

GREAT BRITAIN AND KING COTTON:
THE LANCASHIRE COTTON FAMINE AND THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

RYAN D KELL

The Colorado College

Department of History-Political Science

Copyright ©

by

Ryan D. Kell

2015

GREAT BRITAIN AND KING COTTON:
THE LANCASHIRE COTTON FAMINE AND THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

by

RYAN D KELL

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Undergraduate School of The Colorado College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
HISTORY-POLITICAL SCIENCE

Department of History-Political Science

THE COLORADO COLLEGE

2015

Acknowledgments

I cannot express enough thanks to my thesis advisor, Lindsey Flewelling, Visiting Professor of History at Colorado College. Lindsey was always willing to help me with this project, whether it was with research or editing, while working a busy schedule of her own. I am extremely grateful for all the assistance she provided, and I could not have completed this task without her.

I would also like to thank David Hendrickson, Professor of Political Science at Colorado College. David helped me to polish my final product, making sure that I was accurate and as persuasive with my argument as possible.

My completion of this project would not have been possible without the help of my two academic advisors, Bryant “Tip” Ragan and Peter Blasenheim, both Professors of History at Colorado College. Tip, as my primary academic advisor, helped me navigate my four years of college and I would not have been in position to graduate without him. Peter, my major advisor, has helped me to complete both my thesis and all my major requirements, always willing to give his honest opinion.

While working on my thesis took a lot of time and energy, I also had to focus on what to do after college at the same time. Mike Edmonds, the Dean of Students at Colorado College, was instrumental in helping me see what options I had moving forward. I have Mike to thank for any future success I am able to achieve.

Last but certainly never least, I want to thank my parents, Hale and Andrea Kell. They have given me more than I could have ever asked for, and more than anyone on this list are responsible for the success I have found in my life. I love you both so much, and am eternally grateful.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Anglo-American Relations Before the Civil War	5
Anglo-American Military and Political Standing	7
King Cotton	9
Southern Diplomacy Before the Civil War	12
Chapter 2: Great Britain and the Start of the American Civil War	17
Outline of Confederate Foreign Policy	18
Confederate Support in Great Britain	25
Union Support in Great Britain	28
Chapter 3: The Union Blockade and Anglo-American Relations	33
Immediate Effects of the Blockade	33
The Blockade and British Diplomacy	38
The Trent Affair	43
Chapter 4: The Lancashire Cotton Famine	48
The Beginning of the Cotton Famine	48
The Confederate Cotton Embargo	52
Surviving the Cotton Famine	53
The End of the Confederate Cotton Embargo	56
Chapter 5: Anglo-American Relations During the Cotton Famine	58
King Cotton and the Lancashire Cotton Famine	58
Running the Blockade	61
The Confederate Struggle for Recognition	64

The Indefensible Issue of Slavery	67
Emancipation and the Lancashire Factory Workers	69
Gettysburg, Vicksburg, and British Neutrality	73
Chapter 6: Great Britain and the End of the American Civil War	76
Lancashire in 1865	77
Final Plea of the Confederacy	79
Anglo-American Relations After Appomattox	81
The End of the Lancashire Cotton Famine	83
Conclusion	87
Bibliography	90

Introduction

The American Civil War was one of the most significant historical events of the 19th century, which is seen in how it not only affected the North and South of the United States, but also foreign nations diplomatically involved throughout the conflict. This was especially true with regards to the relationship between Great Britain and the Southern States. The relationship between Britain and the United States had been tumultuous since the independence of the latter in 1776, and by 1860 the power gap between the two was closing. The secession of the Confederate States of America in 1861 therefore initiated important political considerations for Great Britain, not the least of which was the government being faced with which regime, if either, to support.

At the heart of this discussion was cotton production in the South, and in particular its exportation to Great Britain. Since 1840, the American South had become the primary source of cotton for the textile factories in northern England, with as much as 80 percent of cotton being imported from the region.¹ The county of Lancashire was the leading textile producer in the world during the mid-19th century. The products that came out of Lancashire were central to Great Britain's economy as a whole, generating a significant portion of their domestic and international trade.² On the other side of the Atlantic, the American South relied heavily on Britain as the main destination for its cotton exports. While southern

¹ Philip Sheldon Foner, *British Labor and the American Civil War* (New York: Homes

² *Ibid*, 5.

cotton was shipped around the world, Great Britain was the recipient of more than half of that international trade.³

The incredible impact that southern cotton had on both economies led to political relations between Great Britain and the American South being referred to as King Cotton diplomacy. When the Confederacy declared itself independent of the United States of America, it assumed that Great Britain would ally itself over the issue of the cotton trade. At the beginning of the Civil War, the Union decided to blockade the Confederate ports so as to limit the economic impact of cotton on the war. Recognizing its inability to push back the blockade, the Confederate government imposed a cotton embargo on its own product being shipped to Europe in order to create a textile depression, forcing the British to join the war for economic reasons. With this plan, the South was looking to Great Britain primarily for financial support, but also hoped for a significant amount of military aid as well.⁴ While still producing the same quantity of cotton, the South refused to send any across the Atlantic from September 1861 to January 1862.⁵ This was a test of the power of cotton diplomacy, which the Confederacy believed would be strong enough to sway Europe's textile superpowers to their aid.

Immediately after its implementation, the cotton embargo was successful in creating an economic panic in Great Britain. The area most affected was Lancashire. The Lancashire Cotton Famine was mostly felt in the cities of Manchester and

³ Frank Lawrence Owsley and Harriet Chappell Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), 7.

⁴ Amanda Foreman, *A World on Fire: Britain's Crucial Role in the American Civil War* (New York: Random House, 2011), 86-88.

⁵ Owsley and Owsley, 42.

Liverpool where the majority of the textile factories were located. By 1862 tens of thousands of workers had lost their jobs, with more than one hundred thousand put on part time work, often at reduced pay.⁶ While this was the desired outcome of the Confederate cotton embargo, it did not draw the British into the war. Despite their economic troubles, the Lancashire working class continued to voice their support of President Abraham Lincoln and the Union, even with the urging of factory owners and some members of Parliament to do the opposite.⁷ Although the economic motivations associated with a Confederate alliance in the Civil War were significant, the threat of political instability from the Lancashire factory workers caused Great Britain to remain neutral. While the South would continue to appeal to Britain for support following the end of the cotton embargo, they were never able to overtake the influence of the textile unions in Manchester and Liverpool.

Although the Confederacy chose to end the cotton embargo in January 1862 following its apparent failure, cotton did not return to Great Britain. This was due to the continued blockade that the Union set up around southern ports, which had the affect of prolonging the Cotton Famine in Lancashire. Despite this, the workers did not waver in their support of the North. The United States government had not yet explicitly stated emancipation as a goal of the war by 1862, yet many in Britain saw the Confederate stance as pro-slavery.⁸ As the North turned its attention toward emancipation in the later years of the war, support for the Union increased throughout Britain, especially in Lancashire.

⁶ Foreman, 199.

⁷ Foner, 20-21.

⁸ James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 494-496.

Despite the economic troubles in Great Britain related to the textile shortage, that the British did not formally ally themselves with the Confederate States centered on the failure of King Cotton diplomacy. The Lancashire Cotton Famine was the primary issue in Anglo-Confederate relations, with the diplomatic objectives of both governments centered on the cotton being sent from the South to northern England. The Confederate States were unable to convince the British government to formally become an ally, due to the political influence of the pro-Union Manchester factory workers, who achieved greater leverage over Parliament than the Confederate diplomats and King Cotton.

Chapter 1: Anglo-American Relations Before the Civil War

While the relationship between the United States and Great Britain was improving in the years leading up to the American Civil War, the two nations were by no means friendly. Hostilities in the American Revolution and the War of 1812 had given the British a degree of respect for the United States, but had not erased the memory of the colonies that used to be theirs. The Treaty of Ghent in 1814 officially ended hostilities between the nations, yet it failed to create any formal political or military alliance between the two.⁹ The predominant feeling toward the United States in the British Parliament was that there was no conceivable way that the nation could be reacquired as a colony, yet Britain was the more powerful of the two nations, and America must recognize its place. The change in British attitude towards the United States was key in the years leading up to the Civil War, which some in Great Britain saw as proof of their superiority to their Atlantic neighbors.¹⁰

When comparing the two nations in the 19th century, it is important to note that the British were an economic superpower, yet their lead over the United States in both trade and economic strength was decreasing. Great Britain was a world trade leader in the mid 1800s, and income through textile and other international trade was the center of Britain's economy.¹¹ This allowed the British to finance technological advances in their factories in addition to increasing their naval strength, both of which were instrumental in the persistence of the nation's international power. The United States did not have the same production

⁹ Foreman, 20.

¹⁰ Evan John, *Atlantic Impact: 1861* (New York: Putnam, 1952), 4.

¹¹ Foner, 1-3.

capabilities as Great Britain, yet their growing Navy allowed foreign trade to prosper. Trade centered around the exportation of manufactured goods from the Northern states and cotton from the Southern plantations, both of which were growing at incredibly fast rates.¹² While the United States was still economically behind Great Britain in 1860, the disparity between the two was decreasing.

While economics and trade were key to understanding Anglo-American relations before 1860, the importance of politics and military strength cannot be ignored. Democracy was considered more of an American ideal at the turn of the 18th to 19th centuries, yet Great Britain had continued to grant power to its Parliament, adopting more of a democratic approach while retaining the traditional monarchy. Although the monarch still had power in the British system, this was becoming increasingly symbolic during the 19th century.¹³ Political power was being gradually transferred to Parliament, and this gave some members of the British Parliament an interest in maintaining a democratic government in the Americas, in order to prove the ability of democracy to survive conflict. There were divisive issues between the two countries in the early 1800s, however, with the main two being territorial expansion and slavery in the United States.

As a fledgling nation without much foreign influence, the United States was extremely focused on its own borders. As some of the bordering territories were still property of Great Britain, Parliament and Congress were constantly at odds about where the United States could expand to, and what was harmful to British

¹² Foreman, 21-22.

¹³ Ibid, 41.

interests.¹⁴ Territorial expansion brought with it the issue of slavery, an institution that Great Britain had abolished in 1833. Their newfound focus on human rights meant that Britain was opposed to any expansion of slavery. This issue dominated Anglo-American relations in the 1840s and 1850s.¹⁵ Political diplomacy between the two nations continued to revolve around territorial expansion and slavery. In the years leading up to the Civil War, the relationship between the United States and Great Britain was centered on America's growing international influence. While the British opposed the increasing strength of the United States, the importance of the cotton trade between the Southern States and Britain made them wary of overly damaging relations between the two.

Anglo-American Military and Political Standing

Militarily, the United States and Great Britain had developed a sense of mutual respect. While the British had been unable to win a war on American soil, their Navy was still widely recognized as the most powerful in the world. The naval strength of the United States was growing exponentially in the 1850s, however, attracting British notice. In particular, the United States had shown their aspirations against European powers through their attempted annexation of Cuba in the 1850s. The Ostend Manifesto, written in 1854, stated the American desire to obtain Cuba from Spain, going as far as threatening war if the Spanish refused.¹⁶

¹⁴ George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 154-158.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 186.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 218.

After the French, Britain's greatest rival in the Atlantic was the United States Navy, which was not only increasing in size but in the range it patrolled.¹⁷ The United States was adopting an increasingly expansionist policy, with a focus to not only expand its own borders, but also grow its influence in the Western Hemisphere. This, along with the growth of the American Army, was troubling for Great Britain. They were not looking to become involved in another war in North America, but if that were to happen, Parliament was aware that the British would struggle, especially if the United States looked towards Canada.¹⁸ This drove the British military to adopt a cautious strategy towards the United States in the 1850s, focusing on containing their growth through political and military pressure. Great Britain accounted for a large portion of the United States' trade, and their naval strength could disrupt American exports around the world.

Although the political relationship between the United States and Great Britain was increasingly problematic in the mid 19th century, their economic ties remained extremely close. Their trade was centered on the cotton produced by the South, which fed the textile factories of Lancashire. Not all trade between the two nations was directly related to cotton sent from the South to Lancashire, however. Although the Northern States had textile factories of their own, their production quality was not equal to that of Britain, and this led to regular textile exports from Great Britain to the North. The United States could not produce the quantity or quality of textiles as those in Manchester and Liverpool. Therefore textile trade with

¹⁷ Howard J. Fuller, *Clad in Iron: The American Civil War and the Challenge of British Naval Power* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Security International, 2008), XV.

¹⁸ Herring, 224-225.

the North was booming, especially in larger cities like New York. In return, Britain received corn and wheat from the United States, which was produced in abundance on the American frontier. Trade between the United States and Great Britain before the Civil War can be summed up as manufactured goods being sent from Britain in return for raw materials, mainly cotton.¹⁹ Once the war began, it became clear that the North and Britain were not reliant on each other economically, but this was certainly not the case between Great Britain and the South.

King Cotton

Cotton was everything to the American South in the mid 1800s. It was the central pillar of the economy, political power was directly linked to cotton, and the social class structure was based around the plantation culture. This is how the term 'King Cotton' became popular, after it was introduced in a book of the same name by David Christy, as it showed the command that cotton culture had over the entire region.²⁰ When southerners spoke about politics or economics, the common theme was simply that "Cotton is King". By the time the Civil War broke out in 1861, the foreign policy of the Confederacy was even referred to as King Cotton diplomacy by Confederate President Jefferson Davis.²¹ It is therefore imperative to understand the role of cotton in the South before secession to understand diplomacy in the Confederate States.

By 1850, the South was the world's largest producer of cotton, contributing two-thirds of the world's raw supply, most of which was sent to the textile factories

¹⁹ Foreman, 19-35.

²⁰ Owsley and Owsley, 15.

²¹ Ibid, 19

of Western Europe.²² The Southern States did not possess many factories of their own, with only about 10% of the nation's manufacturing capabilities located in the South.²³ Through poor infrastructure and lack of necessary materials, the South did not have the means to build more factories, making the cotton trade all the more important. Between 1841 and 1858 shipments of southern cotton to Great Britain more than doubled, with the same trend occurring on a smaller scale with shipments to the northern United States.²⁴ While Great Britain was the primary destination of cotton exports, the South also shipped large quantities to France, Germany, and Russia. All together, cotton farming made up an incredible 84 percent of the South's economic endeavors.²⁵ As the North diversified its economy, the South remained committed to King Cotton and its plantations up until the Civil War.

The importance of cotton in the South was not simply economic, but also political. The majority of southern politicians were plantation owners themselves, who found wealth and a sense of political purpose through cotton. Benjamin Hill, a lawyer and state-level politician in Georgia, outlined the importance of cotton in politics during a 1860 speech in Milledgeville, Georgia. He was speaking at a rally devoted to his reelection as a state representative, yet the issue of secession was central to southern politics at the time, and thus became a central theme during his campaign. About the divisive nature of cotton politics, especially with relation to slavery, Hill said:

²² Benjamin T. Arrington, "Industry and Economy During the Civil War" (National Parks Service, 2015).

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Owsley and Owsley, 3.

²⁵ Arrington.

Thus it has never approached, but receded from a political solution, and increasing in excitement as it has progressed; all statesmanship, North and South, is dwarfed to a mere wrangling about African Slavery.... The Southern States will continue to raise cotton, but the hoping subject of tyranny in earth may not continue to point to the beautiful success of the experiment of self-government in America.²⁶

Hill's speech demonstrated the importance of cotton to southerners, putting the economic good that came from cotton exports above the issue of slavery. Many politicians like Hill saw the issue of slavery as secondary to the struggle of the South against the tyranny of the United States government, which they believed sought to eliminate their political and social power that came from the cotton trade. Southern politicians, whether at the state or federal level, recognized that their influence came from the plantation economy. That was how they managed to get elected, and they were listened to because of the sway that cotton exportation had on national finances. Without cotton, and as an extension the numerous slaves that were required to work the fields, the political influence of South was in threat of being overtaken by the rapidly growing, industrializing North. King Cotton diplomacy, both foreign and domestic, had become the dominant political focus of the South.

