rights of the Kingdom of Poland, which should be defended by all signatories of the treaty. However, these early discussions had a mixed outcome. On the one hand, both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary seemed 'to understand the validity of [his] arguments'.[436] Sympathetic as they were, however, on the other they argued that the points referring to Poland were rather unclear and Czartoryski's interpretations were only one way of seeing things. Moreover, the treaty had also been signed by Prussia and Austria, making it particularly difficult for Britain and France to

---

[431] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Sprawa belgijska w działalności politycznej księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1833)', p. 6.

[432] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 25 December 1831. BKCz 5274.

[433] Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Działalność Księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego w Wielkiej Brytanii*, pp. 7–8.

[434] Czartoryski to Niemcewicz, 23 October 1831. W. Plater, 'Korrespondencye księcia Adama Czartoryskiego', *Album Muzeum Narodowego w Rapperswyll. Na stoletnią rocznicę 1772 r.* (Poznań, 1872), p. 132.

[435] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 20.

[436] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 29 December 1831. BKCz 5274.

counter their influence in Central Europe. Arguments used by British politicians 'made a very sad impression'[437] on Czartoryski. As he admitted in one of his earliest letters from London, he was not sure what Poles could demand from the British Government after the failure of the Uprising.[438] Hoping for more decisive action on the part of the British Government, Czartoryski felt disappointed that by the first week of January 1832 'the interest [of Poland] remained stagnant'.[439]

These early encounters between Czartoryski and British politicians left no doubt as to what Czartoryski's understanding of the Polish Question was. 'Because they want to keep the Treaty of Vienna so that not a single article is violated, they should now demand its fulfilment [with regard to the Kingdom of Poland]', he argued.[440] His determination was strengthened after the first meeting with Talleyrand in London. As the French envoy argued, only the Treaty of Vienna gave the Poles a chance for diplomatic success after the defeat of the November Uprising.[441] With the quiet support of Talleyrand, Czartoryski became the champion of the legal interpretation of the Polish Question as an issue rooted in the Treaty of Vienna. In consequence his early attempts were aimed at not only making the cause of Poland 'the cause of Britain',[442] but also, perhaps more importantly, at turning the problem of Poland as an element of the 1815 treaty into an issue of European governments.[443] Despite similarities between Czartoryski's approach and opinions expressed by Palmerston during the Uprising, the British Government was reluctant to get involved in the affairs of Poland, forcing Czartoryski to adjust his politics and seek other ways of influencing British political circles. The only successes of these early months was the universal agreement on the part of British politicians not to accept Russian explanations of the Treaty of Vienna and the introduction of the Organic Statute (issued in February 1832 and replacing the Constitution of the Kingdom of Poland). In consequence, the cause

---

[437] *Ibid*.
[438] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 25 December 1831. Plater, "Korrespondencye", pp. 139-142.
[439] Czartoryski to Ludwik Plater, 6 January 1832. BKCz 5274.
[440] Czartoryski to Niemcewicz, 23 October 1831. Plater, 'Korrespondencye', p. 132.
[441] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 25 December 1831. Plater, 'Korrespondencye', pp. 139-142.
[442] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 9 and 16 January 1832. BKCz 5274.
[443] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 25 December 1831. Plater, 'Korrespondencye', p. 140.

of Poland was left 'suspended [*w zawieszeniu*]',[444] waiting for a more favourable international situation that would lead to its resolution.

With people like Palmerston, Grey, and Brougham accepting his explanation of the Treaty of Vienna and his interpretation of the Polish Question, Czartoryski could turn to introducing the Polish Question to a wider audience. Thanks to the contacts Niemcewicz had established in the second part of 1831 in London, the cause of Poland was not lacking in people willing to give their official support. Two ways of influencing the British public opinion were prepared. One pertained to the preparation of an article in one of the leading periodicals. With readership of approximately 10,000 people, these British quarterlies had a large impact on the opinions of the British upper and middle classes.[445] The articles published therein had much more in common with encyclopaedic entries than with anything published in the press, but, at the same time, they had to fulfil certain standards.[446] The usual length of quarterly publications allowed the writers to present a much more detailed argument than those offered by the editorials of daily newspapers. It appeared that the form of articles published in the periodicals would offer a perfect balance between newspaper articles, short but reaching a wider audience, and pamphlets (several, for example the anonymous *Poland. The Polish Question Shortly Stated*[447] or Hunter Gordon's[448] *Considerations on the War in Poland*[449], were already in circulation), which did not always guarantee wide readership. Consequently, Czartoryski choose the *Edinburgh Review* as the best platform to promote the Polish Question and entrusted Henry Rich[450] with the task of writing a long and comprehensive pro-Polish article for the quarterly.[451]

At the same time Czartoryski and Niemcewicz looked for the right Member of Parliament to introduce the subject of Poland to the House of Commons. Although the

---

[444] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 16 January 1832. BKCz 5274.

[445] Shattock, J., *Politics and Reviewers: The Edinburgh and the Quarterly in the Early Victorian Age* (London, 1989), p. 5.

[446] *Ibid*., pp. 6-7.

[447] *Poland. The Polish Question Shortly Stated* (London, 1831).

[448] Hunter Gordon (1799/1800-1855), barrister and writer, he was involved in the early activities of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland.

[449] H. Gordon, *Considerations of the War in Poland* (London, 1831).

[450] Henry Rich (1803–1869), British liberal, later MP for Knaresborough and Richmond.

[451] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, p. 178. Czartoryski to Plater, 17 February 1832. BKCz 5274.

subject of Poland had been raised in the Commons several times during the November Uprising, none of these debates could be considered a successful defence of Polish rights. They are, however, not insignificant in presenting how interest in Poland developed independently from the efforts of the Polish envoys. Even if the Polish Question was considered as only one of the many liberal causes advocated primarily by British radicals (Henry Hunt,[452] George de Lacy Evans,[453] Sir Francis Burdett, and Daniel O'Connell[454]), these early debates helped Niemcewicz in establishing contacts with various MPs – contacts that were later used by Czartoryski in his attempts to make sure that the subject of Poland would be properly introduced to the House of Commons.[455] 'Properly' meant that it would not be linked with British radicalism, but presented in the most universal and neutral way that could appeal to all political parties.[456] This approach was perhaps one of the reasons why, instead of relying on any of the above MPs, Czartoryski and Niemcewicz looked for a new representative. They chose Robert Cutlar Fergusson,[457] a barrister who had spent many years in India and who, despite his liberal sympathies, was not associated with parliamentary radicals. After some considerations and several meetings with Palmerston, Fergusson agreed to become the advocate of Poland in the first serious pro-Polish debate in the Commons.[458]

The Reform Bill, which previously served as one of the distractions that prevented the raise of the Polish Question to greater prominence in British parliamentary debates, once again proved to be a significant factor that the British friends of Poland had to take into consideration. While Czartoryski and Niemcewicz worked hard on preparations of the new pro-Polish debate in the House of Commons, the subject of the Reform entered its final phase. When Niemcewicz tried to convince Colonel de Lacy Evans to introduce the

---

[452] Henry Hunt (1773–1835), known as Orator Hunt, British radical.

[453] George de Lacy Evans (1787–1870), British officer and politician.

[454] Daniel O'Connell (1775–1847), Irish nationalist leader.

[455] The previous debates on the subject of Poland took place on 8 and 16 August, 7 September, and 13 October 1831. See *Hasard*, vol. 5, cc. 930-933; vol. 6, cc. 101-110, 1216-1218; vol. 8 cc. 696-697.

[456] 'There are many who could raise the question [of Poland] in the Parliament, for example O'Connel and Sheil, but we do not want people to think that we rely on radicals, our principles are completely different'. Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 189-190.

[457] Robert Cutlar Fergusson (1768–1838), British judge and liberal politician.

[458] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 206, 220.

cause of Poland to Parliament, he refused to do so due to the Parliament's universal preoccupation with the Reform Bill.[459] Even Fergusson did not hide his reluctance to defend the cause of Poland at a time when the whole country was so preoccupied with other matters.[460] The same could be said about British diplomacy. The London Conference was slowly reaching a final agreement on the subject of the separation of Belgium and the Netherlands and at that particular moment Palmerston seemed unwilling to annoy Russia with a new Polish debate in the Commons.[461] However, neither the lack of public interest, nor the diplomatic troubles of the London Conference could stop Czartoryski from pushing for a pro-Polish debate, which was to take place shortly before Easter of 1832.

Both Henry Rich's article (published in the April issue of *The Edinburgh Review*) and Fergusson's motion (which was floored on 18 April 1832) were part of a highly coordinated offensive that articulated, in great detail, the main points of Prince Czartoryski's policy. 'It [was] of no small importance to precede the motion with [Rich's] article' wrote Czartoryski after Niemcewicz convinced Fergusson to speak on behalf of Poland.[462] Consequently, the Parliamentary debate was delayed several times, partly due to the prolonged process of the article's publication, and partly because Palmerston's own requests related to the ratification of the Belgian settlement. One particularly interesting element of these preparations was the involvement of the Foreign Secretary. He was the first person Fergusson consulted after Niemcewicz's offer to present the pro-Polish motion in the House of Commons. He was also the person who made sure that the debate would take place at a convenient time. It was also possible that proofs of Rich's article on Poland were sent to Palmerston for approval.[463] Although the Foreign Secretary warned Czartoryski that the Poles could count neither on the Whigs nor on the Tories, he remained deeply involved in the activities of the 'wild cards [*luźne figury*]' who decided to support

---

[459] *Ibid.*, pp. 182-183.

[460] *Ibid*., p. 207.

[461] Fishman, *Diplomacy and Revolution*, pp. 181–190. See also Czartoryski to Plater, 2 April 1832. BKCz 5274.

[462] Czartoryski to Niemcewicz, 25 March 1832. BKCz 5274.

[463] Shattock suggests that Fergusson 'deferred his motion in the House for several days and continue[d] to do so until the *Edinburgh Review* reached London'. Shattock, *Politics and Reviewers*, pp. 85, 130.

the question of Poland.[464] On the one hand this fact can be considered as yet another political consideration, an attempt to prevent pro-Polish sentiments from undermining the still ongoing negotiations regarding Belgium.[465] On the other hand, however, Palmerston never missed the occasion to express his sympathies towards Poland during meetings with the Polish envoys and Czartoryski (see above). Finally, it was also possible that Palmerston wanted to make sure that the Polish Question promoted by Rich and Fergusson was properly rooted in the Treaty of Vienna and lacked any radical arguments.

The tone of both the article and the debate was very mild and restrained. Rich's article rejected 'any wild schemes of restoration', but, at the same time, repeated one of the typical arguments used by Czartoryski and claimed that 'there was nothing to annul the rights vested in [Poles] by the Congress of Vienna'.[466] On his part, Fergusson abstained from any clear-cut demands or criticism of the Government, promising to return to the subject of Poland in a more favourable time. The debate itself took place on the last day of the session, before the House adjourned for Easter. Moreover, as the last discussion of the day, it could not attract too much attention from MPs. Even Palmerston himself was absent and it was Lord Althorp who represented the Government in that discussion. Although the debate itself seemed like a very inauspicious beginning of the issue at hand, support for the question of Poland was universal and every MP who decided to speak in this debate shared 'the profound sympathy which the sufferings of the unhappy Poles must excite in the breast of every man of common humanity'.[467]

The debate excited some interest of *The Times*, but, at the same time, the newspaper was fully aware of the difficult situation in European politics. Russia would be left 'unmolested in her sinister policy towards Poland', the editors argued. However, 'the time,

---

[464] Czartoryski to the Polish Legation, 16 January 1832. Plater, 'Korrespondencye', pp. 159-161.

[465] Shortly before the debate Palmerston tried to convince Fergusson that he should underline the positive elements of the new Organic Statute that had been introduced in the Kingdom of Poland. See Czartoryski to unknown recipient, 18 April 1832. BKCz 5274.

[466] Rich, H., 'History, Present Wrongs, and Claims of Poland', *Edinburgh Review* (April 1832), pp. 258-260. Jasiakiewicz, though aware of Rich's article, seems to completely ignore the unique character of British quarterlies, analysing works published in them in his chapter devoted to the problem of British press. See Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*, pp. 11-38; Jasiakiewicz, 'The British Press and the November Uprising 1830-1831', p. 52.

[467] House of Commons Debate, 18 April 1832. *Hansard*, Vol. 12, cc. 636-664.

indeed, is pregnant, but the birth cannot be soon' and 'Poland will yet raise her noble mien among the nations'.[468] The conservative *Morning Post* had a completely different point of view and claimed that, contrary to arguments put forward by Rich and Fergusson:

> the Treaty of Vienna, so far as it related to Poland, has been cancelled by a general consent clearly implied in the conduct of all the parties to it; by the consent of the Polish nation when they attempted by the force of their own independent arms to conquer for themselves the unqualified right of self-government; by the consent of Russia when she set herself to the task of recovering by her own means, and without the participation of her allies, the territories of which successful revolt had deprived her; and by France, England, Austria and Prussia, when they neglected to interpose, while yet the necessity for reconquering Poland was incomplete, and the full rights of conquest could not be acquired.[469]

The newspaper seemed unwilling to acknowledge the unofficial support given to the Russian Army by Prussia and Austria (a development which had become the subject of a short parliamentary debate in August 1831[470]). On the one hand, the *Morning Post*'s comments can be perceived as an interesting conservative counterbalance to the more pro-Polish sympathies expressed during the debate by Sir Charles Forbes[471] and Viscount Sandon[472]. On the other, the newspaper's criticism was aimed at the Whigs, who refused to interfere in the affairs of Poland when they had a chance of doing so. Though the Tories were even more unlikely supporters of Poland, this did not stop the*Morning Post* from criticising the decisions made by the Whigs.

The common element of both Rich's article and Fergusson's motion was their reliance on the 1815 settlement and, in consequence, their presentation of only one Polish Question: that of the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland within the Russian Empire. This was the only way in which Czartoryski wanted to frame the Polish Question.[473] In fact, the question had to be framed in this matter if Poland was to receive any type of political

---

[468] *The Times*, 20 April 1832.
[469] *Morning Post*, 20 April 1832.
[470] House of Commons Debate, 16 August 1831. *Hansard*, vol. 6, cc. 101-110.
[471] Sir Charles Forbes, first baronet (1773–1849), British conservative politician, opponent of the Reform Bill.
[472] Dudley Ryder, first earl of Harrowby (1762–1847), British conservative politician known for his strong opposition to the Reform Bill.
[473] S. Kalembka, 'Koncepcje dróg do niepodległości i kształtu Polski wyzwolonej w myśli politycznej Wielkiej Emigracji', p. 41.

support in Britain. Ideas that previously had been presented only in half-official communications and memoranda presented to British politicians were turned into comprehensive arguments. Through the *Edinburgh Review* the question of Poland reached thousands of readers across the country, while the motion presented in the House of Commons did not only increase the awareness of British MPs, but reached a wider audience through the publication of the whole debate or its summaries in other metropolitan newspapers. As Niemcewicz observed, 'today we have to wait for political events and changes in Russia, for a universal revolution [*wstrząśnienie*] that would be the only hope for the restoration of Poland. The only thing we can do is to prepare minds, [to obtain] sympathy of foreign Governments'.[474] The April debate and Rich's article were only the first steps in that process.

'Engraving the name of Poland on the walls of European Parliaments'

After the Polish Question was introduced to the British public and Parliament in April 1832, British interest in the subject started to develop independently from the activities of Czartoryski and Niemcewicz. This was particularly visible in the creation of various pro-Polish societies across Britain (see below). In the meantime, however, the Poles kept providing their British friends, particularly those active in the House of Commons, with up-to-date news from the Kingdom of Poland. The following year saw a number of different parliamentary debates on the subject of Poland (two in 1832 and three in 1833), but most of them were less organised and less influential than the events of April 1832.[475] Although shortly after his first motion Fergusson started considering a second one, this time the interest and involvement of the Polish exiles was much more limited.[476] Niemcewicz and Czartoryski left London as early as in April, the former travelling to Bristol, hoping to obtain an official petition to the Parliament from the local people, the latter going to Paris

[474] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, p. 279.

[475] See for example Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*, pp. 142-180; Marchlewicz, 'Propolski lobbing w Izbach Gmin i Lordów w latach trzydziestych i czterdziestych XIX wieku', pp. 61–76.

[476] Czartoryski to unknown recipient, 18 April 1832. BKCz 5274.

to spend Easter with his wife and children.[477] Both Poles did not return to the capital until June 1832.

After the April 1832 debate that established the basis for any pro-Polish intervention and explained the significance of the Polish Question in European politics, the June motion had a slightly different aim. Once again the representative of the cause of Poland was Robert Cutlar Fergusson. In his speech, Fergusson did not fail to refer to political issues discussed two months before, establishing links between both debates. However, the main focus of the discussion were Russian atrocities and violations of the Constitution taking place in the Kingdom of Poland in the aftermath of the November Uprising. 'Children had been carried away by thousands … under the colour or pretence of an Imperial Ukase, which declared, that all infants who had neither father nor mother, belonged to the state' Fergusson lamented, presenting several other examples of Russian cruelty. In this context the motion itself, which requested the Government to present copies of the Organic Statute of 26 February 1832,[478] seemed almost as an excuse for the whole debate.

Fergusson's motion was seconded by Viscount Sandon and supported by various Whigs (Lord Morperh,[479] Lord Ebrington[480]), Tories (Sir Robert Inglis,[481] George Pigott[482]) and radicals (O'Connell, Hume, Evans). Even Lord Palmerston himself appeared supportive and he did not refuse to produce the papers Fergusson asked for. He also reassured the House that 'Great Britain possessed a full right to express a decided opinion upon the performance or the non-performance of the stipulations contained in [the Treaty of Vienna]'. Regardless of the strong language used by O'Connell (who called Nicholas I 'the miscreant conqueror') and the rather critical tone of Peel's speech (who 'wished to be quite certain that the allegations [presented by Fergusson and respecting the situation in Poland]

---

[477] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 243–244.

[478] The Organic Statute introduced in the Kingdom of Poland replaced the Polish Constitution granted by Alexander I. Skowronek, *Od konspiracji do kapitulacji*, pp. 1–4.

[479] George William Frederick Howard (1802–1864), seventh earl of Carlisle, from 1825 to 1848 Viscount Morpeth, British Whig politician.

[480] Hugh Fortescue (1783–1861), second Earl Fortescue, Whig politician.

[481] Sir Robert Harry Inglis (1786–1855), conservative politician.

[482] George Pigott (1796-1865), conservative politician.

were true, and would suspend his judgement till he was satisfied upon that point'), the pro-Polish feelings expressed in this debate were universal. The discussion attracted much more interest from MPs representing all sides of British Parliamentary life and, despite the late hour, it was far more successful than the April discussion.[483] Firstly, support for the cause of Poland was expressed by Whigs, Tories, and radicals alike. Secondly, Palmerston's speech, in which the Foreign Secretary expressed his conviction that Britain had the right to oppose the changes taking place in the Kingdom of Poland, strengthened Polish hopes for some kind of diplomatic support. Finally, the motion itself was a small, but important success; and the presentation of the Organic Statute was used in pro-Polish actions both in and outside the Parliament (see below).

Although Czartoryski considered the second debate as a step forward in promoting the cause of Poland,[484] his attention was already turned to other actions aimed at preserving the Polish military spirit through the involvement of Polish soldiers and officers in Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Algiers.[485] Despite Czartoryski's determination to promote the cause of Poland in Britain, calling him 'the chief propagandist' of the Polish Question seems like a serious exaggeration.[486] From mid-1832 it was Władysław Zamoyski who was 'appointed' by Czartoryski as his new representative in Britain, taking over responsibility for promoting the cause of Poland in the parliament.[487] The first debate overseen by Zamoyski was a discussion from 7 August, which linked the Russo-Dutch loan with the problem of Poland and Russian violations of the Treaty of Vienna (the idea was first suggested by the Tory MP George Piggot in a debate from 28 June). The motion, introduced by Colonel Evans, was eventually withdrawn, but served as yet another opportunity to remind the Parliament and the public opinion about the international significance of the cause of Poland.[488]

---

[483] House of Commons debate, 28 June 1832. *Hansard*, Vol. 13, cc. 1115-1152.
[484] Czartoryski to unknown recipient, 30 June 1832. BKCz 5274.
[485] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Polskie Emigracje', pp. 168–177. See also Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Sprawa belgijska w działalności politycznej księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1833)', pp. 21-25.
[486] Lewitter, 'The Polish Cause as Seen in Great Britain, 1830-1863', p. 44-45.
[487] Czartoryski to Palmerston, 3 August 1832. BA PP/GC/CZ/1.
[488] House of Commons Debate, 7 August 1832. *Hansard*, Vol. 14, cc. 1209-1230.

From Zamoyski's perspective, the discussion of 7 August was 'a good debate', one that would increase interest in Poland.[489] One of the main consequences of the 1832 debates was the growing fear of the British Government that continued discussions on the subject of Poland and the expression of anti-Russian sentiment in the Parliament would make British relations with Nicholas I more difficult.[490] These fears were particularly alive at the time of the June 1832 discussion, which took place a day before the planned departure of Lord Durham to St. Petersburg.[491] However, regardless of the Polish determination to continue promoting the cause of Poland in Britain, and despite the Poles' continuous attempts to turn that cause into a major European question, there is very little to suggest that Poland played any significant role in British diplomatic and political considerations. As Palmerston admitted in one of his early despatches to Lord Durham, who replaced Heytesbury at St Petersburg, the subject of Poland remained a significant issue in British-Russian relations and the previous opinions of the British Government (that had been communicated to Heytesbury) 'remain[ed] unaltered'. This, however, did not change the fact that Durham was to declare 'His Majesty's desire to maintain, and, if possible, to draw closer the bonds of alliance which connect two Powers whose union must have so salutary an effect in preserving the peace of the world'.[492] Sympathy for Poland and rejection of any changes that had taken place in the Kingdom after the November Uprising were not enough to change British foreign policy. Avoiding any major European conflict and maintaining the balance of power both in the West and in the East continued to determine the decisions of the Government.

As was illustrated above, preparing a large pro-Polish debate was a difficult task; one which did not always guarantee visible success. Work towards the third motion of Fergusson serves as the best illustration of that process thanks to detailed accounts and a letter by Władysław Zamoyski. Finding the right person to introduce the problem of Poland to the House of Commons was usually the first step for a successful motion. In the early

---

[489] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 7-8 August 1832. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 38-40.
[490] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 8 August 1832. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 40-41.
[491] T. Grzebieniowski, *Polska misja Lorda Durhama, 1832, 1835-37* (Warszawa, 1933), pp. 8–10. See also Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 9 August 1833. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 43-45.
[492] Palmerston to Durham, 3 July 1832. NA FO 417/2, pp. 18-19.

1830s this person was Fergusson, later in that decade it was Lord Dudley Stuart, but after his defeat in the 1837 elections the Poles were forced to look for other speakers, not always so widely recognised as defenders of the Polish cause (Chapters 6 and 7). The next step was obtaining support from other MPs. The names of those who supported the motion were sometimes even more important than the name of the main speaker. Usually the numbers of those who spoke on behalf of Poland in the Parliament were smaller than numbers of those who had declared their support. Facing ministerial opposition, many MPs decided to withdraw their support and abstain from raising their voices in defence of Poland. Regardless of these difficulties, one of the greatest successes of the cause of Poland was that it received backing from the Whigs, the Radicals, and the Tories alike.[493] Although with time knowledge of the Polish Question was becoming more accessible and more people knew about the principles on which Czartoryski based his argument, there was still a need to provide the MPs with more up-to-date and detailed accounts. The Poles had to obtain the new material from Poland, Paris, and other places, translate it, and prepare copies for each supporter (after the motions Zamoyski collected these copies back from the MPs in order to use them on future occasions).[494] It was also necessary for the Poles to liaise with the Government (particularly with Palmerston) in order to obtain 'passive acceptance' to present the Polish Question in the Parliament.[495] Finally, the Polish exiles also made sure that the public understanding of the Polish Question and the events taking place in Poland was accurate, fighting with Russian propaganda and publishing articles in the metropolitan newspapers (particularly in *The Times*).[496]

The final large discussion on the subject of Poland that was held on 9 July 1833 was the most ambitious; the crowning achievement of the almost two-year-long pro-Polish propaganda work of Prince Czartoryski, his supporters, and the British friends of Poland. The motion was introduced by Fergusson, who briefly repeated the points he had made in the previous discussions about the Treaty of Vienna and Russian atrocities. This time the motion requested that 'a humble address be presented to his Majesty, praying that he will

---

[493] Czartoryski to Zamoyski, 28 June 1833. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 146.
[494] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 26-27.
[495] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 143.
[496] *Ibid*., pp. 146-7.

be graciously pleased not to recognize, or in any way give the sanction of his Government, to the present political state and condition of Poland, the same having been brought about in violation of the Treaty of Vienna to which Great Britain was a party'. Fergusson argued that Britain not only had the political right to remain interested in the subject of Poland, but it should also feel the moral obligation to condemn Russian atrocities. As it was pointed out several times during the discussion, 'the cause of Poland was the cause of liberty and humanity' and the debate only confirmed the universal pro-Polish feelings of the British MPs and the Government. There were, however, serious disagreements as to what extent the Motion and pressing for a division would be beneficial to the Poles. Palmerston argued that 'no vote of that House would have the slightest effect in reversing the decision of Russia' and, at the same time, 'no circumstances could arise under which the English Government could give their sanction or acquiescence to the arrangements which the emperor had made in Poland'. Lord John Russell[497] suggested that it would be better not to press to a division 'and causing it to make less impression on the government of Russia than it otherwise would'. The problem of the motion, as Lord Althorp and Sir Robert Peel pointed out in their speeches, was that it did not offer any precise resolution and the Government could not 'consent to become parties to such a vote and not follow it up by some strong measure'. Despite these voices of criticism, Fergusson did not withdraw his motion and, with less than half of members of the House present, it was defeated by 177 to 95.[498]

'The division itself will make a great impression' commented Zamoyski on 11 July, convinced that despite the failure of the motion, the debate would strengthen the cause of Poland in Britain.[499] *The Times* seemed to share this positive view, arguing that 'the representatives of the Commons and England… have declared, without one dissentient voice, that Russia has violated her treaties with us'.[500] It is interesting that, apart from giving the full account of the debate,[501] *The Times* went on to present a long editorial that

---

[497] John Russell (1792–1878), British Whig politician, later Prime Minister.
[498] House of Commons Debate, 9 July 1833. *Hansard*, Vol. 19, cc. 394-463.
[499] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 11 July 1833. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 151-156.
[500] *The Times*, 11 July 1833.
[501] *The Times*, 10 July 1833.

provided a brief overview of the discussion, its political significance, and the main points used to promote the Polish Question in Britain.[502] Other metropolitan newspapers were less enthusiastic, although *The Standard* used the opportunity to criticise the Government ('of the many members who spoke, all, except the ministers… spoke in the spirit of the resolution proposed'), wondering 'whose fault is it that Russia may now safely defy England, justice, and humanity?'.[503] Interestingly, the *Standard* returned to the subject the next day – not only by reprinting an article from the*Morning Herald*, but also by supplementing it with its own editorial, which departed from its usual conservative principles. The newspaper condemned the Whig Government for abandoning Poland 'in order that Louis Philippe might rest securely in the Toullieres, and that Lord Grey should still hold place'. What seemed far more detestable was the fact that 'the Commons of England are reduced to the state of worse than slavery which must not breathe remonstrance nor complaint!'.[504] Although the *Standard* used the Polish Question and Polish suffering for its political means, and there was nothing to suggest that the Tory Government would have acted differently, this was the type of publicity that the Polish exiles wanted. Reactions to the debates and the interest expressed by the liberal and conservative press alike only confirmed the universality of the cause of Poland.

The success of pro-Polish propaganda in Britain also had another aspect: it framed the Polish Question in accordance with Czartoryski's political views. As was argued above, the Polish exiles interpreted the Polish Question in two main ways. The first, presented by Czartoryski, was limited to the stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna, asking for the restoration of the Polish rights guaranteed by that international agreement. The other view called for the restoration of Poland within its pre-1772 borders; the restoration of a Poland that would include not only the Kingdom of Poland, but also the Austrian Galicia, the Prussian Grand Duchy of Posen, and the Western Provinces of Russia. However, Czartoryski's activities in Britain, his personal contacts with leading British politicians and, finally, the limited interest of the Polish democrats and radicals in promoting their cause

---

[502] *The Times*, 11 July 1833.
[503] *Standard*, 10 July 1833. See also *Morning Post*, 10 July 1833.
[504] *Standard*, 11 July 1833.

beyond France made it relatively easy for Czartoryski to monopolise Polish-British relations.

Even though none of the parliamentary debates of that period succeeded in changing the Government's approach to Poland, the rise of British awareness of and knowledge on the Polish Question (in the interpretation offered by Czartoryski) was a real moral victory. Zamoyski considered extending that 'moral influence' as the main element of pro-Polish activities in Britain and Europe.[505] By 'engraving the name of Poland on the walls of European parliaments',[506] Czartoryski aimed at making the Polish Question a recognised element of European politics, even if he was fully aware that the contemporary international situation did not promise any immediate changes to the European balance of power.[507] By appealing not only to political considerations, but also to moral and humane sentiments, Czartoryski was able to universalise the Polish Question without associating it with any particular political party, but instead seeking universal support.[508] While the Polish monarchists concentrated almost entirely on promoting the problem of Poland in the Parliament, the interest in the Polish Question reached far beyond the proceedings of the House of Commons.

The British Friends of Poland and the Polish Question

Czartoryski's hagiographers very often attribute the creation of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (LAFP) to the inspiration, influence, and the direct involvement of the Prince himself.[509] Although recent research on the history of this pro-Polish organisation dismissed these claims, the belief in Czartoryski's influence and close links between his politics and the Association remains strong.[510] The Association came into

---

[505] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, n.d. [1832]. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 53.
[506] *Ibid*., p. 26.
[507] *Ibid*., p. 41.
[508] Czartoryski to Zamoyski, 28 June 1833. *Ibid*., p. 146.
[509] See for example *Żywot Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego*. BKCz 6159, I. S. Lubiewa, *Wspomnienia o Emigracyi Polskiej w Anglii po upadku Powstania z r. 1830 i 31go* (Poznań, 1890), p. 1. Sienkiewicz, *Położenie Księcia Adama Czartoryskiego wojewody po upadku rewolucji 1831*. BKCz 5296. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, p. 28.
[510] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 56–57. Żurawski vel Grajewski argues that Poles, particularly Niemcewicz, were initiators of the idea of the Association. Żurawski vel Grajewski, *Działalność Księcia*

being in February 1832 as the result of Thomas Campbell's pro-Polish feelings that had become, though only for a short time, one of his leading passions of late 1831 and early 1832. Campbell met Czartoryski a few times in early 1832, but there is no evidence that would suggest that they discussed matter of the Polish Question. Although Campbell was clearly impressed by Czartoryski's 'gentleman-like self-command, suavity, and dignity',[511] relations between the two were entirely personal, lacking the political element that was to characterise contacts between the Polish exiles and Lord Dudley Stuart (see below). And, as the first months of the existence of the Association illustrate, the links between the British friends of Poland and Prince Czartoryski were rather limited.

The first meeting of the organisation took place on 25 February 1832. It was a quiet, albeit historical event attended by only 14 people (mostly Englishmen).[512] Among the fathers of the association were Thomas Campbell, Adolph Bach,[513] William Ramsay Maule,[514] Robert Dundas Haldane-Duncan,[515] Thomas Wentworth Beaumont,[516] and Sir Thomas Wyse.[517] Within two weeks of its foundation, the society expanded to 'forty most respectable individuals', including Richard Lalor Sheil,[518] George Traill,[519] William Alexander Mackinnon,[520] Robert Gillan,[521] and Colonel Evans.[522] Campbell became the

---

Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego, pp. 123-125. See also K. Dopierała, 'Literackie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie', *Przegląd Zachodni* (1985), pp. 64–65.

[511] *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III, pp. 106-107.

[512] See Zieliński, *Emigracja Polska w Anglii*, p. 12. Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, p. 55. Grzebieniowski, 'Ćwierćwiecze sprawy polskiej w Anglji', p. 716. Neither Niemcewicz, nor Czartoryski, nor any other Pole took part in this meeting 'in order to keep [the Association] entirely British'. Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, p. 188. Lewitter wrongly assumed that Niemcewicz was involved in the creation of the Association. See Lewitter, 'The Polish Cause as Seen in Great Britain, 1830-1863', p. 38. See also Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*, pp. 68-69.

[513] Adolph Bach (?-1859), German lawyer and émigré.

[514] William Ramsay Maule (1771–1852), first Baron Panmure, British aristocrat.

[515] Robert Dundas Haldane-Duncan (1785–1859), 2nd Viscount Duncan, British aristocrat.

[516] Thomas Wentworth Beaumont (1792–1848), British politician, later the President of the LAFP and the publisher of *The British and Foreign Review*.

[517] Sir Thomas Wyse (1791–1862), British politician and diplomat.

[518] Richard Lalor Sheil (1791–1851), Irish politician and MP.

[519] George Traill (1787–1871), British politician and MP.

[520] William Alexander Mackinnon (1789–1870), British politician and MP.

[521] Perhaps Robert Gillan (1799–1879), Church of Scotland minister.

[522] Campbell to Gray, 7 March 1832. Beattie, III, p. 111.

president and Bach, according to different versions, either the Secretary or the Chancellor of the organisation.[523] The spirits were high and at one point Bach enthusiastically wrote to Niemcewicz that the society may even contribute £1,000 a year to one of the Polish charitable organisations,[524] while Campbell predicted that they would find one thousand people willing to join the society.[525]

The organisation was, in its president's words, 'a literary [society], for collecting, publishing, and diffusing all such information respecting Poland, as may tend to interest the public mind, and keep alive in it a strong interest with respect to the condition of that brave but ill-used nation'.[526] This apolitical approach was one of the reasons behind Czartoryski's limited interest in the creation and early developments of the LAFP. Writing in 1832, he observed that during the November Uprising the Poles had found 'the public opinion in almost all countries very sympathetic [to our cause], but [they had been] unable to influence the way in which the Governments acted towards us'.[527] Perhaps that belief in the inability of the British public opinion to make impact on the Government's policy determined Czartoryski's reluctance to get involved in extra-parliamentary ways of promoting the cause of Poland. The only occasion when Czartoryski expressed deeper interest in the public opinion was when it could support his political activities, either by countering pro-Russian articles in the press or by supporting parliamentary debates by various pro-Polish petitions presented to the House of Commons.[528]

---

[523] In one of Campbell's undated letters, the poet referred to Bach as the 'Chancellor Bach', suggesting that it was 'that long, grinning mountain cat' Hunter Gordon who worked as the Secretary. Campbell to unidentified recipient, n.d. C. Redding, *Literary Reminiscences and Memoirs of Thomas Campbell*, II, (London, 1860), pp. 256–257. At the same time *Address of the Literary Polish Association to the People of Great Britain* lists Bach as the Honorary Secretary, with Gordon as a member of the Council of the Association. [T. Campbell], *Address of the Literary Polish Association to the People of Great Britain* (London, 1832), p. 1.

[524] Bach to Niemcewicz, n. d. BKCz 5450.

[525] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, p. 192-3.

[526] Campbell to Mr. Gray, 7 March 1832. Beattie, III, pp. 110-111. The same aim was presented in the *Rules and Regulations* of the LAFP published in 1833. *Rules and Regulations of the London Association of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1833), p. 3.

[527] [Untitled note]. BKCz 5275.

[528] See for example *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 145-148.

In consequence, the LAFP came into being as an entirely British affair and remained on the peripheries of Czartoryski's attempts to promote the Polish Question in Britain. It accepted the universal understanding of the Polish Question as the problem of the Treaty of Vienna, used various materials provided by the Polish exiles in its publications and succeeded in popularising the cause of Poland across Britain,[529] but continued to function independently. In mid-1832 *Polonia, or Monthly reports of Polish Affairs*, a monthly magazine devoted entirely to the subject of Poland, became the main platform of the LAFP. The British friends of Poland used the publication to dismiss Peel's critical approach to the news of Russian persecutions,[530] present a very detailed outline of Russian violations of the Constitution before the Uprising,[531] and discuss the main points of the Organic Statute.[532] Apart from the contemporary issues, *Polonia* also offered translations of Polish poetry,[533] as well as examples of British poetry inspired by the events that had taken place in Poland,[534] and short essays devoted to the history of Poland.[535] After the publication of Rich's article in *The Edinburgh Review*, initiatives such as *Polonia* remained one of the few ways in which details of the situation in Poland, and the Polish Question in general, could reach wider audience.[536]

There is, however, no evidence which would suggest that the publication of *Polonia* made any serious impact on British public opinion and its attitudes towards Poland. Various pro-Polish societies which were coming into existence across the country (and described in great detail by *Polonia*) worked independently from the activities of the Polish exiles and the LAFP itself. Although their presence suggested that there was a potential demand for similar publications in late 1832, *Polonia* turned out not only to be a very short-lived, but also a financially demanding enterprise. According to some figures, throughout

---

[529] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, p. 56.
[530] *Polonia*, II (September 1832), pp. 60-79.
[531] *Polonia*, I (August 1832), pp. 16-23; II, pp. 160-166.
[532] *Polonia*, I, pp. 7-15.
[533] *Polonia*, II, pp. 228-230.
[534] *Polonia*, I, pp. 53-54; II, pp. 230-232; IV (November 1832), pp. 300-303.
[535] *Polonia*, II, pp. 55-59; III (October 1832), pp. 234-240.
[536] Two other pro-Polish journals were published in Hull (the *Hull Polish Record*) and Edinburgh (the *Polish Exile*). The latter was a work of Polish refugees. See I. Homola-Skąpska, '"The Polish Exile". Polskie czasopismo anglojęzyczne i jego redaktorzy', *Rocznik historii prasy polskiej*, 23.1 (2009), pp. 7-22.

1832 the LAFP spent over £450 for publications and only £80 in support of the Polish exiles in Britain.[537] However, other sources suggest that already by the end of 1832 the Association suffered from a deep financial crisis and its debts amounted to £300, a figure which rose to over £420 in 1833.[538]

Activities and direction taken by the LAFP depended on the decisions made by the leaders of the organisation in a similar way as the activities of the Polish monarchists were determined by principles put forward by Prince Czartoryski. The key figure behind the actions of the LAFP during the first year of its existence was Thomas Campbell, who considered his involvement in promoting the cause of Poland 'a sacred duty which I, for one, will not abandon'.[539] The elderly poet, though very enthusiastic at the beginning, soon lost some of his interest in the Polish Question, partly due to bad health, which forced him to seek refuge away from London, and partly due to everyday issues related to directing the association. In late 1832 he complained to one of the Polish exiles who had just arrived in London: 'You cannot believe how much trouble I have with this Association, every day I have to send dozens of letters and they would like me to send more'.[540] As another Pole commented in one of his letter, 'it would be good if Campbell read his *Pleasures of Hope* to [Adolph] Bach, perhaps it would give them both some comfort'.[541] Troubled with numerous difficulties, both financial and personal, the Association suffered a serious crisis at the end of 1832 and the beginning of 1833, which eventually led to Campbell's resignation in May 1833.[542]

The pro-Polish activities of the LAFP were not, however, limited to promoting the cause of Poland through various publications (apart from *Polonia* the Association published several pamphlets and appeals in 1832 and 1833 and continued, though less frequently, to

---

[537] Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie Literackim Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie. Odezwa do rodaków* (Paryż, 1857), Appendix 3.

