

Chapter 1

CELEBRATING THE MONARCHY
LOYALISM, RADICALISM AND THE CROWD, 1820–1832



At the end of January in 1820, the news of George III's death reached the English public amidst a deep political conflict raging between conservative loyalists and radical reformers. Just a few months earlier, in August 1819, a large demonstration in favour of democratic reforms with a crowd of up to 100,000 had erupted on St Peter's Field near Manchester and ended in a veritable bloodbath. After the local magistrates had issued the order to disband the demonstration, the yeomanry charged wildly into the crowd, leaving eleven dead and hundreds of wounded in their wake. Liberals as well as radicals reacted with outrage and staged protests against the 'massacre of Peterloo' across the country. Meanwhile, the government, under Lord Liverpool, sought to prevent further protests by enacting repressive laws in short succession. These so-called Six Acts were designed to put a damper on the rights of assembly and the freedom of the press. The Peterloo incident thus marked the apex of a crisis that had developed after the end of the Napoleonic Wars. After years of fiery debate, the gap between the interests of the conservative establishment and the demands of radical reformers seemed to have become irreconcilable. Both sides claimed to speak for the majority of 'the people'.¹

And so it came that a new king was to be crowned during this period of constrained peace that reigned in early 1820. Only a few days after the death of his father, celebrations proclaiming George IV as the new king took place in all the cities and villages of the kingdom. Whereas this situation presented an opportunity for demonstrations of loyalty and affinity for the monarchy, it was also overshadowed by the question of whether these festivities might open a forum for voicing further demands for reform that might lead to renewed protests against the government.

Notes from this chapter begin on page 59.

Even after the celebrations were over, the situation was still ambiguous. Although the proclamations themselves were not marred by any incidents and large crowds participated in the festivities across the land, there was not a great outpouring of enthusiasm for the new king and the monarchy.² Accordingly, both conservatives and radicals could call individual celebrations a success. For example, the conservative newspaper *Wheeler's Manchester Chronicle* reported on the festivities in Manchester with a measure of relief, noting that 'the most zealous loyalty pervaded the conduct of the people, and the air rang with acclamations and applause'.³ A crowd of a few thousand assembled as the municipal authorities, accompanied by the army regiments and militia stationed in Manchester, officially celebrated the proclamation of George IV as king at St Anne's Square with a gun salute and the singing of the national anthem. Afterwards, they paraded through the city to the neighbouring town of Salford. Along the way the proclamation was read, to the cheers of the crowd, several times over. *Wheeler's Manchester Chronicle* reported that there was just one attempt to disrupt the procession, which was quickly put down by the assembled crowd and only served to increase the jubilation. It claimed the day as a 'complete triumph of loyalty'.⁴ The liberal *Cowdroy's Manchester Gazette*, on the other hand, maintained that hardly anyone had celebrated the parade as only 'a very small portion of the people assembled joined the authorities of the town and the soldiers in giving nine cheers'.⁵

Given such contradictory accounts of the celebrations of the monarchy, historians have repeatedly cautioned against judging the general political inclination of these crowds merely on the basis of their large numbers and rushing to the conclusion that the cheering masses reported as having attended these kinds of celebrations attest to a fundamental conservative spirit among the people. In particular, Mark Harrison emphasizes the complex character of these celebrations of proclamations and coronations in the early nineteenth century, using Bristol as his primary example. He argues that, on the surface, the public expression of loyalist feeling could blanket over local conflicts, but when looked at more closely, these moments actually underscored these very issues.⁶ Harrison rightly describes the general emptiness of such loyalist rituals and calls for more detailed analyses of their specific local contexts because of the difficulties in assessing the meaning of such events. Yet his own examination of the festivities surrounding the proclamation and coronation of George IV in Bristol, Liverpool, Norwich and Manchester still provides a rather simplified view. For example, he sees the lack of planning to symbolically involve the people in the official celebrations in 1820 and 1821 as a conscious act of exclusion on the part of the municipal authorities. Similarly, on the basis of liberal and radical press reports on the lack of cheering among the crowds, he concludes that there was an ideological antagonism between city leaders and the local population.⁷ Correspondingly, Harrison interprets the reverse signs that appeared in 1831, with the coronation of William

IV, along class lines, and re-emphasizes the opposition between the conservative leaders who were reluctantly involved in the planning of the celebrations and the crowds who cheered the king while harbouring demands for reform.⁸

Yet an examination of lower-class participation in the celebrations of the monarchy in other years, in which a political crisis did not loom so largely overhead, effectively questions the rather oversimplified assumption that there was a fundamental conflict between the political interests of the crowd and the goals of the ruling political classes. A look at Leeds, Bolton and London, for example, reveals that even as early as the 1820s, there was no clear-cut conflict between the municipal authorities and the cheering crowds. Moreover, by extending the perspective beyond the 1820s, a more complex picture of the political positions of those who participated in the celebrations of the monarchy emerges. Rather than a one-sided opposition between 'upper class' and 'lower class', there were a variety of opinions and changing identities apparent among the crowds. Correspondingly, elements of popular conservatism can be detected in the celebrations of the monarchy that attest to the circulation of conservative political attitudes within the English lower classes. At the same time, the popularity of conservative political thought among plebeians undermines assumptions that English society was divided along insurmountable lines of conflict as well as the notion that a fundamental social consensus reigned in England at this time.

Analysing Crowds and the Popularity of the Monarchy

Mark Harrison's analysis of crowds in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century aims to free the historical interpretation of mass phenomena in England from the all too rigid definitions of the masses proposed by Eric Hobsbawm, E.P. Thompson and George Rudé. In their studies, these three Marxist historians sought to replace the strongly negative image of the threatening and unpredictable 'masses' associated with a fear of revolution, which had come to characterize many sociological and socioanthropological analyses of crowds by the time Gustav Le Bon's *La psychologie des foules* appeared in 1895, with a perspective shaped by well-founded sociohistorical analyses. Correspondingly, they wanted to overcome the blanket equation of 'the masses' with 'the people' or the 'lower classes'.⁹ Rather than focusing on the psychological disappearance of the individual in the crowd and the dissolution of individual sociomoralistic standards in the behaviour of a group, they analysed the immediate social context within which crowds appeared, as well as their entirely rational, coordinated and clearly goal-oriented behaviour. Within this framework, it was Thompson in particular who developed the concept of the 'moral economy' of the crowd that has been so often cited.¹⁰ At the same time, these three scholars limited the scope of their interpretations to phenomena that were directly

connected to social protests, civil disturbances and riots. Rudé, for example, explicitly excluded crowds that assembled to celebrate ceremonial, religious or carnivalesque events as well as those attending public performances.¹¹ Despite the rather pragmatic focus on protest culture, the perspective developed by these historians greatly influenced further scholarship on crowds and disturbances in England for quite some time.¹²

In contrast, drawing on continental scholarship on the culture of celebrations, Harrison has developed a broader concept of the 'crowd', which he defines as a large group of people assembled in an open space. He also adds a further criterion, namely that of proximity, as he maintains that crowds must be concentrated in such a way that the people involved influence one another in terms of their behaviour and actions; they must be close enough to each other so that they could appear to contemporary observers as an assembly. At the same time, Harrison proposes an exemplary analytical framework for examining the behaviour of crowds that takes into consideration systematically collected data on a given event such as the date, the time of day (general working hours or rather leisure time), the location of the assembly and/or the route taken by the group or the parade as well as the weather at the time. He then evaluates this information using a 'thick description' method drawn from Clifford Geertz.¹³ In his study, he also consciously includes crowds that took part in ceremonial events that may have at first seemed to be merely a group of spectators. Moreover, he questions the depth of the ideological convictions of agents within crowds.