Socially and culturally, cotton was still king in the South. Class structure was directly related to plantation hierarchy, and the institution of slavery expanded in large part due to the cotton economy. Slaves were necessary to maintain cotton plantations, as this form of agriculture is extremely labor intensive. On March 4, 1850 former Vice President and Senator from South Carolina John C. Calhoun delivered a speech to the United States Senate on the issue of slavery, focusing not

²⁶ Brooks D. Simpson, Stephen W. Sears, and Aaron Sheehan-Dean, *The Civil War: The First Year Told by Those Who Lived It* (New York, NY: Library of America, 2011), 23.

on its economic or political motivations, but the social stability that it afforded the South. Calhoun believed that the abolition of slavery would dissolve the social structure of the South, meaning that,

The relation is one which cannot be destroyed without subjecting the two races to the greatest calamity, and the section to poverty, desolation, and wretchedness; and accordingly they feel bound, by every consideration of interest and safety, to defend it.²⁷

This became a rallying cry for Southern statesmen, who maintained that slavery was a social necessity even more than an economic one. Although the Northern platform did not expressly call for abolition, the fear among Southern voters was that this was the direction policy might turn. The South edged closer to secession to preserve the institution that cotton had allowed to become a part of Southern identity.

Southern Diplomacy Before the Civil War

While there was little formal diplomacy between the Southern States and foreign powers before the secession of the Confederacy, there were relationships between European nations and the South that were independent of the North. Most influential of these European countries was Great Britain, who was the world's leading textile producer in the mid 19th century. On political issues Great Britain negotiated directly with the United States government, yet they had extensive trade networks with the South organized around the port cities shipping cotton. Hill described the British relationship with the South before the Civil War in a public speech given in 1860:

²⁷ Jon Roper, *The American Civil War: Literary Sources and Documents*, Vol. 1 (Mountfield, East Sussex: Helm Information, 2000), 303.

While the storm which England raised in America has been going on, England has been trying to raise cotton in India. She has failed. Her factories are at home, but her cotton can't come from India. She must have cotton. Four million of her people can't live without it. The English throne can't stand without it. It must come from the Southern States. It can't be raised in the South without slave labor. And England has become the defender of slavery in the South.²⁸

Britain by no means supported the institution of slavery in the United States, yet Hill was correct in his assumption that cotton was key to British society. While there were other sources of cotton around the world, such as India, the quality and quantity were not the same standard as cotton from the American South. That the British economy could not stand without it would become the basis of Confederate foreign policy, King Cotton diplomacy. Utilizing the British opposition to the expansion of the United States in North America as well, the South believed that it would have little trouble obtaining the support of Britain in any potential conflicts with the North.

While the relationship between the South and Great Britain was the most prevalent, there were other European countries that had well-established economic ties with the plantation region of the United States. Most notable of these were France, the Germanic States, and Russia. The common theme among these nations was that they were all growing industrially, with a focus on textile production. In 1860, France received the same amount of cotton as the Northern United States at just over 600,000 bales, which matched the combined totals shipped to the German principalities and Russia. While not equal to the two and a half million exported to Great Britain, this amount of cotton was a substantial portion of each country's

²⁸ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 23.

economy.²⁹ The South, however, did not look at the Germanic States and Russia as potential allies due to the inability of their political regimes to offer much foreign aid at that time. This was not considered an issue with France.

Like Britain, the South believed that France could be persuaded towards an alliance through a dependency on cotton. Furthermore, Emperor Napoleon III had a strong dislike of the United States, whose expansionist policies he saw as a threat to French colonies in the Americas.³⁰ Henry Adams, son of the American Minister to Great Britain, discussed the French Monarch's stance in a letter. He wrote, "Any one who knows Napoleon III knows that he means to stick with England."³¹ This meant that the Emperor recognized the similar situation between France and Great Britain, and therefore had decided to follow their action with respect to intervention in the Civil War. Economic and political issues, in particular the cotton trade and a stance against American expansion, had given Napoleon a distrust of the United States government. He was also wary of the growing naval power of the United States, and did not want to interfere without aid from the British Navy. The cotton trade between the American South and Europe was virtually controlled by Great Britain, and this was another reason why Napoleon had decided to follow the lead of the British.

With the knowledge of Napoleon III's stance on the Civil War in hand, Southern politicians hoped that at the very least France would be willing to lend financial support, with military aid considered a possibility. This all depended on

²⁹ Owsley and Owsley, 10.

³⁰ Herring, 229.

³¹ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 411.

whether Great Britain could be convinced to lend support to the South, however, so any attempts at gaining an alliance with France were dwarfed by diplomatic efforts with Britain. Despite the statements of Napoleon III, there was little push for an alliance with the Confederacy coming from others in France. This is summarized in an article from the French journal *Opinion Nationale*, which published:

France has but one enemy in the world – that enemy is England. Let us figure to ourselves France marching gaily to the aid of England in destruction of the only marine in the world that can act as a counterpoise against the naval superiority of England. This would be a monstrous absurdity, treason against traditional French policy.³²

A journal of popular opinion in the early 1860s, the *Opinion Nationale* was known for reporting the political feelings of the French people. Any alliance with the traditional enemy of Great Britain would not be supported by the populace, which turned out to be a major roadblock to Napoleon's ambitions with regards to the Civil War.

With France appearing unlikely to support the Southern States, it was with Great Britain and the dependence on cotton in Lancashire factories that the South placed their faith. Before the Civil War began, the status quo between Great Britain and the United States was full of friction, to say the least. The two nations were increasingly economically dependent on each other, with Britain requiring cotton from the Southern United States, and the United States looking to Great Britain for textiles to fill the need that the American factories could not yet produce. There were also exports of raw materials from the Northern States to Great Britain, yet

³² Owsley and Owsley, 201-202.

this was dwarfed in scope by the cotton trade. All in all, the economies of the two nations were becoming increasingly intertwined.

Despite the trade relationship between them, Britain and the United States were becoming increasingly at odds over political issues. The expansionist policy of the United States government did not sit well with Great Britain, who was concerned about the Americans encroaching on British borders in Canada and Oregon. The increased naval strength of the United States represented an important issue for Parliament, as they saw it as a challenge to British naval superiority around the world. When the American Civil War began in 1861 the relationship with Great Britain was worrisome for the United States, as another blow in diplomacy between the two nations could result in armed conflict. This presented an opportunity for the Confederate government, which sought to exploit the ill feelings between the North and Britain.

Chapter 2: Great Britain and the Start of the American Civil War

On December 20, 1860 South Carolina became the first Southern state to secede from the United States of America. The Confederate States of America was officially formed on February 4, 1861 with the secession of seven other states. By the first summer of the American Civil War, the Confederacy had attained its full strength of eleven states.³³ All eleven were plantation states, with economies dependent on King Cotton and the institution of slavery that accompanied it, yet there were differences within the Confederacy. The Lower South contained many of the first states to secede, as these were the most influenced by cotton culture and its political, economic, and social effects. The Border States, while still growers of cotton, was not nearly as dependent on plantation economy as the Lower South. Their deep-rooted beliefs in slavery, as well as regional loyalty, represented the reasons for choosing the Confederacy over the Union.

Despite a fervent self-belief in its cause, the Confederacy did not have the same ability to wage war as the Union. Northern factories were being transformed to the cause of military preparation, producing everything from uniforms to weapons and artillery.³⁴ While there were some factories in the South, they were not numerous enough to supply entire armies during the war. The poor transportation of goods throughout the Confederacy, due to the lack of a proficient

³³ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 254-255.

³⁴ Arrington.

railroad system in the South, was also a hindrance that the North did not share.³⁵ As an agriculture-based society, the Confederacy needed to look elsewhere for material and financial aid. Securing a source of military supplies and obtaining official international recognition became the initial objectives of King Cotton diplomacy.

Outline of Confederate Foreign Policy

The Confederate government recognized the importance that foreign nations would play in the outcome of the Civil War, and that Great Britain and France especially could shift the balance of power in North America depending on which side they chose. Great Britain had the most invested in the outcome of the conflict, and with its ties to Confederate cotton it became the primary focus of the South's foreign policy. The first step was to gain official recognition as a nation, something that the Union was determined to prevent. With recognition, the Union would legally be the aggressor, which would be a huge blow to not only Northern morale, but also its sense of purpose on the world stage.³⁶ At the start of the Civil War there was already a substantial base of support for the Confederacy in Great Britain, and the South's supporters in Parliament also recognized the importance of granting official recognition as quickly as possible. This would not only allow foreign alliances to be formed free of the restrictions associated with joining rebel groups, but would also give legitimacy to the Confederate nation and its belief in self-determination.

³⁵ Richard E. Beringer, Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Still Jr., *Why the South Lost the Civil War* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1986) 12-13.

³⁶ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 383.

Those who supported the Confederate States in Great Britain were by no means lacking in public influence, which they used to spread their message around the nation. In a speech that was published in *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper* in 1862, Member of Parliament and Chancellor of the Exchequer William E. Gladstone outlined the beliefs of the pro-Confederacy faction. He stated:

We may have our own opinions about slavery; we may be for or against the South; but there is no doubt that Jefferson Davis and other leaders of the South have made an army; they are making, it appears, a navy; and they have made what is more than either – they have made a nation... We may anticipate with certainty the success of the Southern States so far as regards their separation from the North.³⁷

While understanding the importance of cotton to Great Britain, Gladstone and his colleagues based their arguments on the legitimacy of the Confederate cause. They stated that Britain, as a proponent of freedom, should support a new nation that was trying to break from a regime that its people consider oppressive to their rights. The main argument from the pro-Union camp in Britain was the moral argument surrounding slavery, so Gladstone brought out a moral argument in support of the Confederacy. If the British were really proponents of freedom, then they would support a nation that was trying to break free from an oppressive government. The Union had not yet officially come out as pro-abolition, yet their behavior made it clear that slavery was not a desirable institution in the American government.³⁸ Many pro-Union advocates in Britain preached this, and hoped for an official stance of emancipation from the Union as soon as possible.

³⁷ Jon Roper, *The American Civil War: Literary Sources and Documents*, Vol. 3 (Mountfield, East Sussex: Helm Information, 2000), 141.

³⁸ Herring, 234-236.

Gladstone, one of the outspoken leaders of the pro-Confederacy faction, wrote about his interpretation of the conflict in the United States in a letter to a close friend in July 1861. He saw the economic benefits that came from the South, but was more focused on the political aspect of a free and legitimate Confederate government. Gladstone fancied himself a supporter of humanitarianism, and even though the Confederacy maintained legal slavery, he believed that the greater issue was the Confederates' oppression by the United States government. In the letter Gladstone wrote that, "this bloody and purposeless fight should cease."³⁹ The key word here was purposeless, and Gladstone continued to harp on the idea that the Union was wrong to force the South to remain in the Union if the people in that region hoped to protect their perceived rights. He believed that the Union was in the wrong for forcefully trying to maintain governance over a region that no longer wanted to be a part of their nation. Through supporting the South, Gladstone and other pro-Confederate Liberal members of Parliament saw themselves as backing democratic, self-representing governments. As the debate in Parliament over whether to support the Union, Confederacy, or neither intensified during the first year of the Civil War, Gladstone and his colleagues continued to argue that Britain would be supporting a humanitarian cause if they allied themselves with the South.

Despite the argument of Gladstone and the other pro-Southern members of Parliament focusing on legitimacy and political freedom, it was clear that cotton was still the central issue at play. Confederate President Jefferson Davis's wife Varina remembered the debates around cotton in the Southern congress in *Jefferson Davis:*

³⁹ Foreman, 282.

A Memoir by his Wife, which she wrote in the 1880s. Amid the debate of official recognition by Britain, she recounted, “The President and his advisors looked to the stringency of the English cotton market, and the suspension of manufactories to send up a ground swell from the English operatives, that would compel recognition.”⁴⁰ Her observation was representative of the Confederate viewpoint at the time, that cotton was the diplomatic key with Great Britain. The Union recognized cotton as the South’s primary bargaining chip for recognition as well, and sought to undermine their plans.

The Union’s understanding of Confederate diplomacy is shown by the correspondence between Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner, who wrote to British reformer John Bright in early 1862. Bright, a leader of the pro-Union faction in London, and Sumner discussed the potential issues that a cotton shortage in Britain would mean for Anglo-American relations. Sumner wrote, “I see no way except to go forward; nor do I see any way in which England can get cotton speedily except through our success.”⁴¹ Bright responded later that year, and disagreed with Sumner’s assessment, as he recognized the war would be costly and there was no way to avoid the negative effects in Lancashire from the decline in cotton imports from the South. Despite this, he pledged to continue support for the North, something that he was confident the Lancashire workers would do as well.⁴² Sumner and Bright remained in contact throughout the Civil War, and their conversations continue to correspond with Anglo-American diplomacy. As Sumner

⁴⁰ Owsley and Owsley, 19.

⁴¹ Stephen W. Sears, *The Civil War: The Second Year Told by Those Who Lived It* (New York: Library of America, 2012), 353.

⁴² Foreman, 731.

stated, the importance of cotton was recognized by the Union, yet it sought to persuade the British through other means. Support for the Confederacy would simply prolong the war and risked showing the world that Great Britain was still willing to support regimes that denied some of their people freedom. Just as the South knew cotton would be the most effective way of obtaining international support, the North sought to convince Great Britain that the textile trade was not worth the negative effects of allying themselves with a government built around the institution of slavery.

While still believing in the power of King Cotton, the Confederate government recognized that Britain was faced primarily with an economic issue, as opposed to political or social. In order to improve their negotiating position, the South also hoped to find political motivations to gain aid from Great Britain. The United States had gained a reputation of being extremely expansionist during the 19th century, which was worrisome to the British, as they owned a lot of territory in North America surrounding the United States. In particular, Canada was an important region of British control, and it was no secret that some United States politicians believed that it should be theirs. Henry Adams discussed the expansionist issue with his father Charles Francis Adams Sr., the American minister to Great Britain, in 1861. He wrote, "I do not think I exaggerate the danger. I believe that our Government means to have a war with England; I believe that England knows it and is preparing for it... Wait for a Canadian campaign."⁴³ There was open discussion in the United States Congress about expanding into Canada, and while

⁴³ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 411.

this had never been acted on, Parliament was well aware of its possibility. The Confederacy played to this fear, with Britain recognizing that a Union defeat in the Civil War would likely halt American expansionism into Canada and the Oregon territory.⁴⁴

The main factor holding back the success of the Confederacy's foreign policy, and a major reason that Great Britain continued to refuse official recognition of the Confederate States, was slavery. The practice had been abolished in the British Empire in 1833, and ever since then British people had seen themselves as global leaders in social justice. In *Contest for America*, published in February 1862, English radical John Stuart Mill wrote:

We, the emancipators of the slave – who have wearied every Court and Government in Europe and America with our protests and remonstrances, until we goaded them into at least ostensibly cooperating with us to prevent the enslaving of the negro.... should have helped to give a place in the community of nations to a conspiracy of slave owners, who have broken their connection with the American Federation, on the sole ground, ostentatiously proclaimed, that they thought an attempt would be made to restrain, not slavery itself, but their purpose of spreading slavery wherever migration or force could carry it.⁴⁵

Mill saw it as incredible to believe that Britain would offer help to a slave nation. He believed that any British intervention in the Civil War would undo decades of progress against the slave trade simply through an alliance with the South, a slave nation. This put even greater pressure on the British government. Whether the Confederacy was victorious or not, Great Britain would gain an irreversible reputation of supporting slavery in North America. As Mill mentioned, the key issue at play here was slavery. The British needed Confederate cotton to keep their textile

⁴⁴ Foreman, 650-651.