[538] *Report of the [Second] Annual General Meeting of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1834), p. 5.

[539] Campbell to unidentified recipient, 3 May 1832. *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III, p. 122.

[540] S. E. Koźmian, *Anglia i Polska* (Poznań, 1862), pp. 12-13.

[541] Niedźwiecki to Teodor Weber, [October 1832]. L. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane z lat 1832-1839*, ed. by S. Makowski (Warszawa, 2009), p. 12.

[542] *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III, p. 143. See also Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*, pp. 72-73.

do so over the next twenty years[543]). Its initial devotion to 'the diffusion of… information upon the actual state of Poland'[544] was also manifested by various meetings and public events. A pro-Polish dinner took place in May 1832 and involved both the British friends of Poland and Polish exiles (including Prince Czartoryski). One of the guests promised 'that he would make his sons to take an oath never to cease being the enemies of any English Administration that should not try to befriend Poland', though it remains unclear whether he fulfilled his promise.[545] In December 1832 the Christmas Eve celebrations in Sussex Chambers were an occasion for the British friends of Poland to further manifest their sympathy and support for both the Polish Question and the Polish exiles in particular. Sixty Poles attended the event and, as Campbell commented in one of his letters, 'the striking thing was that the English all look melancholy; whilst the Poles, mostly dressed in their military costume, stood up with swelling chests, and a look of triumph'.[546]

After Campbell's resignation in May 1833 the LAFP underwent a reorganization. Thomas Beaumont became the President and Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart[547] became one of four vice-presidents of the organisation. Thanks to Beaumont's financial support and Stuart's pro-Polish zeal,[548] the following years saw a strong revival of the activities of the Association. Although Stuart had not expressed any pro-Polish sympathies prior to 1833, his contacts with Polish exiles in London, particularly Niemcewicz, Zamoyski and Czartoryski, led him to become the most devoted friend of Poland in Britain for the next two decades. Under Stuart's leadership (with Beaumont playing a role of patron and benefactor rather than active leader) the Association became more closely linked with Czartoryski's political agendas than before, leading some Poles to criticise Stuart for being Czartoryski's agent.[549] However, with the change in the understanding of the Polish

---

[543] For a list of the LAFP's major publications see *Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the Poles* (London, 1850), pp. 44-47.

[544] *Rules and Regulations of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland*, p. 3.

[545] Campbell to unidentified recipient, 31 May 1832. *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, III, p. 123.

[546] Campbell to unidentified recipient, n.d. [December 1832?]. Beattie, III, p. 140. According to Niemcewicz only twelve Polish exiles took part in the celebrations at the Sussex Chambers. See Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 573-574.

[547] Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart (1803–1854), British politician and MP.

[548] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 58–65.

[549] Niedźwiecki to Szyszło, 21 September 1834. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, p. 37.

Question that took place in 1834, and which dominated the rest of the decade (see Chapter 5), relations between the Association and Prince Czartoryski (who remained concerned primarily with contemporary British and European politics) did not play as great a role in determining the LAFP's actions as some Poles claimed.

***

In late 1833 Czartoryski and his supporters could look with great satisfaction at the progress of the Polish Question in Britain. Their initial attempts to obtain British support for the cause of Poland, despite their failure, played a significant role in establishing the importance of the cause of Poland in Britain. The different interpretations of the Polish Question that developed during the Uprising (as a problem of the Treaty of Vienna or as a problem of Polish independence) were in late 1831 and early 1832 replaced by one universal approach to the cause of Poland promoted by Prince Czartoryski.

With the help of the British friends of Poland, the Polish exiles were able to introduce the subject of Polish independence and its international significance to the House of Commons. Preparations for all debates taking place from 1832 onward, in contrast to the ones that were held throughout 1831, were prepared with the help of Czartoryski and his supporters, who devoted their time and energy to make sure that the representatives of the Polish cause in the Parliament understood all nuances and pitfalls of Polish-Russian relations in the years that followed the Congress of Vienna. Constant references to the 1815 treaty became a central element of all pro-Polish propaganda in the post-Uprising period in Britain, leading, in consequence, to the universal acceptance of the Polish Question as the problem of the constitutional autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland within the Russian Empire. The limited success of all pro-Polish parliamentary debates did not discourage Czartoryski, who considered the very fact that the debates were held as beneficial to the cause of Poland.

Independently from Czartoryski's efforts to promote the cause of Poland in the House of Commons a different type of pro-Polish activity developed. The creation of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland became, as will be illustrated below, a major factor that contributed to the preservation of the subject of Poland in Britain. It became

particularly visible in the later part of the decade, when British interest in the cause of Poland started to decline.

Developments that took place in Britain between the outbreak of the November Uprising and the end of 1833 determined the shape and the ways in which the Polish Question was promoted for over a decade.

Chapter 5: The Changing Character of the Polish Question in Britain (1834-1841)

The years 1831-1833 were crucial in establishing a common understanding of the Polish Question in Britain. Czartoryski's arguments defending the November Uprising and the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland fell on the fertile ground of British pro-Polish sympathy. Polish successes of the early 1830s were, however, closely tied to recent events in Poland: the November Uprising, its defeat, and the subsequent changes in the status of the Kingdom introduced by Nicholas I. The scale and importance of these events helped to fuel British pro-Polish sentiments for over two years. Czartoryski's decision to settle in Paris and Zamoyski's departure from London in August 1833 were clear signs that Polish monarchists had lost some of their interest in promoting the Polish Question in Britain. At the same time, the attention of the British friends of Poland started to shift from the political problem of Polish independence to the question of Polish refugees in Britain. When in 1834 a group of over 200 Polish soldiers arrived in Portsmouth, the issue of financial support for the newcomers, as well as the issue of a number of other Polish refugees staying in Britain, became the main area of interest for all pro-Polish circles. As will be illustrated, 1834 was not the end of British interest in the cause of Poland[550] and both Polish Questions continued to attract attention of British public opinion throughout the rest of the decade.

As will be argued below, the transition from political Polish Question to a moral one associated with the wellbeing of Polish refugees in Britain was very smooth and the new Polish Question dominated British interests for the rest of the 1830s. This did not mean that the problem of Polish independence disappeared completely. The occupation of Cracow in 1836 and the British reaction thereto proved that the propaganda efforts of the early 1830s made a very successful and long-lasting impact on British understanding of the Polish situation, but this revival was only a short-lived interlude in the more pressing activities on behalf of Polish exiles in Britain. Moreover, the interest in the problem of Cracow's neutrality never reached the same level as in the question of Polish independence

[550] Jasiakiewicz, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego*, p. 4.

during and after the November Uprising. In consequence, both before and after 1836 the subject of Polish refugees dominated the activities of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland and continued to play the most significant part of the society's life even in the 1840s. It marked not only a significant shift in the British approach to the Polish Question, but should also be considered as the development of a new Polish Question that, at certain times, overshadowed the political issues of Polish independence that had been so successfully promoted before 1834. This chapter enriches studies by Marchlewicz and Żurawski vel Grajewski not only by presenting a juxtaposition of both Polish Questions (which, to this day, have been analysed separately), but also by referring to some previously unused primary sources (such as a very detailed accounts presented in *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure* and *British Foreign and State Papers*).

The Problem of Polish Refugees in Britain before 1834

From the very beginning of the Great Emigration it was France that played the role of the centre of the Polish exile. French politics, the general sympathy of Frenchmen towards the Uprising and Polish exiles, coupled with the memory of the Napoleonic Wars, all played a crucial role in determining the main destination of thousands of Polish refugees (see Chapter 2). At the same time, despite British interest in the cause of Poland expressed by both the Government and the public opinion, Poles did not feel any spiritual or cultural bond with Britain, considering it as more distant and less sympathetic towards the cause of Poland. From the Polish perspective, the British shores appeared as a distant (both geographically and culturally) and unwelcoming land. Besides those refugees who came there for political reasons (including Prince Czartoryski and several of his supporters), the majority of Poles arrived in Britain by accident. Unwilling to stay in Britain for too long, they usually quickly left for France. The most exemplary is the case of Major Konstanty Parczewski,[551] Second Lieutenant Chłapowski, and a certain Zieliński,[552] considered the first Polish exiles who came to Britain.[553] All three had taken part in the fighting in

[551] Konstanty Parczewski (1803-1855), Polish officer, violinist and emigre.
[552] There is no precise information regarding any of the other two Poles.
[553] See Marchlewicz, *Wielka Emigracja na Wyspach Brytyjskich*, p. 17.

Lithuania and, after the fall of the Uprising, they arrived in Hull from Memel on board a British steamship in late September 1831. They received a very warm welcome from the local people,[554] staying at the Minerva Hotel in Hull, an enterprise established only two years before.[555] Chłapowski and Zieliński soon left the town and moved to London and then, possibly, to France.[556] Parczewski remained in Hull a little longer, but even he eventually left Britain and settled in Paris.[557] As the calculations of the LAFP show (see Table 1, below), the majority of the Poles who arrived in Britain in 1832 left the country in the same year. Those who remained were, in most cases, either politically involved in the activities of Czartoryski's circle, or financially independent (for example Leonard Niedźwiecki[558] and Krystyn Lach Szyrma, who enjoyed Czartoryski's protection and worked for the LAFP).[559]

The financial problems faced by the Polish exiles in Britain were the most important issue that prevented any significant rise of the number of Poles in that country. This was not only a matter of coming to British shores (requiring payment for passage across the Channel or finding oneself in the right circumstances, as in the case of Parczewski, Chłapowski and Zieliński, who met a friendly British captain willing to take them to Britain), but of obtaining funds once the refugees arrived in Britain. In contrast to France, the official British policy towards refugees allowed them to freely enter and leave the country, but, at the same time, did not provide them with any financial aid. The exiles were, therefore, left to themselves. Thanks to the universal pro-Polish sympathy, they very often

---

[554] *Hull Packet and Humber Mercury*, 24 September 1831.

[555] For details about the Minerva Hotel see R. Barnard, *The Minerva Hotel* (Hull, 1999).

[556] Niemcewicz, *Dziennik*, I, pp. 77-78.

[557] *Hull Packet and Humber Mercury*, 1, 8 and 15 November, 27 December 1831, 10 January 1832. Parczewski did not take an active part in politics of the Great Emigration, although, as a skilled musician (he was a violinist) he organised several celebrations of the outbreak of the Uprising. He also published his account of the Uprising in Lithuania. On Parczewski's involvement in the Uprising, see his own account: K. Parczewski, 'Powstanie w okolicach Niemenczyna. Pamiętnik', *Pamiętniki polskie*, III (Paris, 1845), pp. 162-177. On Parczewski's rank, see *1854. État des Polonais subventionnés réfugiés en France, en juin*. BKCz 5313. Interestingly, Parczewski's biography in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* does not mention this British episode. F. Bronowski, 'Parczewski, Konstanty (1801-1855)'. *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*.

[558] Leonard Niedźwiecki (1811-1892), Polish soldier and exile.

[559] S. Mikos, 'Warunki bytowe emigracji polskiej w Anglii po powstaniu listopadowym', *Gdańskie Zeszyty Humanistyczne. Historia* 8 (1965), p. 80.

could rely on financial help from locals (as in the case of the three officers in Hull), but such help was possible only on a short term basis. The sympathy was so widespread and well-known that the British press referred to several 'impostors' who assumed identities of Polish exiles in order to grub money.[560]

A rise in the number of Polish exiles coming to Britain in 1833 and the subsequent rise of interest in the problem of Polish refugees were caused by the changing approach of the French Government towards the Poles. Faced with several thousand refugees who had arrived in France throughout 1831 and 1832, the French Government imposed restrictions in an attempt to prevent any further migration of Polish exiles. With the eastern border of France closed, and with French consuls and ambassadors unwilling to issue the refugees passports, the Poles had to search for other ways of getting to France.

After their arrival in London, which remained the centre of the Polish emigration in Britain throughout the 1830s and 1840s,[561] the Poles usually received support from the LAFP.[562] Although, as was shown above, initially the LAFP tried to avoid getting involved in the issue of financial support for the Poles (and this was never officially presented as an aim of the Association), from the very beginning the fate of the Polish refugees had a very strong impact on the organisation. The British friends of Poland were unable to avoid the subject and, despite their devotion to promoting political cause of Poland, they very often found themselves forced to devote part of their funds to help the Polish exiles. In order to avoid depleting the LAFP's finances, the Polish Exiles' Friends Society was created in March 1833.[563] The new organisation adopted three ways of supporting Polish refugees in London (and, as it stated very clearly, only in London, as it was 'strictly prohibited by the rules of the Society from dispensing the funds in their hands to any but the distressed Poles who were in this metropolis at the time of the Society's formation'): by providing them

---

[560] See for example *Caledonian Mercury*, 27 September 1832.

[561] *Lists of Polish exiles*, II, BKCz 5316.

[562] The best illustration of that support is the account of Leonard Niedźwiecki. See Niedźwiecki to his parents, [December 1832]. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 13–14. From 1833 money spent on the support for the Polish exiles by the LAFP usually constituted half of the Association's annual income. See Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie*, Appendix 3.

[563] *Polish Exiles' Friends Society* (London, 1833), p. 4. BKCz 111899 III. See also J. Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia z powstania 1831 roku i pierwszych lat emigracji*, pp. 235–237.

with direct financial help, 'endeavour[ing] to find beneficial employment for them', and assisting young Poles in their desire to continue their education.[564]

The second initiative, though listed as one of the main purposes of the Polish Exiles' Friends Society, failed to bring any successful results in spite of several rather infrequent advertisements published in metropolitan newspapers.[565] It was clear that for the Poles, who rarely knew any other foreign language than French, finding a job in Britain was a difficult task. The successful stories of Krystyn Lach Szyrma and Leonard Niedźwiecki were an exception rather than the rule. Their close links with the LAFP and their good knowledge of English (or, in Niedźwiecki's case, the willingness to learn the language) made their case rather unique. For the majority of Poles who came to Britain in 1832 and 1833 the country was only a stopping point on their way to France. Several Poles were lucky enough to benefit from the financial support provided by both pro-Polish societies (for example a certain Maryański was provided with funds to travel to France[566]), but there were also those who were far less fortunate. As a small group of Poles complained to Czartoryski in November 1833, their attempts to obtain financial support from 'a private committee' (it is unclear whether they meant the LAFP or the Polish Exiles' Friends Society) were fruitless and they asked the Prince to provide them with some help (and French passports) to leave Britain.[567]

Faced with the unwillingness of Poles to stay in Britain for too long and seek employment of any kind, it was not surprising that both the LAFP and the Polish Exiles' Friends Society devoted most of their efforts to various fundraising initiatives. The successful cooperation of both organisations helped in preparing a number of such events throughout 1833, including meetings, concerts and masquerades.[568] One of the largest events was a concert given in Vauxhall Gardens, which involved the famous Paganini.[569]

---

[564] *Polish Exiles' Friends Society*, pp. 6-7.

[565] See for example *Morning Chronicle*, 28 June 1833. 20 January 1834.

[566] T. F. Taylor to Czartoryski, 29 April 1833. BKCz 5478, I.

[567] A group of eight Polish émigrés to Czartoryski, 22 November 1833. A similar request was made in December that year. Eugeniusz Breza to Czartoryski, 30 December 1833. BKCz 5478, I.

[568] *Examiner*, 18, 25 August 1833. *Morning Chronicle*, 1 July, 17 August, 15 November, 2 December 1833. *Morning Post*, 22 March, 24, 26 April, 30 July, 14 November 1833. *Standard*, 14 November 1833.

[569] *Morning Post*, 1, 4, 13 July 1833. *Standard*, 27 June 1833.

On one occasion the pro-Polish zeal of the British friends of Poland reached beyond the problem of Poles in Britain and a special meeting was organised for the benefit of the Polish exiles in Switzerland.[570] Such a strong reliance on the universal interest in the cause of Poland and Polish exiles that dominated activities of pro-Polish circles throughout 1833 had to lead to some serious drawbacks and, eventually, the public opinion lost some of its pro-Polish affection. As Niedźwiecki reported in December, the masquerade organised on 18 November, instead of expected profits, resulted in a loss totalling some 20 or 30 pounds.[571] The Literary Association, which still struggled with debt incurred in the previous year, was certainly far less involved in pro-Polish activities of that period.[572]

The fact that between 1831 and the end of 1833 Polish exiles were coming to Britain in small numbers was the most important factor that prevented the rise of the problem of Polish refugees from undermining the political question of Polish independence. With only a handful of Poles in Britain, the only groups interested in their fate were the pro-Polish circles gathered around the Polish societies. Both the LAFP and the Polish Exiles' Friends Society appeared more than capable of dealing with the growing, albeit still relatively small number of émigrés. Consequently, the problem of the Polish refugees in Britain could not compete in importance with the question of Polish independence, which had been actively promoted by Czartoryski and his supporters for the previous two years. Even when the interest in the question of Polish independence started to decline in the second half of 1833, it was not until the sudden rise of Polish refugees in Britain at the beginning of 1834 when their cause became the major issue that replaced the previous Polish Question.

Harbingers of Change

By the end of 1833 the majority of Poles involved in the November Uprising and willing to emigrate found their ways to France, Belgium, or Britain. Those who rejected the idea of exile accepted amnesty and returned to the Kingdom of Poland. However, several groups of

---

[570] *Morning Post*, 17, 20, 24 August 1833. *Standard*, 20 August 1833. For more information about Polish exiles in Switzerland see Chapter 2.

[571] Niedźwiecki to Gurowski, 5 December 1833. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 27-28.

[572] *Report of the [Second] Annual General Meeting*, p. 5.

Polish soldiers (mostly rank-and-file, with only several officers) were detained in Prussia and continuously rejected attempts of the Prussian Government to send them back to the Kingdom. One of these groups (462 people, including soldiers, officers, and women) was sent to France in June 1832.[573] The rest, kept in Prussian citadels in Grudziądz and around Danzig [Gdańsk], had to wait a year and a half to obtain freedom. After the Münchengrätz Conference in October 1833, Austria, Prussia, and Russia agreed to finally resolve the problem of Polish refugees remaining on Prussian territory and, faced with their continuing refusal to return to the Kingdom of Poland, to send them to America.[574] The decision was significantly influenced by a number of disturbances that involved Polish refugees, such as the failed guerrilla war of Zaliwski in the Kingdom of Poland and the no more successful uprisings in Frankfurt and Savoy (see Chapter 2).

All the partitioning powers hoped that sending the refugees to the United States would weaken the revolutionary character of the Polish exile and prevent the Poles from any further involvement in European national and liberal movements. This idea was actively opposed by the Poles in exile, who did everything they could to help the soldiers expelled from Prussia and to prevent their departure from Europe. After Münchengrätz Prussia decided that the rest of the Polish soldiers, 604 people[575] (including soldiers, officers, women and children), would be transported to the United States on three ships: the *Marianne* (213 people), the *Frau Elizabeth* (158 people), and the *Union* (233 people).[576] None of the ships, however, reached the shores of America; hit by the winter storm at the North Sea, the ships were forced to seek shelter in the nearby ports: Portsmouth (the *Marianne*), Harwich (the *Union*) and Le Havre (the *Frau Elizabeth*), arriving there in late

---

[573] For more details see BKCz 5343.

[574] A. H. Kasznik, *Między Francją a Algierią. Z dziejów emigracji polskiej, 1832-1856* (Warszawa, 1977), p. 110. See also Jelavich, *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy*, pp. 100–101.

[575] It is difficult to assess the direct number of Poles sent from Prussia on these three ships, as the numbers in most cases take into consideration only male exiles. It is rarely taken into consideration that among the Poles who arrived in Portsmouth was one woman, a wife of one of the officers, and thus the real number of exiles was 213, not 212. This can also be the case with those who arrived in Harwich and Le Havre. According to other calculations, there were only 569 Poles kept in Prussian citadels at the end of 1833. See *Lista imienna podoficerów i żołnierzy z Wojska Polskiego zostających w Królestwie Polskim w Fortecy Gdańskiej*. BKCz 5313.

[576] S. Mikos, *Gromady Ludu Polskiego w Anglii 1835-1846*, p. 40. See also BKCz 5478, II.

December 1833 and early January 1834. The fates of all three groups were completely different.

The soldiers who arrived in British and French ports immediately became the subject of an ideological struggle between Polish monarchists and liberals. Prince Czartoryski argued that 'Algiers was France' in a clear attempt to convince them that the best way they could serve the cause of Polish independence was by accepting the French proposal and joining the Foreign Legion in Algiers.[577] The exiles, however, remained very reluctant, replying that 'if there is no difference between Algiers and France, then why France does not agree on creating the Polish Legion on its soil?'.[578] Poles from Portsmouth expressed similar views and only those who had arrived in Harwich, possibly due to the distance that separated them from the centres of Polish emigration in France, submitted to Czartoryski's ideas of going to Algiers.[579] 233 of them embarked on the British ship *Earl Kellie* and went to Africa on 31 March 1834.[580] The Poles who had arrived in Le Havre were perhaps the most lucky: with the help of the local people they left the ship and were allowed to stay in the town.[581] The Government was forced to accept the sad reality and after a several-month delay it finally agreed to include the new refugees among the thousands receiving financial support.

Polish exiles from the *Marianne* who arrived in the Portsmouth harbour in January 1834, faced the most difficult choice of all three groups. Unlike the exiles from the *Union*, they received support from both the conservative (Czartoryski's envoy Stadnicki[582]) and the liberal (the agent of General Dwernicki, Captain Stawiarski[583]) groups of the Polish Emigration. Unlike the people from *Frau Elizabeth*, they found themselves on alien and

---

[577] Czartoryski to the Poles who arrived in Le Havre, 16 January 1834. BKCz 5272.

[578] Poles from Le Havre [to Czartoryski], 19 January 1834. BKCz 5478, II.

[579] Żmigrodzki, *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie*, I, p. 264.

[580] Poles from Harwich to Czartoryski, 31 March 1834. BKCz 5478, II. See also Kasznik, pp. 120–123. Czartoryski tried to negotiate the best way of transporting the soldiers from Harwich to Algiers, suggesting cooperation between the French and British Governments. Czartoryski to Earl Grey, 8 February 1834. BKCz 5275.

[581] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 224-5.

[582] Possibly Aleksander Standnicki, of whom very little is known.

[583] Franciszek Stawiarski (1805-1888), Polish student and officer, he arrived in Britain in November 1833.`

unfriendly British soil. For a while they considered the possibility of going to Algiers,[584] but the impact of Dwernicki and Stawiarski, coupled with the success of Poles in Le Havre and the general sympathy of the rest of the Great Emigration, strengthened their resolve. The soldiers from Portsmouth decided to reject Czartoryski's advice, thanked him for his financial help (each of the three groups received £1,000 from him), but refused to go to Algiers.[585] Faced with the very limited options of either joining the Foreign Legion or further emigration to America, the Polish exiles decided that neither of these choices was really satisfactory. After receiving a warm welcome and support from residents of Portsmouth[586] and arousing renewed interest in the fate of Polish refugees across the whole country,[587] the soldiers from the *Marianne* decided to stay in Britain. Interestingly, contrary to Mikos' claim, there was very little evidence of any pro-Polish sympathy expressed by the locals in the second part of the 1834 or in the following years.[588] Information about the Poles ceased to appear in the local newspapers shortly after they settled in the town and no Polish association similar to that created earlier in Hull and other British cities came into being in Portsmouth.

The second large group of Polish exiles arrived in Britain in the later part of 1834 from Switzerland. In the aftermath of unsuccessful uprisings in Germany and Italy (the infamous Savoy expedition), Polish émigrés sought refuge in Switzerland. However, the country failed to provide them with a safe asylum and, under the pressure of Austria, Prussia, Savoy, and other countries, the Swiss Government was forced to expel these revolutionaries.[589] France openly refused to accept them back on its territory and, left with

---

[584] See for example Stawiarski to Czartoryski, 31 January 1834. BKCz 5478, II. Stawiarski served as the intermediary between Czartoryski, Dwernicki and Poles. See also *Mémoire présente au Marechal Soult sur les Polonais arrivant de Prusse* [February 1834 ?]. BKCz 5282.

[585] Czartoryski to the soldiers in Le Havre, 16 January 1834. Czartoryski to the soldiers in Portsmouth, 17 January 1834. BKCz 5275. Soldiers from Portsmouth to General Dwernicki, n.d.; Soldiers from Portsmouth to Czartoryski, 5 June 1834. BKCz 5478.

[586] See for example *Hampshire Advertiser*, 1 March 1834; *Hampshire Telegraph*, 21 April 1834.

[587] See for example *Morning Chronicle*, 26 February 1834; *Morning Post*, 20 February 1834.

[588] See Mikos, 'Warunki bytowe emigracji polskiej w Anglii po powstaniu listopadowym', pp. 82-85.

[589] Zdrada, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 29. For diplomatic correspondence regarding the matter of Polish exiles in Switzerland see 'Correspondance entre La Suisse et Pays Etrangers, relative au séjour des Polonais et autres Refugies Politiques en Suisse', *State Papers: 1835-36* (London, 1838), pp. 979-1048.

no other choice, the Poles were forced to seek refuge in Britain. They were offered a free passage through France to Calais, where they embarked on a steamship to Dover. According to Bartkowski, one of the Poles involved in the uprising in Savoy, 140 Poles left Switzerland in April 1834, which made that group the second-largest wave of Polish refugees coming to Britain.[590] However, unlike the soldiers who had arrived in Portsmouth at the beginning of that year, the exiles from Switzerland kept coming to Britain in small groups from May until August of 1834, making any precise calculations of their numbers particularly difficult. Although arrivals of the 'Swiss Poles' (*szwajcarzanie*) were less visible than the sudden appearance of 212 Polish soldiers in Portsmouth, they nevertheless remained a significant factor in the changes that took place in the British perception of Polish refugees and the Polish Question in 1834 (see below).

Finally, there is some vague evidence of yet another group of Poles who came to Britain in 1834. Following the conference in Münchengrätz between all three partitioned powers, not only Prussia, but also Austria agreed to resolve the problem of Poles detained on its territory. In keeping with the Prussian method, the Austrian Government sent the Polish refugees from Trieste to America. The ship, however, stopped in Marseilles, which allowed the Poles to avoid further exile. The majority went directly to the United States.[591] Some of them agreed to join the Foreign Legion and were soon transported to Oran.[592] Others, who were refused the entrance to France, continued on their path until they arrived in Britain, but the numbers of these exiles remain unclear.[593] Several letters addressed to Czartoryski from different groups and individuals residing in London seem to suggest that, indeed, small groups of Poles were expelled by Austrians from Galicia and transported, via

---

[590] Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia*, pp. 231–232. Mikos estimated that there were around 150 of them. See Mikos, 'Warunki bytowe emigracji polskiej w Anglii po powstaniu listopadowym', p. 82.

[591] See *Lista emigrantów polskich przybyłych do Nowego Jorku na fregatach Gueryera i Hebe z Triestu*; *Lista emigrantów przysłanych do Nowego Jorku z Triestu na korwecie Lipsia w lipsu 1834 r.*; *Lista polskich emigrantów przybyłych do Bostonu na Amerykańskim kupieckim statku Cherokee*. BKCz 5313.

[592] Kasznik, *Między Francją a Algierią*, p. 110.

[593] Evidence of Poles coming to Britain from Trieste was given by Bartkowski and MacKenzie. It appears, however, that in historiography they have been confused with yet another transport of Poles from Trieste that took place in 1836. Marchlewicz mentions only those refugees who came to Britain in 1836. Bartkowski, pp. 235, 246. Mackenzie to Stuart, 17 June 1834. BKCz 5460. Marchlewicz, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 27.

Trieste, to Britain in mid-1834. The majority of them, despite having received the Government Grant (see below), complained that their material situation in Britain was very bad and that 'there [were] no opportunities to find any employment or education'. They asked Czartoryski to negotiate with the French Government in order to allow them to move to France and be granted the same benefits as other Poles.[594]

A common element that characterised all post-1833 Polish exiles coming to Britain was their lack of any choice regarding the place of refuge. They all refused to return to their homeland and dreamed of joining their compatriots in France, but French borders were no longer open and the Government was reluctant to accept any new refugees. Although other Western countries such as Belgium and Switzerland offered the Poles some alternative, such countries nonetheless remained very susceptible to diplomatic pressure from the countries of the Holy Alliance. The case of Switzerland, which was forced to expel Polish refugees that sought shelter on its territory after the unsuccessful revolutions in Frankfurt and Savoy, is perhaps the best example of that weakness. The only concession France was ready to make was allowing the Poles to join the Foreign Legion in Algiers, an idea approved by Czartoryski and his supporters, but rejected by vast majority of other exiles who argued that Polish blood belonged to Poland.[595] In that situation the only two choices left to the Poles in 1834 were Britain or America.

When taking into consideration the ideological background of the Great Emigration and the universal assumption that the main aim of all Polish exiles was to remain in Europe and prepare for a new revolution, it becomes apparent that the American option was not even considered as beneficial to the cause of Poland. Reports sent to France by Poles who had gone to the United States only strengthened the unwillingness of Poles to cross the Atlantic. As Józef Hordyński informed the Polish National Committee in 1832, 'once I finish my work here, I will abandon this country', painting a very unwelcoming picture of

---

[594] Poles in London to Czartoryski, 8 July 1834. Michał Michałowski to Czartoryski, 21 September 1834. BKCz 5478, II. Requests of Poles wishing to move from Britain to France were not, however, limited to those who arrived from Trieste.

[595] 'Akt tułaczów polskich będących we Francji, objawiający niezmienne ich postanowienie'. *Postępowa publicystyka*, pp. 134–137.

America.[596] In consequence, for those Polish exiles who shared the common belief in a quick and victorious return to their homeland, but, at the same time, disliked the idea of military service in Algiers, Britain was the only place where they could stay. This realization effectively transformed Britain from a place of unwilling refuge into the only choice left to the Polish exiles after 1833.

From the Question of Independence to the Question of Refugees: The 1834 Turn

By the end of May 1834 there were over four hundred Polish exiles on the British soil, including a small minority of those who had come to Britain in the previous years; 213 Polish refugees who came and stayed in Portsmouth; several dozen of the 'Swiss Poles' (*szwajcarzanie*); and an unknown number of Poles from Trieste. Britain, which in the previous three years had to deal with a total of just over a hundred Polish refugees (see Table 1), was forced to face an influx of four hundred of them in just a few months. However, the problem of numbers was only secondary to the fact that most of the newcomers had nowhere else to go. Unlike the exiles from 1831-1833, the soldiers from Portsmouth, Trieste, and Switzerland would not leave for France or Belgium anytime soon. By rejecting emigration to America and the idea of joining the Foreign Legion in Algiers, they declared their will to remain in Britain, accepting the potential hardships and difficulties of that choice.[597]

The slow shift of the British interest in the Polish Question can be traced back to the aftermath of the third motion presented in the House of Commons by Fergusson. The failure of the proposed resolution showed clearly that neither the Government nor the majority of the House of Commons were willing to do anything on behalf of Poland. For some time, this development put an end to Prince Czartoryski's activity in Britain, leaving all pro-Polish circles (LAFP, the Polish Exiles' Friends Society, and other, local groups) to their own devices. Lacking any clear guidance, both societies concentrated on the most pressing issue of the Polish refugees. However, the 1834 rise in the number of Polish exiles in Britain made it clear that the earlier ways of resolving the problem of support for

[596] 'List Polaka w Ameryce Północnej'. *Postępowa publicystyka*, pp. 29–31.
[597] H. Temkinowa, *Lud Polski. Wybór dokumentów*, p. 10.

the refugees were insufficient in regard to the scale of the problem, leading both societies to work towards a new pro-Polish debate in the Parliament, the first that would discuss the problem of the Polish refugees.[598]

The debate took place on 25 March 1834, when the fate of the Polish exiles who arrived in Harwich and Portsmouth remained undecided. In a very moderate speech Colonel Evans introduced the subject of the Polish exiles in Britain and presented a petition, which was probably prepared and signed by members of both Polish societies. Regardless of the moderate tone of Evan's speech and the backing from Sir Harry Verney[599] and Sir George Sinclair,[600] the support of Thomas Attwood[601] and O'Connell led to unnecessary radicalisation of the subject. Both speakers used the opportunity to attack the Government and its policies, calling Nicholas I 'a monster' and the 'despot of St. Petersburgh'. Lord Dudley Stuart 'regretted the tone and manner which had been displayed [by Attwood]', but he was only one of a few moderates who supported the question.

The most significant element of the debate was the voice of Lord Palmerston, who, in a similar way as in the previous years, made a clear distinction between the general sentiment and official considerations:

> Our shores were open to the distressed of all countries, and our laws afforded protection to the afflicted of all kinds; but it would be unfair to expect, that the unfortunate of all countries should receive pecuniary support from the Government. The sum which the gallant Colonel wished to be bestowed on the refugee Poles [£10,000] might not be great; but it was not the mere amount of money, but the precedent which the grant would establish, that the House ought to take into consideration. If the principle were once established, that foreign refugees were entitled to pecuniary relief, it would be found afterwards to be a very difficult matter to draw the line of distinction between those individuals and other foreigners, who, at a future time, might present their alleged claims for similar aid. He did not see on what principle they could give the assistance which the petitioners desired, and refuse relief to those Poles who might afterwards come over to this country in

---

[598] *Morning Post*, 20 February 1834. See also *Morning Chronicle*, 13 February 1834. *Morning Post*, 21 February 1834. *Standard*, 20 February 1834. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, II, p. 230.

[599] Sir Harry Verney (1801–1894), British liberal politician and MP.

[600] Sir George Sinclair (1790–1868), British liberal politician and MP.

[601] Thomas Attwood (1783–1856), British economist, liberal politician and MP.

> great numbers, and whose claims to pecuniary relief might be greater… [W]hile there must be a feeling of sympathy in every heart in favour of the unfortunate Poles, Government could not hold out any hope of extending pecuniary relief to them.

Although at the time of the debate it was still unclear whether the problem of Polish exiles in Britain would become long-term or just temporary, Palmerston's approach to the subject did not differ from that expressed towards the question of Polish independence. The Government was, thus, ready to express its sympathy, but unwilling to commit itself to any pro-Polish action. What in the Government's approach to the problem of Polish independence was the result of the determination to preserve the European balance of power, in the discussion on the support for the Polish exiles was dictated by the usual *désintéressement* of the Government in fate of foreign refugees coming to Britain and the fear that any concessions 'would tempt foreigners to be careless in their proceedings, because they would suppose they might find a shelter and settlement here'.[602]

The brief debate, which was dominated by radical voices, was very different from the balanced and well-prepared motions of the previous years. It showed a certain weakness and the lack of political experience of British friends of Poland in coordinating similar actions. Czartoryski's influence, status, and position of a noble victim of the Tsar's persecutions helped him in uniting liberals, radicals, and conservatives in defending the cause of Poland. The first debate on the problem of Polish refugees was, to certain extent, very similar to the discussions regarding Polish independence that had taken place in the previous years, including the late hour of the event and the very limited interest expressed by the MPs.

Even the metropolitan press did not seem interested in commenting on the subject of Polish refugees, with the usual exception of *The Times*.[603] However, this time the usually liberal and pro-Polish paper was rather cautious in expressing its opinions. When it referred to the cause of Spaniards, who had received the Government's support in the 1820s and 'who had been exiles for the cause which we supported', *The Times* warned that their

---

[602] House of Commons Debate, 25 March 1834. *Hansard*, Vol. 22, cc. 651-663.

[603] *Morning Chronicle*, 26 and 27 March 1834. *Morning Post*, 26 and 27 March 1834. See also *Jenerał Zamoyski*, II, pp. 230-231.

example ‘cannot be drawn into a precedent to authorize a charitable subsidy to persons for whom the national policy has been less committed’. In conclusion, although the paper claimed that Evans’ petition was ‘necessarily rejected’, it hoped that the needs of the Polish exiles ‘will meet with open hearts and open purses, without any of those drawbacks and hesitation which official responsibility or reserve imposes’.[604]

The unsuccessful debate and the lack of similar enthusiasm for the cause of Polish exiles that had characterised the problem of Polish independence in the previous years forced the British friends of Poland to rethink their approach to the problem. Its failure became the major issue discussed at the annual meeting of the LAFP in April 1834. The Association recognised the problem and, with the failure of Evan’s motion, decided to continue its charitable work by organising a new pro-Polish event, raising the annual subscription, and preparing a new pro-Polish quarterly. Moreover, a separate collection aimed at clearing the remaining portion of the old debt was organised (bringing over £100, with half of the sum donated by Thomas Beaumont).[605] Either before or after the meeting, the LAFP, perhaps following the suggestion of its Polish Secretary, Krystyn Lach Szyrma, took over the responsibilities of the Polish Exiles’ Friends Society, effectively becoming the only pro-Polish organisation active in the capital. It did not mean, however, that money gathered by the Society would be equally distributed among all Polish exiles. To the growing disappointment and irritation of Polish soldiers in Portsmouth, the LAFP was ready to help only those exiles who lived in London.[606]

Despite the hopes of Princess Lieven that after the Savoy expedition ‘sympathy for the Poles [would] die out’,[607] there were no signs of decline in the interest in the problem of Polish exiles. Several events organised by the British friends of Poland were successful in providing the LAFP with funds that were later distributed among Polish refugees in London. In the meantime, the situation of certain groups of Polish exiles stabilised. Soldiers

---

[604] *The Times*, 27 March 1834.
[605] *Report of the [Second] Annual General Meeting*, pp. 5-13.
[606] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 92–93.
[607] Princess Lieven to Alexander Benckendorff, 25 January 1834. *Letters of Dorothea, Princess Lieven, during Her Residence in London, 1812-1834*, ed. by L. G. Robinson (London, 1902), p. 370.

from Harwich left Britain and headed to Algiers several days after the 25 March debate,[608] while those who arrived in Portsmouth received a warm reception from the locals and settled down in the old military barracks at Gosport.[609] As they explained their decision in a letter to Prince Czartoryski, they 'remained in England with no other purpose than to act in conjunction with the [rest of the Polish] Emigration'.[610] Despite the slow increase in the number of Polish exiles from Switzerland, the departure of soldiers from Harwich led to a visible decline in the number of Poles in Britain between March and June 1834, a factor which certainly contributed to the success of the second pro-Polish debate that took place on 3 June 1834.