Despite these methodological innovations, however, Harrison hardly strays from the rather one-sided, protest-oriented tradition within scholarship on English social history. This can be seen in his – quite legitimate – rejection of the idea inspired by Emile Durkheim that patriotic rituals are events in which societies debate shared values and beliefs or celebrate a moralistic consensus in a quasi-religious way.¹⁴ It is also reinforced in his argument that almost exclusively binds an analysis of celebrations and ceremonial events to a reconstruction of subversive attitudes, which effectively traces a fundamental opposition between the English lower classes and the social elite along the lines of the old labour history. Especially in his examination of the celebrations of the monarchy in the early nineteenth century, Harrison neglects to discuss the changing moods as well as contradictory positions and attitudes that could emerge within a crowd.

Harrison's study is not merely interesting because of its interpretative methods, but also because its assessment of the popularity of the English Crown supports the idea that the popular loyalist Church and King attitude disappeared around 1800. Even today, scholarship on the subject of the popular opinion of the monarchy is still heavily influenced by the works of Linda Colley and David Cannadine that outlined the idea that the monarchy under George III developed into a popular national institution up to 1815, but then became unpopular and controversial under his successors before transforming into a symbol of British

dominance and national identity under the flag of imperialism toward the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁵

Colley, for example, describes the transformation of George III from a young king who seemed to endanger England's constitutional compromise of the seventeenth century by stressing his own political role into a figure of national identification who stood at the centre of a new 'anti-democratic brand of patriotism'. This change, she argues, was connected to an increasing amount of royalist self-staging and public celebrations that touted the king as the personification of the political order. The king's birthday and the anniversary of his coronation became firmly entrenched in the calendar of public celebrations. Events such as the Golden Jubilee in 1809 or the king's recovery from his first phase of madness in 1789, for example, sparked a wave of rejoicing and elaborate festivities across England.¹⁶

Although George III's popularity during the war against France helped to unify the nation and turn the monarchy into a symbol of national greatness, Cannadine describes the story of the monarchy after 1820 as the decline of a national institution. Even before the death of George III, Cannadine maintains, the popularity of the royal house had begun to wane as the Prince Regent, George IV, *de facto* replaced his ageing father; the image of the king as the devoted father of the nation was effectively shattered as the crown passed from father to son, especially because the prince was rather known for being sexually promiscuous and having sparked a series of scandals involving the royal family. Cannadine also links the sinking reputation of the royal family following the Queen Caroline Affair¹⁷ in 1820 to the dwindling of public celebrations of the monarchy and efforts to mould the public image of the Crown. The largely unpopular image of the English monarchs, he suggests, remained firmly in place even under William IV and Queen Victoria. It was not until the last decades of Victoria's reign that the royal family consciously took advantage of celebratory events involving the Crown to re-establish the monarchy as a national symbol by the 'inventing of tradition'.¹⁸

Although the narrative of the monarchy and its public reception outlined by Colley and Cannadine has been thoroughly criticized and revised, their interpretation that the royal family played almost no role in the formation of patriotic and loyalist identities among much of the English population between 1815 and 1870 still holds sway.¹⁹ Indeed, although more recent studies on public debates related to the monarchy in the nineteenth century emphasize the parallel existence of a conservative-loyalist tradition of honouring the royal house and a widespread radical tradition of rejecting the monarchy and sharply criticizing the reigning monarch, they continue to reinforce the periodization put forth by Colley and Cannadine.²⁰ Since then, however, several historians have detected a rather noticeable change in the attitude toward the Crown among much of the middle class even in the early phase of Queen Victoria's reign; some also suggest

that the Chartists had a conspicuously positive view of the Crown.²¹ But with respect to the English lower classes and their participation in celebrations of the monarchy before 1870 in particular, most scholars still stress the anti-monarchist character of crowds and depict the cheering masses as rather thoughtless agents.²² Moreover, few historians have considered the idea that conservative attitudes may have been prevalent among the crowds on the streets.

A look at these celebrations of the Crown in different cities around the kingdom, as well as a comparison of the events in the provinces with those in London, however, provides a relatively distinct impression of the variety of attitudes toward the monarchy and loyalist views that existed among the general population. Yet it is important to bear in mind that a limited perspective in which only a few extraordinary events are taken into consideration ignores the celebrations of the Crown for what they truly were: they were part of a calendar of festivities that took place year after year. That said, however, the meaning and significance attached to these events varied from year to year and they can thus also be read as reflections of contemporary debates and political conflicts. The following section will look at the crowds that participated in the celebrations of coronation day and the king's birthday in the 1820s and the early 1830s. Above all, it questions whether these celebrations on the whole generate a reliable impression of the moods and positions that reigned among the violent crowds of people who attended them.

The Monarchy in the Provinces

A look at the festivities surrounding George IV's birthday in Bolton in the 1820s quickly reveals some of the problems associated with Mark Harrison's argument that these celebrations reflected a clearly decipherable conflict between the masses of spectators and municipal elites. The descriptions of the events in Bolton mostly stem from the radical *Bolton Chronicle* that clearly sided with the city's reformers. Nonetheless, over the course of the 1820s, significant differences can be detected in the depictions of the festivities and the crowds in attendance. In 1820/21 and 1831, it appeared that the celebrations in Bolton were rife with tensions like those in the towns mentioned by Harrison.²³ However, there is little evidence suggesting that conflicts like those associated with the Queen Caroline Affair and the electoral reforms at the beginning of the 1830s emerged in the years in between.