⁴⁵ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 106.

factories running, but in doing so they supported the institution of slavery that was used in the South to harvest the cotton. Support for the North meant a pro-abolitionist stance, at the expense of cotton imports. The views of radicals like Mill would become more popularized as the war continued and the prospect of American emancipation became more realistic.

As slavery was the divisive issue that led to the American Civil War, the South was understandably against abolishing slavery to accommodate British interests. They did, however, try to cultivate the idea that the Confederacy and Great Britain were intertwined. In addition to the large amount of cotton being shipped from the South to Britain, Southerners openly admired the British and spoke of replicating their achievements. William Howard Russell, a correspondent for *The Times* in London who was stationed in Charleston, wrote in April 1861, "Already the Carolinians regard the Northern States as an alien and detested enemy, and entertain, or profess, an immense affection for Great Britain."⁴⁶ Russell interviewed a number of Confederate politicians, and used this to compile his findings that were presented in this article. As a conservative paper, *The Times* hoped to boost support for the Confederate cause in Great Britain. By spreading the concept of a Confederacy devoted to the ideals of Great Britain, which the colonies were founded on, the Southern diplomats who were interviewed hoped to strike a cord with the English. This proved to be extremely difficult, however, with the Confederacy's determination not to abolish slavery.

⁴⁶ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 284.

As mentioned earlier, the main objective at this stage of Confederate foreign policy was to gain international recognition of their nation. In addition to diplomatic recognition, the South sought financial and material aid from Europe, and military help if offered. At his inaugural address as President of the Confederate States on February 26, 1861, Jefferson Davis addressed the needs of the Confederacy, which they could not provide for themselves. Recognizing the manufacturing difficulties that the South faced in relation to the North, and that their chief bargaining tool was the cotton crop heavily relied upon in English factories, Davis said:

This common interest of the producer and consumer can only be interrupted by exterior force which would obstruct the transmission of our staples to foreign markets - a course of conduct which would be as unjust, as it would be detrimental, to manufacturing and commercial interests abroad.⁴⁷

The South could not compete with the manufacturing capabilities of the Union, and Davis knew it. This meant that a drawn out war would see the North much better supplied, and therefore equipped to be victorious. Recognizing this deficiency, the Confederacy sought material aid from Great Britain, both in terms of direct finance and manufactured goods. The longer it took the Confederacy to secure manufacturing aid from a foreign power, the larger the material gap would grow between their armies and those of the Union.

Confederate Support in Great Britain

While British support for the Confederate States could be found around the nation, it was mostly focused in the upper classes. This included wealthy tradesmen

⁴⁷ Jefferson Davis, "Confederate States of America: Message to Congress February 26, 1861(European Commission)" (Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy, February 26, 1861).

who made a living off the cotton trade, the textile factory owners in Lancashire, and a large portion of Parliament.⁴⁸ Their wealth and power came directly from cotton imported from the South, yet the motivations for Confederate support in Parliament are more complicated. These men were tasked with representing their constituents within the nation. This was reflected in their arguments for backing the South. Many noticed the issue that the cotton shortage would have on the economic status of nation, and argued to join the Civil War and attempt to reopen Confederate ports.⁴⁹ There were also members of Parliament who were openly against expansionism in the United States, as well as the Monroe Doctrine, which stated that the Western Hemisphere was under American protection.⁵⁰ Economic and political pro-Confederacy arguments were the most prevalent in Parliament, and by April 1861 there was a large faction of support for the South.

There were other important political arguments for Great Britain supporting the Confederacy. Lord Russell, the Foreign Secretary for Great Britain at the beginning of the Civil War, was another staunch supporter of the Confederate States. In 1861 he stated in address to Parliament, "The South was fighting for independence, the North for empire."⁵¹ Lord Russell's main issue with the United States before the Civil War was their expansionist policy, which could be seen not only in the western movement of the nation but also the perceived oppression of the South leading up to the Civil War. Many members of Parliament echoed this

⁴⁸ Foreman, 501-502.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 37.

⁵⁰ Fuller, 218.

⁵¹ Edwin De Leon, *Secret History of Confederate Diplomacy Abroad* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005) 79.

argument against expansionism. The United States had been expanding westward, and while this was not directly into British territory, American expansion had reached British borders in Oregon and Canada. Lord Russell, along with other members of Parliament, worried that a victorious Union would continue to expand into Great Britain's territory. Beyond this direct threat to British land, there was also apprehension about the growth of American influence throughout the Western Hemisphere.⁵² If the United States were to split into two nations, some members of Parliament believed that expansionist policy would cease following the defeat of the Union, and British interests on the continent would be secured. While the expansion of the United States into British North America never occurred, the fear of such action persisted in some factions of Parliament throughout the Civil War.

Despite the argument of the pro-Confederacy faction of Parliament that democracy and freedom of government was the reason to support the South, most British citizens recognized the issue of cotton. This was the central reason for the Confederacy's other main base of support in England, cotton traders and factory owners. There was a lot of money in the transportation of cotton across the Atlantic and its sale in Great Britain. While the textile factories themselves were located in Lancashire, most British ports received cotton from the South, the sale of which made up a large percentage of the goods coming through. If cotton shipments were to cease during the Civil War, many who made their fortunes through trade with the South would find themselves lacking a source of income.⁵³ These Confederate supporters were not the dock workers or sailors contracted with the ships, as they

⁵² Foreman, 282-285.

⁵³ Ibid, 650-651.

received only small wages. It was the dock managers and owners of the shipping companies who were the strongest supporters of the Confederacy, and they had the income to get their voice heard around the country.

Like them, the textile factory owners in Lancashire were fervent supporters of the Confederate States. While their workers made an averagely low wage, the factory owners had grown rich due to the textile explosion in Great Britain.⁵⁴ Wealth had granted these men a political voice not only in Lancashire, but with Parliament as well. The success of the Confederacy would ensure the continued production of their factories, and therefore the personal income of the owners. These factory owners, along with the business upper class of Britain associated with the cotton trade, became the base for Confederate support in Great Britain.

Union Support in Great Britain

Support for the Union at the start of the Civil War was far more scattered than that for the Confederacy. Most pro-Union sentiment was found in the working classes, as they connected more with their northern counterparts, as opposed to the South who relied primarily upon slave labor.⁵⁵ There was also a large pro-Union voice in Parliament, which came primarily from those who had been elected from support in the working classes. Ever since Great Britain abolished slavery in 1833, the British people considered themselves advocates for human rights. Therefore, many people saw the Union as a popular option due to their abolitionist stance, and the South's pro-slavery agenda as deplorable. British reformer Mill in *The Contest in America*, written in 1862, explained the pro-Union argument for human rights. Mill

⁵⁴ Foner, 19-24.

⁵⁵ Ibid, 48-49.

chose to look towards the future, warning Parliament and the British people of the potential repercussion of supporting the Confederacy. He wrote:

When the new Confederate States, made an independent power by English help, had begun their crusade to carry negro slavery from the Potomac to Cape Horn; who would then have remembered that England raised up this scourge to humanity not for the evil's sake but because someone had offered an insult to her flag?⁵⁶

The insult to the British flag that Mill spoke of was the Trent Affair in November 1861, which will be discussed at length later in this paper. As this was a diplomatic mission to a country not involved in the war, Britain saw it as an insult from the Union that showed a lack of respect. Mill explained that the global image Great Britain had cultivated as a human rights supporter would be undone through an alliance with, or even recognition of, the Confederacy. Along with other pro-Union supporters in Britain, Mill believed that the institution of slavery was something that Parliament should oppose in all forms.

The anti-slavery argument hit home with the British working class, especially among factory workers in Lancashire, as they felt a personal detestation of slavery in the South. These workers believed that Great Britain needed to fix its own labor practices with respect to themselves, yet this could never happen if the government openly supported slavery in another nation.⁵⁷ In *The Contest in America*, Mill stated:

Every reader of a newspaper to the furthest ends of the earth, would have believed and remembered one thing only – that at the critical juncture which was to decide whether slavery should blaze up afresh with increased vigour to be trodden out – at the moment of conflict between the good and the evil spirit – at the dawn of a hope that the demon might now at least be chained

⁵⁶ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 106.

⁵⁷ Foner, 41.

and flung into the pit, England stepped in, and, for the sake of cotton, made Satan victorious.⁵⁸

Pro-Union supporters like Mill recognized the importance of cotton to the British economy, but believed that the destruction of slavery was much more important. If Great Britain were to throw itself behind the Confederacy, simply for the benefits of the cotton trade, the pro-Union belief was that this would be equivalent to openly supporting slavery. As Mill argued, Britain would gain a global reputation for supporting evil, losing their cherished prominence as a proponent of human rights. This argument appealed to the factory workers in Lancashire, who were the ones that would be hit hardest by a cotton shortage. Despite the economic hardships they would face during the Civil War, the working class of Lancashire would continue to support the Union and its cause of emancipation.⁵⁹

The pro-Union movement was not just noticeable in the British working class and among reformers, but also had a large base of support in Parliament. Just like the pro-Confederacy faction sought to convince with political arguments, so did the pro-Unionists. Great Britain was a world power, something universally accepted in Parliament and a source of British pride. The Union supporters in Parliament argued that this meant the nation had a duty to promote good around the world. If Great Britain supported the Confederacy, they would be backing the evil institution of slavery, and this would negatively effect their global reputation.⁶⁰ John Bright, a factory union organizer in Lancashire, spoke about the abolition of slavery being the

⁵⁸ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 106

⁵⁹ Foner, 43.

⁶⁰ Foreman, 219-221.

primary cause for supporting the Union, although he also included political motivations in his arguments. In a speech in March 1863, Bright said:

No man can read the history of the United States from the time when they ceased to be colonies of England without discovering that at the birth of the great republic there was sown the seed, if not of its dissolution, at least of its extreme peril... they dreaded the destruction of their country even more than they hated the evil of slavery.⁶¹

Bright believed that slavery had been the cause of the secession of the South from the United States, as was the consensus among Union supporters in Britain. The North's claim that the war was to maintain the Union hadn't been as appealing to Northern supporters as the cause of abolition, which increased support for the Union once it became an official aim of the war. Bright also believed that slavery, although already abolished in Great Britain, could still be a divisive issue for the nation. If Britain allied itself with the Confederacy, this threatened to alienate the working class, and create further political, economic, and social division in the country.⁶² If Great Britain were to avoid political instability, Bright and those like him believed that the nation must back the Union.

At the beginning of the Civil War, British politics were consumed with the American conflict, and whether it was in their best interest to join the war. The divisions in British society showed that the lower and middle classes more often supported the Union, while the upper classes were primarily pro-Confederacy.⁶³ As Parliament was tasked with representing the nation as a whole, this division had

⁶¹ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 144.

⁶² Foreman, 281-282.

⁶³ Mary Ellison and Peter Jones, *Support for Secession: Lancashire and the American Civil War* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1972) 56.

become the most apparent issue facing Parliamentary procedure. While the two factions in Great Britain were well defined, the nation was no closer to making a decision on forming an alliance with the South, remaining neutral, or supporting the North.

The first months of the American Civil War represented a crucial juncture in Anglo-American relations. The United States' relationship with Great Britain was at its worst since the War of 1812, with another conflict becoming a serious possibility. The textile factories of northern England were greatly affected by the cotton shortage due to the Union blockade, and the economic consequences were hitting all of Britain. As American cotton was exported only out of Southern States, the British were strongly attracted to reopening the South's ports, especially at the expense of the North, who had greatly insulted them through the Trent Affair. The issue of slavery, however, was still the predominant issue for the people of the Confederacy. The British viewed their nation as a supporter of human rights, and were therefore reluctant to ally themselves with a slave holding government. Although Great Britain was officially neutral at the beginning of 1862, both the Union and the Confederacy knew that Britain would have a very important role to play moving forward.

Chapter 3: The Union Blockade and Anglo-American Relations

While the American Civil War was a conflict between two halves of the same nation fighting over a differing ideology, the conflict was not confined to United States soil. Great Britain recognized the crucial role that it would play as the war progressed, regardless of which side it chose to support. The Union saw the influence that British manufacturing could play in the war, as well as their incredible naval strength, should Parliament ally the nation with the Confederacy. The North recognized the unlikelihood of Great Britain joining their cause, due to the issues of American encroachment of British North America and the growth of the United States Navy. Keeping them neutral became the Union's central diplomatic task.⁶⁴ Confederate foreign diplomacy, on the other hand, focused almost solely on gaining recognition and support from a European power.⁶⁵ Recognizing that they could not survive an extended war without at least financial aid, the Confederate government reached out to Great Britain in particular. The conflict in the first months of the American Civil War was not only between the armies of the Union and the Confederacy, but also between their diplomats in Great Britain.

The Civil War officially began in 1861, and the North recognized that victory depended on their ability to undermine the military efforts of the new Confederacy. Union President Abraham Lincoln saw that the strength of the South came from the cotton economy, which had become the basis of their domestic and international politics. The concept of King Cotton diplomacy was well known in the Union, with

⁶⁴ Foreman, 91-94.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 67.

the government realizing that Confederate politics revolved around the financial success of cotton abroad.⁶⁶ The potential income arriving in the Confederacy from nations like Great Britain became a top issue facing the North, and President Lincoln knew that victory depended on cutting off economic aid to the Confederacy. Lincoln therefore ordered a blockade of the Confederate coast, focusing on shipping centers, the largest of which was the port city of Charleston, South Carolina.⁶⁷ The Union had a larger Navy than the Confederacy, allowing the blockade to be quickly set up. It soon became clear to both the North and the South that the blockade would persist throughout the war, unless the South was able to obtain military aid from a foreign power. With Great Britain's naval strength and dependence on Confederate cotton, they became the focus of the South's diplomatic efforts. While the Union blockade was successful in its aim of weakening the Southern war effort, it also impacted the British economy, giving them a greater cause to join the Confederacy. The blockade was a risky decision by the North, and the Confederate government hoped to capitalize on the situation by convincing Great Britain to become an ally.

Immediate Effects of the Blockade

The Union blockade was immediately effective following its implementation, although only to a certain degree. It successfully limited the amount of cotton leaving Confederate ports bound for Europe, especially out of the major ports where the bulk of the Union Navy was focused. There was still a substantial amount of cotton leaving ports where the Union's blockade was not as strong, although not

⁶⁶ Herring, 226-227.

⁶⁷ Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still Jr., 58.

nearly enough to support the South's war effort.⁶⁸ Moreover, the economic strain that the Union hoped to impose on the Confederacy was not initially noticeable. Former United States General Winfield Scott composed a letter in May 1861 to Major General George B. McClellan, the top military officer of the Union Army, to discuss the effectiveness of the blockade. Writing about the extent of the blockade and its importance, Scott said:

We rely greatly on the sure operation of a complete blockade of the Atlantic and Gulf ports soon to commence... The object being to clear out and keep open this great line of communication in connection with the strict blockade of the sea-board, so as to envelop the insurgent States and bring them to term with less bloodshed than by any other plan.⁶⁹

The "great line of communication" that Scott references is the joint effort of blockading the Confederate coast along with the Mississippi River. The purpose of this was to not only to prevent the South from engaging in economic activity out of their ports, but also to split the Confederacy in half through the Mississippi River. At this point the Union blockade was in its first month, and had thus not been organized to proper effectiveness yet. Scott recognized that if the Confederate coast was controlled by the Union, communication between the South and foreign powers would greatly decrease. Not only was the rapid success of the blockade instrumental in crippling the Confederate economy, but also for limiting the aid that could be agreed through diplomatic endeavors. The Union's military leaders knew they could not be victorious if their armies had to fight both the South and European forces, so it was hoped that the blockade would limit the fighting to the territory of the United States.

⁶⁸ Ibid, 139.

⁶⁹ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 339-340.