This time it was Lord Dudley Stuart who introduced a motion requesting financial support for the Polish exiles in Britain. He used Palmerston's doubts expressed in March and presented the cause of the Polish exiles as an issue that would not make as serious of an impact on British politics as the Foreign Secretary had suggested. Stuart 'was quite willing that the grant should be restricted to those who were at present in this country, and that all future claimants should be held excluded from the benefit of it'. James Silk Buckingham supported the motion and, apart from Lord Althorp, who represented the Government, the only other person involved in the debate was Thomas Attwood. There was no discussion and no disagreements between all four speakers and the matter of subsidies for the Poles was eventually agreed upon.[611] As one of the Polish exiles reported to Zamoyski, the debate took place well after midnight, with no more than one hundred and fifty MPs present (of whom one third left the House during Stuart's speech).[612] The motion itself seemed to share all the common features of many previous pro-Polish debates and its success was not the result of heated debate, but, as it appeared, of the decision of the Government to no longer oppose it.[613]

---

[608] They were supported by 235-18-3 provided by the British Government. See *Civil contingencies. An account of the sum expended under the head of civil contingencies, in the year 1834: and an estimate of the amount required for 1835*, p. 9. See also *Report of the [Second] Annual General Meeting*, p. 6.

[609] Mikos, *Gromady Ludu Polskiego w Anglii*, pp. 46–47.

[610] Poles from Portsmouth to Prince Czartoryski, 5 June 1834. BKCz 5472, II.

[611] House of Commons Debate, 3 June 1834. *Hansard*, Vol. 24, cc. 139-142.

[612] General Roman Sołtyk to Zamoyski, 4 June 1834. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 232-233.

[613] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 95–96.

Several days later the matter came to a conclusion when the sum of £10,000 was agreed upon. Stuart used the occasion to reassure the Government that Poles 'infinitely prefer earning a subsistence, to deriving it from the gratuitous kindness of the English people'.[614] The confirmation of the grant was printed on 10 June 1834.[615] Stuart was very optimistic in his assessment of the Polish exiles, but British factory workers seemed more willing to offer some financial support to the Poles than to accept them as co-workers.[616] Despite the best attempts to find the Polish exiles a proper employment and regardless of some successes of these initiatives in the second half of the 1830s, the refugees were to remain a constant burden to the British Treasury for many decades to come.

The 1834 influx of Polish exiles to Britain became the reason behind widespread changes in the character of the Great Emigration (making Britain, as it was argued in Chapter 2, the second largest place of refuge in Europe). More importantly, however, the new Polish Question, understood as the problem of Polish refugees in Britain, started playing a very significant role in the activities of the British friends of Poland. It eventually led the reluctant Government to give in to the demands of the LAFP and provide the Polish refugees with financial help. The new Polish Question did not, however, replace the old one; and the issue of Polish refugees in Britain was strongly intertwined with the problem of the British understanding of the question of Polish independence. On the one hand, references to the November Uprising were used in discussions regarding financial support for Polish refugees in Britain. There were even suggestions that the violations of the Treaty of Vienna in the Kingdom of Poland after the Uprising were the main reason behind the final decision to grant the Poles the Government Grant.[617] On the other hand, popular and fashionable as it was, the question of Polish independence could not survive for too long without events which kept it alive in British minds. And the constant presence of Polish

---

[614] House of Commons Debate, 9 June 1834. *Hansard*, Vol. 24, cc. 340-341.

[615] *Polish exiles. An estimate of the sum that will be required to be issued for the relief of the distressed Poles now in this country* (1834).

[616] Bartkowski, pp. 235-236. In 1836, in reply to the LAFP's suggestion that Poles should use the opportunity of paid work in Scotland, the soldiers of Portsmouth openly refused to 'take the work from people of Scotland'. Lud Polski, Gromada Grudziąż to the LAFP, 26 April 1836. BKCz 6635.

[617] General Roman Sołtyk to Zamoyski, 4 June 1834. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 232-233.

refugees in Britain served as a quiet reminder that the second Polish Question remained without an answer.

The New Polish Question (1834-1841)

If the old Polish Question (understood as the problem of Polish independence), both before and after 1834, was usually the story of individuals and their efforts to gain British recognition of Polish grievances, the new Polish Question (the problem of Polish refugees in Britain) was to a large degree a story of numbers. According to the calculations of the LAFP, 1213 Polish exiles arrived in Britain between 1831 and 1847, of whom 639 left the country (see Table 1). However, as a closer investigation of these figures reveals, they were not always accurate (for example in 1834 at least 233 Poles left Britain[618]). Despite these inaccuracies, the statistics provided by the LAFP should be considered to be as close to the real numbers as possible; and the number of Polish exiles provided in these calculations should be considered as minimal values.[619] Certainly, there were Poles who did not approach the LAFP requesting any support, and those who arrived there either temporarily (see the several cases mentioned above), or who for one reason or another returned to Britain after a short stay on the Continent (although most of these cases happened in the late 1840s and the early 1850s). Finally, there were also people such as Prince Czartoryski, Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, Władysław Zamoyski, and other politically active figures who, while certainly should be classified as exiles, were not included in the LAFP's calculations (as the statistics for 1831 suggest).[620]

Having convinced the Government that the problem of Polish refugees required and deserved official financial support, the Literary Association remained central to most of the developments that took place in the aftermath of the June 1834 debate. When the sum of £10,000 for the Government Grant for the Polish refugees in Britain was agreed upon, the

---

[618] 233 was the number of Polish soldiers who arrived in Harwich and left for Algiers (see above). It is possible that the LAFP did not include them in their calculations because of the temporality of their stay or because, unlike the soldiers from Portsmouth, they did not even land on the British shore. From the Prussian ship that stopped in Harwich they were transferred directly to a British ship, the *Earl Kellie*, which took them to Algiers. See Poles from Harwich to Czartoryski, 31 March 1834. BKCz 5478.

[619] Marchlewicz, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 26.

[620] Zamoyski himself visited Britain more than forty times after 1830. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 12-13.

Treasury addressed the LAFP, suggesting that 'this sum should be applied to its object under the superintendence and direction of the Association of the Friends of Poland… and that it should be suggested to that Association that it might be satisfactory to the Polish Emigrants if in the distribution of this Grant some of the most influential of the Poles were consulted and made Parties to the arrangement'. Not only did the Treasury ask the LAFP for involvement in distributing the money, but the committee dealing with the matter was also 'of opinion that the attention of the Association should be called to the [particular] points in distributing this money'.[621] In its reply, the LAPF suggested that the number of Poles admitted to the Grant should be extended, because of a number of exiles who 'arrived in England since 9 June who could not by possibility have heard of the grant'. Eventually the Treasury agreed to allow approximately fifty additional exiles to be added to the list that amounted to about 488 refugees.[622] They were divided into four groups depending on their military rank (see Table 2), each a receiving different amount of money every four weeks (in a total of 13 instalments). A separate category for the Polish soldiers in Portsmouth was dictated by the fact that, as Lord Dudley Stuart had to explain to his fellow friends of Poland, 'there, they have not to pay for lodging. Besides, *living* is dearer in London'.[623]

The key element of the Government Grant for the Polish exiles was its restricted character. Both the LAFP and the Government assumed that the grant would be a special one-time benefit, which would allow the refugees to receive the whole yearly subsidy if they desired to leave the country.[624] Although it remains unclear how many of the 195 exiles who left Britain in 1834 and 1835 (see Table 1) did so after receiving a yearly subsistence, there is evidence to suggest that at least 14 Poles from Portsmouth left Britain at the end of 1834 in order to seek their fortunes in the United States.[625] According to a list

---

[621] J. Stewart to K. Mackenzie, 23 June 1834. BKCz 5460.

[622] The number provided by the LAFP. See *Appeal of the LAPF to the Inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland in Behalf of the Polish Refugees* (London, 1840), p. 4.

[623] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1837), p. 36.

[624] Mackenzie to Stewart, 27 June 1834. BKCz 5460.

[625] BKCz 5313 and BKCz 5500. See also F. Stasik, *Polska Emigracja Polityczna W Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki, 1831-1864* (Warszawa, 1973), p. 114.

of Polish soldiers residing in Portsmouth from 26 August 1834, the initial number of 212 had declined in the course of a few months to 175, although some of those who departed, encouraged by the LAFP, did so in search of paid work.[626] Several people went to Belgium, where they served in the Belgian Army, others managed to find a way back to France (though it is unclear whether they succeeded in getting financial support from the French Government).[627] The opportunity to leave Britain was not, however, used by everyone and during the first year the numbers of Polish exiles did not decrease.

Table 1: Dynamics of Polish emigration to and from Great Britain, 1831-1847[628]

Year	Arrivals	Departures	Deaths	Remaining
1831	2	-	-	2
1832	30	19	-	13
1833	22	2	-	33
1834	545	123	2	453
1835	76	72	2	455
1836	162	28	5	584
1837	115	27	7	665
1838	54	47	7	665
1839	44	93	7	609
1840	29	51	7	580
1841	18	33	5	560
1842	14	21	7	546
1843	11	18	14	525
1844	47	34	6	532
1845	14	21	9	516
1846	15	28	10	493
1847	15	22	10	476
TOTAL	1213	639	98	

Apart from 1834, the years 1836 and 1837 saw the greatest influx of Polish exiles to Britain, the result of events that took place in Cracow in 1836 (see Chapter 2). After 1837, fewer Poles came to Britain, while numbers of those leaving the country remained rather steady. This resulted in the slow decline of the total number of remaining exiles after 1838

[626] *Spisy Polaków w Anglii, Belgii i Szwajcarii*. BKCz 5316, II. According to Mikos the number of Polish refugees in Portsmouth remained at the same level throughout the 1830s. See Mikos, 'Warunki bytowe emigracji polskiej w Anglii po powstaniu listopadowym', pp. 88-90.

[627] Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia*, p. 238.

[628] Based on Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie*, Appendix 6.

– the direct result of the change the Government introduced to the distribution of the Grant in 1837 and 1838 (see below). Interestingly, while large waves of Polish émigrés arriving in Britain in 1830s were usually connected with events taking place in Poland (the expulsion of the remaining numbers of Polish soldiers from Prussia in late 1833, the occupation of Cracow in 1836), departures of Poles were rarely linked with political events taking place across Europe, at least not until the 1848 revolutions. Far more significant were the decisions of the British Government and changes in its policies towards the Polish exiles.

Table 2: Groups, numbers, and monthly support provided for the Polish refugees in Britain in 1834[629]

Group	Number of refugees in 1834	Sum received (per person per 4 weeks)
(1) Field officers	10	£3
(2) Captains, lieutenants, and ensigns	227	£2
(3) NCOs and privates in London	27	£1-8s
(4) NCOs and privates at Portsmouth	201	£1-1s

Over the years there were very minor changes in the distribution of Poles across the country. At the end of 1834 the majority of Polish exiles in Britain resided either in London (over 240 exiles) or in Portsmouth (less than 200), with a smaller community of about 20 Poles living in Edinburgh.[630] With Portsmouth dominated by the radical socialists,[631] the majority of the newcomers settled in London, where contacts with other Polish exiles and direct access to the LAFP made their lives easier. As Jan Bartkowski noted in his memoirs, the number of Poles residing in the capital was so high that he felt the necessity to move to Edinburgh in order to be able to learn English.[632] However, Leonard Niedźwiecki pointed out that even the extra 7 shillings that he and other Poles in London received (in comparison to their fellow exiles from Portsmouth) was a sum that 'allowed neither to live, nor to die', making 'poverty and complaining' a common element of the émigrés' lives in

[629] 'Appendix 8', *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure; together with the minutes of evidence taken before them* (London, 1848), p. 274.

[630] BKCz 5313.

[631] The Polish People Groups [*Gromady Ludu Polskiego*] developed from the critical attitude of Poles residing in Portsmouth to the developments of the Polish Democratic Society in 1835. See particularly P. Brock, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', *The Journal of Modern History*, 25.2 (1953), pp. 139–56. P. Brock, *Polish Revolutionary Populism: A Study in Agrarian Socialist Thought from the 1830s to the 1850s* (Toronto, 1977).

[632] Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia*, p. 253.

the capital.[633] With time it was becoming clear that the Government Grant would do little to resolve all of the problems faced by the Polish exiles in Britain.

The continuous influx of Polish exiles to Britain forced the Association to supplement the official Government List, which consisted of those who were entitled to the subsidy, with an additional Benevolent List.[634] It included those refugees who arrived too late to receive the Grant and who could only rely on the LAFP funds. In consequence, there was a constant need for additional money. As early as in November 1834 Kenneth Mackenzie, the secretary of the LAFP, in his letter to *The Times* presented the deplorable situation of the Polish refugees in Britain. As he argued, the £10,000 granted by the Government to the Polish exiles was 'no more than a scanty pittance' and that 'these men, with no other means of support, should be subject to great privations'. However, the situation of those who were not found eligible to receive the Government Grant found themselves in far more difficult position. Most of the attempts to find these refugees employment in Britain failed, as 'in every trade the supply of hands is greater than demand for labour'. The letter, as well as the attention paid to it by the editors of *The Times*, showed that the problems of the Polish exiles in Britain had not ended with the passing of the Government Grant. The LAFP, instrumental in the establishment of the Grant, also played a key role in its renewal, petitioning the Government and gathering a 'a number of influential Members of the House of Commons to wait in deputation on the Chancellor of the Exchequer, pressing him to grant the required aid'.[635] The initiative was successful and the Government agreed to issue another £10,000 grant for 1835.[636]

The renewal of the Grant in 1835 (the subject did not even enter parliamentary debates) became the first major turning point in the history of this Polish Question. Although a year later the LAFP could announce 'the determination of Government to make another grant for the ensuing year [i.e. 1836]',[637] it was never officially recognised as a

---

[633] Niedźwiecki to Stanisław Szyszło, 21 September 1834. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 36–41.

[634] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting*, p. 4. *Appeal of the LAPF to the Inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland in Behalf of the Polish Refugees*, pp. 5-6.

[635] *Report of the Fourth Annual General Meeting of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1836), p. 24.

[636] 'Appendix 8', *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure*, p. 274.

[637] *Report of the Fourth Annual General Meeting*, p. 26.

permanent support measure. However, regardless of the changes in distribution, rules, and the amount of money granted to the Polish exiles, even British Conservative governments did not consider withdrawing the payments that provided the majority of Poles in Britain with the main, and sometimes the only, income.[638] As early as in 1836 it became clear that it was 'almost impossible for the Refugees here to seek shelter elsewhere. Every country in Europe prohibits their entrance'.[639] In consequence, the continuation of the Grant was a matter of 'not merely the comfort, but the actual existence of nearly five hundred Refugees'.[640] From the point of view of Melbourne's government, that decision can be considered as a part of a wider policy of dealing with the consequences of the actions of previous governments.[641]

For the first five years the initial sum of the subsidy (£10,000) was retained, notwithstanding the large influx of refugees in the years 1836 and 1837 (see Tables 1 and 3). Although the LAFP succeeded in putting at least some of the new exiles on the Government List, their numbers never exceeded the initial 488 entitled to the Grant in 1834.[642] In 1836 the Association faced very significant opposition from the Government when it attempted to increase the number of Polish exiles eligible for the subsidy. As its members argued, only about 400 Poles remained on the Government List, while the £10,000 was sufficient to grant relief to 475. However, despite numerous letters, representations, and petitions the Government only agreed to include the refugees coming from Cracow on the list of those entitled to the Grant.[643] By 1837 about 110 Polish refugees in Britain were excluded from the grant and, therefore, entirely dependent on the financial support of the LAFP.[644] It was not until 1838, however, when the number of the Polish exiles in Britain, already exceeding 660 (of whom only about 480 were on the Government

---

[638] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, p. 99.
[639] *Report of the Fourth Annual General Meeting*, p. 26.
[640] *Ibid*., p. 24.
[641] Mitchell, *Lord Melbourne*, p. 155.
[642] For example in 1835 89 new Poles were added to the Government List, replacing 111 others who either left the country or deceases. Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, p. 101.
[643] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General meeting of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1837), pp. 4-8.
[644] *Report of the Sixth Annual General Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1838), p. 2.

List[645]), led the LAFP to reintroduce the problem of their financial support to the House of Commons.

Table 3: The British Parliamentary Grant for the benefit of the Polish Exiles, 1834-1847[646]

Year	Sum
1834	£10,000
1835	£10,000
1836	£10,000
1837	£10,000
1838	£10,000
1839	£15,000
1840	£13,000
1841	£12,000
1842	£10,900
1843	£10,500
1844	£10,000
1845	£9,700
1846	£9,400
1847	£9,100

In consequence of Dudley Stuart's failure to be re-elected to Parliament in 1837 elections, the LAFP was forced to rely on their friends and supporters in the Parliament to raise and promote that question. On 27 July 1838 Viscount Sandon filed a motion with the intent of increasing the sum provided for the Poles and support from O'Connell, Burdett, and Inglis showed that similarly to the problem of Polish independence, the new Polish Question could count on backing from all sides of the British political scene. Even the Government did not remain indifferent and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Thomas Spring-Rice,[647] openly admitted that the issue of relief for the Poles was no longer a question 'of principle, but of degree'. This was the first time when the Government openly admitted that the Grant was no longer perceived as temporary resolution to some minor problem, but a significant element of Whig liberal policy. A principal factor behind the decision on the Grant was, as Spring-Rice argued, not the popularity of the cause of Polish

[645] Stuart to Palmerston, 20 May 1838. BA PP/GC/ST/136.

[646] 'Appendix 8', *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure*, p. 274. See also Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie*, Appendix 3.

[647] Thomas Spring Rice (1790–1866), British politician, from 1835-1839 Chancellor of the Exchequer in Russell's Government.

exiles, but whether the money 'was or was not [spent] for the benefit of the public'.[648] The Government refused to increase the amount given to the Poles, but it did agree on adding the exiles from the Benevolent List to those on the Government List, making the largest number of Poles eligible for the grant since its creation. From 1838 the £10,000 subsidy was to be distributed among 656 Polish refugees residing in Britain.[649]

Table 4: Income and expenditure of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, 1832-1847[650]

Period	Income	Expenditure[651]
6 March 1832 – 31 December 1832	£531-15s-4d.	£80-2s.-6d.
1 January 1833 – 18 April 1834	£863-2s-3d.	£420-13s.-6d.
19 April 1834 – 28 March 1835	£1545-16s-11½d	£970-3s.-11½d.
29 March 1835 – 16 April 1836	£814-12s.-4d.	£510-9s.-3d.
17 April 1836 – 3 May 1837	£2544-11s.-3d.	£2097-9s.-8d.
4 May 1837 – 3 May 1838	£4153-14s.-9d.	£3380-14s.-9½d.
4 May 1838 – 3 May 1839	£2121-11s.-11d.	£1400-9s.-6d.
4 May 1839 – 2 May 1840	£1524-12s.-0d.	£1012-2s.-2d.
3 May 1840 – 3 May 1841	£1678-9s.-3d.	£1149-11s.-6d.
4 May 1841 – 3 May 1842	£2113-0s.-7d.	£1369-17s.-0d.
4 May 1842 – 3 May 1843	£1468-13s.-0d.	£1118-3s.-5d.
4 May 1843 – 3 May 1844	£1333-14s.-11d.	£913-2s.-11d.
4 May 1844 – 3 May 1845	£1569-1s.-3d.	£1070-7s.-2d.
4 May 1845 – 4 May 1846	£1758-17s.-0d.	£971-18s.-4d.
5 May 1846 – 3 May 1847	£1379-5s.-7d.	£992-5s.-3d.

1838 also brought about another serious change to the way in which the Grant was administered. After four years, the Government decided to relieve the LAFP from the duty of overseeing the distribution of the money. In October that year the Treasury entrusted the supervision of the Government Grant to John Searles Tebbs, a clerk working in the War-

[648] House of Commons Debate, 27 July 1838. *Hansard*, Vol. 44, cc. 729-737.

[649] 'Appendix 8', *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure*, p. 275.

[650] Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie*, Appendix 3.

[651] Sums presented in this part of the table refer only to the LAFP's expenditure on support for the Polish exiles in Britain, including temporary financial help, education, costs of travel from Britain (only when the émigrés decided to leave the country permanently), and funeral costs. See Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie*, Appendix 3.

office, who received £273 annually for his work as the paymaster of the Polish exiles.[652] It is possible that by appointing Tebbs shortly after the subsidy was extended on all Polish exiles in Britain the Treasury wanted to extend greater control over the Grant and its distribution. Before 1838 the Association was allowed to add one person to the Government List for every three that either died or departed. According to the new resolution, only 'one new appointment [was] made for three death vacancies' and Tebbs, as a Government official, was not as lenient towards the new exiles as, seemingly, the LAFP had been. The fact that the number of Poles receiving the Grant in 1834 and 1838 remained almost the same (488 and around 480) was undoubtedly the reason why the Government felt determined to stop any further admissions of new exiles. As Tebbs reported, between 1838 and 1848 only 13 new persons were added to the list, all of them recommended by Lord Dudley Stuart.[653]

All these changes could be seen as preparations for the rumoured increase of the Government Grant that took place a year later. In 1839 the Treasury finally decided to increase the amount of money granted to the Polish refugees from £10,000 to £15,000 – a not insubstantial change when taking into consideration the rise in the number of those entitled to the subsidy. However, better control over the money meant also that when the number of Poles residing in Britain started to decrease, the Treasury could lower the total amount of the Grant. In fact, the changes of 1838-9 should be considered as the peak of official support the British Government was ready to give to the Poles and, as Tables 1 and 3 illustrate, the following years saw both the decrease in the number of Polish exiles and the gradual decrease of the subsidy. Success of the measure can be seen in the declining number of applications for temporary support received by the LAFP (see Table 5). Between May 1837 and May 1838, when the Grant was still limited to only about 480 Poles, the LAFP received almost 5,000 applications. These numbers fell to under 100 in 1839-40,

---

[652] *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure*, p. 553. According to Bartkowski, Tebbs had been the paymaster since 1834, but Tebbs' own account shows that he took care of the fund after 1838. See Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia*, p. 233. Contrary to Marchlewicz's assumption, Tebbs' work as the paymaster was not part of his duties at the War Office. Marchlewicz, 'Nadzór administracyjny i policyjny nad polskimi emigrantami politycznymi w Wielkiej Brytanii w latach 1831-1863', pp. 64-65.

[653] *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure*, pp. 552-553.

clearly the result of the increase of the official subsidy and the addition of more refugees to the Government List. This did not, however, change the fact that for many years the LAFP's expenditure on support for the Poles in the late 1830s and early 1840s continued to constitute over fifty per cent of the organisation's total income (see Table 4).

All types of financial support provided to the Polish exiles by the Association would have been impossible without support from a variety of public events. They served not only as an encouragement for the people of Britain to 'evinc[e] their love of freedom and benevolence',[654] but also as important social events. The organisers never failed to inform the public of illustrious patrons and guests (including the Duchess of Kent and the Duke of Sussex in 1835,[655] and Lord Palmerston, Marshal Soult, and Duc Nemours in 1838[656]), hoping to encourage British aristocrats to attend. The 1838 fête was so well-advertised that some people were even expecting that the Queen herself would make an appearance.[657] The successes were sometimes very significant: £600 was gathered at a public dinner in Edinburgh attended by Lord Dudley Stuart, Count Zamoyski, and Prince Czartoryski in 1835, £250 in 1836,[658] and over £600 in 1838.[659] But for every success there was also a failure. Despite great interest from the public and the involvement of various artists, an event at the Covent Garden Theatre in early 1836, did not bring in more than £40 in income.[660] A fête in the Cremorne House on 29 August 1837 was 'a total failure' that incurred heavy losses.[661] A second fête organised on 30 July 1838 (after the success of the first one from 17 July) was similarly unsuccessful.[662] Two of the most successful years, 1836-7 and 1837-8, brought over £6000 of income (see Table 4), of which £2248 and

---

[654] *The Times*, 5 July 1838.
[655] *Morning Post*, 17 August 1835.
[656] Stuart to Palmerston, 30 June 1838. BA PP/GC/ST/138.
[657] Niedźwiecki to Karol Hoffman, 17 July 1838. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 356–362.
[658] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, p. 105.
[659] Niedźwiecki to Karol Hoffman, 17 July 1838. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 356–362.
[660] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting*, p. 28. See also Niedźwiecki to Eustachy Januszkiewicz, 15 February 1836. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 63–68. *Report of the Sixth Annual General Meeting*, pp. 55-65.
[661] *Report of the Sixth Annual General Meeting*, p. 3.
[662] Niedźwiecki to Hoffman, 3 August 1838. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 368-369.

£3687 respectively came from individual donations 'for the Relief of the Polish Refugees not participating in the Parliamentary Grant'.[663]

Even after the changes introduced by the Government in 1838 and 1839 to the way in which the Grant was distributed, the LAFP continued to promote the cause of the Polish exiles by organising different meetings and collections. Unlike the question of Polish independence, which lost its appeal among the British public as early as in 1833, the problem of Polish refugees kept attracting attention for many years. To certain extent that survival of the new Polish Question can be attributed to its links with the issue of Polish independence. The majority of the British friends of Poland agreed that no intervention in defence of the Treaty of Vienna and the status of the Kingdom of Poland was possible without a major European war, leading them to abandon that political issue. At the same time the emergence of the problem of Polish exiles allowed British sympathisers and supporters of Polish independence to manifest their devotion to the Polish cause by moral and charitable rather than political means.

At times it was felt that contemporary events (particularly the death of King William IV, the general election and the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837[664]) would overshadow the problem of Polish refugees. However, despite the economic and political crisis of the second half of the 1830s, which included the rise of Chartism (see Chapter 6), the increasing importance of the Anti-Corn Law League, and the weakening position of the Government,[665] interest in the question of Polish refugees did not suffer any significant decline until the first part of the 1840s. In the meantime, the diminishing importance of the question of Polish independence in European politics made its impact in Britain as well. Consequently, despite the occasional reappearance of that question in the course of parliamentary debates and during the events organised by the LAFP, the position and interest in the 'old' Polish Question remained very weak.

---

[663] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting*, pp. 57-67. *Report of the Sixth Annual General Meeting*, pp. 55-65.
[664] *Report of the Sixth Annual General Meeting*, p. 3.
[665] Wood, *Nineteenth Century Britain*, p. 141.

Table 5: Numbers of Poles receiving permanent support from the LAFP and number of applications for temporary support, 1832-1847[666]		
Period	**Number of Poles receiving permanent support**	**Applications for temporary support**
6 March 1832 – 31 December 1832	-	42
1 January 1833 – 18 April 1834	-	38
19 April 1834 – 28 March 1835	-	459
29 March 1835 – 16 April 1836	-	516
17 April 1836 – 3 May 1837	-	1431
4 May 1837 – 3 May 1838	-	4897
4 May 1838 – 3 May 1839	-	1272
4 May 1839 – 2 May 1840	21	96
3 May 1840 – 3 May 1841	30	71
4 May 1841 – 3 May 1842	34	171
4 May 1842 – 3 May 1843	32	151
4 May 1843 – 3 May 1844	31	146
4 May 1844 – 3 May 1845	22	306
4 May 1845 – 4 May 1846	21	291
5 May 1846 – 3 May 1847	18	264

The 'Old' Polish Question (1834-1841)

Between 1831 and 1834 Polish exiles successfully used the great significance of the November Uprising and the subsequent Russian atrocities in the Kingdom of Poland to continuously promote the issue of Polish independence in Britain. The period of the problem's awareness ended with the failure of Fergusson's third pro-Polish motion. Regardless of pro-Polish zeal presented by numerous Polish societies and individuals in that period, British public opinion could not retain its interest in the subject of Poland without any external stimulus. It was not until 1836 when the subject of Poland returned to the British and European attention thanks to the military occupation of Cracow. This was the only serious event related to the question of Polish independence that took place in the second half of the 1830s. Promotion of the cause of the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland was replaced by discussions on the subject of the Free State of Cracow and the violation of its neutrality, becoming the main subject of Polish-related political debates for the rest of the decade. However, despite Czartoryski's determination to frame the problem of Cracow as the new Polish Question; one which would unite France and Britain against

[666] Szulczewski, *O Towarzystwie*, Appendix 4.

the Holly Alliance, neither parliamentary nor public interest in this subject reached the level of the early 1830s.

According to Article VI of the Treaty of Vienna, 'the town of Cracow, with its territory, is declared to be for ever a free, independent, and strictly neutral city, under the protection of Austria, Russia and Prussia'. More significantly, however, Article IX read: 'the courts of Russia, Austria and Prussia engage to respect, and to cause to be always respected, the neutrality of the free town of Cracow and its territory. No armed force shall be introduced upon any pretence whatever'.[667] Unlike other parts of the ancient Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the fate of Cracow appeared, at least theoretically, to be even more favourable than that of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Posen.[668] However, as the events of the fifteen years separating the Congress of Vienna and the outbreak of the November Uprising showed, these freedoms were not respected and the three Powers imposed their own rules on the governance of the city.[669] In 1830 and 1831 Cracow provided the Uprising with several hundred fighters and after the defeat of the Revolution the city became an asylum for those Poles who did not want to emigrate to France.

In the years following the Uprising Cracow swarmed with exiles, conspirators, and secret societies.[670] People associated with the Young Poland and *Carbonari* movements started organising various clandestine organisations in Galicia and the Kingdom of Poland centred around Cracow. Soon, however, their activities came to the attention of Austrian and Russian authorities. When Poles assassinated an Austrian (or Russian) spy, a certain Behrens, in early 1836, the three powers decided to intervene. In a communication from 9 February the representatives of the three powers demanded from the Government of

---

[667] *Final Act of the Congress of Vienna*. *The General Treaty of the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna* [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Final_Act_of_the_Congress_of_Vienna/General_Treaty, accessed 16 May 2016).

[668] It led Schroeder to call Cracow 'a small remnant of Polish independence', despite the fact that for contemporaries it was the constitutional status of the Kingdom of Poland which guaranteed a certain dose of independence and continuation of Polish freedoms. See Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, p. 536.

[669] S. Kieniewicz, 'The Free State of Cracow, 1815-1846', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 26.66 (1947), pp. 70–73.

[670] E. Gracz-Chmura, *Literatura romantyczna w Krakowie (1827-1863)* (Kraków, 2013), p. 38.

Cracow the expulsion of all Polish refugees.[671] The Polish Senate was more than willing to cooperate and immediately took steps to ensure that the plenipotentiaries' request would be enforced.[672] Eight days after the initial communication, the powers informed the Senate that, in their opinion, the Cracow authorities not only did not 'possess the power… to fulfil the directions announced with respect to refugees, and to execute the Law affecting forfeited persons, but also that it does not possess the inclination to accomplish the same to its full extent'. In consequence, troops under the command of Major-General von Kaufmann occupied Cracow with an aim of

> complete expulsion of the revolutionary refugees, the emissaries of the Propaganda, and those seditious men who since the Polish Revolution have assembled at Cracow and upon its Territory, and from thence have extended their destructive machinations to the adjoining Countries. This object once attained, and order permanently restored in the Free State of Cracow, the troops of the 3 Courts will then be immediately withdrawn from this Country.[673]

Very few people believed in the temporality of the occupation of Cracow and the news was met with alarm among the Polish exiles in France and Britain.

Although for the French and British governments the problem of Cracow appeared to be a new phenomenon, Prince Czartoryski had been fully aware of the importance of the Free City as early as in 1832, when he prepared the first memorandum discussing the status of that city.[674] The memorandum was followed by a project of an article, which was meant to be published in British newspapers in 1834,[675] but there is no evidence that any of these works reached a wider circulation. Although Czartoryski mentioned the problem of Cracow in one of his letters to Palmerston[676] and even prepared a separate memorandum to the Foreign Secretary,[677] British attention turned towards the Free City only after its surprising

---

[671] The Plenipotentiaries of 3 Powers to the Senate of Cracow, 9 February 1836. *State Papers: 1835-6* (London, 1837), pp. 1352-1353.
[672] The Senate of Cracow to the Plenipotentiaries of 3 Powers, 9 February 1836. *Ibid*., pp. 1354-1356.
[673] The Plenipotentiaries of the 3 Courts to the Senate, 16 Fabruary 1836. *Ibid.*, pp. 1356-1357.
[674] *Memorandum sur la Republique de Cracovie*. BKCz 5358.
[675] *Projet d'article pour les journaux Anglais sur l'affaire de Cracovie*. BKCz 5358.
[676] Czartoryski to Palmerston, 17 July 1833. BA PP/GC/CZ/3.
[677] *Note pour le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères d'Angleterre sur l'affaire de Cracovie*. BKCz 5358.

and unexpected occupation. However, the tone and arguments used by the Polish exiles nonetheless relied on the earlier drafts prepared by Czartoryski.

As Zamoyski argued in his 1836 memorandum to Palmerston, 'the city of Cracow was declared and acknowledged in the General Act of the Congress of Vienna… to be a free, independent, and strictly neutral town. To this acknowledgement of independence *England has become a party*'.[678] Arguments used by the Polish exiles in their communications to British politicians were, therefore, the same as those used a few years before in defending the status of the Kingdom of Poland. As a signatory of the Treaty of Vienna, Britain had the same rights to intervene in the affairs of Cracow as Russia, Prussia, and Austria.[679] In case of Cracow, however, there could be no doubt that the Treaty was violated. As early as in the beginning of March 1836 Lord Dudley Stuart presented his willingness to discuss the subject of Poland and its neutrality in the House of Commons, claiming that the news from Cracow 'arouse[d] the *indignation* and alarm of any man who feels an interest in the honour of England'.[680] Preparations for the debate, with the active involvement of Czartoryski, Zamoyski and Stuart, were very swift. The discussion took place on 18 March 1836, just over two weeks after the first confirmed news of the occupation reached London.[681]

The Question of Cracow was introduced by Sir Stratford Canning[682] and supported by the usual group of friends of Poland (including Stuart, O'Connell, and Inglis). The debate created an opportunity for the Government to express its deep sympathy towards this 'important matter', although the lack of any official communications in regard to the occupation of Cracow prevented Palmerston and the Prime Minister Lord John Russell from going into too much detail. Sir Robert Inglis was confident that 'the power of public opinion would exercise its influence to check such proceedings', expressing the belief of many MPs and friends of Poland in the strength that the moral power and the influence of the British public opinion had on European politics. At the same time Lord John Russell

---

[678] Zamoyski to Palmerston, n.d. [1836?]. BA PP/GC/ZA/1.
[679] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, III, pp. 381-389.
[680] Lord Dudley Stuart to Lord Palmerston, 1 March 1836. BA, PP/GC/ST/132.
[681] *The Times*, 1 March 1836. *Standard*, 3 March 1836. *Morning Post*, 4 March 1836.
[682] Sir Stratford Canning (1786–1880), British diplomat, later British ambassador to Constantinople.

warned against any 'resolution strongly expressive of their indignation' and after the universal expression of sympathy presented by the Government, the Whigs, and the Tories, the subject was dropped.[683]

A month later, in another late night debate, Patrick Stewart presented a motion that linked the problem of Cracow with the Russian expansion in the East. Once again the discussion allowed MPs to officially show their support for the main points presented in Stewart's motion. Even Palmerston openly mentioned the Government's considerations of sending a consul to Cracow. However, many MPs suggested that Stewart should be satisfied with the universal sympathy expressed during the debate and implored him not to press for a division. Eventually the motion was withdrawn.[684]

The pro-Polish sentiment presented during both debates by numerous MPs and several members of the Cabinet (particularly Palmerston) gave much hope to the British friends of Poland. For a moment it really seemed as if the opinions of the House of Commons could make a serious impact on European politics, turning the occupation of Cracow into a double-edged sword that would strike back at the Holy Alliance. Because of its direct violation of the Treaty of Vienna, the occupation forced Palmerston to act more decisively than during and after the November Uprising. On 15 April 1836 he sent a very strong note to British representatives in Vienna, Berlin, and St Petersburg, protesting against the action of all three powers. The very fact of occupation aside, the Foreign Secretary seemed particularly annoyed with the fact that 'up to the present time, no formal explanation has been given to the British Government by the Three occupying Powers, as to the causes which have led to the proceeding, nor as to the grounds upon which it was conceived to be justifiable'.[685] In order to prevent any further violations of the Treaty of Vienna, and of Cracow's neutrality, as he openly declared in a reply to Stewart's motion Palmerston was considering sending a British consul to the city. The main candidate to that function was Henry Reeve,[686] who visited Cracow in 1835.[687] Palmerston kept using pretty

---

[683] House of Commons Debate, 18 March 1836. *Hansard*, Vol. 32, cc. 403-426.

[684] House of Commons Debate, 20 April 1836. *Hansard*, Vol. 32, cc. 1258-1320.

[685] Copy of a Dispatch from Viscount Palmerston to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and to His Majesty's Ministers at Berlin and Vienna. BA PP/BD/RU/4.

[686] Henry Reeve (1813–1895), British translator and writer, from 1840 one of the editors of *The Times*.

strong language in his correspondence with British representatives in Berlin, Vienna and St Petersburg. In his dispatch to Lord William Russell in Berlin he argued that 'Prussia in fact has no voice in the matter; and has no greatest right of interference with respect to the appointment of a British Consul or Minister at Cracow, than with respect to similar appointments of the British Government in any other part of the World'. As Palmerston concluded, Britain had the right to defend the stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna and was 'entitled to expect from the good faith and honour of Prussia, that she also will scrupulously observe the engagements which she *then* contracted'.[688] Regardless of the Foreign Secretary's language and determination to counter the actions of the Holy Alliance in Cracow, the unwillingness of France to cooperate with Britain in the matter prevented the Government from undertaking any action in Cracow and the problem remained unresolved until the annexation of the city by Austria in 1846 (see Chapter 7).

In 1840 Prince Czartoryski supported the printing and distribution of an address of the inhabitants of Cracow to French and British Governments.[689] The document was accompanied by a memorandum prepared by Hilary Meciszewski about the historical and contemporary status of the Free State of Cracow.[690] Acting in agreement with Czartoryski and Zamoyski, Sir Stratford Canning gave notice about his willingness to present the problem of Cracow to the House of Commons in mid-June 1840.[691] Earlier that month Lord Dudley Stuart presented Palmerston with a letter and an official memorandum regarding the subject of Cracow prepared by Czartoryski.[692] Soon after Władysław Zamoyski reached London and immediately started preparations for the debate with the same energy and enthusiasm that had characterised his actions in the 1830s. He regretted the lack of a

---

[687] Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity*, p. 240.

[688] Palmerston to Lord William Russell, 28 June 1836. NA FO 881/749A.

[689] See for example *Morning Chronicle*, 30 June 1840.

[690] L. Królikowski [H. Meciszewski], *Memoriał historyczny i polityczny o stanie obecnym Wolnego Miasta Krakowa i jego okręgu: na poparcie adressu obywateli krakowskich podanego rządowi francuzkiemu i angielskiemu w październiku, 1839 roku z dołączeniem zbioru dokumentów* (Paryż, 1840).

[691] *Morning Chronicle*, 17 June 1840.

[692] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 127-128. For Czartoryski's memorandum see Czartoryski to Palmerston, 29 May 1840. BA PP/GC/CZ/13.