In the 1820s, the celebrations in Bolton followed the same pattern year after year. During the weeks leading up to George III's birthday on 23 April, the leading administrators in both districts of the city, the boroughreeves and constables of both Great and Little Bolton, planned a large parade through the city, where all the important buildings were decked with flags. As announced in the

Bolton Chronicle, the immediate preparations for the parade took place in the morning as the participating groups assembled in the centre of Great Bolton at the New Market. Lead by a guard of cavalry from the local yeomanry, representatives of local associations and clubs, the local militia with its officers and bands, and the city's officials as well as the clergy from the Anglican Church paraded through the town's main streets. In Bolton in particular, the vicar of the city, Reverend James Slade, and the commander of the local yeomanry, Colonel Ralph Fletcher, were among the prominent participants in the parade. These two men counted among the most well-known Tories in the city. Slade, who came from a leading clerical family within the Anglican-Conservative milieu, was considered to be one of the most important opponents of the liberals and radicals in Bolton. As a magistrate and commander of the yeomanry's cavalry, Fletcher was partly responsible for the use of troops to disband the Peterloo demonstration and had become one of the main enemies of the radical opposition.²⁴

The parade was first supposed to stop on Bradford Square, where marchers from the respective regiments stationed in the city were to be greeted by the public.²⁵ The soldiers fired a round of celebratory salutes before a large crowd of spectators while the military bands played a mix of patriotic songs including 'Rule Britannia' and other popular melodies. Afterwards, the parade, with the regiments in tow, wound its way through the surrounding streets to Little Bolton before heading back to New Market where a large crowd waited. Everyone cheered the king three times before the official part of the celebration came to an end with the singing of the national anthem.

Although the *Bolton Chronicle* was the organ of the radicals who challenged the Tory city government, which was backed by the local gentry, it nonetheless had to acknowledge that the support for these celebrations held under the auspices of the opposing political camp grew among the population over the years.²⁶ The success or failure of the celebrations seemed to have become much more dependent on the weather than on the city leaders' efforts to control a threatening crowd. Year after year, larger crowds assembled for the celebrations that were staged as a festive event open to all. In 1828, for example, the *Bolton Chronicle* commented, 'On no previous occasion have we ever witnessed such general enthusiasm as animated all classes of the inhabitants on that day'.²⁷ It was not until a year later that the newspaper reported that considerably fewer people attended the parade than usual – the crowd on the edges of the street numbered just around twelve thousand. The *Bolton Chronicle* asserted that it was primarily the absence of the 'orangemen and other bigoted ultras' that accounted for the meagre turnout. As the parade took place a few days after the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed on 13 April 1829, it seemed that these groups had refused to participate in the festivities because they were disappointed over the fact that they had lost the fight against legal equality for Catholics.²⁸

Even though the brief account of the *Bolton Chronicle* only permits limited conclusions regarding the social composition of the crowds involved in the festivities as well as their attitudes and reactions, there was no open opposition to speak of between the city's elite and a protest-minded public. As in 1820/21 in Bristol and Liverpool, there were no craftsmen's associations or groups clearly representative of the lower classes that took part in the official part of the celebrations. Not even the radical press, however, seems to have taken this fact as evidence of a conscious effort to exclude plebeians from the celebrations.²⁹ Rather, groups recruited from among the lower strata of society such as the local lodges of the Orange Order apparently took part in the festivities on a regular basis without sparking dissent or conflicts. Indeed, it is quite telling that the particular success of the celebrations in April 1828 came shortly after the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act in March, which had excluded Nonconformist Protestants from public offices and parliamentary mandates, and amidst fiery debates regarding the future legal status of Catholics. The major confrontation between ultra-conservative circles, who saw equality for Catholics as a grievous threat to the English constitutional order and the Protestant identity of the English nation, and their liberal and Catholic opponents was not reflected in the celebrations, despite the fact that the conflict led to fierce confrontations in the coming months in Bolton as well.³⁰

In Bolton, the king's well-known opposition to the emancipatory measures for Catholics demanded by radicals and liberals, the Ultra-Tory control of the festivities and the participation of the Orange Order had the potential to put a damper on the celebrations. However, unlike during the Queen Caroline Affair in 1821, there was no radical mobilization of the crowd. On the contrary, the prevalence of anti-Catholic views among the population and the link between loyalism and anti-Catholicism seems to have made the celebrations all the more successful in 1828. By no means can the celebrations of the king's birthday in Bolton be read as indicative of a confrontation between the elites and the 'people'.³¹ Rather, the general political situation at the local level and the mindset of the majority of those attending the festivities determined whether the celebrations expressed a feeling of conflict or consensus. The mood of the crowd could easily sway within just a few years, switching from decidedly radical to conservative loyalist as circumstances allowed.

Similarly, in the cities of the West Riding in Yorkshire, radicals and liberals only enjoyed a moderate amount of support among the crowds attending the celebrations of the monarchy during the 1820s in the first two years following the Peterloo demonstration. Even at the beginning of the decade, however, little evidence suggests that the majority of the crowds in attendance had radical leanings. Admittedly, a few weeks before the coronation of George IV in 1821, the conservative *Leeds Intelligencer* complained that neither the king's ascension to the throne in 1820 nor his birthday had been properly celebrated in Leeds. In

an article tinged with a measure of concern, the paper also wrote that it hoped that a general feeling of 'national joy' would help put party politics aside for the upcoming coronation festivities.³² Yet after the coronation celebrations the liberal and conservative press only made isolated references to protests among the crowds in Leeds, Huddersfield and surrounding towns. Incidents like those described by Mark Harrison, in which attempts were made by members of the crowd to turn the official celebrations into demonstrations against the king and his Conservative government, neither emerged in 1820 with the proclamation of George IV nor on his birthday on April 23; they were likewise absent as the country mourned the death of the old king. It was not until June 1820, with the trial of Queen Caroline, that radicals mobilized a large crowd of supporters in the West Riding, effectively changing the character of the celebrations in Leeds and Huddersfield, if only temporarily.

In 1820, the proclamation ceremonies in Leeds and Halifax echoed those in Manchester. With their parades of local army and militia units, associations, clubs and the city's magistrates, these celebrations also resembled those in honour of the king's birthday in Bolton. The *Leeds Intelligencer* as well as its liberal competitor, the *Leeds Mercury*, briefly described how the parade made its way through all the city's districts, proclaiming George IV as king at several points along the way. Both papers emphasized that the prevalent mood among the crowd was one of mourning for the new king's father.³³ Disruptions and protests against the proclamation only arose in Huddersfield on the fringe of the procession in which the local Orange Order had also taken part. The *Leeds Mercury* explicitly described the crowd as divided, but noted that some of the over ten thousand spectators on the streets joined in the cheers for the new king without hesitation.³⁴ A mere two weeks later, celebrations and parades took place in many towns in the area in honour of the funeral of George III, but the ringing of the church bells all day, the closed shops and the numerous church services mourning the king did not lead to any public confrontations or protests.³⁵ Moreover, the birthday of the new king two months later passed without incident, accompanied by 'suitable demonstrations of joy'.³⁶