While the blockade was successful in limiting the cotton exported to Great Britain and the rest of Europe, the South was still economically viable. The national treasury had enough wealth to support the military at the beginning of the Civil War. As payment for cotton also took a couple months to arrive due to the nature of trading across the Atlantic, the South was still functioning financially.⁷⁰ Problems surfaced when the payments for cotton began decreasing, with the Confederacy realizing they could not support the war effort with the available finances. Without economic aid, the blockade looked to be successful in limiting the ability of the South to financially back their armies. Sallie Brock, a tutor and author from Virginia, discussed the immediate effects of the Union blockade in *Richmond During the War*, written in late 1861. Giving a firsthand account of Richmond during the blockade, she explained:

From the extraordinary influx of population, and the existence of the blockade, which prevented the importation of supplies in proportion to demand, we were compelled to submit to the vilest extortions by which any people were ever oppressed.⁷¹

The blockade and the subsequent lack of imports hurt more than just the Confederate armies, as Brock recorded here. People were forced into cities to escape the carnage of the Civil War around them in the countryside, yet there were not enough supplies to support the growing populace. If the South was to survive the war, it needed to find a way to bring in the necessary supplies both to directly support the war effort and for the Confederate citizens. This need for economic help drove the foreign diplomacy of the Confederacy, looking for aid from Europe.

⁷⁰ James Ford Rhodes, *History of the Civil War: 1861-1865* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1927) 280.

⁷¹ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 641.

The most logical place for the Confederacy to turn for economic aid was Great Britain, as their textile industry was reliant on cotton from the South. While the Union hoped to persuade the British to join their cause, or at least remain neutral, the blockade negatively affected the North's diplomatic leverage. The situation in Lancashire was deteriorating, with the lack of cotton generating the threat of a financial collapse. By late 1861 the workers of the Lancashire textile factories, many who were members of factory unions, had yet to openly make a statement on the conflict in the United States.⁷² With the economic situation deteriorating, many believed that the workers would look to the government to solve the cotton shortage. This was noticed by Karl Marx, a popular social thinker of the 19th century, in a newspaper piece he wrote for the *New York Daily Tribune* in December 1861. Marx noted that:

At every other moment the mercantile classes of Great Britain would have looked upon the war against the United States with the utmost horror. Now, on the contrary, a large and influential party of the mercantile community has for months been urging on the government to violently break the blockade, and thus provide the main branch of British industry with its raw material.⁷³

It was widely recognized among the people of Great Britain that their economic struggles came from a shortage of cotton, and that this was due to the American Civil War. Observers like Marx saw this as a sign that the Lancashire factory workers and owners would push the government to intervene in the sake of cotton.

⁷² Foner, 11-13.

⁷³ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 131.

The Blockade and British Diplomacy

By the summer of 1861 the Union blockade of the Confederacy had been in effect for a couple months, and news of its affect on the textile industry in Great Britain had reached both the North and the South. The reactions varied between the two governments, and in the Union there was a sense of nervous apprehension. While the purpose of the blockade had been to economically cripple the Confederacy, thus weakening their ability to fight the war, Lincoln and his fellow politicians had known that it would likely be at the expense of potential British support for the Union. In an address to Congress in December 1862, Lincoln described the feelings of Great Britain towards the Union blockade in the first year since its implementation. After discussing that Great Britain had expressed distaste for the blockade and its effects on the British economy, and how they pressured the Union government to terminate it, Lincoln stated:

There are, moreover, many cases in which the United States, or their citizens, suffer wrongs from the naval or military authorities of foreign nations, which the governments of those states are not at once prepared to redress. I have proposed to some of the foreign states, thus interested, mutual conventions to examine and adjust such complaints. This proposition has been made directly to Great Britain.⁷⁴

Lincoln recognized the hypocrisy in Great Britain's claim that the blockade was unfair to their nation, while at the same time Britain engaged in military endeavors around the world that other nations were opposed to. Unlike Seward and other members of his cabinet, however, Lincoln was against upsetting the British. Seward believed that the Union should show its strength through challenging the perceived British influence over the Americas, yet Lincoln did not want to spark conflict with

⁷⁴ Sears, 619.

Britain. Victory over the Confederacy would be difficult enough to obtain without having to contend with Great Britain as well.

The pro-South faction in Great Britain was extremely angered by the Union's blockade of the Confederacy. Opposition in Britain towards the blockade was summarized by Secretary of War Sir George Cornewall, a strong supporter of the Confederacy's right of self-determination. In a statement in late 1861, Cornewall said it was:

Incredible that any government of ordinary prudence should at the moment of civil war gratuitously increase the number of its enemies, and, moreover, incur the hostility of such formidable a power as England. The first effect would be that we should raise the siege of the Southern ports and ourselves blockade the Northern ports.⁷⁵

Cornewall's view was definitely an extreme one, yet it brought to light the anger in Britain towards Union's blockade, and the feeling it was wrongfully implemented. The Confederacy was seen as a legitimate belligerent by Parliament, and while they were not yet a legal nation, this meant it was wrong for the Union to enforce a blockade on Southern ports.⁷⁶ This showed that the issue was more than just cotton, yet also the perceived legality of the North's actions towards the states that had seceded.

Despite the anti-blockade feeling of Cornewall and other British diplomats, there was no sign of the blockade being lifted. While Lincoln recognized their complaints and invited them express their issues, he warned that the outcome of the war was the most important issue to the North. The Union government knew that the blockade was key to winning the Civil War, and while they wanted to avoid

⁷⁵ Fuller, 56.

⁷⁶ Ibid, 48.

Great Britain's involvement in the war at all costs, the blockade was non-negotiable.⁷⁷ With the continuation of the blockade firmly decided, for the Union to keep Great Britain from joining the Confederate cause, Lincoln had to show Parliament that the cost of war was greater than that of the decline of Britain's textile industry.

The relationship between the Union and Great Britain following the implementation of the blockade was complicated. Neither country had a great relationship with the other prior to the Civil War, and the economic hardships that hit Britain due to the cotton shortage did anything but help. The growing tension between the Union and Great Britain was discussed in a letter between Henry Adams to his father Charles Francis Adams Sr., the American minister to Great Britain, in June 1861. Henry Adams warned his father not to alienate Britain, writing that, "I believe it to be essential to our interests now, that Europe be held on our side. Our troubles have gone too far to be closed by foreign jealousies."⁷⁸ Henry Adams recognized the Union's friction with Great Britain, and that the British had the ability to sway the war however they chose, so he urged his father to avoid increasing tensions. The Union knew that its manufacturing advantage gave it the ability to survive a longer war. What the Union government risked was upsetting the neutrality of Great Britain. If the strain of the cotton shortage on Britain's textile industry became too great, resulting in an alliance with the Confederacy, the North's chances of victory would drop drastically.

⁷⁷ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 385-387.

⁷⁸ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 409.

The reaction in the South to the news of British anger over the Union blockade was mixed. While Confederate politicians recognized the success of the blockade greatly limited their financial ability to compete in war with the North, news of Great Britain's struggle to import cotton was positively received in the South. Many southern politicians believed that the Union was driving Great Britain towards the Confederacy with their intention to maintain the blockade, as this would extend the cotton shortage in Britain indefinitely. William Howard Russell, a correspondent for *The Times* of London stationed in Charleston, South Carolina, was skeptical about this approach. In April 1861 he wrote about the Confederate government, "They assume that the British crown rests on a cotton bale, as the Lord Chancellor sits on a pack of wool."⁷⁹ Russell readily showed his personal bias in this passage. He wrote early in the war about British wool as a replacement for cotton, and while this switch was attempted, wool was never able to replace cotton in Northern England's textile factories.⁸⁰ In this sense, the Confederate government was correct in pushing the issue of cotton in an attempt for Britain to recognize them as a nation. Russell's statement that cotton was not everything to Britain, as attempts to use wool as a replacement were made, would prove to be true as the Confederacy struggled for formal British support moving forward.

While the effects of the Union blockade were undoubtedly negative for the Confederacy, the Confederate government hoped to use the impact of the blockade to its advantage. In his inaugural address in early 1861 Confederate President Jefferson Davis discussed the foreign policy ambitions of the Confederate States.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 287.

⁸⁰ Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still Jr., 433.

While the Union blockade had not yet been put into affect, Davis recognized that it was a likely course of action from the North, and that the South must be prepared to lose the ability to export cotton. Speaking about the result of such an eventuality on Europe, Davis stated:

There would be no considerable diminution in the production of the staples which have constituted our exports, and in which the commercial world has an interest scarcely less than our own. This common interest of the producer and consumer can only be interrupted by exterior force which would obstruct the transmission of our staples to foreign markets – a course of conduct which would be as unjust, as it would be detrimental, to manufacturing and commercial interests abroad.⁸¹

Davis was intent on declaring the South's ambition to continue the cotton trade throughout the war, unless an exterior force caused trade to cease, which appeared in the form of the Union blockade.

Looking primarily at Britain, Davis knew that their manufacturing depended on Confederate cotton, and thus he declared to use that knowledge to form the foreign policy of the Confederacy. While this statement from the Confederate President was made before the Civil War began, it remained a focus of Confederate diplomacy as a whole throughout the war. The Confederate government recognized that they could not survive the war without aid from abroad, especially financially to the South's armies. After only a few months of fighting, it was clear that the Confederacy did not have the money or materials to supply their military for an extended war.⁸² Moving forward, Confederate diplomacy was based around coaxing

⁸¹ Jefferson Davis, "Confederate States of America: Inaugural Address by the President of the Provisional Government" (Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 18, 1861).

⁸² Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still Jr., 16.

Great Britain into an alliance as quickly as possible, through the avenue of Britain's cotton shortage.

The *Trent* Affair

A key moment in relations between the Union and Great Britain occurred on November 8, 1861. The RMS *Trent*, a British trade vessel carrying Confederate diplomats James Mason and John Slidell, was intercepted in international waters by the USS *San Jacinto*, a Union naval patroller. The Confederate diplomats were ordered under arrest for attempting to reach Great Britain and France by the *San Jacinto* Captain Charles Wilkes, declaring it an attempted act of war by the Confederacy.⁸³ The capture of the *Trent* infuriated the British government, who saw it as an unlawful seizure of a British ship by the Union Navy. Even though Lincoln ordered the release of the *Trent* shortly after the incident and allowed Mason and Slidell to continue to Europe, tensions between Great Britain and the Union remained high.⁸⁴ The *Trent* Affair, as it came to be called, became a defining moment in foreign diplomacy during the Civil War. It was in the weeks following the capture of the *Trent* that there was the greatest potential for the Confederacy to gain support from Great Britain.

The reaction in Great Britain to the *Trent* Affair was one of outrage, with Parliament condemning the actions of Captain Wilkes as an unlawful breach of the neutrality between Britain and the Union. Some British politicians even hoped to declare the seizure of the *Trent* as an act of war, as they believed the North had blatantly disrespected Great Britain and its stance of neutrality. Benjamin Moran, a

⁸³ Herring, 233-234.

⁸⁴ Foreman, 172-174.

secretary at the American legation in London, recorded the English reaction to the *Trent* affair in his personal journal. On November 27, 1861, Moran wrote that:

That the capture of these arch-rebels gave us great satisfaction at first blush, was natural: & we gave free vent to our exultation. But on reflection I am satisfied that the act will do more for the southerners than ten victories, for it touches John Bull's honor, and the honor of his flag.⁸⁵

As Moran stated, the greatest impact of this even in Great Britain was the feeling that their honor had been challenged. The capture of Mason and Slidell onboard the *Trent* more directly affected the Confederacy, yet that was not how it was perceived by Parliament. Many saw it as a disrespectful to the pride of the British military, their Navy, that the Union would feel capable of arresting a British ship without consequence.⁸⁶ While the Confederate diplomats were released and allowed to reach Great Britain, the disrespect of the *Trent* Affair was not forgotten.

The effects of the *Trent* Affair on Union-British relations was best put by Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner, who addressed the issue in a speech on January 10, 1862. A little over a month had passed since the arrest of Mason and Slidell, and the repercussions on foreign diplomacy had begun to materialize.

Sumner criticized the way that the British handled the *Trent* Affair, saying:

The act becomes questionable only when brought to the touchstone of these liberal principles, which, from the earliest times, the American government has openly avowed and sought to advance, and which other European nations have accepted with regard to the sea. Indeed, Great Britain cannot complain except by now adopting those identical principles.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 647.

⁸⁶ Foreman, 173.

⁸⁷ James M. McPherson, *Defining Documents of American History: The Civil War, 1860-1865* (Vol. 1. Amenia, New York: Grey House Publishing, 2014) 177.

Sumner is speaking about naval conduct in international waters, and his main complaint with respect to Britain's handling of the capture of the *Trent* is that they are trying to limit the Union's ability to wage war against the Confederacy. Sumner and other politicians adopted an almost anti-British stance following the *Trent* Affair, believing that Britain had no right to be upset. Through the way that Great Britain handle the incident, by threatening the Union if Mason and Slidell were not released, some in the United States government believed that war against Great Britain was justified. Lincoln disagreed, recognizing that war with both Britain and the Confederacy would not go well, so he agreed to free the Confederate diplomats.⁸⁸ While this action allowed the two nations to move forward, it did little to ease the tension, and the *Trent* Affair effectively ended any chance of a Union-Great Britain military alliance.

Although the *Trent* Affair was most important for the increase in tensions between the Union and Great Britain, it also offered the Confederacy a chance to gain the cooperation with Britain that it desired. Shortly after the capture of the Confederate diplomats in November 1861, Davis addressed the issue in a speech to the Confederate congress. Davis was upset about the capture of his diplomats, but used the opportunity to connect the South with Britain, saying, "These gentlemen were as much under the jurisdiction of the British government upon that ship and beneath its flag as if they had been on its soil."⁸⁹ Davis went on to discuss that, even though the Mason and Slidell were released, neither the Confederacy nor Great

⁸⁸ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 389-391.

⁸⁹ James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Confederacy: Including the Diplomatic Correspondence, 1861-1865* (Nashville: United States Pub., 1905) 142.

Britain should forget the injustice done by the Union. Despite the best efforts of the Confederate government, however, they were unable to turn the anti-Union sentiment in Parliament following the *Trent* Affair into diplomatic recognition from Great Britain or the financial support the Confederacy required. Despite this failure, Jefferson Davis and the Confederate congress continued to push for support from Britain through not only their need of cotton, but also a joint animosity towards the Union. While the Confederacy had not been offered any official assistance from Great Britain by 1862, Davis was confident that the British would soon recognize the Confederate States. He believed that the economic effect of the cotton shortage, along with the political motivation of assisting the Confederacy in their struggle for self-determination, would lead to British help in defeating the Union.

The decision of the Union to blockade the Confederate ports was incredibly influential, not only for the war itself, but for Anglo-American relations. Through cutting off Confederate cotton exports to Great Britain, the Union effectively discontinued the primary source of income for the Confederacy. Although this helped the Union war effort, it inflicted an incredible economic penalty on Great Britain, whose textile industry relied on Confederate cotton. Making relations between the North and Britain worse, in November 1861 a British ship carrying Confederate diplomats was seized in what Parliament deemed an illegal act. The *Trent* Affair sparked anger throughout Great Britain, which believed that the Union had insulted Britain through its disrespect of their freedom of neutrality. Although Great Britain remained neutral at the beginning of 1862, the diplomatic pressure

from the Union blockade and the *Trent* Affair made an alliance between Britain and the Confederacy seem increasingly likely.