'second Dudley [Stuart]', who could help with the preparations,[693] and felt discouraged by the fact that the debate was postponed.[694] Nevertheless, he hailed the newspapers' readiness to publish the address of the inhabitants of Cracow.[695]

The debate finally took place on 13 July and Zamoyski considered is as yet another success, even though no motion was put forward and the whole discussion was nothing more than a way of repeating previous arguments in defence of Cracow.[696] Canning received support from Henry Gally Knight,[697] but it was Sir Robert Peel's speech that left a particularly good impression. As the future Prime Minister argued,

> the time was come, or at any rate very fast approaching, that the three powers would feel assured that it was for the general interests of Europe, that it was for the maintenance of those true Conservative principles which he believed it was the great object of those three powers to support, that due observance should be given to the settlement that was made in 1815, and that Cracow should be re-established in that independence and freedom which were guaranteed to it in that year.

After three other MPs (Hume, John Colquhoun[698], and Lord Eliot[699]) joined the debate, the subject was eventually dropped.[700] What was interesting in the whole discussion which was to become, as it turned out, the last discussison on the subject of Poland before the Whigs' defeat in the 1841 election) was the limited support provided by MPs who were members of the LAFP, particularly in the context of the debate from 3 August 1840. On that occasion Viscount Sandon and Sir Francis Burdett, both well-known sympathisers of the cause of Poland and Polish exiles, rose in order to request the addition of 52 more Poles to the Government List; the request was rejected by Sir Francis Baring,[701] the Chancellor of the

---

[693] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 1 July 1840. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 130-131. At the time Stuart was no longer an MP.

[694] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 11 July 1840. *Ibid*., pp. 132-133.

[695] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 1 July 1840. *Ibid*., pp. 130-131.

[696] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 13 July 1840. *Ibid*., pp. 133-134. On the address, see for example *Morning Chronicle*, 17 June 1840.

[697] Henry Gally Knight (1786–1846), British antiquarian, writer, and politician.

[698] John Campbell Colquhoun (1803–1870), British Conservative politician and writer.

[699] Edward Granville Eliot (1798–1877), British Conservative politician and diplomat.

[700] House of Commons Debate, 13 July 1840. *Hansard*, Vol. 55, cc. 670-695.

[701] Francis Thornhill Baring (1796–1866), British Whig politician, Minister in the governments of Grey and Lord John Russell.

Exchequer (who replaced Fox-Strangeways on that post in 1839).[702] Both debates showed that there were two types of British friends of Poland. One type, like Canning, but also Evans, was always ready to discuss political matters regarding the fate of Poland. The other type, like Sandon, Burdett, and many others, devoted their energies mostly to the problem of the well-being of the Polish refugees. That distinction, however, went beyond parliamentary debates and as early as in 1834 led to the limitation of the LAFP's interests in the political question of Poland, which, in turn, had an impact on the way in which the old Polish Question was perceived in Britain.

When news of the occupation of Cracow started arriving from Germany and France in February and March of 1836, British newspapers kept their readers informed about the events taking place in the Free State. However, while 'Cracow continue[d] to occupy attention of French and German papers',[703] there was far less interest in the subject in the British press. Interestingly, instead of letters and articles from defenders of the Polish cause, a number of letters from 'a Russian' appeared in the *Morning Post*. Their author was determined to 'take up the defence of my native land' and 'dissipate the prejudices which a certain set of scribblers are endeavouring to spread against my country'.[704] Although the bulk of his attention was devoted to information printed in the *Portfolio*,[705] he also touched upon the subject of Cracow and news presented in the *Morning Chronicle*. The opinions presented by 'a Russian' were in touch with the conservative character of the *Morning Post* and offered an indirect counterbalance to the Whig tendencies presented in the *Chronicle*.

It is surprising that, firstly, the British friends of Poland did not consider replying to these letters on the pages of other papers, and, secondly, that so little was written in defence of the cause of Cracow. Only *The Times* offered some counterbalance to the critical

---

[702] House of Commons Debate, 3 August 1840. *Hansard*, Vol. 55, cc. 1221-1224.

[703] *Morning Chronicle*, 21 March 1836.

[704] *Morning Post*, 5 March 1836.

[705] *Portfolio, or a Collection of State Papers*, 6 vols. (1836-1837) was a series published by David Urquhart, a well-known Russophobe. The majority of the materials published on the pages of *Portfolio* were provided by the Polish exiles. See Miles Taylor, 'Urquhart, David (1805–1877)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28017, accessed 17 May 2016].

approach of conservative newspapers,[706] but the overall pro-Polish sympathy among British public was far less universal and visible than during and shortly after the November Uprising. Even the LAFP appeared far more concerned with the fate of the new exiles that would arrive in Britain after the occupation of Cracow than with the political significance of the occupation itself. Although 'the primary and main object of [the LAFP] was to diffuse information upon the actual state of Poland, to keep alive and interest in her condition, and to provide for the education of the exiled Polish Youth… the number of Polish Refugees who were driven here in 1833-34, in a state of utter destitution, compelled the Council to direct its energies to the object of procuring them the means of subsistence'.[707] Political subjects still attracted the attention of individual members of the Association, but the organisation as a whole was far more concerned with its charitable work and gathering funds for support of the Polish exiles.

The 1840 debate did not lead to any significant rise of interest in the question of Poland or Cracow in the British press. Major metropolitan newspapers helped to prepare the ground for the discussion by publishing the address of the inhabitants of Cracow,[708] followed by detailed accounts of the debate itself[709] and, finally, an extract of a letter from Czartoryski in which the Prince thanked Canning for his involvement in defending the cause of Poland.[710] The last publication was a result of Zamoyski's and Stuart's determination (according to Zamoyski both men visited all the major newspapers with a translated copy of Czartoryski's letter), but even then the press refused to publish those paragraphs which criticised Palmerston's policies.[711] The debate took place in the midst of the Eastern Crisis and, in the context of Czartoryski's diplomacy, it was partly an attempt to unite Britain and France against the Holy Alliance at a time when the ways of both liberal powers started to part (see Chapter 2). Unfortunately, even the usually sympathetic *The Times* (from May 1840 onward contacts between the Polish exiles and this newspaper were

---

[706] See for example *The Times*, 15, 21 March, 1, 2 April, 11 May 1836.
[707] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting*, p. 3.
[708] *Standard*, 29 June 1840; *The Times*, 29 June 1840; *Morning Chronicle*, 30 June 1840.
[709] *Examiner*, 19 July 1840; *Morning Chronicle*, 14 July 1840; *Morning Post*, 14 July 1840; *Standard*, 14 July 1840; *The Times*, 14 July 1840.
[710] *Morning Chronicle*, 1 August 1840; *Morning Post*, 1 August 1840; *The Times*, 3 August 1840.
[711] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 1 August 1840. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 139-140.

even closer thanks to Henry Reeve, who became one of the editors of *The Times*), though it never lost its sympathy for the cause of Poland, started to believe that Palmerston's cooperation with Russia, Prussia and Austria might be the right choice to successfully resolve the Eastern Crisis.[712] At a time of growing animosity between France and Britain, neither Czartoryski, nor even Thiers (who expressed his readiness to cooperate with the British Government in renewing protests against the occupation of Cracow) could make the question of the Free State of Cracow a factor uniting both powers.

The problem of Cracow, though it failed to lead to any decisive and united action on behalf of Britain and France, replaced the issue of the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland as the main topic of Czartoryski's letters and memoranda. In a letter from 1837 Czartoryski reminded Palmerston that the question of Cracow's independence was a central element of European politics that should be finally resolved by the French and British governments.[713] A year later Czartoryski made an attempt to mediate between both governments in order to secure their cooperation in forcing Austrian forces out of Cracow (Prussian and Russian soldiers had already left the city).[714] In 1839 Zamoyski presented Palmerston with a larger memoir in which Czartoryski discussed at length the international relations between France, Britain, and Austria, suggesting the best ways of resolving discord between both liberal powers by their united action against the Habsburg monarchy.[715] However, the Polish monarchists failed to make the question of Cracow a uniting element of British and French politics (in a similar way as the problem of Poland did not succeed in gaining the support of both powers during and shortly after the November Uprising).

Moreover, the political and international significance of the occupation of Cracow promoted by Czartoryski only managed to attract limited attention from the British friends of Poland; and the way in which the question of Cracow was promoted in Britain was far more limited than the pro-Polish actions of the early 1830s. Although in Czartoryski's politics the question of Cracow replaced the question of the Kingdom of Poland, the change

---

[712] *Ibid*.

[713] Czartoryski to Palmerston, 20 February 1837. BA PP/GC/CZ/7.

[714] Czartoryski to Palmerston, 19 November 1838. BA PP/GC/CZ/9.

[715] *Comment l'affaire de Cracovie peut amener une discussion plus générale dans l'état actuel de rapprochement de la France et de l'Angleterre avec l'Autriche*. BA PP/GC/CZ/13.

did not influence the British perception of the ‘old’ Polish Question. The interest in the problem was very short-lived and almost entirely limited to the debates in the House of Commons. After two years of devoting its energies to promoting the cause of the Polish exiles, even the LAFP did not feel particularly attracted to the new-old Polish question. The occupation of Cracow was used by the Association to popularise the problem of refugees, leading to very a significant rise in the organisation's income and, at the same time, showing that despite limited interest in the political issues of Polish independence (or Cracow’s neutrality), the devotion to the humane and moral aspects of the refugee question remained far steadier.

***

The emergence of the new Polish Question linked with the fate of the Polish exiles arriving in Britain had a very profound impact on the British interest in the cause of Poland, replacing, but, at the same time, preserving the old question of Polish independence with a new one. The problem of Polish refugees turned into a popular and universal issue that attracted much wider interest from the British public, signified by various events organised by the LAFP in the second part of the 1830s. While the old Polish Question was perceived almost entirely as a political and diplomatic issue (and, thus, the lack of any significant political events related to Poland led to the slow decline of its importance after 1833), the new Polish Question attracted attention primarily because of its moral and charitable character. In many respects financial support for the Polish refugees in Britain can be perceived as a way in which the British public tried to compensate the Poles for the lack of any official support during the November Uprising. It was also a reason that could explain why the popularity of the cause did not decline in the same way as the cause of Polish independence itself.

The centrality of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland in preserving and promoting the new Polish Question was much greater than in the pre-1834 period. Thanks to Lord Dudley Stuart, the most active member and Vice-President of the Association, and Thomas Beaumont, the organisation’s President, patron, and generous supporter, the LAFP emerged from the crisis of early 1833 ready to take on new challenges. As early as in 1834 it transformed from its initial literary character into an organisation with a larger focus on

charity, which oversaw distribution of the Government Grant and continued to support those Poles who were not lucky enough to be included on the Government List.

The short-lived and very limited interest in the problem of Cracow, expressed both by the LAFP and British press, was a good sign of the marginalisation of the problem of Poland in Britain. As much as the activities of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland aimed at providing financial support for the Polish refugees were thriving, the organisation did not lose its awareness of the political problems of Poland. As Colonel Leicester Stanhope[716] observed on one of the annual meetings of the LAFP, Britain would certainly support Polish independence in the event of a major European conflict.[717] Until then the question of Polish independence was destined to remain in the background of the problem of Polish refugees and on the margins of British foreign policy.

[716] Leicester Fitzgerald Charles Stanhope (1784–1862), from 1851 fifth earl of Harrington, British army officer actively involved in the cause of the Greek independence in the 1820s.

[717] *Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting*, p. 29.

Chapter 6: The Polish Questions and a History of Adjustment (1841-1845)

The major battles of the 1841 election, including the Corn Laws, Chartism, and the economic depression, showed that the main problems faced by the new Government would be domestic in nature. Not surprisingly, for the next five years the interest of Peel's Government was less directed toward foreign affairs than in the previous decade.[718] The economic and agrarian crisis of the 1840s only confirmed that direction, leaving both Polish Questions on the margin of British interest. Although, as will be argued below, both questions managed to attract a considerable degree of British attention on different occasions, neither reached a level of significance that could be comparable with that of the previous decade.

A Conservative victory in the 1841 elections and the subsequent creation of a second Peel Government ended a certain era in Polish-British relations. Throughout the 1830s, despite its occasional appearance in public and parliamentary discussions, supporters of the subject of Polish independence could count on the general sympathy of the Whig Government (or at least several of its Ministers). The change of 1841 put both Polish Questions in a completely new situation, also changing Polish expectations towards the new British leaders. Even though there were fears that the Government may 'share the common indifference' to the cause of Poland,[719] Czartoryski and Zamoyski quickly established links with the leading Tory politicians (particularly Lord Aberdeen, the new Foreign Secretary) and succeeded in bringing the subject of Polish independence to the House of Commons.

However, the situation in Europe and Britain in the early 1840s was completely different from that of ten years earlier. If in the first half of the 1830s the problem of Poland was popular thanks to the November Uprising, the early 1840s lacked any similar event that would popularise the cause of Poland. In consequence, the five years of the Tory

---

[718] P. Mandler, *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform. Whigs and Liberals, 1830-1852* (Oxford, 1990), p. 214. T. L. Crosby, *Sir Robert Peel's Administration, 1841-1846* (London, 1976), p. 138.

[719] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 26 November 1841. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 201-203.

Government in Britain were a time when Prince Czartoryski and the British friends of Poland desperately sought ways in which they could promote the question of Polish independence. The first pro-Polish debate that took place in 1842 was not, as the majority of discussions of the 1830s, connected to any significant event associated with Poland, but served as a way of reminding the British public opinion and the House of Commons about that unresolved question. However, as the echoes of the 1836 occupation of Cracow started to wane, Czartoryski and his British supporters struggled to find the new ways of keeping Britain interested in the fate of Poland. As will be argued below, the main change from their early approach to the Polish Question was the shift from positive (pro-Polish) to negative (anti-Russian) arguments in the attempt to utilise British Russophobia. Even regular Polish balls and other pro-Polish events organised by the LAFP were used as opportunities to manifest and strengthen anti-Russian sentiments of British society.

With the finalization of the decision regarding the distribution of the Government Grant (1838-9) and the unopposed annual renewal of the grant in the following years, the problem of Polish refugees in Britain lost some of its urgency and significance. It did not, however, loose its appeal to the British public and the various pro-Polish activities of the LAFP continued to attract attention from different social circles in the capital. Events organised by the British friends of Poland were as successful as the ones that had taken place in the previous decade, a sign that interest in the Polish refugees remained steady despite the declining importance of the question of Polish independence itself.[720]

The first half of the 1840s also saw a gradual increase of interest in Poland among Chartists. However, contacts between Polish and British radicals before the creation of the Fraternal Democrats in 1845 were rather scarce, partly because of the Polish Democratic Society's involvement in the organisation of a new uprising in Poland, and partly because of the incompatibility of Polish and British democratic principles. As will be argued, neither Polish radicals in Britain could help the Chartists, nor the Chartists could offer any

[720] It happened despite the smaller influx of Polish refugees to Britain than in the previous decade (see Table 1, above). Even the most significant event of that period, the escape of Polish sailors from the Russian ship *Irtysz* in 1844, did not received a lot of attention from British pro-Polish circles and British press. See Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Ucieczka Polaków z rosyjskiego okrętu „Irtysz" w brytyjskim porcie Portsmouth w roku 1844', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica* 69 (2000), pp. 59-71.

significant support for the Polish attempts to regain independence. Apart from challenging Brock's and Weisser's assumptions about close relations between the Polish radicals and the Chartists, this chapter explores the subject of evolution of both Polish Questions in Britain. It includes analysis of Prince Czartoryski's actions in the first half of the 1840s in Britain, particularly the shift from pro-Polish to anti-Russian rhetoric that increasingly characterised his actions in that decade. Because Czartoryski's interests in that period shifted towards east, there is a visible lack of any scholarly works discussing Polish-British relations in the early 1840s.[721]

New Government, New Relations: Czartoryski, the Tories, and the Polish Question (1841-1845)

Relations between Prince Czartoryski and British Conservatives in the 1830s were limited in scale, scope and intensity. With the Whigs in power and the Tories in opposition, the Polish monarchists saw no need to approach the Conservatives for their support of the question of Polish independence. The problem of Poland was very often presented as a universal element of the European balance of power. Compared with the causes of Greece and Belgium,[722] it was certainly far more appealing to the Whigs than to the Tories. This did not stop Czartoryski from noting in one of his letters from March 1832 that 'all political parties, even the Tories, were supporting the cause of Poland',[723] a claim that was nothing more than wishful thinking. At the peak of pro-Polish political propaganda in Britain in the 1830s, shortly before the second motion of Fergusson in June 1833, Czartoryski prepared a *Note sur la Pologne* addressed to all British Tories. The document was yet another

[721] With the exception of studies of history of the Polish refugees in Britain by Marchlewicz and Zieliński and Marchlewicz's monograph on Lord Dudley Stuart. See Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 149-302; Marchlewicz, *Wielka Emigracja* (thematic approach to the subject makes it particularly difficult to trace Marchlewicz's references to that period in this study); Zieliński, *Emigracja polska w Anglii*, pp. 90-114.

[722] *On the intervention of the great Powers in behalf of Greece and of Belgium and on the right of Poland to demand the same*. BKCz 5322.

[723] Czartoryski to Kniaziewicz, 14 March 1832. BKCz 5274.

repetition of pro-Polish and anti-Russian arguments presented in numerous other works, but this time it was aimed at winning Conservative support for the forthcoming motion.[724]

Despite these overtures, British Conservatives remained very distrustful of Polish motives and arguments. The best example of that distrust was expressed by the future Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel, in a debate of 28 June 1832 (the very same in which Nicolas I was called a 'miscreant'), who 'wished to be quite certain that the allegations [presented by pro-Polish speakers] were true, and would suspend his judgment until he was satisfied upon that point'.[725] The remarks prompted a swift and detailed reply published on the first pages of the first issue of *Polonia*,[726] but did not change Peel's or, more generally, the Tories' approach. Sir Robert Inglis remained an exception from that rule, the only Conservative who actively supported the cause of Poland in the House of Commons on various occasions throughout the 1830s.[727]

During the short-lived first Peel Ministry (1834-35) Czartoryski feared that the Government might not allow the renewal of the Grant for Polish exiles from the previous year.[728] However, as long as the Conservatives were not a dominant force in Britain, links between them and Czartoryski were very limited. On the positive side, throughout the 1830s the opposition rarely spoke against the Polish Question. In most cases (such as in June 1833) they were much more concerned with the fact that the motions put forward by the British friends of Poland were either too radical or simply contrary to the interests of Britain.[729] In the late 1830s Czartoryski tried to use his contacts with the Tories in order to challenge the government's approach to the question of Belgium, but the results of that action were rather limited.[730] Although the Tories never supported the cause of Poland in

---

[724] *Note sur la Pologne, communiquée à Mr Poten [Thomas or Richard Potter] et aux autres membres du Parlement du part Tory*. BKCz 5281. The impact of the note remains unclear and, judging from the debate of 9 July 1833, it did not change the fact that the Tories remained distrustful of Polish motives.

[725] House of Commons Debate, 28 June 1832. *Hansard*, Vol. 13, cc. 1115-52.

[726] *Polonia*, I, pp. 2-15.

[727] In 1832 he was listed as one of the non-associated British friends of Poland and he never became a member of the LAFP. BKCz 6464.

[728] Czartoryski's private notes, 15 December 1834. BKCz 6459.

[729] House of Commons Debate, 9 July 1833. *Hansard*, Vol. 19, cc. 394-463.

[730] The international significance of Belgium in the late 1830s was much smaller than at the beginning of the decade and contemporary British politics was much more concerned with the developments taking place

any visible way, at the same time they rarely opposed pro-Polish actions in Parliament, choosing inactivity or absence over direct confrontation. The fact that British Conservatives preferred a quiet lack of interest in the Polish cause over open opposition can be considered as partial success of pro-Polish propaganda. When the Whigs lost the 1841 elections, renewing once-established (even if never very good) contacts with the British Conservatives became a matter of high importance for Czartoryski.

The Polish approach to the new political situation in Britain was a mixture of old and new. Czartoryski still strongly relied on personal contacts with British politicians. The Prince, accompanied by Władysław Zamoyski, arrived in London in September 1841 to re-establish links with members of the new Government, particularly Lord Aberdeen.[731] The new Foreign Secretary became the central figure of Polish political actions in Britain, just like Palmerston in the 1830s. Zamoyski, who took over the role of the unofficial representative of Poland in Britain (a role he had already played throughout the 1830s despite his frequent visits to France and travels around Europe),[732] succeeded in establishing and renewing relations with many Tories (including Lord Wharncliffe[733] and Lord Lyndhurst[734]), as well as Whigs (particularly Brougham and Palmerston).[735] However, Polish expectations towards the Tories were much lower than they had been in the 1830s in regard to the Whigs. Between 1841 and 1846 every sign of British interest in the cause of Poland was welcomed with great enthusiasm,[736] while failures were far less disappointing.

---

in Near East. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Działalność polityczna księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii w sprawie belgijskiej (1838-1839)', pp. 5-20.

[731] Aberdeen to Czartoryski, 10 September 1841. BKCz 5479. See also *Matériaux pour une conversation du Prince Adam Czartoryski Palatin avec Lord Aberdeen, le 9 sept [1841]* BKCz 6458. Contacts between Czartoryski and Aberdeen can be dated back to the early months of 1832. See Czartoryski to Kniaziewicz, 14 March 1832. BKCz 5274.

[732] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, Vol. 4, pp. 201-203.

[733] James Archibald Stuart-Wortley (1776–1845), first Baron Wharncliffe, British politician and Lord President of the Council in Peel's Government.

[734] John Singleton Copley (1772–1863), Baron Lyndhurst, British politician and Lord Chancellor in Peel's Government.

[735] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 3, 14 and 24 January 1842. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 212-217.

[736] For example Aberdeen's willingness to provide Zamoyski with details of British communications with Russia regarding Poland in early 1830s. See Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 7 February 1842. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 226-227.

Despite Aberdeen's declarations that Poland could expect very little in terms of anti-Russian action from the British Government, Zamoyski, in cooperation with the LAFP, prepared the first pro-Polish motion under the Tory Government. A Conservative MP, Henry Gally Knight from North Nottinghamshire, was chosen to present the motion. Czartoryski had listed Knight next to Beaumont and Stuart in his notes from the 1831-2 stay in London (putting them by mistake under the list of patronesses of the Polish Ladies' Society) as someone sympathetic to the cause of Poland.[737] Gally Knight also took part in the Polish debate of 28 June 1832 (see Chapter 4) and supported Sir Stratford Canning in a pro-Polish debate devoted to the Cracow Question on 13 July 1840. It was perhaps that last factor that convinced Czartoryski and Zamoyski that this infrequent speaker would be the best person to present the question of Polish independence to the Tory-dominated House of Commons.[738] The choice of Gally Knight proved right: he joined the LAPF that year and remained a member until his death four years later.[739]

Throughout May and June 1842 Zamoyski discussed details of the forthcoming motion with Aberdeen and Peel.[740] Although both politicians had their doubts as to the purpose and outcome of the debate, they agreed not to undermine the discussion or the rights of Poland based on international treaties.[741] The debate on the subject took place on 30 June 1842. Gally Knight's speech was an excellent outline of the continuity of the Polish Question and its importance in European politics. He referred to well-known facts (because 'there [were] many new Members in this House who [had] not [been] present on former occasions') and previous discussions ('It is not my intention to heap invectives on a sovereign with whom this country is in alliance; my object is to assert a right, but not to give offence – to persuade, and not to irritate', a clear reference to the heated debate of 28

---

[737] *Comites Polonais établis en Europe 1831*. BKCz 6464.

[738] Czartoryski to Mr Gally Knight, 29 April 1842. BKCz 5443. Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, p. 229. See also W. W. Wroth, 'Knight, Henry Gally (1786–1846)', rev. Jane Harding, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2013 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15721, accessed 17 May 2016].

[739] Copson-Niecko, 'Pro-Polish Agitation in Great Britain', p. 473.

[740] Unlike Palmerston, Aberdeen sat in the House of Lords, forcing Zamoyski to consult the issue of the motion with Peel, who defended the foreign policy of his government in the House of Commons.

[741] Zamoyski's notes, 28 June 1842. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 250-251.

June 1832), but the main point of reference was still the Treaty of Vienna. Knight reminded the House of Commons of all Russian violations of that settlement and all discussions that took place in the House of Commons in the previous decade, receiving support from both Liberal (Burdett, Hume) and Conservative (Inglis) MPs. In contrast to the 1840 debate, this time the subject of Cracow was only one of many factors taken into consideration by the speakers.

The most significant, however, was the voice of Sir Robert Peel, who observed that Britain 'possessed a right to information as to the grounds upon which [the] condition [of the Kingdom of Poland] had been changed'. He continued by stating that despite cordial relations between Britain and Russia,

> he could not … consent to any sacrifice of truth or principle. He could not, as a public man, say that in his opinion the policy of Russia with regard to Poland was wise or safe. He spoke of the policy of Russia in reference to Poland, and after what had passed at Vienna this country had a right to discuss, of course in moderate terms, any particular line of policy which might be adopted towards Poland. Acting upon that right, he must declare his conviction that the course now pursued by Russia towards Poland would not ultimately conduce to her own interests… He was convinced, that after all the blood and treasure that must be expended in carrying out such a pernicious policy, it would be found that to abolish the nationality of Poland, was impossible. It might be crushed, but could never be extinguished; its spirit would survive amidst every oppression, and in lands however distant and obscure. As he was not prepared, however, in the name of her Majesty's Government, to offer any hostile remonstrance, still less was he disposed to hold out any idea of open demonstration on this subject.[742]

Peel did not say anything that had not been said before by Palmerston or representatives of Whig governments, but he was praised by *The Times* for the 'unambiguous declaration [in which he] established that no changes in the condition of Poland, or in the relations of this country with Russia, can obliterate the right of the various States of Europe to inquire into and protest against the violation of the stipulations by which the Polish crown was conceded to the Emperor ALEXANDER'.[743]

---

[742] House of Commons debate, 30 June 1842. *Hansard*, Vol. 64, cc. 800-829.
[743] *The Times*, 2 July 1842.

At a time of the diminishing appeal of the Polish Question, along with the lack of any international events that could transform the issue into a European problem and the growing internal problems of Britain, an official voice of sympathy expressed in the House of Commons was, as Zamoyski put it, 'almost a miracle'.[744] Although Peel's speech echoed Czartoryski's own arguments, particularly in reference to the impossibility of the destruction of the Polish nation,[745] this moral success did not lead to any serious political gains. It can be even argued that the most important aspect of the June debate was the fact that it took place at all. Fully aware of the uniqueness of the debate and determined to preserve its success as a piece of propaganda, Zamoyski suggested that 'it would be better not to raise the subject [of Poland] anytime soon'.[746]

For the first time since the outbreak of the November Uprising the British press presented slightly dividing opinions on the subject of the Polish parliamentary debate. For *The Times* the debate was an opportunity to present the contrast between Russia, Prussia, and Austria, explaining how the other powers treated Poles and pointing out that the Russian 'despotic will' and its impact on the Kingdom of Poland 'come within the confines of the policy of Europe, and they must be stigmatized as flagrant outrages on rights which are part and parcel of the general settlement of 1815'.[747] The *Morning Chronicle* followed up by writing that 'the example of Poland ought not to be lost on other nations'.[748] For conservative newspapers the matter was more nuanced. The*Standard* pointed out that 'the opportunity for asserting the rights of Poland… was 10 years ago; but our rulers were then too busy in protecting Jacobin revolutions in the West of Europe, to be able to maintain the cause of true liberty in the East',[749] not an unusual attack on the Whig Government and Palmerston's foreign policy. Far more critical was an Old Whig in his letter to the *Morning Post*. He 'doubt[ed] the *wisdom* of the late Polish motion and debate in our House of

---

[744] Zamoyski to the editors of *Trzeci Maj*, 1 July 1843. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 252-253.
[745] BKCz 5443.
[746] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 5 July 1842. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, pp. 255-256.
[747] *The Times*, 2 July 1842.
[748] *Morning Chronicle*, 1 July 1842.
[749] *Standard*, 1 July 1842.

Commons. If they have *any* effect, either on the Emperor of Russia, or on his subject, the Poles, it will only be to irritate the former… and to agitate the latter'.[750]

The 1842 debate and the ensuing press reactions showed both a continuity and a fresh approach to the subject of Poland. On the one hand, the discussion offered the same references to the Treaty of Vienna that had been the main point of every argument in favour of Polish independence in the 1830s. On the other, over the years Poles gathered a long and detailed list of Polish grievances relating to the events that had taken place in the Kingdom of Poland since the Uprising. Yet, unlike the discussions of the early 1830s, this particular one was almost completely devoid of the political radicalism that characterised those early attempts to promote the Polish Question. Even O'Connell, who had never missed an occasion to attack the Government's policy towards Russia, voluntarily abstained from supporting Gally Knight.[751] Although *The Times* started to indicate the direction in which the Polish Question would evolve in the following years in its strongly anti-Russian commentary, in 1842 the use of British Russophobia did not yet play a central role in pro-Polish activities.

The preparations of the debate were still a strange mixture of British and Polish involvement. While Dudley Stuart had no problems in finding MPs who were interested in the subject, he still urged Zamoyski to come to London and personally support these efforts.[752] Ten years after the initial contact between the Polish exiles and British politicians had been made, personal relations (as shown in Zamoyski's discussions with Aberdeen and Peel) were still a central element of all preparations for parliamentary debates on the problem of Polish independence. With time, the pro-Polish motions and discussions in the House of Commons, though less frequent, became far better prepared and, at the same time, did not lose their universal character.

Although it may appear striking that the 1842 motion was the only attempt to promote the cause of Poland in Britain during the Peel's Ministry, this fact can be easily explained by the relative quiet on 'the Polish front'. There were no new events that could

---

[750] *Morning Post*, 15 July 1842.
[751] Zamoyski to the editors of *Trzeci Maj*, 1 July 1843. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 252-253.
[752] Stuart to Zamoyski, 28 May and 6 June 1842. *Ibid*., pp. 242-244.

draw British attention to the Polish Question, no new facts to be referred to and no need for continuous pro-Polish actions. After Russian suppression of all major Polish conspiracies in the Kingdom of Poland, Polish patriots, both at home and in exile, entered a very difficult time of searching for new ways of working towards independence. The debate was, therefore, a much more *pro forma* initiative: on the one hand, it was to serve as a reminder that the Polish Question is still alive in Britain, while on the other, it was intended to show the universality of the cause; something that even the Tories found worthy of their support.

Unable to obtain any significant support for the cause of Poland, Czartoryski turned his attempts to promote British anti-Russian sentiments, using the cause of Russian involvement in Serbia as the best example of Nicholas I's imperial ambitions. Although Czartoryski's interest in the cause of the Slavic nations of the Balkans began shortly after the fall of the Uprising,[753] it was not until 1843 when he decided to turn that subject into a central problem of his politics in Britain. The subject of Serbia was almost entirely limited to Zamoyski's personal contacts with Aberdeen; and despite some attempts to link the cause of that Balkan state with the problem of Poland, the Polish monarchists failed to undermine good relations between Britain and Russia. As Aberdeen said to Zamoyski after the Serbian debate in the House of Commons in August 1843,[754] 'you would like to push us to sever our contacts with Moscow, but we can defend ourselves from that'.[755] The Foreign Secretary remained unwilling to intervene in this minor incident, concentrating his attention on other issues.[756] Eventually, although Zamoyski considered Czartoryski's involvement in the affairs of Serbia a great success,[757] the subject failed to arouse any greater interest in Britain. The question of Serbia became neither a new Polish Question nor a new turning point in British-Russian relations.[758] This episode of Polish-British relations can be,

---

[753] *Ibid*., pp. 268-269. Though, as Skowronek argued, the roots of Czartoryski's post-1830 policies can be traced to his family's interests which had developed in the second half of the eighteenth century. See Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833-1856)*, pp. 15-19.

[754] House of Commons Debate, 15 August 1843. *Hansard*, Vol. 71, cc. 808-847.

[755] Zamoyski to Czartoryski, 18 August 1843. *Ibid*., pp. 304-305.

[756] Chamberlain, *Lord Aberdeen*, pp. 304–305. L. Guymer, 'The Wedding Planners', p. 552.

[757] *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 306.

[758] On Czartoryski's involvement in Serbian politics see particularly Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833-1856)*, pp. 55-98.

therefore, considered as an unsuccessful attempt at turning British pro-Polish sympathies into anti-Russian actions.

What seemed the most important element of Czartoryski's politics during the first half of the 1840s in Britain was the fact that, regardless of the change in government, the position of the question of Polish independence did not change. It continued to be perceived as the unfinished business of European diplomacy, but there was very little British Government was ready to do in order to defend Polish rights. The 1842 debate only confirmed the universal character of this Polish Question, which received support from the Whigs and the Tories alike. However, at a time of economic and social crisis the attention of the Government was directed at domestic rather than international issues.

The LAFP and the Continuity of Extra-Parliamentary Pro-Polish Actions (1842-1845)

The same problems that overshadowed the parliamentary aspect of the Polish Question in Britain also made an impact on the LAFP. Notwithstanding the devotion and sympathy expressed by Dudley Stuart and other members of the organisation, the organization faced various difficulties in promoting both Polish Questions the first half of 1840s. Apart from the lack of any serious events that could re-introduce the subject of Polish independence to the British public opinion, the British friends of Poland faced growing criticism of their pro-Polish activities at a time of economic crisis in England. Despite these problems, support for the Polish refugees in Britain thrived, culminating in the biggest and the most important public event of the early 1840s: the Polish Ball of 10 June 1844, which took place around the time of Tsar Nicolas I's visit to Britain.[759] It could be said that the Polish Ball of 1844 was an event of even greater importance than the Polish debate in the House of Commons two years earlier.

The tradition of organising pro-Polish events dated back to the late 1830s and, despite the occasional failures, continued into the 1840s. In this regard the change of the

[759] Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Hotel Lambert wobec wizyty Cara Mikołaja I w Londynie w 1844 r.', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica*, 70 (2001), pp. 133–47. The determination of the pro-Polish circles in Britain resembled that accompanying the visit of Grant Duke Alexander in 1839. See Lewitter, 'The Polish Cause as Seen in Great Britain, 1830-1863', pp. 50-53.

Government did not make as significant an impact on the question of Polish refugees as it did on the problem of Polish independence. In 1842, apart from the pro-Polish motion that took place in June, the Literary Association organised three other pro-Polish events: an annual meeting (customarily taking place on 3 May in the Sussex Chambers),[760] a concert for the benefit of the Polish refugees in the Stafford House (15 July)[761] and the first Polish Ball (16 November).[762] By 1843, despite another successful Polish Ball organised at the London Guildhall, more critical voices started to appear.

One of them took the form of a pamphlet titled *The Poles. Are the Polish Emigrants Worthy the Sympathy they have Met in England and Elsewhere? Addressed to the Subscribers to the Polish Fund*. The anonymous author used materials provided by an ex-member of the LAFP and transformed his story of a rather unfortunate acquaintance with several Polish refugees into harsh criticism of Polish exiles, the LAFP, and the very idea of giving the Poles any financial support. Taking into consideration 'many instances… of the treacherous and ungrateful nature of the Poles both in Great Britain and France', the author concluded that 'uncontrovertible facts, notorious and patent throughout Europe, prove the Poles to be utterly unworthy of commiseration or sympathy as a people. Illiberal, despotic, and bigoted when existing as a nation, taken individually… we may seek in vain amongst them for one solitary instance of manliness, honor or virtue'.[763]

Criticism also appeared in *The Times*, which had been playing a role of a bastion of pro-Polish sympathy since the outbreak of the November Uprising. Several letters published by the newspaper illustrated the changing attitudes to the problem of Polish refugees. As certain Anglicus commented, 'for Liberalism's sake, have our own distressed countrymen no claim on a "Liberal's" sympathy? … Let the Poles seek relief in Poland, or wherever else they can get it; but not in England'.[764] He continued in another letter a few

---

[760] *The Times*, 6 May 1842. *Morning Chronicle*, 4 May 1842.

[761] *The Times*, 11 July 1842.

[762] *The Times*, 12, 16, 17 November 1842. Additionally, the anniversary of the outbreak of the November Uprising (29 November) was celebrated by the Polish refugees in the Sussex Chambers without the involvement of the LAFP. See *The Times*, 1 December 1842.

[763] *The Poles. Are the Polish Emigrants Worthy the Sympathy they have Met in England and Elsewhere? Addressed to the Subscribers to the Polish Fund* (London, 1843), p. 18.

[764] *The Times*, 11 November 1843.

days later, ‘Englishmen have a claim in England, which aliens may not share; and that in the misery which now covers the country, every farthing diverted from native to foreign need is a wrong and a robbery’.[765] Still more critical was a certain ‘H.’, who in a similar language advocated for the cause of English workers: ‘We have charities innumerable, the funds of many of which are countless; for all denominations of foreigners our liberality is boundless; but for the class whose strong claim to public sympathy I would advocate there is nothing’. He ended his letter with an appeal to the Poles: ‘let the refugees of Poland (brave if they be) forbear to touch one atom of a fund raised for their subsistence, when it could be applied in alleviating the deep distress, and staying the crimes of their benefactors’ countrywomen’.[766] To these accusations, Dudley Stuart replied by writing that ‘those who think that others have greater claims would do well to devise schemes for their assistance; they will find the friends of Poland as ready as any to co-operate with them, for benevolence, like everything else, is improved by exercise’.[767]

On this occasion the editors of *The Times* decided to take part in the discussion, being ‘rather inclined to agree with “H.”’. They approached the subject in a very careful manner, without estranging either party. On the one hand, the newspaper agreed that ‘the feelings which the first arrival of the Polish emigrants excited in their behalf were too strong to languish, too just to be censured or derided’. On the other hand,

> their position must be infinitely better than it was – their wants fewer.
>
> There has ceased, therefore, to exist that urgent necessity for making an immediate provision which was felt when they first landed on our shores. Since that time other claimants on our charities have unfortunately presented themselves to notice. We would, then, second the appeal of those who call on Englishmen, while they relieve the wants of the foreigner, not to forget the thousands of his countrymen who are destitute and afflicted. We do not ask any man to withdraw his bounty from the Poles, but to extend it in a commensurate degree to those of his own nation; to be as prodigal in his domestic alms as he is expensive on a Polish ball.[768]

---

[765] *The Times*, 15 November 1843.
[766] *The Times*, 8 November 1843.
[767] *The Times*, 13 November 1843.
[768] *The Times*, 13 November 1843.

Despite the editorial's conciliatory note, it was hardly surprising that sympathy for the Polish exiles in Britain was slowly disappearing, with more voices expressing their disappointment with the LAFP's activities and the organisation's devotion to foreign refugees when there were so many destitute Englishmen at home. The 1843 discussions about the Polish Ball showed how in just over ten years the Polish refugees in Britain turned from gallant, brave, but unfortunate soldiers to 'aliens' and 'foreigners'. Unlike the author of *The Poles* pamphlet, however, commentators from *The Times* did not hold any personal prejudices against Poles. They were also far from undermining the political aspect of the question of Polish independence. Instead, they showed that the 'humane' aspect of pro-Polish support, so appealing in the early 1830s, lost its strength in face of the growing economic troubles of the British 'hungry forties'.