However, the apparent harmony surrounding the celebrations of the monarchy in early 1820 does not erase the fact that they took place within an extremely tense atmosphere in these regions as well as in other parts of England. Numerous participants in the Peterloo demonstration had travelled to Manchester from Leeds, Huddersfield and other towns in Yorkshire in order to fight for democratic reforms and other radical goals. Protests and riots had rocked the region in 1819, instilling fear into the hearts of the local conservatives. The celebrations in early 1820 were accompanied by the revival of Luddism and took place parallel to labour struggles in and around Leeds which had been spurred on by the Clothiers' Union, one of the first unions for weavers and drapers.³⁷ Correspondingly, there were many complaints coming from among conservative circles regarding

the radical temperament of the lower classes and how they had been mobilized by radicals and enemies of the state to such a degree that they were no longer willing to advocate for the Crown and the Church.³⁸

Given the fact that the demonstration in Manchester just a few months prior was still fresh in mind and given the strong presence of the military, militias and public authorities at the celebrations in honour of the royal proclamation, the king's funeral and the new king's birthday in Yorkshire, the lack of any crowd protests on these occasions is not surprising. However, this cannot be read as proof of the hegemony of loyalist and conservative attitudes among those attending. At the same time, the striking lack of references to protests in the towns of the West Riding even in liberal newspapers differs noticeably from the case in Manchester and Liverpool. Liberal papers in these two cities either emphasized the negative mood that reigned among the people or cited the politically neutral character of the festivities as an explanation for the absence of protest. They also explicitly stated that the situation was not indicative of widespread conservatism among the public.³⁹ Furthermore, intimidation and the threat of military force did not deter radicals and striking workers in Yorkshire from symbolically expressing their anti-monarchist position outside the boundaries of the official celebrations. An anonymous letter to the editor in the *Leeds Intelligencer*, for example, deplored the fact that members of the Clothiers' Union in Batley, Littleton and a few other towns demonstratively marched through the towns on the day of George III's funeral with drums and lively music as part of a conscious effort to displace the mood of mourning that had prevailed.⁴⁰ It is exactly the coexistence of public protests with celebrations of the monarchy attended by large crowds and marked by few, if any, disturbances that casts doubts on the idea that people had only taken part in the celebrations as a matter of silent protest. Even at the height of radical mobilization, only a part of the crowd seems to have questioned the loyalist tenor of the official celebrations. Correspondingly, protests against the politics of the king and his government mostly appeared outside the framework of official celebrations.

The conflict-rife celebrations following on the heels of the Queen Caroline Affair only serve to further confirm this impression. As in many other regions in England, the trial surrounding the divorce of George IV from his wife Caroline brought the political conflict between conservatives, liberals and radicals in the West Riding to a head.⁴¹ At a demonstration in Leeds in September 1820, a few thousand people signed a petition that demanded the resignation of the government and promised Queen Caroline the support of the city of Leeds. Alongside prominent liberals like Edward Baines, the radical spokesmen Mason, Mann and Brayshaw took to the podium at the demonstration. The *Leeds Intelligencer* maintained angrily that only the 'very lowest classes' of the city let themselves be led astray by these kinds of speakers.⁴² After the failure of the trial against Caroline at the beginning of November, the organization of a demonstrative illumination of

houses and shop windows in the towns of Yorkshire by liberals and radicals resonated strongly in working-class districts in particular. Whereas the conservative press claimed with a measure of relief that the brightly lit districts on the edge of the city were only proof that established, wealthier citizens would not be swayed by the protests in the streets, the liberal papers reported that 'the people' mistrusted the government as well as the king and demanded fundamental reforms.⁴³

From the available sources, however, it is difficult to determine just how widespread such radical protests actually were among the urban lower classes. For example, at the end of the year, the *Leeds Intelligencer* claimed that only a small portion of the lower classes took part in the radical demonstrations; the silent majority, it maintained, stood loyal to the altar and the throne and had merely gone unnoticed thanks to its rather quiet and inconspicuous behaviour.⁴⁴ But, the huge crowds that cheered Queen Caroline in autumn 1820 and repeatedly expressed their displeasure with the king as well as his Conservative government cast more than just a small measure of doubt on these conservative assessments. Nonetheless, the appointment of the new Tory mayor in Leeds, William Hay, was celebrated by a parade of the city's leaders and a special church service in 1820. The first appearance of the newly founded Leeds Volunteers at these festivities attracted a large crowd, but the new militia, which had been established to bolster 'Civil Power', marched through the streets without sparking any protests or unrest. At least in Leeds, the Tory municipal elite was able to express itself and reaffirm its local dominance before a large audience without being questioned by protests coming from the crowds, even during peak phases of radical mobilization.⁴⁵

It was not until the celebrations in honour of the coronation of George IV in July 1821 that scenes occurred in Leeds and other nearby towns that were reminiscent of the conflicts described by Harrison. Both the *Leeds Intelligencer* and the *Leeds Mercury* portrayed the day of the coronation as a holiday, with celebrations in schools, factories and on the streets. The festivities were marked by free beer and food for workers as well as gun salutes, decorated public buildings, ringing church bells and parades through the city. Meanwhile, evening banquets for the conservative city leaders and the regiments of the city brought an end to the official celebrations. But the real highlight of the day came as the Volunteers marched out of town together with the regular troops stationed in the city. Under the eyes of about twenty thousand people, the troops celebrated the occasion on the field near Woodhouse Moor with the presentation of flags and standards that had been donated by 'ladies' from the city. Whereas the *Leeds Intelligencer* observed the 'utmost good humour' and 'heart-cheering loyalty' in the crowd, the *Leeds Mercury* wrote of the dampened elation of the spectators. It described incidents that took place on the edge of the procession, including the waving of a poster with 'God save the King and Queen' as well as numerous cheers to the Queen during the festivities in factories and on the fringe of the ceremony at

Woodhouse Moor.⁴⁶ These kinds of protests intensified as the day went on and culminated in attacks on the Volunteers who were celebrating in different pubs around the city. A rowdy crowd of about five hundred men made its way across the entire Brickgate neighbourhood and threw stones at the pubs, cursing the Volunteers and even violently attacking some of them.⁴⁷

Thus, similar to Harrison's study, a look at the celebrations of the monarchy in the West Riding in 1820 and 1821 reveals nothing like a cross-class consensus in terms of loyalist-conservative politics. However, only a small minority of the crowd was in any way involved in direct disturbances affecting the celebrations themselves, as the great majority of the celebrants took part in the festivities in an inconspicuous way. Moreover, decidedly radical groups such as the Clothiers' Union tended to refrain from sponsoring demonstrations during the official celebrations. Within the very tense atmosphere surrounding George IV's coronation, for example, only a small portion of the crowd sought an open conflict with the municipal leaders and fought for a reinterpretation of the loyalist symbolism of the celebrations. Therefore, even if there were in fact more attendees who tended to disagree with the conservative tenor of the celebrations than not, the notion that there was a clear opposition between conservative elites and the radical-leaning crowds still seems oversimplified.