Chapter 4: The Lancashire Cotton Famine

While Great Britain as a whole was affected by the blockade of the Confederacy, no region was hit nearly as hard as Lancashire. The working classes of Liverpool and Manchester were made up almost entirely of textile factory workers. While the initial effects of the cotton shortage were shortened work hours and therefore smaller paychecks, by the middle of 1861 the situation had deteriorated into a state of financial collapse.⁹⁰ Without nearly enough cotton to fuel the textile industry, many workers lost their jobs and Northern England fell into an economic depression. By 1862 nearly three-fourths of the labor force in the Lancashire factories was unemployed.⁹¹ This disastrous situation became known as the Lancashire Cotton Famine, which characterized the negative economic impact of the Civil War in Great Britain. As the war continued, the situation in Lancashire worsened, making the debate in Britain over whether to aid the Confederacy even more important. It was during the Cotton Famine that the factory workers in Northern England had their greatest influence with Parliament. As the British government did not want to risk an unstable political situation at home, the possibility of joining the Confederate cause became more complicated.

The Beginning of the Lancashire Cotton Famine

When the Union blockade of the South began in April 1861, its effects were felt throughout Britain. It took a couple months, however, before the dire situation in Lancashire materialized. While the amount of cotton arriving in Great Britain had

⁹⁰ Foreman, 273.

⁹¹ Foner, 5.

drastically decreased, the textile factories in Northern England continued for the remainder of the summer at the same pace. This changed in the summer of 1861, when the stores of cotton in Britain had run out and the cotton arriving from the South was not enough to replenish them.⁹² Initially this was thought to be a temporary problem, and as such workers were put on part time salaries with the full intent of the factory managers to restore their previous pay when possible. To the distress of the textile factories, the success of the Northern blockade ensured that the flow of cotton did not increase. The amount of raw cotton available for processing continued to go down, and with it went the availability of work. By August 1861 many workers in Lancashire found themselves without jobs, and Parliament was forced to recognize the economic distress in the county.⁹³

By 1860 the county of Lancashire was one of the economic centers of Great Britain. The manufacturing capabilities of the region had reached all-time heights, with Manchester becoming the nation's most factory-focused city. If Lancashire was the center of the nation's textile industry, then Manchester was the heart of Lancashire. The majority of Manchester's working population was directly involved in the textile industry, and as such the issue of cotton became central to people's livelihoods.⁹⁴ For the people of Lancashire, the onset of the Cotton Famine was difficult to deal with. While many workers initially remained employed, they often found themselves on reduced pay, reduced hours, or in many cases both. British author Edwin Waugh discussed the life of a Lancashire factory worker in the early

⁹² Ellison, 150.

⁹³ Foreman, 273.

⁹⁴ Foner, 20-21.

stages of the Cotton Famine in *Home Life of the Lancashire Factory Folk During the Cotton Famine*, written in 1862. Waugh described:

I went to see them at their own house afterwards, and it certainly was a pattern of cleanliness, with the little household gods there still. Seeing that house, a stranger would never dream that the family was living on an average income of less than sixpence a head per week. But I know how hard some decent folk will struggle with the bitterest poverty before they will give in to it.⁹⁵

The families of the Lancashire textile workers were struggling financially, with only a small average income. Yet surprisingly, as Waugh noticed, in their homes the Lancashire families were surviving on the little that they earned. As Waugh described, the first couple months of the Lancashire Cotton Famine were difficult, but the county remained productive enough to avoid an economic collapse. As cotton remained scarce, however, the problems in the region only increased.

The textile factories in Northern England remained open immediately following the onset of the Union's blockade of the Confederacy, yet conditions were deteriorating. Lancashire was unstable economically and politically, as it was not only the center of the textile industry in Britain, but also of workers unions.⁹⁶ Parliament was well aware of the importance of Lancashire, and the delicate political position that was soon to develop. If the region were to fall into an economic depression, not only would the nation lose the textile industry, one of its principle sources of income, but also the support of the workers. The fear in Parliament was that, if the people there could not find work, those who remained

⁹⁵ Edwin Waugh, "Home Life of the Lancashire Factory Fold During the Cotton Famine" (The Project Gutenberg EBook, 1862) Chapter III.

⁹⁶ Ellison, 10-12.

would look to the government for help when unable to support their families.⁹⁷

Without the financial stability that the textile industry afforded Great Britain as a whole, sending proper economic aid to Lancashire would prove to be extremely difficult.

The inability of the government to provide the necessary help for Lancashire would likely lead to public unrest, and therefore political instability. Lord Palmerston, the British Prime Minister during the Civil War, often discussed in Parliament the political issues of the Lancashire Cotton Famine, especially the issues related to joining the Civil War to alleviate the economic depression in Northern England. In an October 1862 letter to Lord Russell, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, recommending British mediation of the Civil War, Palmerston stated that, “There is no doubt that the offer of mediation upon the basis of separation would be accepted by the South. Why should it not be accepted? I would give the South in principle the points for which they are fighting.”⁹⁸ Palmerston was discussing the issue of cotton, arguing that British mediation would allow the Confederate economy to recover after being unable to export cotton. This would also allow cotton back into Lancashire, fueling the textile factories there, under the guise of ending the bloody conflict in America. The pro-Confederacy faction of Parliament, in agreement with Lord Palmerston’s argument, sought to avoid an economic depression in Lancashire, and the political issues associated with it, through an alliance with the South based around the cotton trade. The Union delegates in Great

⁹⁷ Foner, 74.

⁹⁸ Sears, 603.

Britain recognized this possibility, and avoiding British intrusion into the war for the sake of cotton became the primary foreign policy objective of the North.⁹⁹

The Confederate Cotton Embargo

The Confederacy recognized the issues in Great Britain related to the Union blockade, and sought to use them to their diplomatic advantage. The lack of cotton being imported into Northern England had resulted in the Cotton Famine, which left the region in economic depression and hurt the nation as a whole. Any attempts from the Confederate government to foster an alliance with Great Britain in the summer of 1861 were futile, however, as the hardship in Lancashire did not justify entering the war.¹⁰⁰ Despite this initial failure, the Confederacy decided to continue on the path of cotton diplomacy as opposed to seeking a new diplomatic tactic. The Union blockade on the South had successfully limited the cotton reaching Great Britain, yet while it had created financial hardship on the textile factories in England, they were still functioning enough to keep the region alive, albeit only just. In order to push Great Britain into a situation where interfering in the Civil War was their only option to save their economy, the Confederacy decided to cut off cotton to Europe altogether. While some southern cotton had been able to reach Britain through the blockade in its first months, in September 1861 all cotton trade with Europe was halted when the Confederate government declared a cotton embargo.¹⁰¹

The President of the Confederacy Jefferson Davis described the purpose of the cotton embargo in a speech to the Confederate congress on November 18, 1861.

⁹⁹ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 387-389.

¹⁰⁰ Owsley and Owsley, 21-22.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, 29-31.

Describing the decision of the Confederacy to suspend cotton exportation after observing the effects of the blockade, Davis explained:

For every laborer who is diverted from the culture of cotton in the South, perhaps four times as many elsewhere, who have found subsistence in the various employments growing out of its use, will be forced also to change their occupation. While the war which is waged to take from us the right of self-government can never attain that end, it remains to be seen how far it may work a revolution in the industrial system of the world, which may carry suffering to other lands as well as to our own.¹⁰²

Although he recognized that the cotton embargo will hurt the South's economy, Jefferson Davis was convinced that it will have far worse effects on the nations who have become dependent upon the textile industry. With the focus of the embargo on Great Britain in particular, the Confederate government believed that their best chance of receiving foreign recognition and financial aid was through economic motivation. Davis also called upon principles of self-determination to maintain British sympathies while embargoing cotton. Although cotton diplomacy had yielded no results at the time of the President's speech, Davis and the rest of the Confederate government were confident in the political power of the cotton embargo.

Surviving the Cotton Famine

The results of the Confederate cotton embargo were devastating for the textile industry of Lancashire. Before the start of the American Civil War textile production in Lancashire had accounted for one-fourth of Great Britain's tradable goods, yet through the South's embargo the nation lost nearly 80 percent of its

¹⁰² Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 635.

cotton supply.¹⁰³ Hundreds of thousands of workers in Lancashire either lost their jobs or found themselves working for severely reduced pay, all while trying to make the most out of a dwindling quantity of cotton. The unemployment number in Lancashire in November 1860 was zero, yet by November 1862 it had risen to 330,759. Within those two years, total employment in the county had dropped to less than 40 percent of its former level.¹⁰⁴ The combination of the Union blockade and the Confederate cotton embargo had effectively ended the flow of cotton into Northern England, with devastating results.

The British government attempted to alleviate the woes in Lancashire by turning to India for a cheap alternative to Confederate cotton in 1862, but the Indian workers could not produce the same quality or quantity as the South, and the Cotton Famine continued.¹⁰⁵ In addition to Indian cotton, the British increased their efforts to produce linen and woolen goods in other regions of the nation. Some workers chose to leave Lancashire for other work, but especially for those with families this was not always a viable option.¹⁰⁶ For those that stayed and were lucky enough to remain employed, conditions deteriorated immensely. Working days were expanded, wages dropped, and factories cut their work force to avoid additional costs. Those who lost their jobs had to look for odd work, often as street sweepers, household workers, or even local agricultural field hands. With limited

¹⁰³ Owsley and Owsley, 13-14.

¹⁰⁴ Foner, 5.

¹⁰⁵ Foreman, 502.

¹⁰⁶ Foner, 4-5.

opportunities, many were simply unemployed.¹⁰⁷ The attempts of the Confederacy to force Great Britain into economic chaos seemed to be working well by late 1861.

While the British government tried in desperation to find a solution to the depression in Northern England, the workers had no choice but to find ways to survive. Parliament enacted social welfare programs in Northern England, such as stipends to the unemployed and soup kitchens in the hardest hit areas, yet this proved to be too few and far between.¹⁰⁸ The government simply did not have the money to hold up Lancashire with the textile income from the region as low as it was. In *Home Life of the Lancashire Factory Folk During the Cotton Famine*, Waugh described the state of most workers and their families during the famine. By late 1861, when the Confederate cotton embargo was in full swing, Waugh wrote that a majority of Lancashire families, who had a family member that worked in the textile factories, were:

Dependent either upon the kindness of their employers, or upon the labour of their families in the cotton factories. This last failing them, the result may be easily guessed. The widows and orphans of coal miners almost always fall back upon factory labour for a living; and, in the present state of things, this class of people forms a very helpless element of the general distress.¹⁰⁹

In Lancashire there were few occupations available other than factory work, so when those jobs began to disappear there was little to do other than move away. This was not a possibility for those with families who, as Waugh described, had no choice but to stay in Lancashire, and only knew how to fall back to factory work. While many looked to the government for help, there was little that could be done

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 5-7.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 8-9.

¹⁰⁹ Waugh. Chapter XV.

without a consistent supply of cotton.¹¹⁰ As long as the flow of cotton from the American South was cut off, the situation in Lancashire looked to remain grim.

The End of the Confederate Cotton Embargo

By the end of 1861, it was clear that Lancashire, as well as Great Britain as a whole, was approaching a crisis. Yet to the surprise of the Confederate government, this had not forced Britain into an alliance, as the nation remained neutral.¹¹¹

Although recognized before the cotton embargo as a necessary consequence, the inability to export cotton had been far harsher on the Confederate economy than originally anticipated. Plantations began shutting down, and while the Union blockade was still a presence, the blockade-runners had found themselves without products to transport. This had been a small yet important source of income for the South and cotton for the textile mills in Lancashire, and was a major reason for the economic hardship of the Confederacy and Britain.¹¹² In late-December 1861 the Confederate government decided to end the cotton embargo, as it had failed to achieve its purpose yet had done exceptional damage on the South itself. The Union blockade still greatly limited the amount of cotton leaving the Confederacy bound for Europe, yet this opened up the ability for blockade-runners to resume their missions. Moving forward, the relationship between Great Britain and the Confederacy would be centered along running cotton through the Union blockade, and attempting to undermine the effectiveness of the North's economic warfare.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Foner, 14-15.

¹¹¹ Owsley and Owsley, 43-45.

¹¹² John, 82.

¹¹³ Fuller, XXV.

In the first months of the Civil War, the Union blockade on the Confederacy had been extremely successful, pushing the Confederacy towards financial ruin. In the process, however, the North had further damaged its diplomatic relationship with Great Britain. The South recognized the distress in Britain, and in an effort to force the British into supporting their new nation, the Confederacy imposed a cotton embargo to further damage the British economy. The Confederate government hoped that an embargo, on top of the existing blockade, would leave Britain with no choice but to aid the Confederacy, or risk financial collapse. While the cotton embargo was successful in pushing Great Britain closer towards economic depression, it was not enough to gain British collaboration against the Union. The influence of the factory workers in Northern England proved to be substantial, and this kept Parliament from committing to the Confederate cause. With the financial costs of the embargo too high, the Confederacy was forced to end the cotton embargo in late 1861. Although this tactic of obtaining British aid in the Civil War failed, the Confederacy remained confident of obtaining British recognition.

Chapter 5: Anglo-American Relations During the Cotton Famine

Although the Confederate cotton embargo on Europe ended in December 1861, the textile industry in Great Britain was not greeted by a renewed supply of raw material. The Union blockade was as strong as ever, and the South did not have the naval strength to push it back. The Lancashire Cotton Famine continued in Northern England, and with passing time the situation in the county deteriorated further. More workers found themselves out of work, forcing families to either live in poverty in Lancashire or try their luck in another region.¹¹⁴ With the Confederacy once again willing to send cotton to Britain, Parliament focused on the possibility of intervening in the American Civil War.¹¹⁵ Throughout 1862 and into 1863 British diplomacy was centered on whether to aid the Confederacy, remain neutral, or even support the Union. In the end, the issue came down to whether supporting the Confederacy and regaining access to the cotton trade was worth the supporting the institution of slavery in the South.

King Cotton and the Lancashire Cotton Famine

Great Britain remained neutral at the beginning of 1862, yet the economic distress in Lancashire supported the Confederate strategy of King Cotton diplomacy. President Jefferson Davis, despite the failure of the cotton embargo, was still hopeful that economic pressure from the absence of the cotton trade would persuade Britain

¹¹⁴ Ellison, 23.

¹¹⁵ Foreman, 217.

to join the Confederate cause. Although many in the Confederacy were upset by the continued neutral stance of Great Britain, claiming that they would never come to their aid, Davis recognized that neutrality was not as bad as it seemed. In addition to showing that Britain was undecided on the war itself, it also showed that the British were still wary of the North and the threat that they posed.¹¹⁶ If the Confederacy could continue to hold back the Union and prove their worth as a military and through their ability to govern, Davis believed that Great Britain would have no choice but to recognize the Confederate States. King Cotton diplomacy, based around the anti-Union sentiment in Parliament and the impact of southern cotton on the British textile industry, was still the central foreign policy strategy of the Confederate government.

British support for the Confederacy was still alive and well in 1862, proving Davis correct that help from Great Britain was still a possibility. As mentioned previously, the main base of support for the South in Britain was amongst the upper class, with people who either relied on cotton for their wealth or were against the growth in power of the United States.¹¹⁷ There was also a large base of support for the South in Parliament, who echoed the arguments of the upper class that many of them hailed from and represented. Member of Parliament William Gladstone, a leader of the pro-Confederacy section, outlined the argument for diplomatic recognition of the South in an October 1862 speech at Newcastle, which was published in *Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper*. Gladstone was convinced that

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 650-651.

¹¹⁷ Ellison, 31-32.

recognizing the Confederate States was the right political move for the British government, if only to uphold their international standing, and he argued that:

It may be that a time might arrive when it would be the duty of Europe to offer the world of expostulation or friendly aid towards composing the quarrel. If it be even possible that such a time should arrive, how important that when the word is spoken it should address itself to minds not embittered by the recollection that unkind things have been said and done towards them in Europe, and, above all, in England, the country which, however they may find fault with it from time to time, has we know the highest place in their admiration and esteem.¹¹⁸

Gladstone knew that if the South should find themselves victorious, they would look to Europe and remember who had helped them, and who had not. If Great Britain was the first to recognize the legitimacy of the Confederate government, it would give them exceptional diplomatic power in the region. Gladstone had always believed that the South offered more for Great Britain than the North, and showing British support through recognition would not only be a means of obtaining cotton, but also a political ally in an important part of North America.