Regardless of the criticism of pro-Polish actions organised by the LAFP, many of them can be considered as financial and propaganda successes of the cause of Polish refugees. And no other event in the first years of the 1840s proved more successful than the Polish Ball organised in June 1844, exactly at the time of Tsar Nicholas I's visit to Britain. Although some sources portray that visit as 'a sudden decision',[769] there were signs suggesting that it was not so abrupt. The possibility was privately discussed in March[770] and *The Times* informed about the prospect of the Tsar's visit to Britain as early as in late April.[771] Even *Punch* mused that in the case of Nicholas I's arrival 'he should have a guard of honour composed of Polish refugees, and an offering from English Jews'.[772] Initial arrangements had possibly been made as early as in the beginning of 1844.[773] All that allowed the British friends of Poland to prepare themselves for the visit and the Polish Ball (which took place on 10 June 1844) became the most successful event of that period.

---

[769] Czartoryski to Stuart, 14 May 1844. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 322.

[770] Princess Lieven to Lady Palmerston, 24 March 1844. *The Lieven-Palmerston Correspondence, 1828-1856*, ed. by L. Sudley (London, 1943), p. 261.

[771] *The Times*, 26 April 1844.

[772] *Punch, or the London Charivari*, (London, 1844), VI, p. 124. The reference to Jews related to the recent news of Russian persecution of Jews in the Pale of Settlement.

[773] W. B. Lincoln, *Mikołaj I*, trans. by H. Krzeczkowski (Warszawa, 1988), p. 235.

Interestingly, it was not the LAFP that became the driving force behind the event but Lady Palmerston,[774] 'the most devoted supporter' of the event,[775] and over 40 other official patronesses of the Ball.[776] The list included Duchesses of Somerset,[777] Bedford,[778] Hamilton[779] and Sutherland,[780] as well as Baroness Louisa de Rothschild.[781] It was primarily due to the ladies' involvement that the Ball finally took place on the planned date, despite suggestions that the pro-Polish action of this type would offend Nicolas I. However, no official request for postponing the event arrived (only a personal visit of Vice-Chamberlain of the Household, Ernest Bruce[782]) and the organisers concluded that 'it would be shameful for Englishwomen to postpone the Polish Ball because of the Tsar'.[783] Despite some personal differences between members of the organising committee, the event finally took place on 10 June, one day after Nicholas I left Britain. While it is unclear to what extent the relentless devotion to the cause of Polish refugees presented by the Ladies influenced the Tsar's decision to leave Britain after only nine days, there can be no doubt that information about the visit should be considered as the main reason that led to the organisation of the Ball on that particular date. The event linked together both Polish Questions and became not only a manifestation of continuous support for the Polish refugees in Britain (bringing in an income that amounted to £1000,[784] making it one of the

---

[774] Emily Mary Temple (1787–1869), Lady Palmerston (from 1839), philanthropist and political hostess.

[775] Stuart to Zamoyski, 16 May 1844. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 322-323.

[776] *The Times*, 15 May 1844.

[777] Margaret Shaw-Stewart (d. 1880), second wife of Edward Adolphus Seymour, 11th duke of Somerset (1775–1855).

[778] Anna Maria Russell (1783–1857), wife of Francis Russell, 7th Duke of Bedford (1788–1861).

[779] Susan Euphemia Beckford (1786–1859), wife of Alexander Douglas-Hamilton, 10th duke of Hamilton and 7th duke of Brandon (1767–1852).

[780] Harriet Sutherland-Leveson-Gower (1806–1868), wife of George Granville Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, 2nd Duke of Sutherland (1786–1861).

[781] Louisa de Rothschild (1821–1910), philanthropist.

[782] Lord Ernest Bruce (1811–1886), British courtier and politician, Vice-Chamberlain of the Household between 1841 and 1846.

[783] Stuart to Czartoryski, 11 July 1844. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 326-329.

[784] As Żurawski vel Grajewski argued, the sum of £10,000 given in *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV p. 323 is far too high and in the original letter the income from the Ball amounted to only £1000. Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Hotel Lambert wobec wizyty Cara Mikolaja I w Londynie w 1844 r.', p. 143.

most profitable pro-Polish events in the history of the LAFP[785]), but, because Nicholas I was the symbol of Russian cruelties that had taken place in the Kingdom of Poland for many years, the Ball became a rare expression of British interest in the cause of Polish independence.

There were, of course, voices of criticism. A certain 'Philopatris' observed that there were enough 'disease, and destitution, and misery… existing amongst the population of the city' to avoid extending British sympathy and charity 'to foreigners, who can have but little claim upon our feelings, either from their morality or good conduct'. He continued by accusing Polish refugees of being gamblers and criminals, 'ungrateful and worthless men… not fit object of such extensive and exclusive benevolence'.[786] To these accusations, Dudley Stuart had a ready reply. Not only were various charities successful in raising money for the support of the English poor, but over £20,000 was collected for the relief of the poor in London in the previous winter. Moreover, 'individual instances of ill-conduct among the Poles may, no doubt, be pointed out; but I assert fearlessly that their conduct has been generally exemplary; and I do not believe that any other set of men of the same number and in like circumstances, be they of what nation they might, would be found to contain so few offenders as these unfortunate Poles'.[787]

Nevertheless, critical voices could not undermine the continuous universality of both Polish Questions. The fact that they were never limited to any particular social or political group, and that pro-Polish activities were successful under Tory rule and a the time of economic depression, can be considered as the most important legacy of the 1830s. We can only suspect that Prince Czartoryski had to feel real satisfaction upon reading the comment regarding Nicholas I's visit to London published in the *Punch*:

---

[785] As *The Times* informed, 'the number present was not inaccurately estimated at 1,000 or 1,100; and the amount realized by the ball, it is expected, will be upwards of £700'. *The Times*, 12 June 1844.

[786] *The Times*, 6 June 1844. It was the only criticism of pro-Polish actions that appeared in this newspaper, despite much more anti-Polish picture presented in the correspondence of Szulczewski and several secondary sources. See Szulczewski to Niedźwiecki, 7 June 1844. BK 2409. See also Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Hotel Lambert wobec wizyty Cara Mikołaja I w Londynie w 1844 r.', p. 136. B. Cygler, *Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej*, pp. 126–127.

[787] *The Times*, 7 June 1844.

> [The tsar] will be dropping his money, snuff-boxes, brooches, orders, and what not, wherever he goes. Money costs *him* nothing, remember, and he can afford to lavish it. Friends, Countrymen, swear with *Punch* ! – Carry every shilling the man leaves to the Polish fund. Remember what is the hand that offers those honours. Don't touch his money. Hand it over to Lord Dudley Stuart.[788]

Punch, though never particularly pro-Polish, did not miss the occasion to manifest anti-Russian feelings in a number of articles and cartoons. The paper proposed a long list of suggested toasts to be proposed at official dinners, including 'Universal Despotism', 'The Extermination of the Poles', and 'The immortal Memory of Nero'.[789] In a commentary on Nicholas I's visit to the Zoological Gardens, the journal published an illustration of a bear with the Tsar's face being fed by Queen Victoria with a snack named 'Poland'.[790] As the authors mused, the real bear 'growl[ed] in the very purest Russian', allowing the Tsar to have a long conversation with the animal:

> *Bear.* …By the way, too, it happens very unluckily that they're going to give a ball to the Poles.
>
> *Emperor.* …it all makes for my game. I shall talk to the Lady Patronesses, and offer to give them any money for their very benevolent purpose. And then I shall be praised for my forbearance – my humanity…
>
> *Bear.* Nevertheless, there is this untoward matter to get over. You talk about going amongst the lady aristocracy of England – the lovely, the refined, the tender. How will you get out of that very black business – the flogging of Polish women?
>
> *Emperor*. Nothing more easy. I shall bow and smile at the Opera.[791]

The significance of the satirical writings in the *Punch* lays in their more anti-Russian than pro-Polish character and in the fact that they were published independently from any pro-Polish activities of the Poles themselves or the LAFP. They also illustrated the influence of all pieces of information gathered by Czartoryski and his supporters and published in British newspapers and periodicals. Nicholas I's visit to Britain was a trigger that made all such gestures and sympathies manifest themselves in a spontaneous ways.

---

[788] *Punch*, VI, p. 243.
[789] *Ibid*., p. 244.
[790] *Ibid*., p. 245.
[791] *Ibid*., p. 254.

The success of the Polish Ball led the LAFP to organise another event later that year[792] and another in June 1845.[793] Both, however, were far less popular and far less successful. No prominent figures were interested in offering their support to other events and the pro-Polish zeal of British ladies shown in 1844 proved to be only temporary. As was illustrated above (see Chapter 5), the LAFP continued to provide financial support for a number of Polish refugees who came to Britain after the new rules respecting the distribution of the Government Grant were imposed in 1839. For most of the 1840s the number of Polish exiles leaving Britain was higher than numbers of arrivals, allowing the Government to gradually decrease the sum of the Grant (see Table 3). Even the number of applications for permanent and temporary support received by the LAFP decreased, as did the overall income of the Association. As early as in 1844 it was evident that support for the Polish refuges in Britain was not as necessary as in the previous decade. It can be, therefore, argued that the 1844 Polish Ball was more a political manifestation of anti-Russian feelings of the British society than an event aimed primarily on providing financial support for the Polish exiles. Unlike the 1830s, however, the new decade also saw the development of other types of Polish-British relations.

Before the Fraternal Democrats: Other Ways of Promoting the Cause of Poland in Britain (1841-1844)

Chartism and Polish radicalism were movements that came into being in very specific and diverse political, social, and cultural contexts. Despite the common radical denominator of both movements, differences between the two were more pronounced than their similarities. The Chartists operated within the boundaries of the law, while for the Polish exiles the struggle for the democratic independence of their homeland was a struggle against international law and the established order. Consequently, while the Chartists were predominantly peaceful in their actions (despite the early claims that they might resort to force as the last resort), the radical Poles did not hide their militancy: not only because the majority of exiles were soldiers and officers, but also because any other way of regaining independence seemed very unlikely. Moreover, while the leaders of the Chartist

[792] *The Times*, 14 November 1844.
[793] *The Times*, 12, 14 June 1845.

movements remained in direct contact with the people they led and influenced, the Poles considered themselves (and the whole emigration) as the rightful representatives of their compatriots in the homeland (see Chapter 3). What they proposed was change from above (led by better-educated and politically conscious classes constituting the Great Emigration); while at the same time the core idea of the *People's Charter* relied on action from below.[794] Finally, unlike Poles and other continental radicals, the Chartists did not consider their struggle in a wider European context. The overall aims and means of both groups were, therefore, different, leading to a rather slow development of relations between the Polish democrats and the British radicals.

While it is true, as Weisser argued, that 'Polonophilism did not became central to working-class interest in foreign affairs' until the fall of the November Uprising and the arrival of Polish exiles in Britain,[795] there is very little evidence to suggest the existence of any serious relations between Poles and the Chartists in the 1830s. British workers feared that the Poles would take their jobs,[796] while the Poles themselves openly refused to 'take the work from people of Scotland' when the LAFP tried to find them employment there.[797] The publication of the English translation of the *Manifesto of the Polish Democratical Society* in 1837,[798] the publication of *An Address to the Working Class of Europe and Especially to the Polish People* in 1838,[799] and the involvement of Major Bartłomiej Beniowski[800] in the failed and badly prepared Newport Uprising in 1839[801] were an exception rather than the rule. Poland and the Polish Questions did not play any significant role in the politics of the British radicals in the 1830s.[802] Even the turn of the decade, when

---

[794] See *The People's Charter* (London, 1838).
[795] H. Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815-48* (Manchester, 1975), p. 49.
[796] Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia*, pp. 235-236.
[797] Lud Polski, Gromada Grudziąż to the LAFP, 26 April 1836. BKCz 6635.
[798] Brock, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', p. 143.
[799] Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements*, p. 73.
[800] Bartłomiej Beniowski (d. 1867), Polish exile and radical.
[801] Weisser, pp. 99-117. See also A. Lewak, 'Beniowski, Bartlomiej (zm. 1867)'. *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*.
[802] Brock, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', p. 147. Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements*, p. 84.

Chartism reached its peak, was a period when European affairs remained of secondary importance to the Chartists.[803]

Apart from becoming the second largest centre of the Great Emigration, Britain also became the centre of Polish radicalism. Democrats, liberals, and radicals exiled from France and Belgium found safe haven on the British shores. In the late 1830s Leonard Niedźwiecki mused that the divisions among Poles in Britain were 'as numerous as in the French Parliament: it is difficult to remember all of them, and even more difficult to understand differences between them'.[804] These divisions can be considered as the main reason why it took so long for the Polish radicals and the Chartists to find the right platform for cooperation.[805] Although signs of improving contacts between both groups were visible in the early 1840s, the process was not finalised by the middle of the decade.

The most significant liberal political party which organised in exile was the Polish Democratic Society (see Chapter 2). However, its centre remained in France, where the Poles could rely on their connections with the French parliamentary opposition (particularly in the early 1830s) and from where their contacts with other European nations and the homeland itself were much easier. Moreover, the fact that the majority of Polish exiles settled in France, helped the democrats to slowly but steadily strengthen their grip on the Great Emigration, emerging, at the end of 1830s, as the best-organised political party in exile. There were, however, other groups that came into being, particularly in Britain, where a relatively small number of Polish exiles created an exceptionally high number of political parties. As Niedźwiecki's quote shows, even the Poles had problems with understanding the nuances of the Polish radical groups that came into being in Britain. These divisions were even more complicated and difficult to comprehend if we take into consideration the complete lack of a single leader that could unite these groups in a fashion similar to that of Czartoryski.

The first signs of growing interests between Polish left-wing parties and the Chartists started to appear in the *Northern Star* at the beginning of the 1840s. In late 1841

---

[803] Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements*, p. 84.
[804] Niedźwiecki to Karol Sienkiewicz, 19 July 1839. Niedźwiecki, *Listy wybrane*, pp. 548–550.
[805] Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements*, p. 119.

two articles appeared in the Chartist newspaper: one was an appeal from Polish radicals from Portsmouth ('The Polish People in England to the People of Great Britain'), the other was an address of British workers ('The Democrats of Sheffield to the Polish Exiles in England'). Both were a reaction to the London Straits Convention signed between Britain, France, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, as well as to the resolution of the recent conflict between Turkey and Egypt. Poles, however, did not think that the treaty 'really represented your [i.e. British] national feeling towards our tyrant [Nicholas I]… You have your own tyrants; therefore we could not believe that you might be the allies of the most wretched tyrants in the world!'.[806] To that, the democrats of Sheffield replied by saying: 'you denounce the treaty of the 14th of July. We unite with you in execrating that treaty, by which England was insanely and wickedly bound to support the designs of Russia upon Turkey. You do the people of England but justice in supposing that the national feelings of this country were not represented in that treaty'.[807]

Despite the common denomination of both appeals and numerous slogans of brotherly love, sympathy, and support, Poles and Englishmen alike used the opportunity to promote their own causes. Under the usual rhetoric of democracy and brotherhood the Poles clearly hoped to obtain British support for Polish independence, though it is doubtful whether they had any clear idea of what kind of support they could expect. For 'the democrats of Sheffield' the case was clear: only after the success of their own struggle against 'a host of plundering aristocrats, stock-jobbers, capitalist, state-priests, pensioners, and court-parasites' and the introduction of the Charter would the British people have 'the power to extend the arm of fraternity to every other people'.[808] In other words: they wished Poles well and hoped that *their* next struggle would be successful. It is doubtful whether the Chartists who replied to the letter of the Poles from Portsmouth were aware of the fact that the authors represented a marginal group among the Polish exiles in Britain.

The following years did not show any growing interest among the Chartists in the cause of Poland. Two other articles dealing with the matter of the Polish Question appeared

---

[806] *Northern Star and Leeds General Advertiser*, 20 November 1841.
[807] *Northern Star*, 11 December 1841.
[808] *Northern Star*, 20 November 1841.

no sooner than in December 1843, when the *Northern Star* presented the account from the thirteenth anniversary of the outbreak of the November Uprising celebrated by Poles in London,[809] followed by an emotional commentary titled 'Shall Poland Perish?'.[810] The first article was an interesting piece of evidence that even a decade after the arrival of Polish exiles in Britain the Chartists were still unaccustomed to even the most basic divisions among the Great Emigration. The editors did not seem to be aware that the LAFP, the event's organizer, was very often criticised by more radical exiles for its relations with Prince Czartoryski; and that the people who attended anniversaries at the Sussex Chambers usually had very little interest in Chartism.[811] Three weeks later, however, the newspaper

> turn[ed] to the democratic Poles, and call[ed] upon them not to forget the work of their mission… to remember that they are the representatives of sixty millions of Sclavonians, denationalized and held in bondage by the crowned brigands of Europe; to remember that their country is the frontier of civilised Europe, and the ancient protector of the West against Northern and Eastern barbarism: to remember that their countrymen, to the number of twenty millions… look[ed] to them as their deliverers from their worse than Egyptian bondage.

Nevertheless, the Poles were left to their own devices in their fight for the independence, but, as the Chartists enthusiastically wrote, it was enough to declare democracy and freedom for Poland to rise 'in her giant might to crush her invaders'.[812]

Taking into consideration the scarcity of contacts between Polish and British radicals prior to 1845 and the British unawareness of the principal divisions among the Polish exiles, Brock's claim that 'the democratic camp, in fact, played a similar role in regard to the radicals and Chartists outside parliament as Czartoryski and the conservatives did toward the Whig and Tory politicians sympathetic to the Polish cause within parliament' appears completely misjudged.[813] Not without importance was the fact that at a time when the Chartists started expressing their interest in establishing better contacts with the Polish exiles, the Polish Democratic Society had already abandoned its earlier interest

---

[809] *Northern Star*, 9 December 1843.
[810] *Northern Star*, 30 December 1843.
[811] Weisser, *British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815-48*, p. 119.
[812] *Northern Star*, 30 December 1843.
[813] Brock, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', p. 148.

in the European brotherhood of nations and started working towards a new uprising in Poland (see Chapter 3). Moreover, the Chartists never offered the Poles any support for the cause of Polish independence other than moral support. Although these factors did not prevent Polish, German, and British democrats from creation of the Fraternal Democrats, they certainly made an impact on the limited interest of the Polish Democratic Society in relations with the Chartists, forcing them to cooperate with other, far less significant, groups of the Polish exiles.

Different aims and approaches did not stop the British and Polish radicals from uniting against Nicholas I during his visit to London in June 1844. On 6 June a special and very numerous gathering took place at the National Hall in Holborn for the purpose of 'ascertaining how far the people of England are prepared to welcome to their country the Russian Emperor Nicholas'. According to *The Times*, 'a very large portion of the assembly were foreigners – Poles, Germans, Italians, and Frenchmen… [and] the "natives" chiefly consisted of labouring men and mechanics, Chartists and Socialists', showing 'how far this gathering may be considered as a demonstration of the feelings of the people of England'.[814] For the Chartists, however, this marked was an excellent opportunity to speak about the fraternity of nations, repeat all well-known facts on the Russian atrocities in Poland, express their pro-Polish sympathies, criticise Russia, condemn Nicholas I's reception in Britain, and present a number of pro-Polish resolutions. As a sign of the growing internationalism of the movement, William Lovett, a member of the London Working Men's Association and the author of *The People's Charter*, 'read an address from the Poles at Brussels to the people of England, which was very voluminous'.[815] However, no voice from the Polish exiles in Britain was heard; and the address itself, though written by Joachim Lelewel himself, at the time the leader of the Union of the Polish Emigration, was the voice of only one (and by no means the most influential) liberal party of the Great Emigration. There was some irony in the fact that at this radical gathering speakers repeated all of the points referring to the history of Russian atrocities that had been promoted not by Polish liberals or democrats, but by the monarchists.

---

[814] *The Times*, 7 June 1844.
[815] *Northern Star*, 15 June 1844.

Relations between the Polish radicals and the Chartists should be, therefore, considered as marginal to the development of either of the Polish Questions in Britain. With the Government Grant secured and the LAFP taking care of those who were not on the official list, the needs of the Polish refugees in Britain were very small and the Chartists did not even think of offering any financial support to the Poles. At the same time, despite the fact that the Polish radicals and democrats had a completely different understanding of the problem of Polish independence from that championed by Czartoryski, their limited contacts with the Chartists did not lead to any change in the way in which the British society perceived the question of Polish independence. Poles could not support Chartists in their struggle for power,[816] while the leaders of Chartism expressed no willingness to get involved in the Polish struggle for independence. Even the creation of the Fraternal Democrats did not change the incompatibility of both groups.

The Fraternal Democrats and the Polish Questions in 1845

The lack of any established relations between the Chartists and foreign exiles residing in London proved not to be an obstacle in developing a common front between the two groups, which took the shape of the Fraternal Democrats. The organisation was aimed at uniting British and foreign democratic circles of the metropolis, while being, at the same time, the first serious expression of the Chartists' interest in the revolutionary movements that had been developing in Europe since early 1830s. While both the foreign refugees in Britain and the Chartists remained fully aware of each other's activities, sometimes (like in 1844) joining ranks to promote a common cause, there had been no direct platform for cooperation prior to the creation of the Fraternal Democrats. However, the establishment of this new organisation happened several years too late to catch at least some deeper interest from the Polish Democratic Society.

Significantly, the Fraternal Democrats tried to unite the different national trends of democracy (including British) that were, in essence, too diverse to work together. For the

[816] The only time when the Polish exiles (the Dwernicki's Committee) got involved in internal affairs of Britain, by publishing an appeal supporting one of the radical candidates during 1838 elections. The step was widely criticised by Polish monarchists, Democrats and British friends of Poland. See Brock, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', pp. 145-146.

Chartists, who operated within the boundaries of a well-established society, the main aim was to reform the existing system and create a truly representative democracy.[817] Their goals had very little in common with Polish plans for 'the abolition of privileges and the reign of equality'[818] and absolutely nothing with the revolutionary approach necessary in order to regain independence. According to the *Manifesto of the Polish Democratical Society*:

> Regenerated and independent Poland will be Democratical. All her inhabitants, without distinction of birth or creed, will receive intellectual, political, and social emancipation. A new order of things, embracing property, labour, industry, education, and every social relation; a new order of things, based upon the principles of equality, will be substituted for that anarchy which the usurping nobles have hitherto dignified with the name of law… Sovereignty will return to the people; the old dominant class will be effectually dissolved.[819]

In many respects, the opinions of the Polish Democratic Society presented the organization's hostility towards aristocracy and nobility, without offering any detailed plans in regard to the future governance of Poland. Apart from the incompatibility between evolutionary ideology of Chartism and revolutionary approach of the Polish Democratic Society, the position of Polish democrats in Britain in the first half of the 1840s was not very strong, with the majority of members of the society residing mostly in France and Belgium.

Taking these issues into consideration, it is hardly surprising that the Polish exiles in Britain had failed to establish any closer relations with the Chartists and the creation of the Fraternal Democrats did not change a lot in this regard. It is possible that the formless, unregulated character of the Fraternal Democrats in the months between the organization's inception and the outbreak of the Cracow Uprising in early 1846 contributed to, on the one hand, limited interest of the better organised Polish Democratic Society and, on the other, some interest in the organisation expressed by members of other Polish groups.[820] The proletarian rhetoric and promotion of universal, working class unity did not fit with the

---

[817] M. Chase, *Chartism. A New History* (Manchester and New York, 2007), pp. 7–8.
[818] *Manifesto of the Polish Democratical Society* (London, n.d. [1837?]), p. 9.
[819] *Ibid*., p. 12.
[820] H. Weisser, 'Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848', *The Historical Journal*, 14.1 (1971), p. 57.

Polish democratic approach. Although Polish radicals were clearly class-conscious and strongly anti-aristocratic, even the most radical group among all Polish parties did not share that universal proletarian internationalism. Finally, Poland remained a dominantly agricultural country, in which modern industrialism was developing much slower than in the West, which meant that all ideological efforts of the Polish exiles were, therefore, aimed not at working classes, but at the peasants. Of several hundred Polish refugees residing at the time in Britain, only one, Ludwik Oborski,[821] took any active role in the activities of the Fraternal Democrats.[822]

One of the few expressions of the Fraternal Democrats' interest in the cause of Poland before 1846 was the 'important fraternal meeting' that took place on 7 December 1845.[823] The event was presented as 'crowded to excess' (including British, Polish, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Swiss, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Hungarian, Transylvanian, and Turkish democrats), with speeches that 'excited an indescribable enthusiasm' and resolutions that 'were adopted unanimously'. These were the archetypical, and usually exaggerated, elements of the reports of the Fraternal Democrats' meetings published in the *Northern Star*[824] and there is very little to suggest that this sudden expression of pro-Polish interests among the Chartists and other foreign democrats was really that numerous and enthusiastic as the report stated. Interestingly, apart from the aforementioned Oborski, the meeting was attended by at least two other Poles: Karol Stolzman[825] and a certain Pruszyński.[826] No representative of the Polish Democratic Society was present and the content of the resolutions passed at the meeting was, in many respects, contrary to the aims and ideological concepts of the organisation. As both Polish democrats and monarchists started to realise that no restoration of Poland would be possible without taking into

---

[821] Ludwik Oborski (1787-1873), Polish officer and exile.

[822] Even Oborski's biographer does not consider his involvement in the activities of the Fraternal Democrats as significant episode of Oborski's life. See Cygler, *Pułkownik Oborski, Szermierz wolności* (Gdańsk, 1976).

[823] *Northern Star*, 13 December 1845.

[824] Weisser, 'Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848', p. 56.

[825] Karol Stolzman (1794-1854), Polish officer and exile, member of the Union of the Polish Emigration.

[826] Possibly Ludwik Pruszyński (d. 1852), Polish officer and exile.

consideration the feelings of the people at home, their search for European support no longer remained a primary objective.

Expressions of sympathy, fraternal support, and universal democratic hatred and criticism towards the aristocracy were not enough to win over the Polish Democratic Society, or any other Polish group, for the cause of the Fraternal Democrats. With the attention of the Polish democrats turned towards the homeland and the organisation of a new uprising, only less significant and less organised groups of Polish exiles were willing to participate in the activities of the Fraternal Democrats. However, differences between the Polish radicals and the British democrats far outweighed the similarities. On the Polish side, only several democratic exiles were able to abandon their national ideas in favour of the internationalism offered by the Fraternal Democrats. At the same time, however, the British leaders of the organisation were willing to express their support for democrats of all nations, but apart from the voices of sympathy and fraternity neither the Poles nor any other nationality could count on their more active support. Eventually, although the creation of the Fraternal Democrats may be considered as a significant step in establishing a united platform for cooperation between British and foreign democrats, it failed to change the way in which the question of Polish independence was understood in Britain.

***

Ten years after the end of the November Uprising and five years after the occupation of Cracow the question of Polish independence lost some of the attractiveness and novelty it had experienced in the 1830s. After Palmerston's settlement of another Eastern Crisis in 1841, interest in the problems of foreign politics gave way to the domestic issues that bothered British society. Peel's Government tried hard to resolve contemporary economic and social problems, while subjects such as Polish independence drifted into the periphery of the interests of both the Government and the press. The only pro-Polish debate in the House of Commons in that period took place in 1842, in the midst of economic depression, and served more as a reminder of the unresolved Polish Question rather than a

demand for any serious action from the British Government.[827] Despite the slow economic recovery that followed, the question of Polish independence did not re-enter parliamentary discussions until the outbreak of the Cracow Uprising and the subsequent annexation of the Free City of Cracow into Austria in 1846 (see Chapter 7).

At the same time the question of Polish exiles in Britain, though it lost some of its importance after the Government introduced new regulations in 1839, continued to thrive. Thanks to the involvement and activity of the LAFP, a number of successful charitable events aimed at gathering financial support for the Poles were organised and the Association could offer additional support to those Polish exiles who did not receive the Government Grant. The 1844 Polish Ball that took place during the time of Tsar Nicholas I's visit to Britain was the best sign of continuous sympathy towards Poland and Polish exiles. Organised as yet another charitable event, it became almost a political manifestation of the interest in both Polish Questions expressed by all classes of the British society. Paradoxically, the significance of the Ball was far greater than that of any pro-Polish parliamentary debate that had taken place in the House of Commons in the many years prior.

Far less significant in terms of promoting the cause of Poland or the cause of the Polish exiles were links between the Polish radicals and the Chartists. Democracy, fraternity, and the internationalism of the European working class were very nice slogans indeed, but they nonetheless failed to attract the Polish exiles to the cause of the Chartists. At the same time the Polish Democratic Society's preoccupation with regaining independence and working towards another uprising made the problems of the British working class highly irrelevant to the planned struggle. From the point of view of the Chartists, the subject of Poland was attractive, albeit completely irrelevant to the evolutionary struggle of the movement. Even the creation of the Fraternal Democrats cannot be considered a meaningful change: although it created a way of uniting British and foreign democratic circles, the activities of this organisation remained insignificant to both British and Polish struggles for democracy and independence.

---

[827] Crosby, *Sir Robert Peel's Administration*, p. 8.

In comparison to previous decade, the years 1841-1845 may appear as a period of the limited success of the Polish Questions in Britain. Politically, the subject of Poland remained on the peripheries of the interests of the British Government, hanging in limbo between two major uprisings (1830 and 1846), which played a central role in attracting international attention to the problem of Poland and its fate. The beneficial role of events such as the 1842 debate, the 1844 Polish Ball, or the creation of the Fraternal Democrats was very temporary and, in terms of promoting or defending the Polish Questions, of very limited scope. At the same time, however, they proved that the pro-Polish propaganda of the previous decade had made very strong impact on British understanding of the role Poland played in European politics and that both questions continued to resonate through all parts of the British society.

Chapter 7: Britain, the Cracow Revolution, and the Aftermath (1846-1847)

For many years following the fall of the November Uprising the Polish exiles in Western Europe never abandoned their dream of another revolution; one which would restore Polish independence. Their early attempts to organise an anti-Russian movement in the Kingdom of Poland (see Chapter 2) all failed, either because of insufficient preparations or because of unreal expectations.[828] It was only after the Polish Democratic Society finally decided to get involved in the long-term preparations for another uprising, starting with the relocation of the central committee of the organisation from Poitiers to Versailles in 1840, when chances for a new revolution became more realistic.[829] When the uprising finally broke out in January and February 1846, it was highly uncoordinated. Of all three partitions, the revolutionaries achieved some degree of success only in Cracow, but the events there were overshadowed by the rebellion in Galicia, where Polish peasants rose up not against Austria, but against their own Polish landlords (many of whom were involved in the preparations for the revolution). The rebellion (known in Polish as *rabacja galicyjska*) was the best illustration of the limits of democratic and liberal propaganda; a political and moral defeat of the attempts to organise an uprising that would spread across all three partitions and involve all parts of the Polish society. At the same time the short duration of the revolution in Cracow (which lasted for only ten days) highlighted the limitations of the Polish democratic conspiracy at home (for more details see Chapter 3).

Ironically, it was not the short-lived Cracow Revolution, but the subsequent occupation of the city by the forces of the three partitioning powers and, above all, the final annexation of the Free City to Austria in late 1846 that made much a greater impact on the international public opinion and international politics than the leaders of the uprising could have imagined. As will be argued in this chapter, the main interest expressed by British MPs, the press, and the British public opinion was not rooted in sympathy towards the revolution itself (with the exception of the Chartists), but became an expression of British

---

[828] Skowronek, *Od konspiracji do kapitulacji*, pp. 19–32.
[829] Kalembka, *Wielka Emigracja*, p. 190.

protest against political changes and violations of the Treaty of Vienna in the aftermath of the event. The unique character of the impact of the occupation and annexation of Cracow has received very little scholarly attention.[830] By looking at the reactions of the British government to the subject of Polish independence, as well as the gradual evolution of contacts between Polish radicals and the Chartists, this chapter aims to answer the question of why the issue of Cracow attracted so much attention in Britain in the early months of 1847.

The development of the British perception of the Revolution and its aftermath can be divided into two periods. In the first one, from March to November 1846, British politics, the press, and the public opinion was coming to terms with the outbreak and the failure of the Revolution, as well as the occupation of Cracow by military forces of the three Protecting Powers. The feeling that prevailed during these months was that British voices of condemnation and disapproval (expressed in the Parliament, the press, and in the course of several pro-Polish meetings) would be enough to force Russia, Prussia, and Austria to withdraw and return the Free State of Cracow to its former status, in a similar way as it had happened after the 1836 occupation (see Chapter 2). When, in November 1846, the annexation of Cracow to Austria became a fact, Britain was forced to redefine its approach to that open violation of the Treaty of Vienna. Although the language used in the months following the annexation became far more aggressive, the way in which Britain hoped to make an impact on Austria did not change: political remonstrances and public condemnation seemed to be the only element of the British repertoire. The fact that at the time of the Revolution and for several months after power in Britain was still held by the Peel Government (preoccupied, at the time, with the repeal of the Corn Laws), with Lord Aberdeen as the Foreign Secretary, did not help the cause of Poland.

The revolutionary disturbances in Cracow were a clear indicator that even fifteen years after the 1830 revolution the Poles had not abandoned their hope of regaining independence. It was also the first event since the November Uprising which made a significant impact not only on Poland and Polish exiles, but also on European politics. In

---

[830] With Marchlewicz's biography of Dudley Stuart being the only exception. See Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 204-264.

consequence, after years when the question of the Polish refugees played central role in the British interest in matters related to Poland, 1846 brought about a significant shift in regard to the question of Polish independence. The problem of Cracow, understood and promoted for many years as one of the facets of the larger Polish Question, became central to the majority of pro-Polish actions throughout 1846 and 1847.

At the same time, the question of the Polish refugees received much less attention. Although the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland continued to organise pro-Polish events, their number was small (fewer than during the peak of the LAFP's activity in the second part of the 1830s) and they were also less popular in comparison to previous years. The cause of Cracow, though successful in renewing British interest in the problem of Polish independence, nevertheless failed to make any significant impact on charitable feelings towards Polish exiles.

The Cracow Revolution of 1846 and British Politics

Since the late 1830s the Polish Democratic Society had been working on another uprising that would cover all three partitions. When it finally took place in the early months of 1846, it succeeded only in Cracow, mostly because news of the failure of similar action in the Grand Duchy of Posen did not reach the city on time. Disturbances broke out on 18 February, temporarily forcing the Austrian forces to retreat from the city. This development allowed Polish revolutionaries to form the National Government and, on 22 February, issue a Manifesto (later known as the Cracow Manifesto) declaring the democratic principles of the Revolution. Among the key elements of the documents was the unconditional resolution of the land question, promising all peasants that the land they toil would become their own property.[831] Despite its democratic principles and promises of the better future, the revolution was short-lived. The Provisional Government was much too concentrated on domestic issues and the city soon fell to the forces of Austrian, Prussian, and Russian troops that entered the city at the beginning of March 1846, only days after the first news of

[831] *Manifest Rządu Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej do Narodu Polskiego* (Kraków, 1846). See also H. Weisser, 'The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846', *The Polish Review*, 13.1 (1968), p. 19.

the uprising reached London and Paris. This 'ten-day revolution'[832] had neither the time, nor the opportunity to make any significant impact on international politics. Despite the great expectations of the democratic side of the Great Emigration, 1846 proved to be a disaster.[833] The real impact of the events of February 1846 was based not on the revolution itself (which was often criticised for its radical, or even communist, principles), but on the reaction of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, which led to the annexation of the Free State of Cracow into the Austrian Empire in November 1846.

However, as the first pro-Polish debate (which took place on 6 April 1846, a month after the suppression of the Polish uprising) after the Cracow Revolution illustrated, there was also some interest in the events that took place in Galicia at the time of the Polish uprising and it was that subject that dominated the first major discussion on Poland, which took place in the House of Lords since the outbreak of the November Uprising. The President of the LAFP, Lord Thomas Wentworth Beaumont, introduced the subject of the alleged involvement of the Austrians in attacks of peasants on the local nobility that accompanied and followed the outbreak of the Cracow Revolution. Beaumont's initiative seemed to be completely independent from those of British pro-Polish circles, and it was certainly introduced without any previous consultations with Czartoryski or Zamoyski (see below). The fact that the motion lacked support from the Polish exiles and other British friends of Poland made it relatively weak and disassociated from any previous attempts to promote the cause of Poland in Britain. Contrary to the numerous links between the Treaty of Vienna and the Polish Question used by Czartoryski in the previous years, Beaumont argued that the reasons for his intervention were not based 'on any condition, or treaty, or international established usage'. However, the greatest mistake and weakness of the motion was that Beaumont abstained from referring to the problem of the Cracow Revolution, concentrating instead on the issue of Galicia and 'the practice… of establishing a kind of servile war', i.e. the alleged use of peasants against their landlords by Austrian authorities.[834] As Lord Aberdeen argued in his reply, 'the matter was one in which this

[832] Kieniewicz, 'The Free State of Cracow, 1815-1846', p. 83.
[833] S. Kieniewicz and H. Wereszycki, 'Poland Under Foreign Rule 1795-1918', p. 409.
[834] See for example *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 414-419. For more details, see Chapter 3.

country was not directly concerned. Neither British interests nor British subjects were affected by these events, be they true or false'. Moreover, 'he did not consider it to be the duty of this country to interfere in the administration of a province belonging to such a State as Austria'.[835] Unfortunately for the cause of Poland, the Foreign Secretary's approach to the cause of Cracow turned out to be similar to the one that he expressed towards events in Galicia.

Aberdeen's criticism fully revealed the weakness of Beaumont's intervention, leading Zamoyski to comment that 'none of them understood the subject, neither people who wish us well, nor the minister, [who appeared to be] a good friend of Metternich'.[836] Zamoyski's disappointment is understandable: not only did Beaumont refuse to discuss the international problem of Cracow in reference to the Treaty of Vienna, but he seriously weakened his speech by references to newspaper articles and private letters. However, as Lord Dudley Stuart noted in one of his letters, the main obstacles in presenting the cause of Cracow in any stronger way was the lack of information from Galicia and the absence of Zamoyski from London.[837] As the case of 1842 debate (see Chapter 6) had shown, the presence of the active and influential Polish exile, a *de facto* representative of Czartoryski, was enough to convince even the most unwilling politicians to speak in defence of the cause of Poland and convince them use 'proper' (from Czartoryski's point of view) arguments in their speeches. The March debate in the House of Lords lacked many elements of a successful pro-Polish discussion (see Chapter 4).