After 1821, moreover, these kinds of confrontations ceased to accompany the celebrations in the West Riding altogether. Until 1827, both the *Leeds Mercury* and the *Leeds Intelligencer* often described the usual celebrations on the king's birthday in the same way, without mentioning any untoward incidents.⁴⁸ The highlights of the well-attended festivities during these years were a travelling theatre troupe from the capital, which performed scenes from George IV's coronation ceremony in London on the stage in Leeds in 1822 and at the elaborate ceremony held in honour of the laying of the foundation for a new Anglican church in Woodhouse the year after.⁴⁹ Many people ringed the streets as the city leaders, followed by the lodges of the Orange Order and some other associations, made their way to the construction site in a conscious effort to link the king's birthday to a religious message. Even in 1826, when the local celebrations in Leeds and surrounding cities were accompanied by strikes and unrest resulting from the widespread unemployment in the region, there appear to have been no protests or battles over the interpretation of the celebrations.⁵⁰

Conflicts only seem to have occurred in 1828 and 1829 on these holidays, but they raged between the different political camps in the city and not along class lines. Whereas the *Leeds Mercury* ignored the celebrations in early 1828, the *Leeds Intelligencer* reported on the extensive parade while also noting the success of a campaign to gather signatures for a petition against the emancipation of the Catholics.⁵¹ A year later, on the king's birthday, the now embittered conservative newspaper complained about the advent of the Emancipation Act and encouraged the Protestants of the city to continue to fight for the constitution. The

Leeds Mercury, on the other hand, spoke of rather subdued ‘demonstrations of loyalty’.⁵² Apparently the scale of the festivities shrank after the emancipation of the Catholics because many plebeian loyalists from the anti-Catholic Orange Order withdrew from the celebrations because they were disappointed with the Crown and government. The celebrations of the monarchy in the West Riding thus clearly resembled those in Bolton in the 1820s. As in Bolton, no protests against the loyalist tenor of the celebrations emerged within the crowds nor were great numbers deterred from attending the events of the day despite the heavy conservative involvement in the festivities. For many people in the towns of the West Riding, these celebrations appear to have been so popular because of their loyalist character.

At the same time, however, the conflicts surrounding the celebrations in 1828 and 1829 already began to reflect a change in the general political framework, which ultimately altered the character of the celebrations significantly after the new king ascended to the throne in the summer of 1830. George IV’s successor, William IV, was considered to be a supporter of reforms and as such he was revered by liberals as well as radicals as a ‘Patriot King’, much unlike his predecessor. The celebrations at the beginning of his reign were therefore accompanied by a rather extensive mobilization of the reform movement. The festivities drew especially large crowds, who cheered William as a reformer and a people’s king. In Leeds, more people attended his proclamation in July 1830 than any before, which the *Leeds Mercury* saw as a reflection of the more liberal atmosphere and the hopes associated with the new monarch. Quite apparently, for many who now took part in the festivities, the loyalist character of the parades and celebrations in honour of George IV’s birthday had deterred them from attending. That said, however, it appears that only the number of spectators changed, as there is no indication that there was a particular increase in enthusiasm on the part of the lower classes. Likewise, William’s proclamation does not seem to have sparked a symbolic reinterpretation of the traditional elements of the celebrations, as suggested by Harrison’s study. Correspondingly, the conservative *Leeds Intelligencer* could paint the unusually well-attended celebrations in a positive light, citing the popularity of the festivities as a clear indication of the people’s attachment to the throne.⁵³

A year later, however, the celebrations in honour of William’s coronation had a clearly liberal tone, which reflected the fact that the political situation had fully changed its course. Only a few days after William IV ascended to the throne at the beginning of July 1830, the July revolution broke out in Paris, which sparked a new wave of radical protests and strengthened liberal demands for parliamentary reform. Almost simultaneously, the social tensions resulting from the protracted unrest among farm labourers in southern England, which had stemmed from the long-lasting economic crisis following the end of the Napoleonic Wars, seemed to unravel. In the midst of this widespread crisis atmosphere, liberal

and radical reformers managed to unite different protest movements behind the demand for an expansion of the suffrage. In November 1830, the Duke of Wellington resigned as Prime Minister and Lord Grey was able to form a government that began to tackle extensive reform projects in the early months of 1831.⁵⁴

Given these developments, the coronation celebrations in many cities in September 1831 became a symbolic expression of the advent of a new era that was supposed to come with the new king. As in the examples described by Harrison, the conservative elites in the towns of the West Riding either stepped back from the planning of the events altogether or bickered with the local liberals over the financing of the festivities.⁵⁵ As a result, the official celebrations in Leeds, for example, were rather modest, while in Halifax they were cancelled completely. Nonetheless, large crowds assembled on the streets in most towns and cities to cheer their king. Whereas the radical-led craftsmen's associations in Halifax, in light of the disagreements within the city government, organized their own parade honouring William as a reformer, the crowds at the official celebrations in neighbouring towns repeatedly made clear that the popularity of the new king rested on his reputed support for the reforms planned by the new government. Even the *Leeds Intelligencer* had to concede the success of the liberal and radical reformers in its report; it described a 'general and spontaneous display of loyalty and attachment' to the king, despite the heavy rain that put a damper on many of the planned events of the day.⁵⁶

The coronation celebrations in 1831 in the West Riding, however, do not indicate that there was any kind of permanent conflict between conservative municipal elites and the lower classes who leaned toward radical protests, akin to those traced by Harrison in Bristol and Liverpool.⁵⁷ The widespread spirit of reform, however, could also be detected in the celebrations of the Crown in years to come. In May 1832, for example, a tellingly small number of people attended the festivities in honour of William's birthday after it became clear during the suffrage reform debates that the king was anything but a proponent of the Reform Bill. As a result, the birthday celebrations in Leeds, as in many other cities around England, stood quite in the shadow of the parades, concerts and public banquets that the reformers organized to celebrate the expansion of the suffrage just a few days later.⁵⁸ Despite this symbolic reprobation of William IV for supporting the conservative opponents of the suffrage reform, the parades and festivities in honour of his birthday in 1833 once again passed without incident and without any indication that the crowd tried to reverse the symbolic meaning of the day's events.⁵⁹

In conjunction with the clearly loyalist celebrations in the years prior to the advent of reforms, the sudden and temporary change in the political tone of the celebrations in 1831 and 1832 reveals the fundamental mutability of the celebrations of the monarchy much more than any kind of shift in power within a long-lasting struggle between social elites and the masses. Indeed, there was no clearly

observable, permanently entrenched loyalist, liberal, or radical tendency among the attending crowds. Likewise, the ability of an elitist municipal government to control the festivities or use them to propagate a conservative social ideal under the aegis of the Crown remained quite limited. Rather, the celebrations were continually interwoven with current political conflicts and could be used by competing parties as a stage for symbolic confrontations, whether it be in the context of the emancipation of the Catholics or the question of parliamentary reforms. The crowds along the streets did not express themselves as a unified lower class and certainly not as a self-conscious working class. On the contrary, these crowds reflected the changing attitudes and different political identities associated with the heterogeneous plebeian social groups from which they were made.