While Gladstone himself only spoke about diplomatic recognition of the Confederacy, there was also a section of Parliament that hoped to go beyond that and directly aid the Confederate war effort. The argument for supplying the South was based on the idea that if the Confederacy could gain official recognition, it would legitimize their fight against the Union and open the door for British aid.¹¹⁹ *The Times* of London published an article on October 7, 1862 outlining the pro-Confederate argument in Parliament, indirectly stating the benefits of providing the South with direct aid. The author viewed the Union as the aggressor in the Civil

¹¹⁸ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 141.

¹¹⁹ Ellison, 109.

War, and condemned the North for its destruction of the South, writing, “The South without its cotton and its sugar and its tobacco would be of small use to New York... and would be a sorry gain, even if it could be obtained.” *The Times* recognized the economic potential of the South, and the fear was that the North would see all the plantations sent to ruin simply to retain a region that did not want to be a part of the United States. With the South already low on materials, Britain could supply the armies and the cities to help the Confederacy push back the Union. Following the war the South would not only be in the debt of the Union, but also would still have the ability to trade its cotton, which would be a boost for the struggling British economy. Although it was becoming likely that Great Britain would not provide direct military aid for the Confederacy, many in the nation hoped that it could still have a direct impact on the outcome of the war.¹²⁰

Running the Blockade

Although the Confederacy chose to end their embargo on cotton to Europe in December 1861, cotton did not return to the factories of Lancashire. The Confederate government had informed Britain that they were looking to reopen the cotton trade, yet the naval strength of the South was not enough to break through the blockade.¹²¹ Despite Britain remaining neutral and informing the South that they would not be providing assistance, there was a segment of the British population that still sought to aid the Confederacy. The decision of these men, most of whom were either owners or managers of shipping companies in Northern England, was to run the blockade and bring cotton back to Lancashire. Shipyards in

¹²⁰ Owsley and Owsley, 84.

¹²¹ Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still Jr., 185.

England began building blockade-runners for the Confederacy, which illegally took supplies to the South in return for cotton to Britain.¹²² Although strictly unofficial, this showed the Confederacy that they still had strong support for their cause in Great Britain. While the Confederate government still pursued a diplomatic relationship with Parliament, a great focus was made on ensuring the success of the blockade-runners. The South was hopeful that if a small amount of cotton returned to the textile factories in Lancashire, it would create a push to increase the amount and obtain British support for the Confederacy.¹²³

Although the amount of cotton being illegally smuggled through the blockade was minute compared to the pre-war levels being traded with England, it was enough to catch the attention of President Abraham Lincoln and the Union government. Lincoln addressed the issue of British running the Union blockade in a message to Congress in December 1861, shortly after the detention of a blockade runner who had planned to return to Northern England with cotton for textiles. Mentioning that the ship, the *Perthshire*, was in fact a British vessel seized lawfully for attempting to breach the blockade, Lincoln proclaimed:

As this detention was occasioned by an obvious misapprehension of the facts, and as justice requires that we should commit no belligerent act not founded in strict right, as sanctioned by public law, I recommend that an appropriation be made to satisfy the reasonable demand of the owners of the vessel for her detention.¹²⁴

While the reaction from Lincoln appeared surprising given that a foreign power attempted to aid the South, his speech accurately describes the position of the Union

¹²² Fuller, 186.

¹²³ Owsley and Owsley, 219-221.

¹²⁴ Simpson, Sears, and Sheehan-Dean, 655.

towards Great Britain at the time. Despite the *Perthshire* being a British ship guilty of supporting the Confederacy, the official stance of Great Britain was still firmly neutral. Just as with the *Trent* Affair, there were those in Congress that expressed anger with Britain for attempting to undermine the Union, and some even sought to provoke war.¹²⁵ Lincoln, however, recognized the influence that Great Britain could have on the Civil War should they ally themselves with the Confederacy, and that this would drastically affect the ability of the North to win the war. Despite the anger with Britain over allowing its citizens to continuously run the Union's blockade, it was better to ignore this than give Parliament a reason to revoke its stance of neutrality.

The worst year of the Lancashire Cotton Famine was 1862, with the impact of the Union blockade and the aftereffects of the Confederate cotton embargo virtually shutting down the textile factories in the region. By the end of the year, however, things were beginning to improve. Between November 1862 and December 1863 the number of employed factory workers in Lancashire increased by roughly 40 percent, much of which was due to the return of a portion of cotton due to blockade running.¹²⁶ British ships bringing Confederate cotton had been gradually increasing their shipments since the end of the cotton embargo, albeit a fraction of what was seen before the Civil War.¹²⁷ Despite this improvement, conditions in Lancashire were still dreadful, with roughly half of working age males remaining unemployed.

¹²⁵ Ibid, 407.

¹²⁶ Foner, 5.

¹²⁷ Ibid, 50.

To the surprise of the Confederacy, the reaction of the British government to the continuation of the Cotton Famine despite blockade running was to remain neutral. On January 12, 1863 the Confederate congress released a statement that said, "But it is especially in relation to the so-called blockade of our coast that the policy of European powers has been so shaped as to cause the greatest injury to the Confederacy."¹²⁸ The blockade was hurting both the Confederacy and Great Britain, yet blockade-runners had shown that even a small amount of cotton could improve the situation in Lancashire. Therefore the Confederate congress was outraged by the continued stance of acceptance by Parliament towards the Union blockade, seeing it as an attack against the Confederacy. As they believed that Great Britain was justified in breaking the blockade should it directly impact their citizens, the Confederate government saw the neutral stance of Britain as opposition to the South's struggle. Although the Confederacy continued to push for a diplomatic relationship with Great Britain, relations between the two were noticeably strained.

The Confederate Struggle for Recognition

By 1863 the Civil War had been raging for roughly a year and a half, limiting cotton shipments to Northern England for that same time period. Despite the negative effect this had on the British economy, and the condition of Lancashire, the Confederacy made little diplomatic progress with Britain. Although unofficial blockade running was proving to be effective, there had not been a hint of official support from Parliament. The attitude of the Confederacy towards British intervention is documented in a December 1863 meeting of the Confederate

¹²⁸ Richardson, 282.

Congress, where the progress of diplomatic missions to Europe was discussed.

President Davis addressed the delegates assembled and said:

The result of these arrangements has, therefore, placed it in the power of either France or England to obstruct at pleasure the recognition to which the Confederacy is justly entitled, or even to prolong the continuance of hostilities on this side of the Atlantic, if the policy of either could be promoted by the postponement of peace.¹²⁹

As shown by this statement, the Confederate government realized the power that foreign nations could play in the Civil War by simply recognizing the legitimacy of the Confederate States. Yet to the anger of the Confederate Congress, Britain and other nations continued to ignore the South's plea for recognition. By 1863, with momentum in the Civil War shifting towards the Union, the Confederacy recognized that it needed help in some form from foreign powers. Since direct material aid was extremely unlikely, the government chose to pursue diplomatic recognition. Great Britain, however, continued to ignore the Confederacy by not recognizing their official existence. This greatly upset the South, as this was seen as leaning towards a justification of the invasion of the South by the North.

The issue of diplomatic recognition was so important to the Confederacy because of the legitimacy that accompanied it. Despite the Southern belief that their new nation was founded on principles of democracy and self-determination, the lack of international recognition kept them officially labeled as rebels.¹³⁰ The Confederate government believed that the United States had oppressed the people of the South, and that they therefore had a right to secede. Although this view sounds noble, without the South being viewed internationally as a legitimate nation,

¹²⁹ Ibid, 348.

¹³⁰ De Leon, 61-65.

the principles on which the Confederacy was built were being denied. To Davis especially, recognition legitimized the experiment of the Confederate States. The lack of commitment to the Confederate cause angered Davis, especially with the British claiming to support the right of self-determination by governments.¹³¹ Whether the war was won or not, if the Confederacy could not obtain official recognition, the secession of the Southern States would not be justified. Davis and the Confederate government believed in their self-determination, yet this would only be supported internationally if the Confederacy could gain official recognition.

Despite the best attempts of Confederate diplomats, obtaining official recognition from Great Britain proved to be extremely difficult. House of Lords Peer Lord Russell described the attitude of Parliament towards Confederate recognition in a September 1862 letter to Lord Palmerston, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. After Palmerston introduced the issue of mediating a peace deal between the Union and Confederacy, Russell replied, "I agree further, that, in the case of failure, we ought ourselves to recognize the Southern States as an independent State."¹³² Palmerston replied to Russell's statement by maintaining that, while he would be interested in mediating peace, Britain should remain neutral, which would be impossible if Parliament recognized the Confederacy. This proved to be the main issue with the South obtaining diplomatic recognition from Great Britain. Although there were many in Parliament who supported the South, it was never enough to justify recognizing the Confederate States. The primary diplomatic mission of the Confederacy for the rest of the war remained obtaining recognition from Europe to

¹³¹ Owsley and Owsley, 438.

¹³² Sears, 444.

legitimize their cause, yet the political situation in Britain remained divided over the issue.

The Indefensible Issue of Slavery

Great Britain had voted to abolish slavery in the empire in 1833, with the institution officially gone in 1837.¹³³ While it was a relatively short 24 years to the start of the American Civil War, it was long enough to Great Britain to generate a general anti-slavery feeling, which was a product of an increased importance placed on human right in British society. This was also a symptom of the workers' rights movement in Britain, which grew out of the fight for abolition and had been progressing in recent years with the growth of unions in the textile factories.¹³⁴ While some Parliamentary members and some of their constituents, often the upper classes, supported the Confederacy, the same could not be said of the working classes. The argument of the South that they were supporting human rights through self-determination and their struggle for independence from the United States was seen as hypocritical.¹³⁵ As long as the institution of slavery was legalized in the South, the British working population refused to accept their claim that the Confederate States were build on freedom.

As it became increasingly clear that Great Britain would remain neutral in the Civil War, Lincoln, Secretary of State William Seward, and the United States Congress proposed a treaty to Parliament. This was meant to satisfy the more influential British politicians, such as Palmerstone, Russell, and Gladstone. The

¹³³ "An Act for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the *British Colonies*" (The National Archives of the United Kingdom. August 28, 1833).

¹³⁴ Foner, 20.

¹³⁵ *Ibid*, 90.

“Treaty between United States and Great Britain for the Suppression of the Slave Trade”, as it was called, was signed on April 7, 1862.¹³⁶ In summary, the treaty made it so the naval forces of both the United States and Great Britain would avoid any association with the slave trade, as well as disrupt it whenever possible. While not an incredibly important document in law, it was symbolic of the progressing standing of Great Britain and the Civil War. When the *Trent* Affair had occurred only a half year earlier, it had appeared as if Britain would join the war on the side of the Confederacy. After April 7, 1862, the influence of Great Britain on the Civil War was far from finished, despite its desire to remain officially neutral.

The issue of cotton dominated the first years of the American Civil War in Britain, yet by mid-1863 the loudest voice came from the anti-slavery, pro-Union working class.¹³⁷ No voice was louder than John Bright, the MP for Birmingham, who had become the leader of the human rights movement in Britain. Bright was incredibly passionate about Britain’s role in the Civil War, convinced that unless they supported the Union and the path to emancipation, Parliament risked destroying Britain’s international reputation. With the passage of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, the North had officially made the abolition of slavery a war goal, which generated an important reaction in Great Britain. In a March 1863 speech at St. James’s Hall, Bright spoke about the arguments of the pro-Union sector of British society. Chief among these was the anti-slavery stance of the North, of which Bright said:

¹³⁶ Ibid, 58

¹³⁷ Foreman, 397.

It is a question for those millions of freedom or slavery, education or ignorance, light or darkness, light or darkness, Christian morality... or an overshadowing all-blasting guilt. There are men... who say that we in England, who are opposed to the war, should take no public part in this great question... It is not in our power to bring it to a close, but I know not that we are called upon to shut our eyes and to close our hearts to the great issues which are depending upon it.¹³⁸

Bright brought forth the argument that, even though Britain should not become militarily engaged in the Civil War, their stance was still important, as proven by the fact that they were holding public meetings on the subject. If the nation recognized the Union as morally correct, and supported their cause, then the human rights image of Britain around the world would be maintained. Bright and his followers saw this as incredibly important, a belief that they worked to impose in Parliament.

Emancipation and the Lancashire Factory Workers

On January 1, 1863, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which declared all slaves within the Confederacy as free citizens. While the declaration itself was only a wartime act, it was made clear that full abolition would occur immediately following the war if the Union was victorious.¹³⁹ The Emancipation Proclamation was received in Britain with mixed feelings, especially amongst the Confederate supporters in London. They felt that the declaration was outside Lincoln's right as President. *The Times* of London published a pro-Confederacy editorial on October 7, 1862, following the preliminary announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation in September. *The Times* denounced the Emancipation Proclamation as well as the poor leadership of Abraham Lincoln, taking issue with the fact the document was only legally binding in the South, and wrote, "Where he

¹³⁸ Roper, *The American Civil War*, Vol. 3, 144.

¹³⁹ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 557-558.

has no power, Mr. Lincoln will set the negroes free; Where he retains power he will consider them as slaves.”¹⁴⁰ *The Times* echoed the argument of pro-Confederate members in Parliament that Lincoln was only looking to free the slaves as a force to use against the Confederacy, and that he did not intend to abolish slavery altogether. This was a way to argue for siding with the Confederacy without having to support slavery, and still being for human rights in supporting a government looking for self-determination. It was difficult for the pro-South argument to remain prominent in Britain, however, as the popular reception to the Emancipation Proclamation was generally positive. This was especially the case in Lancashire, where despite the continuation of the Cotton Famine, support for the Union was at a high point.

The textile factory workers in Lancashire were overjoyed by the creation of the Emancipation Proclamation, as they saw it as a victory for human rights everywhere. In fact the people of Manchester in particular were so supportive of the legislation that they directly wrote to Lincoln. The *Manchester Guardian* printed an “Address from the Working Men to President Lincoln” on January 1, 1863, the same date that Lincoln released the Emancipation Proclamation. The letter from the people of Manchester praised Lincoln as a leader of freedom, and officially declared their support for the Union. The *Guardian* printed a passage from factory worker Hugh Mason, who wrote, “I have no doubt whatever that the rebellion was planned, and has to this moment been prompted, for the sole object of perpetrating slavery,

¹⁴⁰ Sears, 573.

and my prayer is that it will fail of its diabolical purpose.”¹⁴¹ The letter written to President Lincoln showed the strong belief in Lancashire that freedom was the most important right, and therefore agreed with the Union over their fight to abolish it. Although the Cotton Famine was still devastating the region with many unemployed and struggling, the factory workers chose to support the anti-slavery cause of the North over the cotton from the South that would have saved their factories.

When Lincoln received the letter from the Manchester factory workers, he was incredibly moved by their support. He wrote back on January 19, 1863 to share his views on the Union, the abolition of slavery, and to thank the workers for supporting freedom above all. First addressing his knowledge of the Lancashire Cotton Famine and the importance of Great Britain, Lincoln wrote:

I know and deeply deplore the sufferings which the working men at Manchester and in ail Europe are called to endure in this crisis. It has been often and studiously represented that the attempt to overthrow this Government which was built on the foundation of human rights, and to substitute for it one which should rest exclusively on the basis of slavery, was likely to obtain the favor of Europe.¹⁴²

Lincoln was fearful of the Confederacy obtaining aid from Britain, since even though they had abolished slavery themselves, there was more that the South could offer through trade than the North. He continued his letter to the people of Manchester by declaring his joy that, while this was the case with many members of Parliament, the working class remained true to the cause of freedom despite their poor financial situation due to the Cotton Famine. Lincoln went on to write:

¹⁴¹ F. Hourani, "Manchester and Abraham Lincoln: A Side-Light on an Earlier Fight for Freedom" (Internet Archive. January 1, 1863.), "Address from Working Men to President Lincoln".