Aberdeen's limited interest in the subject of Galicia and Cracow expressed during the 6 April debate was not, however, the result of the lack of information about the situation abroad. Although Britain did not have any representative in the Free State (despite plans to introduce a consul following the 1836 occupation of Cracow), the British Government relied on the accounts and news received from its diplomats in Berlin (the Earl of Westmorland[838]), Vienna (the Charge d'Affaires Arthur Charles Magenis[839] and later also

---

[835] House of Lords debate, 6 April 1846. *Hansard*, Vol. 85, cc. 574-579.
[836] Zamoyski to Stuart, 9 April 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 447.
[837] Stuart to Zamoyski, 14 April 1846. *Ibid*., pp. 447-448.
[838] John Fane (1784–1859), eleventh earl of Westmorland, British diplomat.
[839] Arthur Charles Magenis (1797–1867), British diplomat.

consul Sir Robert Gordon[840]) and, to a much lesser extent, St Petersburg (Bloomfield[841]) and Warsaw (du Plat[842]). The first reports, written shortly after 18 February, arrived in London by the end of the month.[843] Although both Westmorland and Magenis kept the Foreign Office well informed about the events unravelling in Cracow, Lord Aberdeen seemed completely uninterested in the subject himself. His first official despatch arrived June 1846 and was addressed to Colonel Du Plat in Warsaw. In his letter, the Foreign Secretary lamented the outbreak of the revolution and noted that Russia, Prussia, and Austria 'possess the right… to take proper steps to secure themselves against any recurrence of the dangers from which they have so recently escaped'. As he concluded, the British Government 'will suspend their judgement, and abstain from active interference on behalf of [Cracow]'.[844]

Not for the first time in history of the question of Polish independence did the problem of Poland remain on the peripheries of British foreign policy. In 1846 Aberdeen's attention remained preoccupied with the problem of relations with France and the question of Spanish Marriages,[845] in the similar way in which Palmerston's interests in the early 1830s laid in securing Belgian independence (see Chapter 4). Similarities with the previous decade went even further. Apart from the diplomatic issues that preoccupied the Foreign Secretary, Peel's Government tried to resolve the ongoing economic crisis by repealing the Corn Laws, matter that attracted as much attention from the British society as the Reform Bill fifteen years earlier.[846] This time, however, Czartoryski and Zamoyski decided to wait for the resolution of the repeal instead of trying to promote the cause of Poland during prolonged and heated debates on the issue.

As it turned out, the decision was the right one and the post-repeal weeks brought further changes to the British political scene. After a victory in the House of Commons on

---

[840] Sir Robert Gordon (1791–1847), British diplomat, brother of Lord Aberdeen.
[841] John Arthur Douglas Bloomfield (1802–1879), British diplomat; from 1846 second Baron Bloomfield.
[842] George Gustavus Du Plat (d. 1854), British diplomat and consul at Warsaw.
[843] Westmorland to Aberdeen, 23 February 1846. Magenis to Aberdeen, 21 February 1846. Bloomfield to Aberdeen, 2 March 1846. Du Plat to Aberdeen, 10 March 1846. *State Papers: 1846-7*, p. 1042 *et passim*.
[844] Aberdeen to Du Plat, 25 June 1846. *State Papers: 1846-7*, pp. 1065-1066.
[845] See Guymer, 'The Wedding Planners', pp. 549–573. See also Chamberlain, *Lord Aberdeen*, pp. 343–378.
[846] T. A. Jenkins, *Sir Robert Peel* (Basingstoke, 1999), pp. 123–134.

15 May 1846, the repeal passed through the House of Lords thanks to the prestige and arguments of the Duke of Wellington on 25 June. On the same day Peel's Government fell in a minor debate, leading to the return to power of the Whigs. 'A good friend of Metternich', Lord Aberdeen was replaced by Lord Palmerston, giving Poles much more hope for British intervention on behalf of Cracow. A new round of debates on the question of Poland and Cracow took place in August, first in the House of Lords (11 August) and a week later in the House of Commons (17 August). On this occasion preparations for both discussions were overseen by Zamoyski, who had stayed in London since May[847] and made sure that this time the pro-Polish debates would not deviate from the political problems of the Treaty of Vienna and its violations. Although Zamoyski left London for Tunbridge Wells in Kent directly before the first debate, he was kept informed about the preparations by Dudley Stuart (who, shortly before 11 August, visited Palmerston to discuss the details of the forthcoming discussions[848]).

Lord Beaumont, who once again was the Polish representative in the House of Lords, presented a motion in which he asked for papers relating to the 'events which have recently taken place at Cracow'. Although this time Beaumont's speech concentrated on the subject of Cracow, he nevertheless felt obliged to also mention the events that took place in Galicia. In contrast to his previous motion, this time he stressed 'the necessity of seeing carried out and enforced the treaties to which [Britain] was a party', also referring to the European balance of power and humanity. A side effect of the speech was that it presented Austria as the most cruel and barbaric of all three partitioning powers. On several occasions Beaumont compared the 'bad' Austria with the 'good' Prussia (which had successfully contained the revolution before its outbreak in the Grand Duchy of Posen by arresting and imprisoning the leaders).

However, regardless of the actual importance of Cracow, the issue of Galicia and the peasant revolt in the province once again seriously undermined the strength of the

[847] He arrived in British capital on 16 May. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 453.
[848] Stuart to Zamoyski, 4 August 1846. *Ibid*., p. 466-467.

motion. As the President of the Council and the Whig leader in the House of Lords, Marquess Lansdowne[849] pointed out,

> in the case of Cracow, they had to deal with an independent republic, whose independence was guaranteed by the Congress of Vienna. As for Gallicia[850] [sic]… they had no more right to give an opinion as to the internal government of it than they had of the internal government of any other State on the continent of Europe.

While Beaumont and Lord Kinnaird[851] spoke against Austria and its actions in Cracow and Galicia, and Lansdowne tried to keep a middle ground, the Duke of Wellington presented more conservative views, having 'no hesitation in saying that if ever a breach of treaty was justifiable this was the case'. The debate was yet another late night pro-Polish discussion that attracted very limited interest from the Lords (no one spoke but Beaumont, Kinnaird, Wellington, and Lansdowne) and, after Beaumont amended his motion to limit its subject matter to the problem of Cracow alone, the motion was agreed to and the House adjourned.[852]

Although the Cracow debate received the usual coverage in the press,[853] the only newspaper that commented on the subject at length was the conservative *Standard*. According the paper's interpretation of the events, the Poles themselves were to blame for the first (18 February) and the second (2 March) occupation of Cracow. In the first case the Austrian intervention was fully justified, 'as one would be justified in breaking into the house of his next door neighbour to remove an incendiary preparing to blow up his house'. On the second occasion, because the local authorities 'allowed their city to be made the workshop of a conspiracy which was preparing like horrors for the neighbouring country', the Austrians had 'no other object than to put an end to the existing anarchy'.[854] Wellington's speech and the *Standard*'s commentary were both expressions of a

---

[849] Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice (1780–1863), third marquess of Lansdowne, Whig politician.

[850] In majority of reports from Parliamentary debates the name of the region was spelled incorrectly, with two 'l's instead of one. In the subsequent quotes that error was corrected for the sake of clarity.

[851] Arthur Fitzgerald Kinnaird (1814–1887), tenth Lord Kinnaird of Inchture and second Baron Kinnaird of Rossie, British liberal politician.

[852] House of Lords debate, 11 August 1846. *Hansard*, vol. 88, cc. 602-622.

[853] See for example *Daily News*, 12 August 1846; *Standard*, 12 August 1846; *The Times*, 12 August 1846.

[854] *Standard*, 12 August 1846.

conservative approach to the subject of Cracow which, despite its acceptance of international treaties, considered the whole affair as a legitimate intervention that stopped the spread of revolution across the Austrian Empire. The most surprising, however, was the silence of the usually pro-Polish *The Times*, which abstained from any commentary on the subject of Cracow.

The 11 August debate in the House of Lords served as a preparation for a more detailed and more popular motion in the House of Commons, introduced a week later by much better known friend of Poland, Joseph Hume.[855] While Lord Beaumont asked for the correspondence regarding the recent events in Cracow, Hume turned towards the 1836 occupation of Cracow and never realised his plans of sending a British consul to the city. His motion asked for the presentation of 'extracts of any correspondence… relative to the appointment of a British Consular Agent at Cracow'. In his speech, Hume went back as far as 1830, regretting that 'nothing had been done since the year 1830, when [Britain] lost the opportunity which then occurred of restoring to Poland her rights that she had lost… [and] that the honour of England was sullied by allowing other States to trample upon a Treaty to which she was a party'. In seconding the motion, Richard Milnes[856] ironically observed that 'the principle of non-interference was becoming the favourite foreign policy in England'. He continued by suggesting that the presence of British consul at Cracow could have prevented any violations of the Treaty of Vienna by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. In a careful speech Lord Palmerston expressed his sympathy to 'a great and a noble people' of Poland, but, at the same time, he disagreed with Milnes' argument, since

> [w]hether the Treaty of Vienna is or is not executed and fulfilled by the great Powers of Europe, depends not on the presence of a consular officer at Cracow. It depends on the communications which may take place between the Governments which are concerned in it; and these communications are totally independent of a consular agent at Cracow.

At the same time, the Foreign Secretary agreed that 'it is impossible to deny the that the Treaty of Vienna has been violated in the recent transactions' and that 'as far as proper

---

[855] Hume, who spoke in defence of Poland on several occasions in the previous decade, had never joined the LAFP. See Copson-Niećko, 'Pro-Polish Agitation in Great Britain', pp. 456-496.

[856] Richard Monckton Milnes (1809–1885), British writer and conservative politician.

representations on the part of the British Government can go, everything shall be done to ensure a due respect being paid to the provisions of the Treaty of Vienna'. With respect to Hume's motion, Palmerston thought that 'after ten years have passed since that correspondence took place, it would be very injurious to rake up the differences that existed at that period, and which had not any bearing on this subject [i.e. the question of the occupation of Cracow]'.[857]

However, after presenting his interpretation of the events that took place in Cracow Palmerston argued that he 'would give the three Powers credit for not having intentionally departed from the engagements of the Treaty of Vienna'. The revolutionary ferment in Cracow required intervention and 'when the emergency… shall have ceased, it will be the duty of the three Powers to replace the republic of Cracow on the footing of complete independence'. Instead of joining Hume's and Monckton Milnes' condemnation of the three powers, Palmerston expressed his 'high and opinion of the sense of justice and of right that must animate the Government of Austria, of Prussia, and of Russia, to believe that they can feel any disposition or intention to deal with Cracow otherwise than Cracow is entitled by treaty engagements to be dealt with'. Optimistic as he was with regard to the future of Cracow, the Foreign Secretary used his speech to present a warning to the three Powers: 'if the Treaty of Vienna be not good on the Vistula, it may be equally bad on the Rhine, and on the Po; and therefore I am convinced, that not only a sense of justice, but a sense of policy and of self-interest, will lead those Powers to see that the Treaty of Vienna must be respected as a whole, and that it is eminently for their interests that that whole should in all its parts be observed.' Facing the very pro-Polish sympathies presented by Palmerston, Hume decided to withdraw his motion and satisfy himself with the papers regarding the most recent occupation of Cracow. Despite its weaknesses (particularly the constant references to the events that took place in Galicia), the whole debate was aimed not only at defending the rights of Cracow to independence, but also became the first opportunity to openly talk about the fate of Poland since the 1836 occupation of the city.[858]

---

[857] House of Commons Debate, 17 August 1846. *Hansard*, Vol. 88, cc. 815-838.
[858] *Ibid.*

Interest among British newspapers in the pro-Polish discussion in the House of Commons was much greater than in any of the previous debates in the House of Lords. The radical *Daily News* used the occasion to write more generally about the problem of Poland, expressing the conviction that

> [t]he chief virtue of such protests lies in themselves: in their effect on Europe, in their appeal to the future. Government, we fear, can do little. As to the Treaty of Vienna, so emphatically invoke, the clauses of the treaty which affect to stipulate for Polish independence, are but rags, which the western diplomatists of that day put on to cover their own imbecility and weakness…
>
> Let us not flatter the Poles with vain hopes. We do not doubt the regeneration of their noble country, but we doubt its ever being effected by the arms of interference of the West… Polish nationality has but to bid its time.[859]

The weekly *Examiner* noted with some pride that 'there exists in Europe a tribunal of public opinion that is not powerless to pronounce upon nefarious acts of despotism and oppression'. Interestingly, the newspaper also raised another interesting point by writing that it was very improbable that Austria encouraged '*communism* in Cracow for the sake of exciting an outburst… Such plans and diabolical activity as this is far more Russian than Austrian – not perhaps the activity of the Russian Cabinet, but of its unprincipled, irresponsible, and restless agents'.[860]

The *Examiner* touched, though only in passing, on a very important element of the Cracow Question and its relation to the wider problem of Poland. For the first time since the Polish Question appeared on the European political scene after the November Uprising, did the attention of the Great Emigration, the European public opinion, and European politics seem to concentrate on Austria, not Russia. The shift towards (or rather against) Austria that followed the Cracow Revolution could not rely so strongly on British anti-Russian sentiments, suggesting the need to transform it into a more Russia-centred issue (such a transformation was at the core of Hume's Motion, which was presented in the House of Commons in March 1847, see below). The three debates that took place in 1846 were undoubtedly successful in raising the awareness of the problem and expressing British

---

[859] *Daily News*, 19 August 1846.
[860] *Examiner*, 22 August 1846.

sympathy towards its cause. However, despite the universal conviction of the strength of 'a tribunal of public opinion', the debates did not make any significant effect on Russia, Prussia, and Austria; and the protecting powers carried out their intended annexation of Cracow to Austria in November 1846. There was also no visible impact on British foreign politics, once again determined by Lord Palmerston.

It remains unclear to what extent the Foreign Secretary believed in his own arguments about the goodwill of the three protecting powers. Several weeks before both August debates Colonel Du Plat had confirmed the rumours of the withdrawal of Russian and Prussian troops from Cracow.[861] The news had been followed by Westmorland intelligence on the withdrawal of all three plenipotentiaries.[862] The Ambassador at Berlin was able to confirm that Prussian authorities were 'uninformed of any intention to pursue a line of conduct which should be opposed' to the stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna.[863] Perhaps that last piece of information became the main point of Palmerston's conviction of the goodwill of Eastern courts. The dispatch from Sir Robert Gordon at Vienna seemed to confirm that assumption. According to Gordon 'if there exists… a disinclination to confer freely with British and French authorities upon the question of Cracow, it proceeds not, in my opinion, from any intention of these Powers to violate the Act of the Congress of Vienna which guaranteed the independence of that Republic, but rather that they have not as yet themselves determined to what extent their interference may be required'.[864] The situation appeared very similar to the one in 1836, when everything ended with the temporary occupation of Cracow by all three powers, stopping Palmerston from being worried about a long-term and permanent violation of the Treaty of Vienna. Instead of protests, this time the British Government accepted the Austrian intervention as legitimate (or at least justified) breach of the Treaty of Vienna, quietly hoping that the whole affair would end in a similar way as the troubles that had taken place ten years before.

In contrast to the 1842 pro-Polish debate (see Chapter 6) and in particular to other debates from the previous decade, the involvement of Polish exiles in the preparations of

[861] Du Plat to Palmerston, 23 July 1846. *State Papers: 1846-7*, p. 1067.
[862] Westmorland to Palmerston, 28 July 1846. *Ibid*., p. 1068.
[863] Westmorland to Palmerston, 11 August 1846. *Ibid*., p. 1068.
[864] Gordon to Palmerston, 14 August 1846. *Ibid*., p. 1069.

both August discussions was rather limited. The most unusual development was Zamoyski's absence from London (caused by his declining health[865]) at the time of both debates. Lord Dudley Stuart, accompanied by Ludwik Bystrzonowski,[866] managed to successfully coordinate pro-Polish efforts in the capital, making sure that Beaumont would not make any more mistakes by avoiding the subject of the political and international significance of the occupation of Cracow. Although the debate became yet another chance to express British unanimity towards the Polish Question, its real effect was limited to a moral victory. As Stuart reported to Zamoyski, 'Palmerston's speech surprised everyone; they will shudder in Vienna and St Petersburg [hearing about it]'.[867] Even Zamoyski felt pleased with the speech of 'that rogue [*łotr*] Palmerston'.[868]

The Foreign Secretary's sympathy for the cause of Cracow and his willingness to express pro-Polish sentiment in the House of Commons had been the staple of debates since the early days of the Polish Question in Britain. They never, however, led to any significant change of British official foreign policy. 1846 was no different. After Palmerston's return to the Foreign Office, the problem of Cracow had to compete for his attention with what appeared to be a much more pressing and much more important problem – the problem of the Spanish Marriages. Consequently, deteriorating relations with France prevented Britain from acting in defence of Cracow in a similar way as ten years earlier.[869]

British Politics and the Annexation of Cracow

Before November 1846, at the time of the annexation of Cracow to Austria, British politicians and publicists were convinced that the protecting powers would never go any further than a military occupation of Cracow that would resemble the one from 1836. The general belief in the goodwill of Austria, Prussia, and Russia was coupled in that period

---

[865] It was also the reason why he had postponed his visit to Britain. See Zamoyski to Stuart, 9 May 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 451.

[866] Ludwik Bystrzonowski (1797-1878), Polish exile and Polish Secretary of the LAFP. He served as Czartoryski's emissary in Serbia in the 1830s.

[867] Stuart to Zamoyski, 18 August 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 467-469.

[868] Zamoyski to Stuart, 18 August 1846. *Ibid*., p. 469.

[869] Chamberlain, *Lord Aberdeen*, pp. 387–388.

with the assumption that parliamentary debates in France and Britain expressing support and sympathy towards Cracow and Poland were enough to prevent any further violations of the Treaty of Vienna. This conviction was strengthened by the rumours that 'the three protective powers will shortly make overtures to the cabinets of St James's and the Tuileries respecting the affairs of Poland in general, and Cracow in particular'.[870] When the first news of the occupation of the Free State started arriving in Britain, *The Standard* informed with some pride that 'it is thought that the plan [of incorporation] would have long since been carried into effect, had not the declaration in the French chambers and the English parliament interfered'.[871] This was neither the first, nor the last expression of the British conviction that Parliamentary debates and expressions of sympathy for Poland and Cracow could make an impact on European diplomacy and decisions made by the autocratic courts of the Holy Alliance.

The news of the occupation reached London in mid-November 1846 and was received by Palmerston 'with deep regret and with much surprise'. As he informed Ponsonby in Vienna, the previous communications 'had led Her Majesty's Government to expect that some proposal would be made by the 3 Powers for some modification of the political condition [of Cracow]… but Her Majesty's Government were not prepared for such a communication… and feel themselves bound to protest against the execution of the intention which has thus been announced'. But instead of strongly condemning the annexation, Palmerston concluded his protest by writing that the British Government 'deeply impressed with the conviction that it is above all things important that the engagements of Treaties should at all times be faithfully observed, most earnestly hope that means may be devised for guarding the territories of the 3 Powers against the dangers adverted to in their identic communications, without any breach of the Treaty of 1815'.[872] The mild language of the letter, as well as Palmerston's unwillingness to coordinate his actions with France, made the Western protests a mere formality; one unable to change or

---

[870] *Examiner*, 3 October 1846. See also *Morning Post*, 22 September 1846.
[871] *Standard*, 17 November 1846.
[872] Palmerston to Ponsonby, 23 November 1846. *State Papers: 1846-7*, pp. 1082-1085. The same instructions were directed to British representatives at Berlin and St. Petersburg.

undermine the decisions of the three protecting powers.[873] The British belief in the universal moral power of its politics and public opinion proved false, but nobody (and particularly not Palmerston) was ready and willing to search for other ways of influencing Europe. The disillusioned Czartoryski was convinced that separate protests of Britain and France would fail and the fear of war would prevent further action on behalf of Cracow.[874]

Because of the long recess of the Parliament that lasted from August 1846 until 19 January 1847, no debates on the subject of Cracow were held in the last months of the 1846. However, when the Parliament reassembled on 19 January to hear the Speech from the Throne, the issue of Cracow (a 'manifest Violation of the Treaty of Vienna'[875]) had a prominent place in the Government's considerations. Although the situation in Ireland and the problem of the Spanish Marriages (or, more generally, British relations with France) were the most pressing issues in the debate on the Address in Answer to the Speech, several speakers rose to support (Howard,[876] Inglis, Peel) or criticise (Bentinck,[877] Disraeli[878]) the Government's approach to the Cracow Question.[879] The next day Joseph Hume took the opportunity to outline his approach to the subject that was to become his main line of argument in the forthcoming three-night-long debate on the problem of Cracow (see below). It was clear from both January debates that, not for the first time, the problem of Poland had to compete for political attention with more pressing domestic issues (the Irish famine) and other questions of foreign policy (the Spanish Marriages and relations with France). The situation was, in many respects, similar to the early 1830s; and the attempts to raise the problem of Poland during the prolonged discussions on the Reform Bill and the Belgian Questions. However, unlike in the 1830s, and even unlike in 1842, neither Prince Czartoryski nor one of his representatives were present in Britain. Instead of staying in

---

[873] J. Ridley, *Lord Palmerston* (London), p. 316.

[874] Czartoryski to Zamoyski, 27 November, 19 December 1846. Leonard Niedźwiecki to Zamoyski, 27 November 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 289-291.

[875] House of Lords debate, 19 January 1847. *Hansard*, Vol. 89, cc. 1-5.

[876] Henry Charles Howard (1791–1856), thirteenth duke of Norfolk, British Whig politician.

[877] Lord George Frederic Cavendish-Scott-Bentinck (1802–1848), British Tory politician.

[878] Benjamin Disraeli (1804–1881), British writer and Tory politician, later Prime Minister.

[879] House of Commons debate, 19 January 1847. *Hansard*, Vol. 89, cc. 67-166.

London, Dudley Stuart visited Czartoryski in Paris at the beginning of February.[880] It did not, however, stop the vice-president of the LAFP from getting involved in the preparations for the motion.[881] At the time when the motion was discussed, Zamoyski was travelling along the Nile and entertaining himself by shooting at crocodiles (with limited success).[882] Although the first significant rise of interest in the Polish Question in a decade was watched with great interest by the Polish exiles, their involvement in promoting and advising was limited.

It took almost two months before Hume was finally able to present his motion in the House of Commons.[883] In the meantime, the press kept the British public well informed about the affairs of Cracow, publishing official diplomatic dispatches and translating and commenting on articles published in French newspapers (for a detailed overview of the approach of the press, see below). In consequence, when the debate finally took place, every MP interested in foreign affairs had enough information on the subject. The Cracow debate began in the House of Commons on the evening of 4 March, when Joseph Hume spoke at length in the House of Commons about the problem of Cracow, its independence, and the guarantees of the Treaty of Vienna:

> By these late proceedings [i.e. the annexation of Cracow], the legal sanction given by the Congress of Vienna to the settlement which it guaranteed, was gone. The partition of Poland was no longer legal. It was no longer legal, because the parties had violated the stipulations of the treaty under which it took place. All Europe was liberated from the yoke of the Treaty of Vienna… Poland had a full right to reassert her own freedom; and he knew no reason why the same rule should not prevail on the Rhine, the Po, and the Danube… the suppression of the State of Cracow destroyed every pretext of European law. There was no international law which could not be maintained in Europe. The effect of treaties was gone.[884]

---

[880] Stuart to Zamoyski, 6 February 1847. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 528-531.

[881] Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 262-263.

[882] The only successful catch was the young crocodile caught by the local sailors, but even then killing the beast was extremely difficult. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 506-507.

[883] He presented the intention of discussing the problem of Cracow in relation to the Russo-Dutch Loan on 19 January. *The Times*, 20 January 1847.

[884] House of Commons debate, 4 March 1847. *Hansard*, Vol. 90, cc. 861-895.

In short, Hume underlined the fact that the annexation of Cracow was an international problem, in the similar way as Czartoryski had argued after the fall of the November Uprising (see Chapter 4). In this case, however, it was also evident that the governments of Russia, Prussia, and Austria did not care for British or French protests, leading Hume to propose more decisive action against them. Not military in nature ('I do not wish for war; I am a man of peace'), but economic. His proposal stated that because of the violation of the Treaty of Vienna, Britain was no longer bound to continue the annual payment of the Russo-Dutch loan as it had been agreed in the treaty of 1832.[885] The whole motion consisted of four points. The first one read that the House of Commons 'views with alarm and indignation the incorporation of the free City of Cracow, and of its Territory, into the Empire of Austria'. Three others dealt directly with the Russo-Dutch loan.[886]

The Motion met with mixed reception. In seconding it, Viscount Sandon agreed with Hume that 'it was impossible to deny that the general stability of Europe was shaken' by the annexation, although he abstained from expressing his views on the later point and asked for a 'hearty and unanimous consent of the House to at least the first resolution'. Although Lord John Russell expressed his sympathy towards Cracow and spoke against the annexation ('the Three Powers were not justified by the Treaty of Vienna in conducting for themselves the consideration, whether the free State of Cracow should be maintained or extinguished'), he nevertheless declared himself against the whole Motion on both political and legal grounds. Despite the universal agreement that the Treaty of Vienna was violated, that violation was not enough to make Britain abandon its obligations to Russia, which were outlined in a different treaty. As the Prime Minister warned, 'it is not advisable that the House of Commons should affirm resolutions with respect to the conduct of those foreign Powers, unless it be intended to follow up those resolutions by some measures or actions on the part of the Executive Government'. The 4 March debate, in the similar way to many other pro-Polish debates in the previous fifteen years, took place late at night. Due

---

[885] The motion was, therefore, an attempt to present that 'society of merchants' economic benefits of pro-Polish action. See Żurawski vel Grajewski, 'Kupcy i arystokraci. Szkic do wizerunku Anglików w praise obozu monarchiczno-liberalnego Wielkiej Emigracji', pp. 118-119.

[886] House of Commons debate, 4 March 1847. *Hansard*, Vol. 90, cc. 861-895.

to the lengthy speeches of Hume, Sandon, and John Russell, it was agreed that the discussion be adjourned until the following week.[887]

The first person to unconditionally support Hume's motion was Richard Monckton Milnes, one of the first speakers to discuss the subject when the discussion resumed on the evening of 11 March. As he pointed out, the separation of Belgium and Holland led to the change in the way in which the Russo-Dutch loan was paid and, therefore, the annexation of Cracow should be treated in the same way: 'I assert that the stipulations of the second convention are now at an end, just as the first were in 1832'. Dr Bowring made an unsuccessful attempt to move the debate from the problem of Cracow towards the problem of Poland in general, hoping that 'the greater question of the regeneration of Poland itself, and of a recognition of its rights and liberties, which had been so recklessly trampled upon, would be brought before [the European powers] for consideration and decision'. His voice was ignored and other speakers (such as Viscount Mahon[888]) pointed out that 'however much the partition of Poland was to be deplored, [they] had looked upon it as a fact fulfilled'. The whole matter was, therefore, divided into two main questions: 'the one, approbation or disapprobation of the conduct of the Three Powers – the other, payment or not-payment of the Russo-Dutch Loan'. While several speakers (Molesworth,[889] Mahon, Inglis) supported and agreed with the first issue, while disagreeing with the second one, there were also more critical voices. The first one belonged to Lord Dalmeny,[890] who criticised Hume for degrading

> this great question of national laws and national rights, the faith of treaties, and the principles of justice, into a sordid consideration of pounds, shillings, and pence… In my opinion, the relations between mighty States ought to be conducted on a higher footing than the petty transactions between man and man. They ought to be inspired by a loftier principle, and maintained upon loftier grounds… States ought to be animated by a more elevated spirit, and guided by views more comprehensive and enlarged.

---

[887] *Ibid.*

[888] Philip Henry Stanhope (1781–1855), fourth Earl Stanhope, known as Lord Mahon, British politician.

[889] Sir William Molesworth (1810–1855), British liberal politician.

[890] Archibald Primrose (1809–1851), Lord Dalmeny, British liberal politician, father of Archibald Philip Primrose (1847–1929), future Prime Minister.

It was, therefore, not only a matter of British honour, but of British international influence not to break the engagement with Russia over the Russo-Dutch loan. 'Let us fulfil our high mission as the censors of nations, the rebukers of the oppressor, the vindicators of the oppressed', Dalmeny appealed, but in order to do that, British politics had to remain devoid of any 'sordid motives'. How Dalmeny perceived the failed impact of the British 'high mission' in preventing the annexation of Cracow remains unclear, but his speech indicated that this failure should not be seen as the reason behind abandoning the whole idea of the alleged moral influence of Britain on European politics altogether.

The approach presented by Sir Robert Peel and Lord Bentinck was far more critical. Peel, who denied that Britain was 'morally justified in refusing the payment we undertook to make to relieve ourselves', argued that 'in the present state of Europe a strict and honourable adherence to treaties is the best foundation of peace, and the best hope of solving any difficulties that the present aspect of affairs may present'. Having rejected the second part of the motion, Peel went on to discuss the problem of protests against the annexation of Cracow. Sharing Russell's approach, he said that he could not 'think it a dignified course to place upon record a resolution of this nature without being prepared to follow it up by some practical step'. Although the former Prime Minister rejected the motion, he nevertheless shared the universal feeling that the annexation of Cracow was a violation of the Treaty of Vienna. Lord Bentinck, on the other hand, refused to accept the motion and presented his ultraconservative views of the events that took place in Cracow and Galicia in 1846 (echoing the Austrian explanations of the necessity of the annexation). The most significant, and the most criticised, element of Bentinck's speech was his argument that he could not 'consent to brand the Emperor of Austria, or the Emperor of Russia, or the King of Prussia with the charge that they have been guilty of a manifest violation of the Treaty of Vienna'. Peel and, particularly, Bentinck, were in the minority. The latter was ridiculed by Thomas Duncombe,[891] who observed that 'the noble Lord… appeared to be in the secrets of the Three Powers' and thanked him 'for having plainly stated his sentiments, in case he should ever become the Foreign Secretary of this country'. Despite the fact that the second day of the debate saw the presentation of more diverse

[891] Thomas Slingsby Duncombe (1796–1861), British radical politician and supporter of Chartism.

opinions on the subject of Cracow, the discussion was nevertheless far from concluded. Although Lord John Russell did not like the idea of adjourning the discussion for the second time (since it 'would take away some of that influence which the debate is likely to have'), many MPs backed the idea of adjournment.[892]

16 March was the third and the last day of the debate. Because it was clear that the matter of Cracow was finally about to be resolved, and the House would be (or not) divided on Hume's motion, many speakers impressed on Hume that division was not necessary. 'All that was necessary had been done in this case, in expressing a strong opinion upon it; and almost all who had taken part in the debate had, with perfect unanimity, agreed in opinion that the Treaty of Vienna had been violated' argued Lord Vane.[893] He was supported by Lord Wharncliffe, who stressed 'the inconvenience of the House coming to a resolution which they were not prepared to follow up by active measures' and concluded that 'a division was not likely to show a very strong array on the side of the hon. Gentleman [Hume]; and it might, therefore, be supposed, that there was less sympathy with his views in that House, with respect to the annexation of Cracow, than was really entertained'. The most significant contributions to the debate on that last day were the long-awaited speeches by Disraeli and Palmerston. In a long, passionate condemnation of Hume's motion, the former worked hard to prove that Britain had no right to suspend the payment of the Russo-Dutch loan, because 'the violation of a particular treaty, inserted in a general treaty, is not a violation of that general treaty'. Disraeli was referring to the fact that Cracow's status as a free state was not the result of the General Treaty of Congress from 9 June 1815, but of the Additional Treaty relative to Cracow signed between Austria, Prussia, and Russia on 21 April and 3 May 1815, presenting a wide range of historical references proving his point.

Without much difficulty, Palmerston dismissed Disraeli's argument:

> The stipulations which were entered into by Prussia, Austria, and Russia, relating to the city of Cracow, were annexed to the Treaty of Vienna, and… the 118th Article of that Treaty declared that they should have the same force as if they were integral parts of the treaty… [I]ndependently of the 118th Article, you must get rid of the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th Articles, which are part of the general treaty to which all the

[892] House of Commons Debate, 11 March 1847. *Hansard*, Vol. 90, cc. 1157-1225.
[893] Charles William Vane (1778–1854), third marquess of Londonderry, British army officer, and politician.

> Powers were contracting parties… I say, therefore, it is perfectly plain that the arrangement as to Cracow was founded upon stipulations to which Great Britain was a party; and I hold that the violation of that treaty is a violation of the arrangements to which Great Britain was one of the contracting parties.

Despite accepting the fact that the Treaty of Vienna was violated, Palmerston was against supporting the motion or even pressing for a division: 'The technicalities of the House of Commons are little understood elsewhere; and if the hon. Gentleman [Hume] presses this Houses to a division on the previous question [first point of the motion], although we understand what that division means, I am sure he will see that it would be considered as a division of opinion on a question upon which hardly any division of opinion exists'. After listening to 'the opinion of the House… so strikingly and unanimously displayed in support of the views which he had himself expressed' Hume 'deemed his triumph complete'. Without pressing for a division and risking the defeat of the motion, he decided to withdraw it and the House adjourned at one o'clock.[894]

Although the March debate may be perceived as the British response to the problem of annexation of Cracow, the city's incorporation to Austria was only a trigger that revived the widely understood Polish Question and British interest therein. The fact that the debate attracted so much political attention and lasted for three long nights was undoubtedly the result of the fifteen-year-long pro-Polish agitation in Britain. In contrast to the discussions of the 1830s, in March 1847 all speakers had a vast and detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Vienna and the recent events (thanks to the publication of all official despatches regarding the affairs of Cracow in the first months of 1847). Instead of concentrating on vague and often unclear issues (as was the case in the early years of the Polish Question, see Chapter 4), this time the MPs were determined to concentrate on the very specific subject of the annexation of Cracow, without venturing to spend too much time on the issues of Galicia, the Partitions of Poland, or the November Uprising.

There can be no doubt about the uniqueness of the Motion itself. It was a well-constructed argument, using the fact that the annexation was a violation of the Treaty of Vienna and proposing an official economic sanction directed at one of the powers that

---

[894] House of Commons debate, 16 March 1847. *Hansard*, Vol. 91, cc. 26-103.

violated the treaty. Despite the fact that it was Austria who annexed Cracow, it was widely assumed that Russia was the main initiator of the scheme, which established a link between problem of Cracow and British Russophobia.[895] However, economic and financial arguments failed to make any impression on British politicians, falling on deaf ears and even leading to protests against the perception of British politics as directed by similar calculations. Finally, for the first time in history of the question of Polish independence the March debates revealed so stark of a divide among the MPs who took part in the discussion. As was argued earlier, even the Tories avoided direct criticism of the cause of Poland, preferring either absence or non-involvement in the debates of the previous decade. When they spoke, they showed a lot of restraint, usually opposing proposed motions, but accepting the principles behind the Polish Question championed by the British friends of Poland. In March 1847, however, for the first time since the outbreak of the November Uprising did there appear voices of criticism of the very legitimacy of Polish claims (repeated, as will be illustrated below, by some newspaper commentaries).

Can the March debates on the subject of Cracow be considered the peak of British interest in the cause of Poland? Beyond doubt, the debates marked the longest and the most intense discussion on the Polish Question that had taken place in the House of Commons after the November Uprising. There can be no doubt that by 1847 of the issue of Poland, Cracow, and pro-Polish interpretations of the Treaty of Vienna became common knowledge among Britons. There existed a vast and detailed literature, including pamphlets, books, and journal and newspaper articles, offering numerous details on the history of Poland and the violations of the Treaty of Vienna. That knowledge, however, did not lead to any increased interest in the Polish Question. In the same way as the moral and political arguments of the 1830s, the economic and financial issues raised by Hume in his motion failed to make any impression on the House of Commons and the Government. The moral triumph of the debate was not, however, followed by any other attempts to revive the problem of Cracow or Poland. When coupled with the mixed reactions of the British press and rather

[895] As Janowski observed, British interest in Poland was rarely associated with the policies of Austria and, as was illustrated above, it was Russia which was universally perceived as the main enemy of Polish independence. See Janowski, 'Tematyka i konteksty brytyjskich zainteresowań Polską w latach 1831-1841', p. 119.

insignificant extra-parliamentary pro-Polish activities of the LAFP and the Chartists, the 1847 debates can be, therefore, considered a swansong.

The British Press and the Issue of Cracow

Although the March debate was an excellent example of the almost complete unanimity of British MPs with respect to the cause of Cracow, opinions presented in the British press were much more diverse. Initially, all reactions to the annexation of Cracow were sympathetic to the cause of Poland. The *Morning Chronicle* called it 'an act so nakedly despotic and illegal that no sophistry can cover it with even a show of defence',[896] while the *Standard* expressed its hope that 'something must be done' to end '*the reign of perfidy* commenced with the ruin of Poland [i.e. the partitions]'.[897] However, despite these voices of sympathy, the problem of Cracow was from the very beginning presented not independently, but as part of a much larger international issue. 'Who can doubt', wrote the *Morning Chronicle* in the very same article in which it lamented the annexation, that 'the freedom of Cracow has been really sacrificed to those despicable intrigues which so recently disgraced the Court of Madrid… The Spanish match, knowingly or unknowingly on the part of its authors, was the necessary preliminary to the annexation of Cracow'.[898] In its usual tone of criticism directed against the Whigs, the *Standard* argued that the French were not to blame, because 'the liberties of that unfortunate Republic have been sacrificed, not by Louis Philippe… but *by Lord Palmerston*'. As the *Examiner* concluded several days later, Cracow's fall 'will go down to history for ever connected with the espousals of Madrid'.[899] At the time of growing international problems in the West, the cause of Cracow failed to become an independent political question. For the British press it was only part of more pressing issues surrounding British-French relations and the question of the Spanish Marriages, in a similar way as the problems of British relations with the July Monarchy and Belgian independence overshadowed the November Uprising in 1831. It seemed

[896] *Morning Chronicle*, 23 November 1846.
[897] *Standard*, 24 November 1846.
[898] *Morning Chronicle*, 23 November 1846.
[899] *Examiner*, 28 November 1846.

indisputable, even though regrettable, that the annexation of Cracow was a *fait accompli* and very little could be done to change this situation.

After fulfilling their moral duty of condemning the annexation of Cracow, the major newspapers seemed to lose some their interest in the problem. The only reason behind the prolonged reappearance of Cracow in the British press was the prominence of the issue in France. Numerous references to French newspapers made the impression that in its indignation with the fate of that city France led, while Britain followed.[900] 'The present enthusiasm throughout France for the liberation of Cracow, far greater and more universal than anything of the kind in this country, does honour the French' wrote *Daily News* in one of its editorials.[901] From late November the majority of information about Cracow was based on information from French newspapers, with numerous references to *Le Journal des Débats*, *Siècle*, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and *La Presse*.[902] British interest in Cracow was, therefore, replaced with interest in the French interest in that subject (the situation was very similar to that from 1836, see Chapter 5). The French connection, however, allowed people like David Urquhart to present their views on contemporary politics. In a series of letters to *The Morning Post* (later published as *Europe at the Opening of the Session of 1847. The Spanish Marriages and the Confiscation of Cracow*[903]) Urquhart outlined his political views and hatred towards Palmerston, which had its roots in the unsuccessful *Vixen* affair of 1834.[904] Urquhart agreed with the *Standard* by arguing that it was Palmerston who should be blamed for the annexation of Cracow, which 'was not pressed until he came into

[900] In one of his letters to Zamoyski, Czartoryski praised the French press and agreed that although British newspapers were also preoccupied with the annexation of Cracow, they nevertheless 'write with less enthusiasm'. Czartoryski to Zamoyski, 27 November 1847. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 489.

[901] *Daily News*, 27 November 1846.

[902] See for example *Daily News*, 24, 26 November, 1 December 1846; *Morning Chronicle*, 12 December 1846; *Morning Post*, 30 November, 1, 3, 4, 12 December 1846; *Standard*, 1 December 1846.