The Capital Celebrates the Crown

The perspective on celebrations of the monarchy up to 1832 emerging from Bolton and the cities of the West Riding correlates with an analysis of the same festivities in London. Through the physical presence of the court and the king, the celebrations in the capital took on a different character than those in provincial cities. Court ceremonial, official state acts and demonstrations of local identity by the participating boroughs of London blended together in a public meeting of the monarchy and the crowd. In Leeds and Bolton, the relationship between the conservative municipal leaders and their liberal and radical opponents as well as the population at large took centre stage in the eyes of the crowd. In London, however, the participation of the king and the great number of opportunities for the public to deal directly with the monarchy meant that the king himself and the political agents at the national level were the focus of the crowd's attention. State visits, receptions, public appearances of the monarch before the opening of Parliament and even seemingly private royal visits to the theatre attracted curious onlookers and crowds in great numbers. This resulted in the repeated appearance of great assemblies of people on the streets of London at short intervals.

Given this situation, the well-documented events in London during the Queen Caroline Affair seem to confirm Mark Harrison's interpretation of the celebrations of the Crown as well as the notion that London was the traditional centre of radical agitation. Over the course of months in 1820, violent masses demonstrated their support for Queen Caroline day after day and tied their protests against the humiliation of the king's wife to radical demands for parliamentary and constitutional reforms. For a while, it seemed as if the capital stood on the brink of a revolution.⁶⁰ Support for the queen was repeatedly expressed in demonstrations on the streets and celebratory parades in which hundreds of thousands of signatures on greetings and petitions from followers around the country were handed over, sparking great riots more than once. George IV, in

contrast, bore the brunt of public criticism like almost no other monarch before him. Just a few months after Peterloo, he was booed by a large crowd at the opening of Parliament in November 1819 and greeted by calls of ‘Manchester, Murder, Shame’. In autumn 1820, the cheers for Caroline meshed with a sharper critique of the king and his political convictions. Later, in September 1821, Caroline’s funeral sparked a wave of large riots in which radical supporters of the dead queen clashed with the military stationed in London.⁶¹

Nonetheless, the general attitude of the crowds on the official Crown holidays in London at the beginning of the 1820s was surprisingly positive. The proclamation of George IV in London at the end of January in 1820, for example, was met with large crowds cheering the new king. After the proclamation was read for the first time before George’s residence at Carlton House, although the king himself was not present, a parade with the magistrates of the city of Westminster and high-ranking representatives from the royal household, accompanied by the Life Guard of the king, marched along Pall Mall in the direction of Charing Cross, where the proclamation was read again. The parade then turned toward the City of London and crossed Temple Bar to Chancery Lane after having been stopped briefly by the Lord Mayor on the border as part of the traditional ritual in which the parades were formally granted permission to enter the City. As the parade made its way through the City, it was accompanied by a long procession, led by the Lord Mayor, members of the City Council and other representatives of the City, followed by a delegation from the royal house. As the crowds cheered, the proclamation was read aloud several times at different locations in the City, followed by the singing of the national anthem, cheers to the new king, and gun salutes. An extraordinarily large number of people took to the streets on this day. The reports in *The Times* and the *Observer* repeatedly mentioned that the procession had difficulty making its way through the masses assembled on the streets.

Unlike at the opening of Parliament in December, the political tensions between radicals and conservatives did not bloom into protests against the monarchy. Only the conservative Lord Mayor of the year before, Alderman Atkins, who had already been repeatedly attacked by radical crowds in public for his defence of the use of the military in Manchester, was booed and ridiculed once again by the crowds attending the proclamation. In general, the day was surprisingly harmonious. It was not the protests against conservative magistrates or symbolic gestures of solidarity with the radical victims of the events in Manchester that dominated the celebrations, but rather enthusiasm for the Crown and a ‘general sense of pleasure’.⁶²

As in Leeds and the West Riding, there also appeared to be a rather striking coexistence of protest and celebration. Extensive, sometimes aggressive protests against the king and government often accompanied harmonious celebrations of the monarchy in which the Crown was seen as the symbolic head of the nation and a conservative understanding of the monarchy reigned on the streets.

Without calling into doubt the fact that radical views were widespread among the lower classes in 1820, the cheering masses on these occasions attest to the continuance of a tradition of popular monarchism that could not be completely swept away by radical demands for democracy and criticism of the Crown.

Not even the months of agitation in support of Caroline could call this popular tradition permanently into question. Rather, on the contrary, classic studies of the Queen Caroline Affair from John Stevenson and Walter Laqueur point out that the radical mobilization of the crowds in London was only possible because solidarity with the ridiculed queen had sprung out of loyalist feelings. Likewise, they note that in a rather curious way, loyalism and respect for the Crown, outrage over the mishandling of a wife and the deprivation of her rights, as well as concerns over the political and economic situation of the population all channelled into support for Caroline. Furthermore, they argue that radical leaders in London were able to sustain such a high level of public protest for so long because they understood that they had to cleverly bind the different strands of the popular reception of the Affair with the political demands of their movement.⁶³

Correspondingly, Stevenson has observed that the popularity of the queen faded noticeably soon after the trial was over.⁶⁴ On the one hand, this was partly because Caroline accepted a pension from the government in early 1821, which made her seem like a traitor to her supporters in the eyes of many radicals because she joined the corrupt system that had been so heftily criticized in the months before. On the other hand, conservatives and loyalists launched a targeted propaganda campaign with leaflets, pamphlets and the soon widespread popular loyalist weekly *John Bull* to revive the Church and King tradition that had surfaced in the London proclamation celebrations despite the political crisis raging at the time.⁶⁵ The coexistence of loyalist and radical tendencies in the crowds on the streets was a decisive factor: it was not the opposition between conservative elites and the radical population that reigned over Crown celebrations and public appearances of the king, but rather the concurrence of radical protest and monarchist enthusiasm on the streets.