¹⁴² Ibid.

I hail this interchange of sentiments, therefore, as an augury that, whatever else may happen, whatever misfortune may befall your country or my own, the peace and friendship which now exists between the two nations will be, as it shall be my desire to make them, perpetual.¹⁴³

Whatever the official relationship between the United States government and Parliament, Lincoln stated that the letter from Manchester had shown him that the two nations were grounded in the same belief in human rights. This was what had kept Great Britain neutral up until this point, and Lincoln was confident that the views of the working class showed that Parliament would not be able to support the Confederacy without risking the anger of the British people.

While the previous exchange was orchestrated by the working population of Manchester, it was representative of the growing pro-Union stance in Great Britain. The Emancipation Proclamation had made clear the intention of the United States to abolish slavery after the Civil War, and while there was worry over only the southern slaves being immediately freed, this fear proved to be unfounded.¹⁴⁴ The pro-Confederacy section of Parliament had thus far avoided the issue of slavery by arguing that there was no guarantee it would be abolished by the North, and that therefore support should be given to the Confederacy government in their struggle for self-determination. After January 1, 1863, however, the platform of Lincoln and the Union to abolish slavery became clear, and severely weakened any attempts of Parliament to support the South.¹⁴⁵ Any support for cotton or the Confederacy would now be viewed in Britain as backing slavery as well, which would further alienate the government from the working population. In order to avoid

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Foreman, 318.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 320.

destabilizing Britain itself, it became increasingly clear that Parliament would continue to remain neutral in the Civil War.

Gettysburg, Vicksburg, and British Neutrality

The turning point in Anglo-American relations during the Civil War came in July 1863. This was due to two Union military victories over the Confederacy, Gettysburg on July 3 and the successful siege of Vicksburg on July 4.¹⁴⁶ These were the two largest military defeats suffered by the Confederacy to date, and effectively turned the tide in the war. Gettysburg was a rare instance where a Confederate Army penetrated Union territory, and the failure to find any success showed that the South was beginning to lose military power. The loss of Vicksburg, the most important Confederate city on the Mississippi, not only cut the South in half, but it showed that they lacked the material means of winning the war.¹⁴⁷ The defeats of the Confederacy in the summer of 1863 had a devastating effect on diplomacy between the South and Great Britain. Even the most ardent supporters of the Confederacy in Great Britain began to lose faith in the ability of the South to win the war. With the abolition agenda of the North there was virtually no chance Parliament would support the Confederacy without believing they could win the war.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 661-663.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 637-638.

¹⁴⁸ Foreman, 571.

Following the Confederate defeats at Gettysburg and Vicksburg, it looked as if Great Britain was set to remain neutral until the end of the Civil War. These two battles had greatly shifted momentum in the war towards the Union that, with a larger and better-supplied army, was poised to maintain its advantage. In April 1864 Charles Francis Adams Jr. wrote to his father, the United States Minister to Great Britain, describing the state of the war. Adams Jr. wrote that, "Since this month came in this war seems to have gone so far that now, in this last effort, either we must crush them or leave them so weak that little enough more blood will be left to shed."¹⁴⁹ This letter from Adams Jr. to his father showed the confidence in the Union that they would be victorious, seeing it as only a matter of time until the South was forced to surrender. The imminent defeat of the South was a view shared in Britain, which is expressed in Charles Francis Adams Sr.' return letter to his son. Adams wrote, "Looking back on the progress made since we began, it is plain to my mind that the issue, if persevered in, can terminate only in one way... The question with the South is only of more or less of annihilation by delay."¹⁵⁰ As the United States Minister to Great Britain, Adams had an intimate relationship with Parliament, and was therefore well informed of the British stance on the Civil War. With it becoming increasingly clear that the Confederacy could not defeat the Union, the chances of Great Britain aiding the South, or even recognizing the Confederate States, were slim to none.

¹⁴⁹ Aaron Sheehan-Dean, *The Civil War: The Final Year Told by Those Who Lived It* (New York: Library of America, 2014) 168.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 203.

By 1864 it had become clear that Great Britain would not intervene in the Civil War. Despite the continuing economic depression in Lancashire, the gradual improvement of the textile industry coupled with the anti-slavery stance of the workers with the Union meant King Cotton diplomacy had effectively failed for the Confederacy. The South's defeats at Gettysburg and Vicksburg in the summer of 1863 had turned the momentum of the war in favor of the North, and drastically impacted Confederate diplomacy with Britain. Coupled with the Emancipation Proclamation showing Lincoln's commitment to abolition, Parliament could not support the South. This represents a change in opinion from the early years of the war, where it appeared that the South had a high chance of winning the war. Union superiority in the Civil War by 1863, coupled with the North's new official stance of emancipation, severely hurt the pro-Confederacy argument in Britain. The working class in Lancashire had shown that Union victory was more important than their financial situation, and this was a political battle that the British government could not afford. As the American Civil War entered its final year, it was looking as if Great Britain would play no official role in the conflict. Desperate to change the British stance, the Confederate government was forced to reexamine their diplomatic tactics.

Chapter 6: Great Britain and the End of the American Civil War

By late 1864 the end of the American Civil War was approaching, and Great Britain was still a neutral observer. With the military advantage of the Union coupled with the pro-abolitionist stance of the British people, Parliament appeared to have no choice but to remain neutral. Undercover efforts to aid the Confederacy, primarily blockade-running, continued until the end of the war, yet this was the extent of Britain's aid.¹⁵¹ There was nothing that could be done officially without national recognition of the Confederacy, which was impossible for Britain. Although the feeling in Parliament was that the South had built a legitimate government through their desire to be free of subservience to the United States government, defeat would be internationally devastating to Britain. If they had supported a pro-slavery government that was eventually defeated by the same nation it rebelled against, Parliament would have faced not only internal pressure, but also potential repercussions from the Union and those who supported them.¹⁵² Also, with the official passage of the Emancipation Proclamation, supporting the Confederacy was not a viable option. The self-determination of the South was not as important as the British stance on slavery, which would not allow their government to support a regime with legalized slavery. As long as the South remained committed to slavery, neutrality was the only remaining stance that would not have damaged the British nation.

¹⁵¹ Ellison, 170-171.

¹⁵² Foreman, 583-584.

Lancashire in 1865

Although Lancashire had still not recovered its pre-Civil War level of industry by 1865, the state of the textile factories were vastly improved over 1862, when the Lancashire Cotton Famine was at its worst. Unemployment rates had continued to rise, average household income was increasing, and the general attitude of factory workers was improving. By May 1865 there were just fewer than 100,000 unemployed in Lancashire, well below the 330,000 in November 1862. The number of employed textile workers was also the highest since the beginning of the Civil War, showing that Northern England was well on its way towards recovery.¹⁵³ The improvement in Lancashire was due to an increase in cotton imports, with Britain finding other trade centers with the South still embroiled in the Civil War. The only cotton coming out of the Confederacy was due to blockade running, and while this was still successful, it alone did not provide enough cotton to restart the textile industry. British expansion into India had uncovered that, while cotton could be grown there, it was not of the quality or quantity of the American South.¹⁵⁴ The answer was found in Egypt, which was the only region that rivaled the quality of southern cotton. By 1865 British trade with Egypt was accounting for nearly half of its previous imports from the South.¹⁵⁵ Although Egyptian cotton was not enough to restore the Lancashire textile industry to its pre-war profitability, it allowed many factories to reopen and workers to return to work. The Lancashire Cotton Famine was nearing its end.

¹⁵³ Foner, 5.

¹⁵⁴ Foreman, 502.

¹⁵⁵ Herring, 236.

With renewed economic growth in Lancashire, the pro-South argument for restoring the cotton trade had died out. While political arguments for recognizing the Confederacy persisted in some sections of Parliament, Egyptian cotton was proving to be a suitable replacement for that of the Southern States. Although resumed trade with the South would provide enough raw material to end the Lancashire Cotton Famine, the cost of joining a side that was clearly losing would have been too great for Parliament to justify.¹⁵⁶ W. T. M. Torrens, a British author who wrote about the troubles in Lancashire firsthand, discussed the conflict between the factory workers and Parliament in *Lancashire's Lesson: Or, the Need of a Settled Policy in Times of Exceptional Distress*, published in 1864. Torrens recounted a meeting in Parliament where the issue of Lancashire was brought up amidst the debate of aiding the Confederacy:

Parliament was not summoned to meet earlier than usual. When it did assemble, questions were asked tending to elicit explanations of the Ministerial policy regarding the American blockade; and anxiety was expressed from time to time, in a great variety of ways, respecting the industrial and social condition of Lancashire. But beyond the reiteration of the resolve not to interfere in the Civil War, no declaration of any importance was made.¹⁵⁷

The issue of the Lancashire Cotton Famine was brought to Parliament as workers looked for aid, yet it was made clear that they would not support any action helping the Confederate States. This was a common problem throughout the Civil War for Parliament, especially towards the end of the war in 1865, where the government was looking to help the people of Lancashire, but could not assist the Confederacy in

¹⁵⁶ Foreman, 743.

¹⁵⁷ W. T. M. Torrens and Charles Pelham Villiers, *Lancashire's Lesson: Or, the Need of a Settled Policy in Times of Exceptional Distress* (Internet Archive. 1864) 28.

return for cotton. As abolition in the United States was the primary issue in the eyes of most British citizens, Parliament was forced to look for other options to relieve the textile factories, unable to support or recognize the Confederacy.

Final Plea of the Confederacy

At the beginning of 1865 the war was not going the Confederacy's way, and many southern leaders were beginning to accept that defeat was inevitable in the South's current situation. That made the issue of gaining diplomatic recognition from Great Britain that much more important. If the North won the war while the Confederacy was still legally a rebellion, then they could be treated as such after the war ended.¹⁵⁸ There would be no international pressure against the Union reintegrating the Confederacy and forcing abolition on the Southern States. This would make reintegration into the United States more difficult, with international pressure on the Union for reconquering a sovereign state.¹⁵⁹ If they were able to obtain diplomatic recognition, on the other hand, the belief of the Confederate government was that it could give the South a boost and regain lost momentum against the North. At the very least, recognition would give the Confederate States legitimacy, even if they lost the war. The Confederate hoped that foreign recognition would act as a deterrent to the Union campaign in the South, with Lincoln hoping to avoid war with Britain. Even if the Confederacy rejoined the United States, had they been a legitimate nation at one time, it would possibly have allowed them to retain some of the rights that had caused the Southern States to secede.

¹⁵⁸ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 837-838.

¹⁵⁹ Rhodes, 392-394.

Jefferson Davis knew the importance of gaining recognition from Great Britain on the Confederate war effort, and by 1865 he was desperate. In a final attempt to appease the British, Davis informed Parliament that he was willing to abolish slavery in the South in order to gain recognition for the Confederate government. On December 27, 1864, Davis sent Duncan F. Kenner, a Confederate congressman, to London to meet with Prime Minister Lord Palmerston about the possibility of Confederate recognition in return for the abolition of slavery in the South.¹⁶⁰ Despite the best attempt of Kenner, Parliament did not accept the terms of recognition, as they realized the Confederacy could not conceivably be victorious. If their government was willing to give up the core of Southern identity, then the British government recognized the inevitability of Confederate defeat. The offer of emancipation of southern slaves from Davis demonstrated the true desperation of the Confederacy in 1865, that they were willing to give up the institution that the Civil War began over, in order to maintain independence.¹⁶¹ The hope was that if the South abolished slavery it would appease the abolitionists in Great Britain, allowing Parliament to recognize the Confederacy without the political recoil of supporting a nation with legal slavery. Seeing that the South was headed for defeat, Davis and the Confederate congress were willing to go to extreme lengths to save their young nation.

Great Britain chose to remain neutral in 1865, however, despite the best efforts of Davis and Confederate diplomats. The British completely had lost faith in the ability of the South to win the Civil War. In the opinion of Parliament, the

¹⁶⁰ Foreman, 726.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 742.

willingness of the Confederacy to readily emancipate their slaves for international recognition showed that their government had also lost hope in victory.¹⁶² With the working class of Britain primarily pro-Union, Parliament could not afford to join the losing side in the Civil War, as this would only further alienate the working class and generate political instability in Britain. The Kenner mission also further weakened the conviction of many Confederate supporters in Great Britain. A primary reason that many chose to support the Confederacy at the start of the Civil War was their stance as a self-determined nation, fighting to break free of the oppressive North. This impressed many members of Parliament, who admired the southern will to maintain their tradition, even if it meant secession and war. Without the desire to maintain southern tradition at any cost, the ideological reasons for supporting the Confederacy no longer existed. With only the lure of the cotton trade remaining, which also had severely lost its ability to inspire, the Confederacy had lost nearly all support in Great Britain.¹⁶³

Anglo-American Relations After Appomattox

The American Civil War officially came to an end on May 9, 1865, with the declaration that the insurrection of the South was over. The war had virtually been finished since exactly one-month prior when the main Confederate Army surrendered to the Union at Appomattox courthouse in Virginia.¹⁶⁴ Great Britain had remained officially neutral until the end of the war, and despite actions such as the shipbuilding of blockade-runners in Northern England, had offered little actual

¹⁶² Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still Jr., 370-371.

¹⁶³ Ellison, 190.

¹⁶⁴ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 848.

aid to the Confederacy. The United States government agreed to overlook the small breaks from neutrality in the name of peace, as neither nation wanted to go to war with each other.¹⁶⁵ It was clear that Britain had a new global power to contend with in the United States. With the drastic losses in the conflict of the Civil War, however, the attention of America turned towards rebuilding a devastated nation. The period of reconstruction following the end of the war would prove to be relatively quiet in terms of Anglo-American relations.

There was one event immediately following the Civil War that caught the attention of Great Britain, the assassination of Lincoln on April 14, 1865.¹⁶⁶ The reaction to his death among the pro-Union British citizens was of stunned disbelief, which soon gave way to mourning the leader that they had greatly respected as a global leader in human rights. His loss was especially felt in Lancashire, where the stance of Lincoln and the Union against slavery had been enough to maintain a pro-North sentiment in the region, despite the devastating Cotton Famine due to the lack of Confederate Cotton. The people of Manchester went as far as to build a statue of Lincoln in the center of the city, which stands to this day.¹⁶⁷ This was due to their communication through letter with Lincoln over the issue of the Emancipation Proclamation, and their identification with the Union's stance against slavery in the latter years of the war. The reaction to Lincoln's death in Parliament was more subdued, as it focused not on the death of the man himself, but what it meant for the United States moving forward. Palmerston, who was no longer in office at the time

¹⁶⁵ Herring, 246-247.

¹⁶⁶ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 853.

¹⁶⁷ Hourani, "President Lincoln to the Working Men of Manchester".

of the assassination, died shortly after Lincoln in the fall of 1865. Both nations found themselves having to cope with the loss of an influential leader.¹⁶⁸ 1865 brought political change to both Britain and the United States, with the new leadership tasked with improving the dissolving relationship between the two nations.

The End of the Lancashire Cotton Famine

While there were many negative political changes in Great Britain that accompanied the end of the American Civil War, the bright spot was that southern cotton finally returned to Lancashire. The Cotton Famine had lasted four long years, since the United States had ordered the blockade of the South. With the official end of the Civil War in May 1865, with it came the order to end the blockade of the former-Confederacy.¹⁶⁹ This allowed the former cotton trade between the South and Britain to resume, albeit with several important differences. First, the cotton was no longer produced by slave labor. Although the cotton was produced and farmed in the same fashion, and therefore of the same quality, the laborers were now paid, and therefore the cost of southern cotton increased.¹⁷⁰ In addition to paying workers, the South was also under close watch from the United States government in what would become known as Reconstruction. Cotton trading between the South and Britain was regulated more closely by the occupying forces, and the increased difficulty of shipping cotton to Lancashire the cost not only

¹⁶⁸ Kevin Peraino, *Lincoln in the World: The Making of a Statesman and the Dawn of American Power* (New York: Crown Publishers Group, a Division of Random House LLC, 2013), 191-192.