[903] Urquhart, D., *Europe at the Opening of the Session of 1847. The Spanish Marriages and the Confiscation of Cracow* (London, 1847).

[904] Although the *Vixen* affair was the result of Urquhart's cooperation with Poles, links between him and the Polish exiles did not last for long. See Marchlewicz, *Polonofil doskonały*, pp. 215–216.

office. He has done for Russia, by a few lines on a page of paper, what all her Baskirs and all her Calmucks never could have accomplished'.[905]

The position of *The Times*, strongly pro-Polish since Henry Reeve joined the editorial board in 1840,[906] was slightly different. In one of the editorials published after the annexation of Cracow the newspaper claimed that 'whilst we feel the strongest commiseration for the fate of this unhappy city, which has literally been persecuted to the death, and whilst we abhor this repetition of the partition of Poland on the last fragment of Polish territory, the nature of the transaction, the violation of the treaty, and the insolent indifference to the voice of public opinion and the claims of Western Europe, are even more important in our eyes than the act itself'.[907] Unlike other papers that started losing their interest in the problem of Cracow by the end of 1846, *The Times* continued to comment on various Cracow-related issues throughout December 1846, all the while reporting on the French interest in the question.[908]

In early January 1847, when Urquhart was waging his personal war against the Foreign Secretary on the pages of the *Morning Post*, the newspapers started publishing official correspondence relating to the affair of Cracow and the Spanish Marriages.[909] *The Times* went as far as to publish extracts from the 1814 correspondence of Castlereagh regarding the negotiations relating to Cracow at the Congress of Vienna.[910] When the Parliament reconvened in late January, the attention of the press concentrated on the Queen's Speech and the ensuing parliamentary response. Of all voices in the January debates, that of Benjamin Disraeli was deemed the most interesting. The *Morning*

---

[905] Urquhart, *Europe at the Opening of the Session of 1847*, p. 19. See also The Morning Post, 12 January 1847.

[906] Trev Lynn Broughton, 'Reeve, Henry (1813–1895)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23296, accessed 17 May 2016].

[907] *The Times*, 18 November 1846.

[908] It informed about the radical pro-Polish meeting that took place on 16 December at the National Hall in Holborn and commented on the French circular addressed to the Northern Powers (which appeared in the French press in the second half of December), as well as on the Austrian reply. *The Times*, 17 and 22 December 1846.

[909] See for example *Morning Chronicle*, 15 January, 4 February 1847; *Daily News*, 15 January 1847. *Morning Post*, 21 January 1847.

[910] *The Times*, 31 December 1846, 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9 January 1847.

Chronicle mused that 'he has stuck into the right path for attaining a kind of European reputation. He has certainly taken a short and easy cut towards that species of celebrity which is the meed of intellectual eccentricity'.[911] The *Morning Post* limited itself to a brief presentation of Disraeli's and Palmerston's views regarding the Treaty of Vienna and concluded that 'we shall be glad to see how the Noble Lord and the Honourable Gentleman will settle this matter when the topics of foreign policy… come on for separate discussion'.[912]

On 4 March, the day when Hume presented his motion, all major newspapers already knew its content, which can be seen as a clear attempt of pro-Polish circles to popularise the problem of Cracow and the debate itself. The reactions, however, were not particularly enthusiastic. It is possible, warned the *Morning Chronicle*, 'to push this [pro-Polish] feeling too far, both for our own credit and for the advantage of those whom we would assist'.[913] A more critical approach was presented by the *Morning Post*, which called the motion 'the grand fuss', 'one of the absurdities into which John Bull every now and then falls' and 'resolution of tavern meeting'.[914] It also pondered 'whether the re-union of Cracow to the Austrian monarchy is or is not a departure from these general arrangements *on the part of Russia*?'.[915] The most striking, however, was the language used by *Daily News*, which did not differ too much from that of its conservative rivals. Using musical metaphors, it read:

> [The question of Cracow] may, indeed, make a very pretty *libretto* for amateur performers to sing from. For our part, we have no objection to attend and applaud. The music is excellent, the sentiment generous and touching, the moral irreproachable, the *corps* is one of unrivalled brilliancy and talent; but in this season of public distress and curtailed rents, we cannot afford a box for the season. Besides, there is not time: we have relief committees, and sanitary meetings, and mechanics' institutes, and ragged schools, washing-house and lodging-house establishments for the poor. Where are the time and the money for a Polish opera?

---

[911] *Morning Chronicle*, 22 January 1847.
[912] *Morning Post*, 22 January 1847.
[913] *Morning Chronicle*, 4 March 1847.
[914] It was a reference to pro-Polish events and meetings that on various occasions took place in Freemasons Tavern in London.
[915] *Morning Post*, 4 March 1847.

Besides internal considerations, there were international problems that required British attention. 'To quarrel with Russia, Austria, and Prussia, at a moment when we can scarcely preserve the form of diplomatic intercourse with France, is, if it be anything more than empty words, utter insanity'.[916] The previous unanimity in condemning the annexation of Cracow was, therefore, replaced with the unanimous criticism of Hume's motion even before he had the opportunity to present it. Strangely enough, this development was not equal with the loss of sympathy for Cracow.

The *Standard* was among the first to criticise the debate. 'Like all debates which must lead to nothing, [it] has been more amusing than important so far – for it has been adjourned'.[917] Its criticism was followed by the *Examiner*, which ridiculed Hume's suggestion to 'curtail the Czar's pocket-money'.[918] Both the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Morning Post* regretted that the government allowed for the adjournment of the motion, praised Lord John Russell's speech, and continued to criticise the motion as being opposite to 'a sense of national honour, and… the dignity, wealth, and lofty character of the British empire'.[919] Among the limited number of voices of sympathy was the short editorial published in the *Era* weekly under the headline 'Violation of the Treaty of Vienna and £100,000 a Year to the Violator'.[920] Much stronger, as usual, was the voice of *The Times*. The newspaper did not feel discouraged by the fact that the debates 'have wholly demolished' the key points of the motion referring to the Russo-Dutch loan and could not 'conceive on what defensible principle the house of Commons and the Government will on Thursday next hesitate to give effect to the protest of the Crown, and to relieve the Exchequer of this country from a disbursement of the public money which is henceforth uncalled for, illegal, and dishonourable to the country'.[921]

The second part of the debate attracted interest mostly because it offered the opportunity for further criticism. However, for the *Standard* it was an occasion to

---

[916] *Daily News*, 4 March 1847.
[917] *Standard*, 5 March 1847.
[918] *Examiner*, 6 March 1847.
[919] *Morning Chronicle*, 5 March 1847. *Morning Post*, 5 March 1847.
[920] *Era*, 7 March 1847.
[921] *The Times*, 5 March 1847.

completely change its approach after hearing Bentinck's speech and cheer the relief 'from the savage despotism of a Jacobin democracy, by the extinction of the mock independence' of Cracow.[922] This sentiment was seconded by the *Morning Post* that could not 'understand how any intelligent and right-minded man can sincerely sympathise with the madness and wickedness which it has been the successful object of the annexation of Cracow to crush and to extirpate'.[923] Despite its criticism, the *Examiner* was able to see the brighter side of the problem:

> The opinions of Members of Parliament on grave matters of foreign policy have been kept for such a long time so closely bottled and corked up, that one is not surprised to find, that the subject, once fairly opened, does display and inordinate degree of effervescence, and that every drop and every bubble must come forth… The importance of Cracow, or of that Poland of which it is the last relic, no one will be disposed to deny. But the utility of a debate on the subject is to be doubted; at least, of such a debate as the present, in which very one perceives and is aware from the first, that the only reality is words. Every speech spoken on Thursday night was in fact the speech of a juvenile debating society.[924]

The 'useless and undignified prolongation of the debate on Cracow' (as the *Morning Chronicle* put it)[925] did not lead to any serious change in the approach to the problem, although Lord Bentinck's speech convinced some people (including the editors of *The Standard*) to re-evaluate their views on what had really happened in Cracow. Never before in the history of the Polish Question were the differences between British politicians and the contemporary press as stark as in the case of Hume's motion. This time even *The Times* abstained from detailed commentary on the subject, awaiting its final resolution. Voices of the pro-Whig the *Morning Chronicle* and the more conservative the*Standard*, the *Morning Post*, and the*Examiner* were unanimous in their criticism.

The concluding debate of the three-day long series received very limited attention from the press. Perhaps the most striking was the commentary of the liberal *Daily News*, praising Disraeli's 'remarkable' speech and agreeing with him that Russia, Prussia. and

---

[922] *Standard*, 12 March 1847.
[923] *Morning Post*, 13 March 1847.
[924] *Examiner*, 13 March 1847.
[925] *Morning Chronicle*, 13 March 1847.

Austria were 'more immediately interested' in the fate of Cracow, having thus enough reasons to interfere than Britain and France.[926] For its part, the *Morning Post* wrote a long postscript not only to the problem of Cracow, but to 'what is absurdly enough called the Polish question', which was one of 'periodical fits of political insanity' of British politics.

> We have heard Lord Morpeth admit in public that, when the question [of Poland] is now mentioned, it is received with the muttered observation – "Oh! This is Dudley Stuart again, with his eternal Poles"; we have seen Polish balls denuded of their former aristocratical support, and left to the fostering care of Aldermen and Common Council men; and we have not failed to remark the general disgust occasioned by the fact, that in every country of Europe, and even beyond its limits, where the Poles were the partakers of national hospitality, they have continually taken part in fomenting political commotions…
>
> All these considerations induce us to the opinion that the Polish paroxysm is in progress of subsidence, though we are conscious that it has not passed over.[927]

The Times remained the only paper that saw the positive side of the problem, arguing that 'it has been avowed, with one exception, unreservedly, by speakers of the most opposite opinion on ordinary subject, that the extinction of the free city of Cracow… was an act of gross political violence and dishonesty'.[928]

The reactions of the British press to the occupation of Cracow were varied. Although initially all newspapers shared a common indignation with the actions of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and continued to present their interest in the problem through numerous references to the French press, the interest they expressed in support of the renewed politicisation of the problem was limited. The criticism of the press grew with the unexpected (and, for many newspapers, unnecessary) prolongation of the March debate. In the end, even if Hume considered the three-night-long debate a political success, the fact that both Bentinck and Disraeli used the second and the third night to undermine the general assumptions about the annexation of Cracow, harmed the perception of the whole cause in a manner which far outweighed all expressions of sympathy and the support of the British MPs.

---

[926] *Daily News*, 17 March 1847.
[927] *Morning Post*, 18 March 1847.
[928] *The Times*, 7 March 1847.

Beyond the Press and Politics: Other Approaches to the Cracow Question

Interest in the problem of the occupation and annexation of Cracow was by no means limited to British parliamentary debates and the press, even if in 1846 and early 1847 they took the lead in expressing British sympathy and criticism towards the question of Cracow. Aside from them, the problem of Cracow received attention from two different groups: the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland and the Chartists. At a time of the diminishing importance of the question of Polish refugees in Britain, the problem of Cracow seemed a perfect way to underline the problem. However, apart from the publication of the *Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the People of Great Britain and Ireland* (written by Lord Dudley Stuart), the Association abstained from getting involved in promoting the question of Cracow. For the Chartists, the events of 1846 were the main inspiration to express greater interest in the fate of Poland and the Poles. Although various expressions of pro-Polish sympathy continued to appear on the pages of the *Northern Star*, the Chartists' interest never played a significant role in British radical policies, remaining outside the two main Polish Questions.

The Literary Association of the Friends of Poland and Cracow

In contrast to many previous events which brought the subject of Poland to European attention, for the first months that followed the Cracow Revolution the LAFP remained surprisingly uninvolved in defending or promoting that cause. The lack of involvement of the Polish monarchists in the Revolution (see Chapter 3) led to very limited contacts between Czartoryski, Zamoyski, and Dudley Stuart in that period.[929] This lack of instructions did not, however, stop Stuart from preparing the *Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the People of Great Britain and Ireland*, the second such document in the history of the LAFP (the first *Address*, written by Campbell, was published in 1832, see Chapter 4), written throughout March and April 1846 and published in May that year. In the *Address* Stuart presented an interesting account of the continuity of the Polish Question in Europe, referring, as it was customary in almost all publications and debates on the subject of Poland, to the partitions of Poland, the Treaty of Vienna, Russian

[929] Stuart to Zamoyski, 14 April 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, pp. 447-448.

violations of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Poland, and the November Uprising. The publication was, therefore, a reminder of all sufferings of the Poles 'from the moment that they were reduced to subjection, up to the present instant'.[930] Perhaps far less visible to a British reader was the way in which Stuart supported Czartoryski's cause by undermining the Polish democrats' ideas and claiming that they 'must not be taken for the voice of the people [of Poland]'.[931]

When Stuart finally turned in his work to the problem of the Cracow Revolution and the peasant revolt in Galicia, he did all he could to defend the cause of Poland, though not necessarily the recent disturbances themselves. After explaining his own understanding of the Cracow Manifesto (and dismissing accusations of communism, which were the most common criticism of the document), he pointed out that 'no conclusion can be drawn, from this document, as to the general feelings of the people of Poland… Nor can the conduct of the peasants in Galicia be taken as evidence of the general feelings of the peasantry in Poland'.[932] What was, therefore, to be considered as the real spirit of Polish peasantry? Stuart argued that the great support provided by them during the November Uprising should be considered as the best example of their patriotism, while the recent disturbances were the effect of 'the demoralizing system of the Austrian Government'.[933]

The main problem of the new *Address* was neither its historical inaccuracy (seen particularly in Stuart's claims about the peasants' support of the November Uprising) nor its style, which lacked Campbell's zeal and literary qualities. The most problematic was the absence of any concluding suggestion or demand. While Campbell ended his 1832 publication with the hope that 'an universal declaration of your [i.e. British] sentiments, in some shape or other, is due to the cause humanity, and to the honour of our native land',[934] Stuart only offered his 'confidence in the justice of the Almighty', and hoped that 'however distant, the day at length will come, when power shall no longer prevail over right, and

---

[930] [Stuart, D.], *Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the People of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1846), p. 5.
[931] *Ibid*., p. 34.
[932] *Ibid*., p. 37.
[933] *Ibid*., p. 39.
[934] [Campbell], *Address of the Literary Polish Association to the People of Great Britain*, p. 20.

when this Association shall congratulate their fellow countrymen, and the world, on the triumph of humanity, of justice, and of religion, in the RESTORATION OF POLAND'.[935] In one of his letters to Zamoyski Stuart claimed that the *Address* was welcomed in Britain by many prominent people, but at the same time complained that 'if the headquarters [i.e. Czartoryski] does not like it, then it is useless'.[936] Zamoyski replied with a quick approval of Stuart's work, pointing out that his information about the divisions among the Poles may result in the 'improvement' of the situation and bring some of the exiles under the leadership of Czartoryski.[937] Despite its weaknesses and inability to set any precise aims for the people of Britain and Ireland, the *Address* served as an important reminder of all details associated with the Polish Question. Moreover, by presenting a highly pro-Polish interpretation of the events in Cracow, it voiced a strong conviction that neither the failure, nor the political program of the Cracow Revolution can be condemned. Both were 'a proof that the nation, which tyranny has taken so much pains to annihilate, is not yet extinct'.[938] The outbreak and the failure of the Revolution should be, therefore, perceived as a sign of the unyielding thrive for independence expressed by Poles, turning the Polish Question into a subject that would never stop playing its role in international politics. The *Address*, published before the two major debates in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, should be considered not only as a reminder of the unfinished problem of Poland and Cracow, but, more importantly, a source material providing the most up-to-date facts and interpretations of the events that had taken place in Poland.

On 3 May 1846 another annual meeting of the LAFP took place in London, attended by thirty five Englishmen and over twenty Poles.[939] In his speech on that occasion Lord Dudley Stuart explained why the Association had not been more involved in promoting the problem of Cracow in Britain. He spoke against 'the project of a public demonstration with reference to the late events in Poland – a demonstration which Prince Czartoryski, aware as he was of the state of public sentiment in England, had expressed a

---

[935] [Stuart], *Address of the Literary Association*, pp. 46-47.
[936] Stuart to Zamoyski, 4 May 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 450.
[937] Zamoyski to Stuart, 9 May 1846. *Ibid*., p. 451.
[938] [Stuart], *Address of the Literary Association*, p. 45.
[939] Stuart to Zamoyski, 4 May 1846. *Jenerał Zamoyski*, IV, p. 450.

strong feeling against'.[940] His speech illustrated how reliant the LAFP was on decisions coming from Czartoryski in Paris, particularly in regard to the subject of Polish independence. Consequently, no pro-Polish event promoting the cause of Cracow was organised by the Association,

The LAFP's dependence on Czartoryski's decisions did not, however, extend to the question of Polish refugees in Britain. In June 1846 a Polish Ball took place at Willis's Rooms in London, gathering a large number of British friends of Poland. However, the event was less successful than previous balls.[941] The positive relation from the ball offered by *The Times*[942] can be contrasted with the much more critical account presented in the *Morning Post*:

> In comparison with the balls of the three past years, the Polish ball of last night was a failure. There were diamonds and Duchesses, and pears and flowers, and lovely dames of high degree, and organised quadrilles… but with all these powerful accessories, it was what is termed in sporting phraseology a slow affair… In the attendance there was a great falling off since last year. On that occasion there were upwards of 1,500 persons present, whereas last night there were not 800 "friends of Poland" in the room; a proof that our charity is becoming so domestic as to prefer seeking at home for its objects.[943]

Two other events, the second Polish Ball and the Concert (both organised in the London Guildhall in November 1846) were even less numerous and far less successful.[944] Neither of the two, however, was organised in order to defend or promote the cause of Cracow, serving, instead, as the usual opportunity for the British friends of Poland to express more general sympathy for that country and for the Polish exiles in Britain.

During the 1847 annual meeting, despite the lack of any positive resolution of the March parliamentary debates, Lord Beaumont optimistically claimed that 'man must be a slow observer of passing events who did not perceive on the continent a state of things which must sooner or later lead to the recognition of those rights which existed in the Poles

---

[940] *Daily News*, 5 May 1846.
[941] *Report of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland* (London, 1847), p. 5.
[942] *The Times*, 9 June 1846.
[943] *Morning Post*, 9 June 1846.
[944] *Report of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland*, pp. 4-8.

to be an independent people'. In the conclusion to his speech, the President of the LAFP expressed 'his belief that the sympathy of this country with Poland was stronger now than it was 12 months ago'.[945] Even if the claim (possibly based on responses to Hume's Motion) was true, expressions of that sympathy after March 1847 were very limited.

1846 did not change the LAFP's approach to the Polish Questions and the organisation continued to concentrate its efforts on the problem of the Polish refugees in Britain. Although the successes of pro-Polish events organised in 1846 and 1847 were not as significant as of those in the previous decade, this cannot be simply explained by the fact that British 'charity [was] becoming so domestic as to prefer seeking at home for its objects'.[946] The situation of the Polish exiles in the 1840s was far better than in the previous decade, making the need for extensive fundraising on their behalf much less pressing. Not only were there fewer of them, but also the majority of those present in Britain received the Government Grant, leaving only a small minority of refugees with no choice but to rely on the LAFP's support. Consequently, because the problem of Polish exiles in 1846 and 1847 was not as pressing as in the previous decade, neither the LAFP's determination to organise pro-Polish events nor British generosity maintained the levels of the 1830s.

The British Working Class

As it was argued in the previous chapter, relations between the Polish democrats and the Chartists before the Cracow Revolution were very limited. While the failure of the Cracow Revolution seriously undermined democratic attempts of the restitution of Poland, it nevertheless served as a key factor that raised British radical interests in the Polish Question to unprecedented levels. For two years (until 10 April 1848 and the subsequent demise of Chartism) Cracow, Poland, and Polish democracy received more attention from the Chartists and the *Northern Star* than in all the previous years of the movement combined.[947] The Polish radicals in London did not remain deaf to these voices of

---

[945] *The Times*, 4 May 1847.

[946] *Morning Post*, 9 June 1846.

[947] As in the case of the pre-1846 relations between the Polish radicals and the Chartists, the *Northern Star* remains the main source of information.

sympathy, leading to a short, but intense period of mutual understanding between both groups.[948]

After the news of the Cracow Revolution reached Britain, the pages of the radical *Northern Star* became filled with reports from Cracow and Poland, proofs of British working class sympathy for the Revolution, and background information explaining the position of Cracow and the history of Poland. Unlike the interest in the events of 1846 presented in other newspapers as well as in parliamentary debates, the leaders of the British working class did not limit themselves to condemning the occupation and annexation of Cracow. Instead, they strongly sympathised with the ideological part of the Revolution, becoming the only British champions of the Provisional Government and the Cracow Manifesto. The interest of the Chartists was not based on a legalistic approach, the Treaty of Vienna, or the political principles of the balance of power, but on pure sympathy for the first fully democratic Polish revolution.[949] These sentiments were quickly transformed into more visible pro-Polish activities, including numerous meetings and demonstrations. It remains, however, unclear to what extent opinions expressed on the pages of the *Northern Star* can be considered as expressions of British working class sentiments and to what extent they were simply thoughts and sentiments of the leaders of Chartism.[950]

At the meeting of the Fraternal Democrats on 19 March 1846 the subject of Cracow dominated the proceedings and resulted in the publication of the *Address of the Fraternal Democrats Assembling in London, to the People of Great Britain*, in which the authors appealed to all classes, but 'to the proletarians specially, because the cause of Democratic Poland is their cause; and because bitter experience convinces us that the cause of genuine liberty in Poland has by few, very few friends among the privileged classes of this country'. In comparison to the more legalistic and restrained appeal prepared by Dudley Stuart, the work of the Fraternal Democrats was much more direct: 'Fling away from you the reproach that you are "a nation of shopkeepers". Show that you are a nation of patriots, whose patriotism is not that of selfishness, but of humanity, not confined to yourselves, but

---

[948] Weisser, 'The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846', p. 4.

[949] Weisser, 'The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846', pp. 6–8.

[950] The case of the *Northern Star* and Chartism is very similar to a more universal issue of the unclear relation between the press and public opinion.

embracing the whole human race. Poland appeals to the world for succour, let not the people of Britain be the last to aid. Forwards!'.[951] Among the signatures of the Secretaries of the Fraternal Democrats there was no Polish name despite the prominent role of Ludwik Oborski as one of the organisation's secretaries.

A week later, on 25 March, a meeting took place at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in London. The Chartists invited a number of respectable individuals to that meeting, but unfortunately, John Bowring, Lord Dudley Stuart, and Joseph Hume, did not attend the event despite their sympathies for the cause of Poland. In a letter to the organisers, Stuart explained that he was 'not of opinion that any attempt to elicit the expression of public sympathy for the Poles is likely to be advantageous to them at the present moment'.[952] The invitation of Stuart, the vice-president of the LAFP and well-known supporter of Prince Czartoryski, showed that the Chartists remained ignorant of some elements of Polish exile politics. Nevertheless, the 25 March meeting was 'very numerously attended', full of 'great cheering', and numerous voices of sympathy for Poland. It also passed two significant resolutions: one for the creation of 'a committee… to be entitled "Poland's Regeneration Committee", for the purpose of guarding the interest of the Polish cause, and promoting, by every available means, the restoration of Poland'; the other for addressing a petition 'to the British Parliament, requesting the intervention of the British government in support of the restoration of Polish nationality and freedom'.[953] The second 'numerous and respectable' meeting took place on 30 March and unanimously passed 'a string of resolutions similar to those passed at the Crown and Anchor Tavern', offering a similar set of arguments and voices of sympathy for Poland, Cracow, and the democratic principles presented during the recent Revolution.[954]

---

[951] *Northern Star*, 21 March 1846.

[952] As was illustrated above, Stuart explained his views two months later at the annual meeting of the LAFP by saying that it was Czartoryski's opinion that no pro-Polish meeting could help the cause of Poland. See *Daily News*, 5 May 1846.

[953] *Northern Star*, 28 March 1846.

[954] *Northern Star*, 4 April 1846.

Other pro-Polish meetings took place throughout April[955] and May,[956] with the newly created Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration taking care of the financial side of these events.[957] Reports of other activities of the Democratic Committee published in the *Northern Star* were rather infrequent, suggesting that the organisation itself did not succeed in establishing itself as a strong representative of the Polish cause in Britain.[958] The only monthly report of the Committee was published in July, but it concentrated entirely on presenting details of the events taking place in Poland.[959] The presence of Ludwik Oborski, who was elected a member of the organisation, did not change its marginal role in both British and Polish politics,[960] and for the remainder of 1846 and 1847 information about the Committee's activities was very scarce.[961]

The disassociation of the Chartists from contemporary British politics prevented them from making any significant impact on any of the two main Polish Questions. However, that factor made the *Northern Star* the only British newspaper that remained interested in the cause of Poland and Cracow in the later part of 1847. At the same time, the Fraternal Democrats and the Democratic Committee for Poland's Regeneration continued to organise pro-Polish meetings. On 23 February 1847 a public meeting in commemoration of the Cracow insurrection took place in the Literary Institute, John-Street, and resulted in the preparation of a petition to the Parliament on behalf of Poland.[962] On 9 April, several weeks after the end of the parliamentary debate on the Polish Question, a smaller meeting took place at the Chartist Assembly Rooms where a special address of the Democratic Committee to the people of Great Britain and Ireland was prepared.[963] The meeting which seemed the most significant was the one that took place on 14 May 1847. The usual report from that event presented much more information about the scope of activities of the

---

[955] *Northern Star*, 11 April 1846.
[956] *Northern Star*, 16, 23 May 1846.
[957] *Northern Star*, 13 June 1846.
[958] Weisser, 'The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846', p. 10.
[959] *Northern Star*, 18 July 1846.
[960] Cygler, *Pułkownik Oborski*, pp. 108–110.
[961] See *Northern Star*, 23 January, 3 April, 22 May and 17 July 1847.
[962] *Northern Star*, 27 February 1847.
[963] *Northern Star*, 17 April 1847.

Democratic Committee than any of the previous ones. As the Secretary of the organisation informed, the printed pamphlets containing the annual report and the address of the organisation were forwarded to several metropolitan newspapers and various 'members of the committee, or known friends of Poland' residing in a whole range of towns and cities, from Aberdeen and Edinburgh to Bristol and Birmingham.[964]

The Chartist interest in the problem of Poland that developed, rather surprisingly, after the Cracow Revolution, was different from other expressions of sympathy that had been developing in Britain after the 1831. Firstly, the unsuccessful insurrection, due to its democratic and radical character, caused a great rise of interest among Chartists. The central element of that change was the Cracow Manifesto, published shortly after the outbreak of the Revolution, which outlined the main democratic principles of the National Government. Secondly, in comparison to those of the LAFP, the interests expressed on the pages of the *Northern Star* were far less politically-orientated. What made British working men feel sympathetic to their Polish counterparts was their common goal and the growing class consciousness. It seemed that the idealised vision of Polish peasants, coupled with the complete impossibility of establishing any contacts with them, contributed towards creating an idealistic vision of Poland in the minds of the Chartists.

***

British reactions to the new Polish Revolution, its failure, the occupation of Cracow and the subsequent annexation of the Free State of Cracow to Austria illustrated both the continuous influence of the question of Polish independence and significant changes that were taking place in Britain throughout the 1840s. On the one hand, the problem of Poland did not need introduction and the rhetoric developed by the British friends of Poland in and outside of the Parliament could rely on the rich source material, which had been prepared for over a decade of pro-Polish activity in Britain. The importance of these resources was so high that even the Chartists used them in their expressions of sympathy for Poland and the democratic principles of the Cracow Revolution. Another common element that was

[964] *Northern Star*, 22 May 1847.

shared by supporters of the cause of Poland from all classes was the universal belief that speeches, publications, press articles, meeting,s and other expressions of pro-Polish sympathy could make a real impact on European politics. This notion had been haunting the British approach to the question of Poland since the early 1830s, serving as a justification for not pressing for any decisive government action on behalf of Poland. In this respect, the debates of 1846 and 1847 did not differ from the debates that took place throughout the 1830s and 1840s, failing to influence British foreign policy and certainly not making the expected impression on the rest of Europe.

On the other hand, however, even the continuity of pro-Polish agitation could not change the fact that the 1840s were a period of a slow, but steady decline of British interest in the cause of Polish independence. This fact made the parliamentary and press debates on this subject nothing more than a simple expression of sympathy. However, the 1846 debates, for the first time in history of the Polish Question in Britain, saw the appearance of voices of criticism. Unlike in the previous cases, several MPs (particularly Disraeli and Bentinck) spoke against the pro-Polish principles based on the Treaty of Vienna, which for years had been the central element of all parliamentary and extra-parliamentary discussions on that subject. Though critics of these principles remained in the minority, their impact was seen in the press commentaries to the 1847 debates.

The Cracow Revolution, perceived as one of the facets of the question of Polish independence, almost completely dominated the history of Polish-British relations in 1846-7, including parliamentary debates, press articles, and public meetings organised by the Chartists. The impact of the question of the Polish refugees was much smaller and limited to the pro-Polish meetings organised by the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland. Following Czartoryski's instruction, the Association avoided linking its charitable work with the problem of Cracow, making the *Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the People of Great Britain and Ireland* the only visible expression of its involvement in the cause of Polish independence.

Conclusion

The seventeen years that separated the outbreak of the November Uprising and the beginning of the Springtime of Nations were a period when the character of the Polish Question in Britain changed the most (in contrast to the post-1848 decades). From the relatively unknown, albeit popular issue of Polish independence during the Polish-Russian struggle in 1830-31 it was transformed into a well-understood question pertaining to European stability and the European balance of power. However, despite the numerous attempts of the Polish exiles to make the problem of Poland central to the political considerations of British and European diplomacy, British interest in this question never reached the same level as in the months of the November Uprising. As this thesis has argued, the role played by the issue of Polish independence in British political considerations depended very strongly on events in Poland. And because no other event in the period between 1830 and 1847 reached the same level of significance as the November Uprising, the problem of Poland was becoming increasingly less attractive.

Meanwhile, the question of the Polish refugees, introduced in this thesis for the first time as a separate Polish Question, served as a way in which British society could express their devotion to and interest in the problem of Polish independence. By supporting the unfortunate Polish refugees, members of the British public tried to compensate for the lack of a pro-Polish diplomatic or military intervention both during the November Uprising and later. Unlike the question of Polish independence, this problem was almost entirely disassociated both from the events in Poland and from the pro-Polish propaganda of Czartoryski and his supporters. With the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland in the centre of all charitable activities, British interest in the fate of the Polish exiles usually depended on the way and intensity in which the Association decided to promote their cause.

Turning Point or New Beginning?

Neither the history of the Great Emigration, nor the history of the Polish Questions in Britain came to an end in late 1847. However, as was illustrated in Chapter 7, British reactions to the occupation of Cracow can be considered as a watershed moment for both the parliamentary and the public interest in the cause of Poland. Never again did the

problem of Polish independence attract as much attention as in the period of 1830-1847. Because of the failed Cracow Revolution, when the wave of national risings swept through the Continent after the events in France in early 1848, the Poles at home and in exile were caught unprepared.[965] Although they took part in almost every revolution that took place across the Continent in those turbulent years, at times contributing very significantly to the temporary success of particular revolutions, they nevertheless failed to promote their own cause.[966] In those promising years there was, effectively, no question of Polish independence that functioned independently from other national questions and there was very little interest in the cause of Poland in Britain.[967]

1848 also brought about a serious change in the perception of the Polish refugees, many of whom left Britain and France to participate in the revolutions taking place in different parts of Europe.[968] This widely known fact led the British public, for many years sympathetic to the cause of Polish exiles, to change its approach. From the glorious defenders of their national freedoms and knights fighting against despotism they turned into dangerous revolutionaries destabilising European peace. Although nothing changed in the official approach of the British government towards the refugees, sympathy for the Polish refugees visibly declined.[969] After 1848-9 the number of Polish exiles coming to Britain grew rapidly, partly because of the involvement of Poles in the uprisings across the Continent, and partly because of the changing policies of other countries, particularly France, which had played an important role as the centres of the Great Emigration.[970] Poles, however, were not the only ones who sought refuge in Britain, and the sudden influx of

---

[965] M. Zgórniak, *Za naszą i waszą wolność* (Warszawa, 1987), pp. 3–4.

[966] With the exception of events that took place in Wielkopolska (the Prussian partition). *Ibid*., pp. 23-31.

[967] See Jagodziński, *Anglia wobec sprawy polskiej w okresie Wiosny Ludów*.

[968] At one point the government decided to withhold payments of the full subsidy to those who declared their willingness to leave Britain permanently. See *Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure; together with the minutes of evidence taken before them*, p. xxxiv.

[969] See particularly K. Marchlewicz, 'Continuities and Innovations: Polish Emigration after 1849', pp. 103–120.

[970] See particularly S. Kalembka, 'Emigranci polscy - ofiary represji politycznych we Francji II Republiki i II Cesarstwa'. *Powstaniec polski w Prusach Wschodnich i na emigracji : Z dziejów wychodźstwa polskiego i myśli politycznej po 1831 roku* (Olsztyn, 1995), pp. 211–22. On the consequences of that change see for example H. Rzadkowska, *Działalność Centralizacji Londyńskiej Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego 1850-62* (Wrocław, 1971).

Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, and Hungarians made Britain proud of its status of 'the Asylum of Nations',[971] even though this fact rarely led to any significant support for the refugees or their causes.

To discuss the role and the diminishing importance of the question of Polish independence during the Springtime of Nations, as well as the difficult issue of Polish refugees in the aftermath of European Revolutions, would have taken this thesis into the early 1850s, when Polish and Hungarian refugees came to Britain after a long diplomatic conflict that followed their detainment in Turkey. Moreover, to discuss their fate and the fate of the problem of Poland after 1848 would also require an analysis of the Crimean War and an overview of the reasons why, despite the fact that it was the conflict that all Polish exiles had been waiting for all this time, anti-Russian coalition failed to do anything for the cause of Poland.[972] The year 1848 should be, therefore, treated as a beginning of a new epoch, a year of revolutions, which, similarly to those of 1830, opened a new period in the history of Europe. After the dust settled, the power was re-established, and peace restored, Europe was a completely different place. The history of the Polish Questions in Britain in the years 1848-63 is yet to be told. Work on this period would be a natural extension of this PhD; one which would contribute not only to the subject of Polish-British relations, but also to the history of the Great Emigration (which tends to concentrate on the pre-1848 era).

Poland as a Forgotten Question

As this thesis has illustrated, the failure of the question of Polish independence was determined by two types of factors. The first group of factors involved those elements on which the Poles, both at home and in exile, had an impact. Among them were military actions, such as the November Uprising and the Cracow Revolution, which served as primary reminders of the unresolved Polish Question to the rest of Europe and, despite their failures (or, to some extent, because of them), succeeded in drawing international attention to the problem of Poland. Moreover, pro-Polish propaganda in Britain played a significant role in explaining the situation of Poland to those who were willing to listen, as well as in establishing diplomatic and moral grounds for a potential pro-Polish intervention. Although

[971] Porter, *The Refugee Question*, pp. 7–8.
[972] *Polacy i ziemie polskie w dobie Wojny Krymskiej*, ed. by J. Borejsza and G. Babiak (Warszawa, 2008).

usually one-sided and presented from the point of view of the Polish conservatives, the way in which the subject of Poland was promoted transformed the Polish Question from a relatively unknown and marginal issue into a popular cause that received support from all sides of British political and public life. The failure of the Polish Question to become one of the major elements of British and European politics was not, therefore, caused by the lack of devotion and determination on the part of the Polish exiles. Instead, a number of 'external' factors (i.e. those outside the influence of the Poles) played a far more significant role in determining the shape and the role of Poland.

Firstly, Poland's geographical position between Russia, Prussia, and Austria prevented any successful intervention. Access to the territories of Greece, Belgium, and Italy made these countries far easier to support by either France or Britain, even though none of them were as successful at promoting their cause as the Poles. All other questions, even though not resolved without military action, turned out to be conflicts on a very limited scale, even when they involved the major European powers. The situation of Poland was different and both Polish exiles and their British friends were fully aware of the fact that the full restoration of Polish independence would be possible only after the outbreak of a major European conflict. Paradoxically, however, it was the determination of nations such as Greece and Italy to regain independence against all odds that eventually forced the European powers to become involved in their affairs, while in the case of Poland the lack of a similar determination was the main reason for the failure of Polish military actions.

Timing was another important factor. Though there were plans for an uprising to take place during the Russo-Turkish war of the late 1820s,[973] the conspirators did not decide to take action. When the revolution finally broke out in November 1830, regardless of the impact of the events in France and Belgium thereon European diplomacy was entirely preoccupied with the problem resolving the Belgian Question and avoiding French expansion. 'Our great object now is the Peace of Europe. We must not allow our feelings to get the better of our reason' wrote Lord Heytesbury to Palmerston shortly after the outbreak of the November Uprising.[974] Fear of France was, indeed, one of the defining elements of

[973] Skowronek, *Od Kongresu Wiedeńskiego do Nocy Listopadowej*, pp. 47–49.
[974] Heytesbury to Palmerston, 20 December 1830. BA, PP/GC/HE/121.

contemporary foreign policy. It prevented Palmerston from cooperating with the July Monarchy in the early days of the November Uprising, as well as after the 1836 occupation of Cracow. The 1830s and 1840s were a period when all European powers were determined to uphold the existing balance of power (as the peaceful resolution of both Eastern Crises illustrated), making it particularly difficult for the Poles to succeed in their attempts to regain independence. The universal determination to retain the system established at the Congress of Vienna was too strong for the Poles to undermine it.[975] As 1848 illustrated, even the widespread revolutionary fervour of the Springtime of Nations was not enough to make a permanent impact on European politics, though it is doubtful whether the Poles found any consolation in that fact.[976]

Domestic problems in Britain, particularly at the time of the November Uprising and the Cracow Revolution, were also significant in preventing any substantial rise of pro-Polish interest in those periods. In the early 1830s it was the problem of the Reform Bill that occupied the minds of the British public, press, and politics. Fifteen years later the same role fell to the economic crisis and the lengthy debates on the subject of the Corn Laws Repeal. It can be hardly surprising that British internal affair were always far more important than the distant problem of Polish independence. Moreover, as Britain suffered from a serious economic crisis in the later part of the 1830s and the first half of the 1840s, the attention of the British society drifted almost naturally towards internal issues, leaving issues pertaining to foreign policy on the margins of its interest.

It was not insignificant that throughout the whole period that followed the November Uprising Prince Czartoryski, by all means the most experienced Polish diplomat and politician of the period, abstained from any direct involvement in Polish revolutionary activities. Instead, he concentrated on preparing the ground for a future uprising that would have made sense only in a favourable international situation. For Czartoryski, no political development that took place between 1831 and 1847 was beneficial enough for the Poles to risk another revolution. Even when Czartoryski decided to support the Cracow Revolution, his role resembled the one he assumed during the November Uprising: he followed rather

---

[975] Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics*, pp. 797-800.
[976] *Ibid*., pp. 800-803.

than led. The fact that after the failure of the 1846 uprising many exiles joined the ranks of Czartoryski's supporters became proof of the success of conservative ideology over the liberal principles of the Polish democrats.[977] The Prince's victory in the struggle for the souls and minds of Polish exiles was belated. Despite several attempts to change the situation of Poland after 1847, he was no more successful than in the previous decades. With every year that followed the November Uprising British interest in the cause of Polish independence declined. The ideological victories of the Polish monarchists could not stop the gradual disappearance of the Polish Question from the political and public spheres of British life.