In the first months of 1821, this was particularly clear to see in the public appearances of the king and queen at the theatre, which had been carefully prepared by both sides. Whereas the behaviour of the audience before and after the performance was relatively easy to control thanks to announcement of the visit and the appropriate placement of supporters, it was virtually impossible to control the reactions of the partly curious, partly unruly crowds of supporters who had been mobilized by their respective camps on the streets around the theatre. For example, in February, George had to fight his way through throngs of supporters and opponents to get to Drury Lane Theatre and Covent Garden.⁶⁶ Similar scenes occurred in March and May, although the number of people in the crowds who confronted the king with boos and cheers for the queen clearly

seemed to decline.⁶⁷ At the same time, the queen could reckon with the support of at least some of the crowd when she went to the theatre.⁶⁸

Just how difficult it was to gauge the mood of the crowds in London can be seen in the coronation of George IV that took place that summer in Westminster Abbey.⁶⁹ Whereas the coronation celebrations in 1821 were the last great hurrah for Caroline in much of England, the queen's attempt to win over the crowds on the streets by demonstratively taking part in the coronation without an invitation went wide of its mark. Numerous observers surprisingly found that the support for Caroline did not extend beyond a small portion of the crowd. They also noted, with a measure of relief, that apart from a few smashed windows on festively decorated houses, the much-feared unrest on the streets never came. Rather, on the contrary, the king received a striking amount of applause from the crowds. Additionally, the extensive celebration, including the festive parade of the court to the cathedral as well as a large public gathering in Hyde Park, the spectacular launching of a hot-air balloon and the illumination of houses and buildings throughout the city in the evening followed by fireworks, all took place without incident.⁷⁰ Shortly thereafter, however, the city seemed to be once again securely in the hands of radical supporters of the queen. The funeral procession carrying Caroline, who had died just after the coronation, led to one of the worst street battles in the history of London. Tens of thousands of the queen's supporters pressed forward violently so that her coffin could make its way around the city, giving the people of London the opportunity for one last overwhelming demonstration of glorification.⁷¹

All told, the celebrations of the monarchy at the beginning of the 1820s were thus similar to those in Leeds and Bolton. As such, they can be characterized as expressing anything but a conservative consensus. That said, the conflicts that were reflected within them, even in the capital, did not result from a fundamental opposition between conservative elites and radical spectators. Rather, the events in London once again revealed the complexity of the identities within the crowds and the coexistence of different views and attitudes. Even at the height of radical agitation in 1820 and 1821, the behaviour of the crowds demonstrated admiration for the king and support for his politics just as much as anti-monarchist positions and radical demands for reform. It was not until years later that England experienced the extent to which radical protests could eclipse the unifying national image of the monarchy and the conservative messages attached to royal celebrations and ceremonies. These celebrations of the Crown revealed how strongly the impression of a contested monarchy lacking the support of the people was linked to the particular political framework of political crises within English society.

By the mid 1820s, however, the opposition between radical and conservative voices in the crowds attending the celebrations in London could no longer be heard. As in provincial cities, the king's birthday in April was celebrated more

elaborately year after year. Unlike in the West Riding or Bolton, the heart of the festivities in London was not a parade led by the leaders of the London boroughs or the court, but rather a large state reception held by the king for the court and the political elite of the capital. The arrival of the state guests made for a different kind of parade. Great numbers of spectators assembled in Pall Mall to watch the coaches bringing the guests to the residence of the king, cheering them along the way. Military bands entertained the crowds with popular melodies and repeatedly played the national anthem; the marching of the regiments stationed in London, gun salutes, ringing bells and the illumination of houses in the evening along streets decorated with flags rounded out the picture of the celebrations. As in Bolton, the celebrations in 1828 reached a climax; a year later, the conflicts surrounding the emancipation of the Catholics, which had led to riots in London in the fall of 1828, resulted in more modest festivities. Given the fact that the king was often present in the city, the celebrations in the capital were generally less significant than those in the provincial towns. The unspectacular reports printed in the conservative as well as the liberal press differed greatly from the more detailed portrayals of the events published in Bolton and Leeds.⁷² Cheering crowds at George's public appearances in and around London were a relatively regular sight in the late 1820s. The king was received with enthusiasm not only during military parades or state visits, but also when he attended the races at Ascot. The races attracted growing crowds year after year, all of whom were more than ready to welcome the royal family.⁷³

Amidst the liberal and radical agitation for the expansion of suffrage in the 1830s, however, clearly radical and liberal mindsets could once again be detected in the crowds on the fringes of the official celebrations of the monarchy in the capital. At the end of May in 1831, William IV's birthday was celebrated with a great illumination of the entire city after ringing bells and gun salutes as well as waving flags had accompanied the official inspection of the troops that marked the day. The strikingly different character of the celebrations in this year did not go unnoticed by sceptical conservative observers such as those writing in the *John Bull*, but it was the liberal press of London that really did somersaults over the new enthusiasm for the Crown as well as reforms heard in the voices on the streets. For the *Observer*, the new king was quite apparently the most popular king since the legendary King Alfred from Anglo-Saxon times. *The Times*, in turn, made fun of the loyalists who did not know what to do with the 'Reformer King'.⁷⁴

Nonetheless, the celebrations in London were not marked by political disagreements between conservatives and reformers as they were in many towns in the rest of the country. This could be seen just a few months later with the coronation of William IV in September 1831. Partisan conflicts did not play any role in the preparations for the day because the planning of the festivities in the capital lay largely in the hands of the court, and many elements were dictated by

ceremonial traditions. The symbolic participation of radical-leaning unions or the loyalist lodges of the Orange Order, which could lead to hefty conflicts over the intended message of the celebrations in other cities, was out of the question in London. Military associations and official dignitaries presided over the parades or rituals such as the firing of salutes to a much greater degree in the capital than in the provinces. Likewise, the royal couple with their state guests, the court and the upper aristocracy dominated the official celebrations. As a result, both the politicians of the new reform government as well as their conservative opponents were pushed to the sidelines of the festivities in London.

Consequently, the coronation in London did not send any kind of message of reform throughout the country. The huge crowds in the neighbourhoods around the palace and the government buildings that followed the new monarch to the coronation or cheered the invited guests as they arrived at the cathedral did not link their curiosity and enthusiasm for the Crown with suffrage demands. *The Times* made an effort to depict the new popularity of the Crown, in a dubious comparison with the supposed flop of the coronation of George IV, as a sign of the onset of an era of reform. But, as conservatives pointed out, the call for reforms was nowhere to be heard.⁷⁵ Indeed, liberal newspapers like the *Observer* could not detect a clear political tendency at the official celebrations, the public festivals in the parks nor during the illumination of the city in the evening.⁷⁶

Over the course of the year that followed, however, the successful mobilization of the reform movement became more apparent in London. The celebration of William IV's birthday, for example, was met with more reticence among the population because of his dismissal of the Reform Bill. The official festivities took place as usual and once again attracted considerable crowds on the streets, but the queen complained publicly that she was 'cruelly and undeservedly insulted and calumniated' at several opportunities.⁷⁷ It seemed that the celebrations in years prior had profited from the king's surmised support for reforms, which led some people to attend the festivities who would have otherwise been put off by the day's loyalist subtext. This change in tone reflected just how much the crowds' enthusiasm for the Crown at the beginning of the 1830s was dependent on whether the monarch was truly prepared to support the reform politics of the majority in the House of Commons. Notwithstanding the shifting situation, there were still plenty of opportunities for the king to be celebrated in public, and sometimes the attacks against him only served to further solidify his popular support. For example, the throwing of a stone at William at the Ascot races a few days after his birthday fostered solidarity between the crowds in attendance and the king.⁷⁸ At the end of the month, in contrast, the king was met with boos and whistles coming from a crowd of several thousands while attending a military parade of the Grenadier Foot Guards in Hyde Park.⁷⁹

With the climax of the reform crisis in the summer of 1832, the popularity of the Crown among the population of London undoubtedly hit rock bottom. On

the whole, however, the celebrations of the monarchy in the capital followed a pattern similar to those in Bolton and the cities of the West Riding. The mood of the crowd proved to be capricious – seemingly split, almost decidedly loyalist, sometimes displaying sympathy for radical reform demands. Permanent lines of conflict between protest-oriented lower classes and loyalist elites along the lines of Harrison’s argument, however, are not to be found. Rather, the celebrations offered not only the agents directly involved with the official events, but also the crowds in attendance room to express their own political opinions. These views were shaped by respective perceptions of the Crown and society, but they were also influenced by the contexts surrounding the individual celebrations, which were defined by current political constellations and debates. In practice, the great affinity for loyalist ideas among social groups from the lower classes was clearly demonstrated time and time again.