¹⁶⁹ Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still Jr., 432-433.

¹⁷⁰ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 860.

increased, but the amount being exported decreased.¹⁷¹ Despite this change in relationship, the textile factories welcomed the return of southern cotton back with open arms.

With the return of cotton from the southern United States, the Lancashire textile factories again resumed their place as the focal point of the British economy. The increase in cotton imports resulted in factories requiring new workers, bringing the unemployment rate back near zero, as it was before the Civil War. The production of wool and linen goods had grown dramatically from 1861-1865 to compensate for the Lancashire Cotton Famine, yet the demand for these products was not as great as for cotton textiles.¹⁷² Egyptian and Indian cotton had kept Northern England's textile factories alive during the Civil War, but the quality and quantity of the raw material from these countries was not as high as that of the South. The reminder of what happened due to overdependence on one source of cotton was still fresh in the minds of many factory owners, who therefore kept some trade with Egypt and India open, if only to diversify Britain's textile options.¹⁷³ Although the Lancashire Cotton Famine had been a dark time for the factory workers of Northern England, and Britain as a whole, the return of cotton represented a return to good economic standing.

While the reaction to the defeat of the Confederacy in Great Britain was mixed, correspondence between officials in Britain and the Americans showed that

¹⁷¹ Herring, 251-253.

¹⁷² Ellison, 196.

¹⁷³ Foreman, 502.

it was hardly a surprise by the last months of the war. Charles Francis Adams Sr., the United States Minister to Great Britain, wrote about the historical significance of the war in Britain in a letter to his son Henry from London on June 17, 1864. As this letter was written around a year before the official end of the Civil War, it showed the increasing belief in Britain that the South would be defeated. Adams discussed the lasting impact of the war on Britain's international reputation, and he believed that it would be negative. About Britain supporting the evils of slavery, Adams wrote that, "The sympathy elicited in Europe with this rotten cause, among the aristocratic and privileged classes, is a sufficient proof of the support which wrongful power hopes to obtain from its success."¹⁷⁴ While Great Britain had remained officially neutral throughout the Civil War, it was clear to United States officials like Adams that they would have opposed the Union if possible. The American government continued to view diplomacy with Britain as important moving forward, yet Adams believed that Britain had hurt its international reputation throughout the course of the war.

The end of the Civil War in 1865 was welcomed in Northern England, as it meant that the Lancashire Cotton Famine was over. While conditions had been improving during the last year of the war, the return of the flow of cotton to the textile factories was an economic boost that was much needed. The workers in Lancashire were also very proud of their contributions to human rights throughout the war, having maintained their pro-Union stance despite the financial difficulties that accompanied the decline in cotton imports. The Confederacy tried in vain to

¹⁷⁴ Sheehan-Dean, 202-203.

gain recognition in the final months of the war, with Davis going as far as offering emancipation, but Parliament held to the beliefs of the people of Lancashire and remained neutral. The Lancashire Cotton Famine had an incredible impact on the American Civil War, with the textile workers supporting human right and the North despite the negative effects of the Union blockade on Northern England. While Parliament often came close to aiding the Confederacy in their secession from the United States, the influence of the people of Lancashire left Great Britain with no choice but to remain neutral, which was extremely beneficial to the war effort of the North. For the Confederacy, however, the inability to obtain British support was one of the most prevalent reasons for their defeat in the American Civil War.

Conclusion

The defeat of the Confederacy in the American Civil War can be attributed to numerous factors, yet one of the most important was the inability of the government to obtain foreign support. The South focused especially on Great Britain, which they believed would be willing to aid the Confederacy for multiple reasons. These included British opposition to the expansionist policy of the United States and support for Confederate self-determination. Most important, however, was Great Britain's dependence on Southern cotton. King Cotton diplomacy, as it was called, became the cornerstone of the Confederacy's foreign policy. Britain's main export during the 1860s was textiles, and the loss of raw material due to the Civil War plunged the nation into economic distress. This was especially true in Lancashire, the region of Northern England where the majority of Britain's textile factories were located. The lack of Southern cotton meant that many factory workers found themselves out of work, and the region as a whole became economically depressed. The Lancashire Cotton Famine was the primary issue in Anglo-Confederate relations during the Civil War.

The main problem during the Lancashire Cotton Famine was the economic impact that it had on Great Britain. Employment rates of factory workers dropped drastically, leading to financial issues for workers and their families. On the national level, the Cotton Famine meant a collapse in international trade, as textile exports were the center of Britain's foreign business. This shows the importance of the Confederacy to Great Britain, whose cotton was supporting the textile industry in Northern England. As this was one of the staples of the British economy, the

blockade that the Union imposed on the South pushed Britain, and especially Northern England, into economic distress.

Looking back through historic context, however, the lasting image of Lancashire during the Civil War was the relationship between the factory workers and Lincoln, connected through their passion for human rights and desire to abolish slavery.¹⁷⁵ Lincoln credited the factory workers of Manchester with being the base of support for the Union in Great Britain, and believed that their political sway in Parliament was a contributing reason to Britain remaining neutral throughout the Civil War. Pro-Union leaders, John Bright especially, became national figures due to their support of abolition above anything else, even while the Lancashire Cotton Famine was directly affecting their own lives. The statue of Lincoln in Manchester is testament to the fact that the factory workers were incredibly proud of their stance against slavery, especially given what was sacrificed to obtain it.

The influence of the Lancashire workers in their support of abolition in the United States underlined the complete failure of King Cotton diplomacy by the Confederacy. When the war began, the Confederate government was convinced that the power of cotton would bring recognition to their nation.¹⁷⁶ Southern diplomats were correct that a cotton shortage would have on Great Britain, with the Lancashire Cotton Famine bringing the nation close to economic collapse. Davis and the rest of the Confederate congress did not predict the affect that the textile workers would have on the government, however, with the domestic politics that came with the working class' pro-abolition stance keeping Parliament from giving

¹⁷⁵ Hourani.

¹⁷⁶ Owsley and Owsley, 1.

aid to the Confederacy. At the very least the South hoped that the power of cotton would force Britain to recognize the Confederacy over fear of what would happen should they be unable to have access to the raw material.¹⁷⁷ The factories in Northern England found placeholders for southern cotton, however, with a combination of blockade running and foreign imports keeping the textile industry in Lancashire alive until 1865. By underestimating the impact of the pro-Union factory workers in Northern England on Britain's neutrality in the Civil War, the policy of King Cotton Diplomacy implemented by the Confederacy proved to be a failure.

The foreign policy of both the Confederacy and Great Britain was focused on finding a way to get Southern cotton back into the British textile factories, while the Union focused on keeping Britain from allying themselves with the South. Despite the best efforts of what became known as King Cotton Diplomacy, the Confederacy was unable to convince the British government to formally become an ally. This was due to the political influence of the pro-Union Manchester factory workers, who were able to put greater pressure on Parliament than the Confederate diplomats. Had Confederate diplomacy been successful, the manufacturing shortage in the South would have been solved by British aid. The North's greatest advantage would have been negated, changing the entire course of the war. In the end, the anti-slavery stance of Lancashire outlasted the economic distress in the region, and kept King Cotton diplomacy from being successful. Great Britain remained neutral in the Civil War, and the Union was victorious over the Confederacy.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid, 51.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"An Act for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the *British Colonies*." The National Archives of the United Kingdom. August 28, 1833. Accessed February 22, 2015, from www.nationalarchives.gov.uk.

Bourne, Kenneth, and D. Cameron Watt. *British Documents on Foreign Affairs: Part I, From the Mid-Nineteenth Century to the First World War, Series C, North America, 1837-1914*. Frederick, Maryland: University Publications of America, 1986.

Cecil, Robert. "The Confederate Struggle and Recognition." *Quarterly Review*, Volume 112, No. 224 (October, 1862): 535-70.

"Confederate States of America: Constitution for the Provisional Government." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 8, 1861. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.

"Constitution of the Confederate States, March 11, 1861." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. March 11, 1861. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.

"Correspondence of the Department of State, in Relations to British Consuls Resident in the Confederate States." Internet Archive. 1863. Accessed February 4, 2015, from <https://archive.org>.

Costi, An. Michele, and Charles Wilkes. "Memoir on the Trent Affair." Internet Archive. 1865. Accessed February 5, 2015, <https://archive.org>

Davis, Jefferson. "Confederate States of America: Inaugural Address by the President of the Provisional Government." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 18, 1861. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.

Davis, Jefferson. "Confederate States of America: Message to Congress February 26, 1861(European Commission)." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 26, 1861. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.

Davis, Jefferson. "Confederate States of America: Veto Message February 28, 1861 (Slave Trade)." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 28, 1861. Accessed February 2, 2015, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.

Davis, Jefferson. "Jefferson Davis: Private Letters 1823-1889." North American Women's Letters and Diaries. 1889. Accessed February 8, 2015, from <http://0-solomon.nwld.alexanderstreet.com.tiger.coloradocollege.edu>.

Fillmore, Millard. "Millard Fillmore to Abraham Lincoln, Monday, December 16, 1861 (Trent Affair)." The Abraham Lincoln Papers at the Library of Congress. December 16, 1861. Accessed February 8, 2015, from <http://memory.loc.gov>.

"Harpers Weekly, the Trent Affair: The Trent Question." Civil War Trust. January 2, 1862. Accessed February 12, 2015, from <http://www.civilwar.org/education/history/primarysources>.

- Hourani, F. "Manchester and Abraham Lincoln: A Side-Light on an Earlier Fight for Freedom." Internet Archive. January 1, 1863. Accessed February 5, 2015, from <https://archive.org>.
- Lincoln, Abraham, and William H. Seward. "British-American Diplomacy: Additional Article to the Treaty for the Suppression of the African Slave Trade" Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 17, 1863. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.
- Lincoln, Abraham, William H. Seward, and Lord Lyons. "British-American Diplomacy: Treaty between United States and Great Britain for the Suppression of the Slave Trade." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. April 7, 1862. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.
- Pierce, Franklin, and W. L. Marcy. "British-American Diplomacy: Convention of 1853 between Great Britain and the United States." Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy. February 8, 1853. Accessed February 2, 2015, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century.
- Richardson, James D. *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Confederacy: Including the Diplomatic Correspondence, 1861-1865*. Nashville: United States Pub., 1905.
- Roper, Jon. *The American Civil War: Literary Sources and Documents*. Vol. 1. Mountfield, East Sussex: Helm Information, 2000.
- Roper, Jon. *The American Civil War: Literary Sources and Documents*. Vol. 2. Mountfield, East Sussex: Helm Information, 2000.

- Roper, Jon. *The American Civil War: Literary Sources and Documents*. Vol. 3. Mountfield, East Sussex: Helm Information, 2000.
- Sears, Stephen W. *The Civil War: The Second Year Told by Those Who Lived It*. New York: Library of America, 2012.
- Semmes, Raphael. *The Cruise of the Alabama and the Sumter*. Vol. 1. Carleton, New York: Saunders, Otley & Co. 1864.
- Sheehan-Dean, Aaron. *The Civil War: The Final Year Told by Those Who Lived It*. New York: Library of America, 2014.
- Simpson, Brooks D. *The Civil War: The Third Year Told by Those Who Lived It*. New York: Library of America, 2013.
- Simpson, Brooks D., Stephen W. Sears, and Aaron Sheehan-Dean. *The Civil War: The First Year Told by Those Who Lived It*. New York, NY: Library of America, 2011.
- Sinclair, Arthur, and William N. Still Jr. *Classics of Naval Literature: Two Years on the Alabama*. 2nd ed. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1896.
- "The American Civil War: Letters and Diaries." Civil War Letters and Diaries. January 1, 2015. Accessed February 5, 2015, from <http://0-solomon.cwld.alexanderstreet.com.tiger.coloradocollege.edu>.
- "The Local News (Alexandria, VA): General News." Library of Congress. December 24, 1861. Accessed February 5, 2015, from <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov>.

"The Local News (Alexandria, VA): Decision of the U.S. Government in the Trent Affair." Library of Congress. December 28, 1861. Accessed February 5, 2015, from <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov>.

W. T. M. Torrens, and Villiers, Charles Pelham. *Lancashire's Lesson: Or, the Need of a Settled Policy in Times of Exceptional Distress*. Internet Archive. 1864. Accessed February 5, 2015, from <https://archive.org>.

Waugh, Edwin. "Home Life of the Lancashire Factory Fold During the Cotton Famine." The Project Gutenberg eBook. 1862. Accessed February 6, 2015, from <http://www.gutenberg.org>.

Wilson, Charles L. "Charles L. Wilson to William H. Seward, Wednesday, November 27, 1861 (Capture of Mason and Slidell)." American Memory: Abraham Lincoln Papers at the Library of Congress. November 27, 1861. Accessed February 5, 2015, from <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov>.

Secondary Sources

Arrington, Benjamin T. "Industry and Economy During the Civil War." National Parks Service. February 7, 2015. Accessed February 7, 2015, from <http://www.nps.gov/resources>.

Beringer, Richard E., Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Still Jr. *Why the South Lost the Civil War*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Blackett, Richard M. "Multimedia: Divided Hearts: Britain and the American Civil War." The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History. May 6, 2002. Accessed February 2, 2015, from <http://www.gilderlehrman.org>

- Carwardine, Richard, and Jay Sexton. *The Global Lincoln*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Catton, Bruce, and James M. McPherson. "Europe and the American Civil War." In *The American Heritage New History of the Civil War*. Sterling Publishing, 2001.
- De Leon, Edwin. *Secret History of Confederate Diplomacy Abroad*. Edited by William C. Davis. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.
- Ellison, Mary, and Peter Jones. *Support for Secession: Lancashire and the American Civil War*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1972.
- Foner, Philip Sheldon. *British Labor and the American Civil War*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1981.
- Foreman, Amanda. *A World on Fire: Britain's Crucial Role in the American Civil War*. New York: Random House, 2011.
- Forster, Stig, and Jorg Nagler. *On the Road to Total War: The American Civil War and the German Wars of Unification, 1861-1871*. Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute, 1997.
- Foster, Kevin J. "The Diplomats Who Sank a Fleet: The Confederacy's Undelivered European Fleet and the Union Consular Service." *National Archives Magazine*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (January 1, 2001).
- Fuller, Howard J. *Clad in Iron: The American Civil War and the Challenge of British Naval Power*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Security International, 2008.
- Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- John, Evan. *Atlantic Impact: 1861*. New York: Putnam, 1952.
- Johnson, Walter. *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford
University Press, 1988.
- McPherson, James M. *Defining Documents of American History: The Civil War, 1860-
1865*. Vol. 1. Amenia, New York: Grey House Publishing, 2014.
- McPherson, James M. *Defining Documents of American History: The Civil War, 1860-
1865*. Vol. 2. Amenia, New York: Grey House Publishing, 2014.
- "Milestones: 1861-1865: The Civil War and International Diplomacy." Office of the
Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, US Department of State. Accessed
February 5, 2015, from <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1861-1865>.
- Owsley, Frank Lawrence, and Harriet Chappell Owsley. *King Cotton Diplomacy:
Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America*. 2nd ed. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Peraino, Kevin. *Lincoln in the World: The Making of a Statesman and the Dawn of
American Power*. New York: Crown Publishers Group, a Division of Random
House LLC, 2013.
- Rhodes, James Ford. *History of the Civil War: 1861-1865*. New York: MacMillan
Company, 1927.
- Symonds, Craig L. *Lincoln and His Admirals: Abraham Lincoln, the U.S. Navy, and the
Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.