The 'Other' Polish Question: Success or Failure?

While determining the success of the question of Polish independence in Britain is relatively easy, and the fact that between 1830-1847 Poland did not regain its freedom serves as the best proof of the failure of this question, the situation is not as clear-cut in regard to the problem of the Polish refugees in Britain. As was suggested, for the British friends of Poland the cause of the exiles served as a way in which they could express their sympathy for the cause of Poland without getting Britain involved in any serious international conflict with Russia. It was clear that without a successful resolution of the problem of Polish independence, there was no chance that the Polish exiles would suddenly stop being a burden for British philanthropy. The fact that after initial reluctance even the government decided to offer the Poles financial support supports the notion that in Britain sympathy expressed towards the refugees became the accepted way of expressing support for the cause of Polish independence. Despite the adjustments of the Government Grant that took place in the second half of the 1830s, two things remained unchanged. Firstly, the grant continued to exist as a temporary, annually renewed support measure, which could have been cancelled at any time. Secondly, however, neither the Whig nor the Tory governments ever considered abandoning the scheme and discontinuing the grant.

From the very beginning actions aimed at providing support for the Polish exiles, directed and, with time, completely dominated, by the Literary Association of the Friends

[977] Czartoryski himself did not feel any satisfaction when people who had been his enemies became his friends. Bartkowski, *Wspomnienia*, pp. 251-252.

of Poland, took place with very limited involvement on the part of the exiles themselves. This fact created a visible contrast when compared with the actions and events related to the other Polish Question, which were usually overseen by either Czartoryski or Zamoyski. The problem of the Polish refugees in Britain was almost entirely a British affair rather than a response to the political ideas of Czartoryski and his supporters.

The LAFP was successful at securing the Government Grant for the Poles and distributing the funds among the majority of exiles in Britain. After 1838 it continued its charitable activities, but limited them to those exiles who were excluded from governmental support. The LAFP was in the centre of almost all major pro-Polish events and actions that took place in Britain in 1830s and 1840s, sometimes (like in 1844) succeeding in attracting wide support and gathering impressive lists of patrons and patronesses. Links between the organisation (particularly its vice-president, Lord Dudley Stuart) and Prince Czartoryski were often criticised by other Polish refugees. However, from the British point of view they rarely mattered or even, when Czartoryski or Zamoyski were able to attend dinners or balls organised by the LAFP, they added to the grandeur of these events.

The activities of the LAFP were not, however, limited to providing the Polish exiles with financial support. The organisation's suggestion that the government should allow the refugees to leave the country with part of the annual subsidy was a step that was to lead to the gradual decline in the number of the Polish refugees in Britain. However, this development was only a partial success. Events taking place in Europe throughout the 1830s and 1840s and the fact that of all countries Britain remained the only place that did not impose any restrictions on the newly arrived refugees were the most significant factors preventing the decline in the number of the Polish exiles. Attempts at making the Poles more independent by finding them proper work also turned out to be of rather limited success.

In determining the degree of the success or failure of the problem of the Polish refugees in Britain one should look at the aim of this particular question. Unlike the problem of Poland itself, which would only end with regaining some degree of independence, the issue of the refugees had no visible ending point. Though it remained strongly interconnected with the problem of Polish independence (since the restoration of

Poland would have undoubtedly led to the return of all exiles to their homeland), in itself the question of refugees had no precise aims. Instead, the British friends of Poland acted on an *ad hoc* basis, without any direct plan or idea. As was argued, every increase in their number (caused by the events on the Continent) led the LAFP to organise new pro-Polish events aimed at gathering funds that were later distributed among the exiles. Regardless of the great successes of several of these events, no sum gathered by the Association was ever high enough.

The problem started to lose its appeal at the time of the economic depression of the 'hungry forties'. Although the declining finances of the LAFP can be explained by the gradual decrease in the number of Poles who required financial help (particularly after 1839), the 1840s saw the appearance of first voices of criticism in British the press of the whole idea of financial support for foreigners. Though this criticism did not prevent the LAFP from achieving significant successes (with the most visible one achieved during the visit of Tsar Nicholas I to London in 1844), and the British unwillingness to support the Poles did not reach its peak until 1848-9, the backlash nevertheless illustrated how the LAFP's devotion to this question began to annoy some groups of the British society.

Both Polish Questions were effectively impossible to resolve in the contemporary European situation. In consequence of their continuous presence in British public and political life the initial sympathy started to wear off already in the early 1840s and never returned to the level of the 1830s.

Concluding Statements: Dynamics of the Polish Questions

The decreasing interest in the subject of Poland along with the diminishing devotion to provide financial support for the Polish refugees in Britain may suggest that the history of both Polish Questions between 1830 and 1847 was that of a gradual decline in interest, popularity and importance. As this work argued, this was not necessarily the case and both questions complemented each other. When it became clear that pro-Polish propaganda reached its limits in the early 1830s, the sudden arrival of hundreds of Polish refugees helped to preserve the name of Poland in a period that lacked any events that could popularise the problem of Polish independence.

While the refugees became a quiet reminder of the unresolved Polish Question, their difficult situation and almost constant need for financial support led to the emergence of a new Polish Question, this one associated with the well-being of the Polish refugees in Britain. For over a decade (from 1834 at least until the successful Polish Ball in 1844) the refugees attracted sympathy from different parts of the British society. As the history of the LAFP illustrated, financial support for the refugees did not display a stable, increasing, or decreasing tendency. Instead, the level of support depended to a considerable degree on the actions of the Literary Association, which adjusted its pro-Polish activities to satisfy the needs of the increasing numbers of refugees. There were two periods when the subject of the refugees reached its peak. The first pertained to the years 1838-9, when the government, faced with the increasing numbers of the Poles, decided to increase the sum of the Government Grant and to include all refugees present at that time in Britain in the subsidy. The second peak can be seen in the events that surrounded the visit of Nicolas I to London, when the Polish Ball became the manifestation of British anti-Russian sentiment and a reminder that the interest in Poland, though not particularly visible in British public and political life, continued to excite sympathy among the British society.

Similar fluctuations characterised the British approach to the problem of Polish independence. After the initial sympathy expressed during the November Uprising and the support Poland received in 1832 and 1833 from different pro-Polish groups, interest in Poland was replaced by interest in the Polish refugees themselves. In the second part of the 1830s it was the issue of Cracow that replaced the subject of the autonomy of the Kingdom of Poland as the main political and diplomatic problem related to Poland. However, even that new aspect of the question of Polish independence and the stronger-than-before reliance on the Treaty of Vienna in debates on the occupation of Cracow did not change the government's unwillingness to intervene in the affairs of Poland. Although several parliamentary debates on the subject took place between 1836 and 1846, in that period the problem of Polish independence remained strongly insignificant to British foreign policy. The sudden outburst of interest in the cause of Poland, once again in the guise of the problem of Cracow, which followed the Cracow Revolution and the annexation of the city to the Austrian Empire in 1846 culminated in the three-night-long debate in the House of Commons in March 1847. The debate marked the peak of parliamentary interest in the

cause of Poland which, nevertheless, failed to turn the question of Polish independence into a major factor of British foreign policy. Fear of another European war that would have inevitably followed any open support of Polish claims was as significant in determining the British approach to the Polish Question in 1847 as it had been sixteen years earlier.

The questions of Polish independence and the Polish refugees did not lack British support, sympathy, and interest. What they did lack, however, was the existence of a beneficial international situation that would allow Britain and France to intervene on behalf of Poland without triggering a major European conflict with the Holy Alliance. As this work has shown, Britain was not that different from France as it is believed when it came to interest in the cause of Poland.[978] Unlike France, however, Britain did not give any false hopes to the Poles. As one of the exiles observed, 'I would prefer a Frenchman as an ally of my nation, but for a personal friend I would always choose an Englishman'.[979] It was, indeed, Britain which, despite failing to provide Poland with any direct support, turned out to be the home of a number of the most devoted defenders that Poland had in Europe. Though the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland lost some of its significance after the sudden death of Lord Dudley Stuart in 1854, it nevertheless managed to survive until the acclaimed restoration of Polish independence in 1918.[980]

It cannot be argued that the limited impact of the problem of Polish independence on the British (and, indeed, European) politics of the 1830s and 1840s was the result of the minor importance of that subject. It was also not for the lack of trying on the part of Polish exiles and their British supporters that the question of Poland never became central to British political considerations. At the same time, reactions to the problem of the Polish refugees became the best illustration of what type of voluntary and generous support the British society could have perhaps offered Poland in more favourable times. It was not until 1914, however, when the new European war broke out, an event that already in the 1830s had been considered as one of the prerequisites of the successful resolution of the cause of

[978] M. Rezler, *Nie tylko orężem. Bohaterowie wielkopolskiej drogi do niepodległości* (Poznań, 2013), p. 28.
[979] Koźmian, *Anglia i Polska*, pp. 22-23.
[980] M. A. Biggs, *The Literary Association of Friends of Poland, 1832-1924. A Retrospect.* (London, 1924).

Polish independence. Until then the question of Polish independence was to remain one of the forgotten questions of nineteenth-century European history.

Bibliography

Archives

Central Archives of Historical Records (*Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych*), Warsaw, Poland

Władze Centralne Powstania Listopadowego: 630

Czartoryski Library (*Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich*), Cracow, Poland

[Materials of the Polish National Government, 1830-31]: 5296, 5299, 5308, 5309, 5310

[Various materials relating to the problem of Polish emigration, 1831-1847]: 5313, 5316, 5343, 5443, 6159

[Czartoryski's correspondence, 1830-1847]: 5272, 5274, 5275, 5450, 5460, 5472, 5478, 5479, 5500

[Czartoryski's political papers, 1830-1847]: 5281, 5282, 5322, 6458

[Materials relating to the problem of Cracow, 1832-1847]: 5358, 6537

[Materials relating to the activities of the LAFP, 1824-1848]: 6464, 6459, 6635,

The National Archive, Kew Gardens, England

Foreign Office Papers (FO): 417/2, 881/749A

Palmerston Papers, University of Southampton, England

General Correspondence (GC): CZ/1, 3, 7, 9, 13HE/121-160, ST/132, 136, 138, ZA/1-3

Drafts (BD): RU/4

Primary sources

Memoirs, Diaries and Collections of Letters

Bartkowski, J., *Wspomnienia z powstania 1831 roku i pierwszych lat emigracji* (Kraków, 1967)

Beattie, W., *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, 3 vols. (London, 1849)

De Broglie (ed.), *Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand*, IV (Paris, 1891)

Koźmian, S. E., *Anglia i Polska* (Poznań, 1862)

Lubiewa, I. S., *Wspomnienia o Emigracyi Polskiej w Anglii po upadku Powstania z r. 1830 i 31go* (Poznań, 1890)

Łukaszewicz, W., and W. Lewandowski, eds., *Postępowa publicystyka emigracyjna: wybór źródeł* (Wrocław, 1961)

Niedźwiecki, L., *Listy wybrane z lat 1832-1839*, ed. by S. Makowski (Warszawa, 2009)

Niemcewicz, J. U., *Dziennik pobytu zagranica od dnia 21 lipca 1831 roku do 20 maja 1841 roku*, 2 vols. (Poznań, 1876)

Parczewski, K., 'Powstanie w okolicach Niemenczyna. Pamiętnik', *Pamiętniki polskie*, III (Paris, 1845), pp. 162-177

Plater, W., ed., 'Korrespondencye księcia Adama Czartoryskiego', *Album Muzeum Narodowego w Rapperswyll. Na setną rocznicę 1772 r.* (Poznań, 1872), pp. 127-230.

Robinson, L. G., ed., *Letters of Dorothea, Princess Lieven, during Her Residence in London, 1812-1834* (London, 1902)

Rostworowski, M., *Dyariusz Sejmu z r. 1830-1831* (Kraków, 1908)

Sapieha, L., *Wspomnienia (z lat od 1803 do 1863 r.)* (Poznań, n.d.)

Sudley, L., ed., *The Lieven-Palmerston Correspondence, 1828-1856* (London, 1943)

Szyrmowa, J., *Dziennik z lat emigracji*, ed. by K. Marchlewicz (Poznań, 2011)

Zamoyski, W., *Jenerał Zamoyski, 1803-1868*, 6 vols. (Poznań, 1914)

Newspapers and Periodicals (1830-1847)

Caledonian Mercury

Daily News

Edinburgh Review

Era

Examiner

Hampshire Advertiser

Hampshire Telegraph

Hull Packet and Humber Mercury

Hull Polish Record

Journal des débats

Le constitutionel

Morning Chronicle

Morning Post

Northern Star and Leeds General AdvertiserPolonia, or Monthly Reports of Polish Affairs

The Portfolio, or a Collection of State Papers

Punch, or The London Charivari

Polish Exile

Standard

The Times

Trzeci Maj

Pamphlets and Other Publications (in chronological order)

The Foreign and State Papers (London, 1830-1847).

Gordon, H., *Considerations of the War in Poland* (London, 1831).

[Mochnacki, M.], *Do rodaków bawiących w Paryżu* ([Paryż, 1831?]).

Poland. The Polish Question Shortly Stated (London, 1831).

Porter, J., *Thaddeus of Warsaw* (London, 1831).

[Campbell, T.], *Address of the Literary Polish Association to the People of Great Britain* (London, 1832).

Address of the Literary Polish Association to the People of Great Britain (London, 1832).

Protestacja przeciw traktatom od 1772. do 1815. rozszarpującym Polskę ([Paris?], 1832).

TDP do Polaków (Paryż, 1832).

Polish Exiles' Friends Society (London, 1833).

Rules and Regulations of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London, 1833).

Polish exiles. And estimate of the sum that will be required to be issues for the relief of the distressed Poles now in this country ([London?], 1834).

Report of the [Second] Annual General Meeting of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London, 1834).

Civil contingencies. An account of the sum expended under the head of civil contingencies, in the year 1834: and an estimate of the amount required for 1835 (London, 1835).

Report of the Fourth Annual General Meeting of the Friends of Poland (London, 1836).

Manifesto of the Polish Democratical Society (London, 1837?).

Poetical Works of Thomas Campbell (Edinburgh, 1837).

Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth Annual General Meeting of the London Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London, 1837).

Report of the Sixth Annual General Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London, 1838).

The People's Charter (London, 1838).

Akt z roku 1834 przeciw Adamowi Czartoryskiemu wyobrazicielowi system polskiej arystokracji (Poitiers, 1839).

Appeal of the LAPF to the Inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland in Behalf of the Polish Refugees (London, 1840).

Królikowski, K. L., *Mémoire Historique et Politique Sur L'état Actuel de La Ville Libre de Cracovie*, (Paris, 1840).

The Poles. Are the Polish Emigrants Worth the Sympathy They Have Met With in England and Elsewhere? Addressed to the Subscribers to the Polish Fund (London, 1843).

Gaszyński, K., *Poezje* (Paryź, 1844)

Kopja Dziennika Rządu Rewolucyjnego, z czasów ostatniego Powstania w Krakowie, 22 Lutego 1846 Roku, i Relacja o zaszłych wypadkach (Paryż, 1846).

Manifest Rządu Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej do Narodu Polskiego (Kraków, 1846).

Mowy Xięcia Adama Czartoryskiego, od roku 1838-1847 (Paryż, 1847).

Relacja wypadków zaszłych w Krakowie i Galicji, od dnia 18 lutego po 25 kwietnia 1846 (n.p., n.d.).

Report of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland (London, 1847).

Urquhart, D., *Europe at the Opening of the Session of 1847. The Spanish Marriages and the Confiscation of Cracow* (London, 1847).

Report from the Select Committee on Miscellaneous Expenditure; together with the minutes of evidence taken before them (London, 1848).

Stuart, D. C., *Address of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland to the Poles* (London, 1850).

Szulczewski, K., *O Towarzystwie Literackim Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie. Odezwa do rodaków* (Paryż, 1857).

Czartoryski, A. J., *Żywot Juliana Ursyna Niemcewicza* (Berlin-Poznań, 1860).

———, *Rozważania o dyplomacji* (Kraków, 2011).

Secondary sources

Adamska, J., 'Przyczynki do działalności kulturalno-literackiej Krystyna Lacha Szyrmy', *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 23 (1961), pp. 101-107

Aszkenazy, Sz., 'Zabiegi dyplomatyczne Polskie, 1830-1831', *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 1902, pp. 417–61

Barszczewska-Krupa, A., *Kościuszko. W kręgu mitologii narodowej* (Łódź, 1995)

Bielecki, R., *Zarys rozproszenia Wielkiej Emigracji we Francji. 1831-1837. Materiały z archiwów francuskich* (Warszawa-Łódź, 1986)

Biggs, M. A., *The Literary Association of Friends of Poland, 1832-1924. A Retrospect.* (London, 1924)

Bolsover, G. H., 'Nicholas I and the Partition of Turkey', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 27 (1948), pp. 115–45

Borejsza, J., *Piękny wiek XIX* (Warszawa, 2010)

Borejsza, J., and G. Babiak, eds., *Polacy i ziemie polskie w dobie wojny krymskiej* (Warszawa, 2008)

Boyce, D. G., 'Public Opinion and Historians', *History*, 63 (1978), pp. 214–28

Brake, L., Demoor, M. (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (Gent, 2009)

Brock, P., *Nationalism and Populism in Partitioned Poland* (London, 1973)

———, 'Polish Democrats and English Radicals', *The Journal of Modern History*, 25 (1953), pp. 139–56

———, *Polish Revolutionary Populism: A Study in Agrarian Socialist Thought from the 1830s to the 1850s* (Toronto, 1977)

Brown, D., *Palmerston: A Biography* (London, 2010)

Brown, M., 'The Comite Franco-Polonais and the French Reaction to the Polish Uprising of November 1830', *The English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), pp. 774–93

Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, (Cambridge, 1910)

Cetnarowicz, A., *Tajna dyplomacja Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego na Bałkanach 1840-44* (Kraków, 1993)

Chamberlain, M. E., *Lord Aberdeen. A Political Biography* (London, 1983)

———, *'Pax Britannica'? British Foreign Policy, 1789-1914* (London, 1989)

Charmley, J., *The Princess and the Politicians. Sex, Intrigue and Diplomacy in Regency England* (London, 2006)

Chase, M., *Chartism. A New History* (Manchester and New York, 2007)

Chonacki, W., and J. Dąbrowski, *Krystyn Lach Szyrma, syn ziemi mazurskiej* (Olsztyn, 1971)

Clarke, J., *British Diplomacy and Foreign Policy 1782-1865: The National Interest* (London, 1989)

Coleman, A. P., 'The Great Emigration', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 311-323

Copson-Niećko, M. J. E., 'Pro-Polish Agitation in Great Britain, 1832-1867' (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London, 1968)

Cramer, F. A., 'Polacy w Genewie w latach 1831-1839', in *Materiały do biografii, genealogii i heraldyki polskiej* (Warszawa, 2005), pp. 9–53

Crosby, T. L., *Sir Robert Peel's Administration, 1841-1846* (London, 1976)

Cybowski, M., 'First and Last Refuge: France and Britain as Centres of the Polish Great Emigration', in *John Bull and the Continent* (Frankfurt am Main, 2015), pp. 59–74

———, 'Ten dziwny wiek XIX: Czekając nieoczekiwanego', *Esensja* 10 (142) 2014, p. 159

Cygler, B., *Pułkownik Oborski, szermierz wolności* (Gdańsk, 1976)

———, *Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej* (Gdańsk, 1963)

Czubaty, J., *The Duchy of Warsaw, 1807-1815. A Napoleonic Outpost in Central Europe* (New York, 2016)

Dackiewicz, J., *Synowie Napoleona. Aleksander Walewski* (Łódź, 1978)

Davies, N., *God's Playground. A History of Poland* (Oxford, 1981), II

———, *Heart of Europe* (Oxford, 2001)

———, '"The Langour of so Remote and Interest": British attitudes to Poland 1772-1832', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, new series, 16 (1983), pp. 79-90

Dopierala, K., 'Literackie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie', *Przegląd Zachodni*, 1985, pp. 63–77

Droz, J., *Europe between revolutions, 1815-1848* (Glasgow, 1988)

Drozdowski, P. J., 'Echoes of the Polish Revolution in Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century English Literature (A Selection of Works and Voices: Part One)', *The Polish Review*, 38 (1993), pp. 3–24

———, 'Echoes of the Polish Revolution in Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century English Literature: Part Two', *The Polish Review*, 38 (1993), pp. 131–48

Dunn, J., '"The November Evening": The Warsaw Uprising of November 1830', *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 16 (2003), 126–35

Dutkiewicz, J., *Anglia a sprawa polska w latach 1830-31* (Warszawa, 1967)

———, *Francja a Polska w 1831 r.* (Łódź, 1950)

Dziewanowski, M. K., 'Czartoryski and His "Essai Sur La Diplomatie"', *Slavic Review*, 30 (1971), pp. 589–605

———, 'Czartoryski: European Federalist', *Current History*, 19 (1950), pp. 21–28

Feldman, J., 'U podstaw stosunków polsko-angielskich, 1788-1863', *Polityka Narodów*, (1933), pp. 7–47

———, 'The Polish Provinces of Austria and Prussia after 1815; the "Springtime of Nations"', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 336-364

Fishman, J. S., *Diplomacy and Revolution : The London Conference of 1830 and the Belgian Revolt* (Amsterdam, 1988)

Fraser, A., *Perilous Question. The Drama of the Great Reform Bill 1832* (London, 2013)

Gadon, L., *Emigracya polska: pierwsze lata po upadku powstania listopadowego* 3 vols. (Kraków, 1901)

———, *Książę Adam Czartoryski podczas powstania listopadowego* (Kraków, 1892)

Gardner, M., 'The Great Emigration and Polish Romanticism', *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 324-335Gleason, J.H., *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain* (Oxford, 1950)

Goddeeris, I., 'The First Years of Belgian Alien Policy: Decentralization Measures and Government Relief for Polish Refugees in the 1830s', *The Polish Review*, 45 (2000), pp. 65–96

Golebiowska, Z., 'Jane Porter - angielska admiratorka Tadeusza Kościuszki', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 56 (2001), pp. 7–15

———, 'Podróż Izabeli i Adama Jerzego Czartoryskich do Wielkiej Brytanii (1789-1791)', *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 38-39 (1983), pp. 129–46

———, *W kręgu Czartoryskich: Wpływy angielskie w Puławach na przełomie XVII I XIX Wieku* (Lublin, 2000)

Gracz-Chmura, E., *Literatura romantyczna w Krakowie (1827-1863)* (Kraków, 2013)

Grochulska, B., *Małe państwo wielkich nadziei* (Warszawa, 1987)

Grunwald, C, *Trois Siècles de Diplomatie Russe* (Paris, 1945)

Grzebieniowski, T., 'Anglia wobec sprawy polskiej', *Przegląd Współczesny*, (1938)

———, 'Ćwierćwiecze sprawy polskiej w Anglji', *Droga*, (1931), pp. 707–22, 818–32

———, *Polska Misja Lorda Durhama, 1832, 1835-37* (Warszawa, 1933)

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, A., 'Sensacja – informacja – komentarz. Londyńska prasa informacyjna o polskich „rewolucjach" 1791 r.', *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 66 (2009), pp. 91-111

Guymer, L., 'The Wedding Planners: Lord Aberdeen, Henry Bulwer, and the Spanish Marriages, 1841-1846', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 21 (2010), pp. 549–73

Habermas, J., *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* (London, 1989)

Hagen, W. W., 'National Solidarity and Organic Work in Prussian Poland, 1815-1914', *The Journal of Modern History*, 44 (1972), pp. 38–64

Hahn, H. H., *Dyplomacja bez listów uwierzytelniających: polityka zagraniczna Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego 1830-1840*, (n.p., 1987)

Halecki, O., ‘Anglo-Polish Relations in the Past’, *Slavonic and East European Review*, 12 (1934), pp. 659–69

Hammen, O. J., ‘Free Europe Versus Russia, 1830-1854’, *American Slavic and East European Review*, 11 (1952), pp. 27–41

Handelsman, M., *Adam Czartoryski*, 3 vols. (Warszawa, 1948)

———, *Anglia-Polska, 1814-1864* (Warszawa, 1917)

———, ‘Czasy Porozbiorowe 1795-1918’, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 51 (1937), pp. 303–26

———, ‘The Duchy of Warsaw’, *The Cambridge History of Poland*, II, pp. 236-256.

———, ‘The Polish Kingdom’, in *Cambridge History of Poland* (Cambridge, 1941), II

Hobsbawm, E., *The Age of Revolution. Europe from 1789 to 1848* (London, 1962)

Homola-Skąpska, I., ‘“The Polish Exile”. Polskie czasopismo anglojęzyczne i jego redaktorzy’, *Rocznik Historii Prasy Polskiej*, 23 (2009), pp. 7-22

Howarth, T. E. B., *Citizen-King. The Life of Louis-Philippe King of the French* (London, 1961)

Jagodziński, *Anglia wobec sprawy polskiej w okresie Wiosny Ludów* (Warszawa, 1997)

Jakóbczyk, W., *Przetrwać nad Wartą, 1815-1914* (Warszawa, 1989)

Janowski, M., ‘Tematyka i konteksty brytyjskich zainteresowań Polską w latach 1831-1841’, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, (1989), pp. 111–30

Jasiakiewicz, W., ‘The British Press and the November Uprising 1830-1831’, *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici, English Studies*, 2, 1991, pp. 51-79

———, *Brytyjska opinia publiczna wobec powstania listopadowego w okresie 1830-1834* (Toruń, 1997)

Jelavich, B., *A Century of Russian Foreign Policy 1814-1914* (Philadelphia-New York, 1964)

Jenkins, T. A., *Sir Robert Peel* (Basingstoke, 1999)

Jupp, P., ‘The foreign policy of Wellington’s government’, in C. M. Woolgar (ed.), *Wellington Studies*, 3 (Southampton, 1999), pp. 152-183.

Jurek, L., *Polish Risorgimento. Visions of the Modern Polish Nation and Their Italian Foundations* (Frankfurt am Main, 2012)

Kalembka, S., ‘Emigranci polscy - ofiary represji politycznych we Francji II Republiki i II Cesarstwa’, in *Powstaniec polski w Prusach Wschodnich i na emigracji: z dziejów wychodźstwa polskiego i myśli politycznej po 1831 roku* (Olsztyn, 1995), pp. 211–22

———, *Wielka Emigracja 1831-1863* (Toruń, 2003)

———, ed., *Wielka Emigracja i sprawa polska a Europa (1832-1864)* (Toruń, 1980)

———, *Wielka Emigracja. Polskie wychodźstwo politycznie w latach 1831-1862* (Warszawa, 1971)

Kamiński, K., ‘Polacy w Belgii w latach 1832-1863’, *Przegląd Historyczny*, 21.6 (1977)

Kasznik, A. H., *Między Francją a Algierią. Z dziejów emigracji polskiej, 1832-1856*, (Warszawa, 1977)

Kieniewicz, S., ‘The Free State of Cracow, 1815-1846’, *Slavonic and East European Review*, 26 (1947), pp. 69–89

Kieniewicz, S., and H. Wereszycki, ‘Poland Under Foreign Rule 1795-1918’, in *History of Poland*, ed. by S. Kieniewicz (Warszawa, 1979), pp. 335–540

Knapp, J. M., *Behind the Diplomatic Curtain. Adolphe de Bourqueney and French Foreign Policy, 1816-1869* (Arkon, 2001)

Kramer, L. S., ‘The Rights of Man: Lafayette and the Polish National Revolution 1830-1834’, *French Social Studies*, 14 (1986), pp. 521-546

Kraushar, A., *Klub Patryotyczny warszawski w czasach powstania listopadowego (1830-1831)* (Lwów, 1909)

Kukiel, M., *Czartoryski and European Unity 1770-1861* (Princeton, 1955)

Leslie, R. F., *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830* (London, 1956)

———, ‘Politics and Economics in Congress Poland, 1815-1864’, *Past and Present*, 1955, pp. 43–63

———, *The Polish Question. Poland’s Place in Modern History*, Historical Association General Series, 57 (London, 1964)

Lewak, A., ‘Czasy Wielkiej Emigracji’, in *Polska, jej dzieje i kultura od czasów najdawniejszych aż do chwili obecnej*, III (Warszawa, 1930), pp. 193–233

Lewitter, L., ‘The Polish Cause as Seen in Great Britain, 1830-1863’, *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, 28 (1995), pp. 35-61

Limanowski, B., *Historja ruchu rewolucyjnego w Polsce w 1846 r.* (Kraków, 1913)

———, *Stuletnia walka narodu polskiego o wolność* (Lwów, 1894)

Lincoln, W. B., *Mikołaj I*, trans. by H. Krzeczkowski (Warszawa, 1988)

Lipoński, W., *Polska a Brytania 1801-1831* (Poznań, 1978)

———, 'The Influence of Britain on Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski's Education and Political Activity', *Polish-Anglosaxon Studies*, 1, 1989, pp. 33-67.

Łepkowski, T., *Powstanie listopadowe* (Warszawa, 1987)

Łopaciński, W., *Powstanie listopadowe* (Warszawa, 1921)

Mandler, P., *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform. Whigs and Liberals, 1830-1852* (Oxford, 1990)

Marchlewicz, K., 'Brytyjskie środowiska polonofilskie w dobie wczesnowiktoriańskiej', *Mazowieckie Studia Humanistyczne*, 2 (2002), pp. 89–102

———, 'Continuities and Innovations: Polish Emigration after 1849', in *Exiles from European Revolutions. Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (London, 2003), pp. 103–20

———, *Dystans, współczucie i „znikomy interes". Uwarunkowania brytyjskiej polityki wobec Polski w latach 1815-1914* (Poznań, 2016).

———, 'Nadzór administracyjny i policyjny nad polskimi emigrantami politycznymi w Wielkiej Brytanii w latach 1831-1863', *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 61 (2004), pp. 61–77

———, *Polonofil doskonały. Propolska działalność charytatywna i polityczna Dudleya Stuarta* (Poznań, 2001)

———, 'Propolski lobbing w Izbach Gmin i Lordów w latach trzydziestych i czterdziestych XIX wieku', *Przegląd Historyczny*, 145.1 (2005), 61–76

———, *Wielka Emigracja na Wyspach Brytyjskich 1830-1863* (Poznań, 2008)

Marlow, J., *The Peterloo Massacre* (London, 1969)

McCord, N., and B. Purdue, *British History, 1815-1914* (Oxford, 2007)

McLean, T., *The Other East and Nineteenth-Century British Literature. Imagining Poland and the Russian Empire* (Basingstoke, 2012)

Mikos, S., *Gromady Ludu Polskiego w Anglii 1835-1846* (Gdańsk, 1962)

———, ‘Warunki bytowe emigracji polskiej w Anglii po powstaniu listopadowym’, *Gdańskie Zeszyty Humanistyczne. Historia* 8 (1965), pp. 79-98

Morawski, K., *Polacy i sprawa polska w dziejach Italii w latach 1830-1866* (Warszawa, 1937)

Mowat, R. B., ‘The Near East and France, 1829-1847’, in *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, 1923)

Noiriel, G., *Refugies et sans-Papiers* (Paris, 2012)

Nowak, A., *Miedzy carem a rewolucja* (Warszawa, 1994)

———, ‘The Conception of Panslavism in the Political Thought of the Great Emigration’, *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 73 (1996), pp. 29–54

Omond, G. W. T., ‘Belgium, 1830-1839’, in *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, 1923), II

Pinkney, D. H., *The French Revolution of 1830* (New Jersey, 1972)

Pomorski, J., ‘Geneza, program i struktura organizacyjna Towarzystwa Literackiego Przyjaciół Polski’, *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, (1978), pp. 157–82

Porter, B., *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge, 1979)

Prażmowska, A. J., *A History of Poland* (Basingstoke, 2004)

Rapport, M., *1848. Year of Revolutions* (London, 2009)

Reddaway, W. F., ed., *The Cambridge History of Poland*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1951)

Redding, C., *Literary Reminiscences and Memoirs of Thomas Campbell*, 2 vols. (London, 1860)

Rezler, M., *Wielkopolanie pod bronią 1768-1921* (Poznań, 2011)

———, *Nie tylko orężem. Bohaterowie wielkopolskiej drogi do niepodległości* (Poznań, 2013)

Ridley, J., *Lord Palmerston* (London, n.d.)

Rzadkowska, H., *Działalność Centralizacji Londyńskiej Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego 1850-62* (Wrocław, 1971)

Schroeder, P. W., *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848* (Oxford, 1994)

Shattock, J., *Politics and Reviewers: The Edinburgh and the Quarterly in the Early Victorian Age* (London, 1989)

Skowronek, J., *Od Kongresu Wiedeńskiego do nocy listopadowej* (Warszawa, 1987)

———, *Od konspiracji do kapitulacji* (Warszawa, 1989)

———, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833-1856)* (Warszawa, 1976)

———, 'Dyplomacja czy polityka? Spory o charakter działalności Hotelu Lambert', Bułhak, H. *et al.* (eds.), *Z dziejów polityki i dyplomacji polskiej. Studia poświęcone pamięci Edwarda hr. Raczyńskiego Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej na wychodźstwie* (Warszawa, 1994), pp. 122-135

Spiller, R. E., 'Fennimore Cooper and Lafayette: Friends of Polish Freedom, 1830-1832', *American Literature*, 7 (1935), pp. 56–75

Stasik, F., *Polska emigracja polityczna w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki, 1831-1864* (Warszawa, 1973)

Stummer, W., 'Literackie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polski w Londynie w latach 1832-1864' (unpublished PhD Thesis, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Biblioteka Instytutu Historycznego, 1977)

———, 'Rola Literackiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Polski w kształtowaniu brytyjskiej opinii publicznej w sprawie polskiej (1832-1856)' in Kalembka (ed.), *Wielka Emigracja i sprawa polska a Europa (1832-1864)* (Toruń, 1980), pp. 43-64

Szpotański, S., 'Emigracja polska w Anglii (1831-1848)', *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 274 (1909), pp. 259–87, 541–62

Temkinowa, H., *Gromady Ludu Polskiego (zarys ideologii)* (Warszawa, 1962)

———, *Lud Polski. Wybór dokumentów* (Warszawa, 1957)

Teslar, J. A., 'Poland in the Poetry and Life of Thomas Campbell', Antemurale, XII (Rome-London, 1968), pp. 267–310

Thackeray, F. W., 'N. N. Novosil'tsow, the Polish Years', *The Polish Review*, 28 (1983), pp. 32–46

Tokarz, W., *Sprzysiezenie Wysockiego i noc listopadowa* (Warszawa, 1980)

———, *Wojna polsko-rosyjska, 1830 i 1831* (Warszawa, 1930)

Tyrowicz, M., *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie. 1832-1863. Przewodnik Bibliograficzny* (Warszawa, 1964)

Weisser, H., *British Working-Class Movements and Europe, 1815-48* (Manchester, 1975)

———, ‘Chartist Internationalism, 1845-1848’, *The Historical Journal*, 14 (1971), pp. 49–66

———, ‘Polonophilism and the British Working Class 1830-1845’, *The Polish Review*, 12 (1967), pp. 78-96 .

———, ‘The British Working Class and the Cracow Uprising of 1846’, *The Polish Review*, 13 (1968), pp. 3–19

Wicklum, M. E., ‘Britain and the Second and Third Partitions of Poland’ (unpublished PhD Thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, 1999)

Willaume, M., ‘Działalność polityczna Hotelu Lambert w Mołdawii i Wołoszczyźnie w latach 1840-1846’, *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Sklodowska*, 33/34 (1978), pp. 51–75

Wood, A., *Nineteenth Century Britain, 1815-1814* (Harlow, 1982)

Wood, J. R., ‘The Times (1785-)’, Brake, L., Demoor, M., (eds.), *Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland* (Gent, 2009), pp. 627-628.

Zajewski, W., *Polska, Belgia, Europa. Wiek XIX* (Olsztyn, 2007)

———, *Powstanie listopadowe 1830-1831* (Warszawa, 1998)

Zamoyski, A., *Poland: A History* (London, 2009)

Zawadzki, W. H., *A Man of Honour. Adam Czartoryski as a Statesman of Russia and Poland 1795-1831* (Oxford, 1993)

Zdrada, J., *Historia Polski 1795-1914* (Warszawa, 2005)

———, *Wielka Emigracja po powstaniu listopadowym* (Warszawa, 1987)

———, *Zmierzch Czartoryskich* (Warszawa, 1969)

Zieliński, L., *Emigracja polska w Anglii w latach 1831-1846* (Gdańsk, 1964)

———, ‘Polonia or Monthly Reports of Polish Affairs’, *Rocznik Historii Czasopiśmiennictwa Polskiego*, 4 (1965), pp. 43–58

Żalinski, H., *Kraj. Emigracja. Niepodległość* (Kraków, 2006)

———, *Stracone szanse: Wielka Emigracja o powstaniu listopadowym* (Warszawa, 1982)

Zgórniak, M., *Za naszą i waszą wolność* (Warszawa, 1987)

Żmigrodzki, J., *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie (1832-1862)*, 2 vols. (London, 1983)

Żurawski vel Grajewski, R. P, 'Polskie emigracje 1831-1918', in *Historie Polski w XIX wieku* (Warszawa, 2015), IV, pp. 115-276.

———, *Działalność Księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego w Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1832)* (Warszawa, 1999)

———, 'Hotel Lambert wobec wizyty Cara Mikołaja I w Londynie w 1844 r.', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica*, 70 (2001), pp. 133–47

———, 'Sprawy polskie w korespondencji dyplomatycznej lorda Henry'ego Palmerstona z lordem Williamem Heytesburym w okresie powstania listopadowego', H. Chudzio and J. Pezda (eds.), *Wokół powstania listopadowego. Wybór studiów* (Kraków, 2014), pp. 187-206

———, *Wielka Brytania w 'dyplomacji' Księcia Adama Czartoryskiego wobec kryzysu wschodniego (1832-1841)* (Warszawa, 1999)

———, 'Ucieczka Polaków z rosyjskiego okrętu „Irtysz" w brytyjskim porcie Portsmouth w roku 1844', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica* 69 (2000), pp. 59-71

———, 'Działalność polityczna księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii w sprawie belgijskiej (1838-1839)', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica* 66 (1999), pp. 5-20

———, 'Sprawa belgijska w działalności politycznej księcia Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego wobec Wielkiej Brytanii (1831-1833)', *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica* 65 (1999), pp. 5-30

———, 'Kupcy i arystokraci. Szkic do wizerunku Anglików w prasie obozu monarchiczno-liberalnego Wielkiej Emigracji (1833-1848), in P. Matusik, K. Marchlewicz, *Swoi i obcy. Studia z dziejów myśli Wielkiej Emigracji* (Poznań, 2004), pp. 111-121.

Online resources

Hansard [http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/]

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition [http://www.oxforddnb.com/]