Some may question whether this interpretation goes too far in attributing agency to the crowds. In most cases, the celebrations were organized by local elites, quite often the municipal administration or, in London, the royal court. It was not uncommon for them to be accompanied by free beer or public banquets, which required employers to accept, if not advocate, a pause in work in order to allow for much of the population to take part on normal weekdays. But it seems rather oversimplified to suggest that the peaceful and apparently acquiescent attitude of these large crowds resulted from a manipulative mobilization ‘from above’ that makes it impossible to draw conclusions about the actual political opinions of those involved. Rather recently, Frank O’Gorman has decisively criticized this kind of interpretation of loyalist rituals and celebrations put forth by scholars such as Nicholas Rogers in his study on the burning of Thomas Paine effigies in the winter of 1792/93.⁸⁰

Two elements of O’Gorman’s critique in particular can be applied to the celebrations of the monarchy in the 1820s. First of all, as with the burning of the Paine effigies, a substantial portion of the English population took part in the celebrations. Although this chapter has only focused on a few cities, numerous other examples from around England could easily be added. There is no indication that the continually large crowds at the festivities in Bolton, Leeds and London were unusual, despite the lack of exact figures. In many cases, at least half of the city must have taken to its feet. This fact alone makes it rather improbable that the crowds of spectators stood under pressure or were coerced to take part in the celebrations of the Crown. Secondly, like the ritual of burning effigies, these festivities were not short-lived. Rather, they often began in the morning and lasted for hours, often extending into the evening, especially if elements such as the illumination of the city or an entertaining fair were involved. Moreover, thanks to the parades at the heart of these celebrations, the festivities spread over a large swathe of the city as different centres of action were created through the repetition of performances, proclamations or gun salutes. Not only were the actual

participants in the parade constantly in motion, but also a large portion of the spectators moved with the parade through the neighbourhoods. The crowds often changed location several times, breaking up and reforming at other places around the city. It seems hardly imaginable that thousands of people could be coerced into such manoeuvres for hours at a time against their will, especially given that demonstrations of disapproval and protests were not ruled out, but rather often took centre stage.

Yet none of these factors can speak to the direct motivations of the participants. This means that only rather vague conclusions can be made about the loyalist or radical notions that may have brought different groups together to attend the celebrations. Insights into the identities of these groups cannot be obtained from an analysis that only looks at the descriptions of the events and evaluates their circumstances. Moreover, the dynamic processes associated with masses of people, as perhaps most impressively articulated by Elias Canetti in his studies on the crowd, can hardly be captured in such an assessment. Aspects associated with crowd behaviour such as the headiness generated by the sheer size and density of a crowd, the parallel behaviour of countless individuals or the complete fixation of the interest of all on a shared centre must have played a role in these celebrations of the Crown; these points are sometimes hinted at within press reports, but they cannot be firmly grasped.⁸¹ Consequently, to a certain degree, these crowds remain unpredictable and unfathomable, but in a completely different sense than a fear of the threatening masses would suggest.

However, two cautious conclusions can be made about the dissemination of political views among broad portions of the population that contradict the prevailing view shared by many scholars. On the one hand, the celebrations of the monarchy were not rife with class conflicts that erupted in radical critiques against the official subtext of the celebrations and their national symbolism in relation to the monarchy. Rather, it was the specific political and social context, which changed each year, and the respectively dominant viewpoint within the assembled crowds that shaped the contours of these celebrations. The quick shift from a more radical or more loyalist disposition within crowds, for example, influenced the behaviour of those involved and ultimately determined the character of the celebration. On the other hand, evidence suggests that there was not a fundamental break with the tradition of the celebrations, with their loyalist subtexts, stemming from the late eighteenth century. The local festivities after 1820 do not differ markedly from those that took place during the regency of George III, as described by Linda Colley; the monarchy remained a central element of national identification. Moreover, the Crown could also usually count on a great deal of popular support for its celebrations. For radicals and liberals, George IV may have seemed to be a frightening figure to have on the throne, but his role in English society was nonetheless often celebrated in an overwhelming way. Long before its apparent reinvention in the late nineteenth century, the monarchy

proved its popularity time and again. On the heels of the popular loyalist feelings that erupted around 1800, it continued to serve as a bond between political convictions that formed in opposition to demands for radical reforms.

Notes

1. For a recent summary of the details of 'Peterloo' and radical agitation from 1816 to 1821, see R. Poole, 'The March to Peterloo: Politics and Festivity in Late Georgian England', *Past and Present* 192 (2006), 109–53. For a discussion of older literature on the subject, see N. Kirk, 'Commonsense, Commitment and Objectivity: Themes in Recent Historiography of Peterloo', *Manchester Region History Review* 3 (1989), 61–66; and E.P. Thompson, 'Peterloo', in E.P. Thompson, *Persons and Polemic* (London: Merlin Press, 1994), 169–92.
2. The *Brighton Herald* reported that a crowd of at least fifteen thousand had assembled in Brighton (5 February 1820), while the *Liverpool Mercury* estimated that a hundred thousand people had attended the festivities in Liverpool (25 February 1820). According to *The Times* (1 February 1820) and *Observer* (6 February 1820), huge crowds assembled for the proclamations in London.
3. *Wheeler's Manchester Chronicle*, 12 February 1820.
4. *Ibid.* The commander of the troops in Manchester reported to the government in London in a similar manner: 'My chief inducement to address your Lordship is to inform you how extensively the true spirit of Loyalty seemed to pervade all classes of His Majesty's subjects – the rich and the poor, the merchant and the labourer, the manufacturer and the lowest artisan'. Letter from Morris to Sidmouth, 20 July 1821, National Archives, Home Office Papers, Disturbance Correspondence, HO 40/16–23: 397.
5. *Cowdroy's Manchester Gazette*, 12 February 1820, as quoted in M. Harrison, *Crowds and History: Mass Phenomena in English Towns 1790–1835* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 256. See also *Manchester Observer*, 12 February 1820.
6. M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 260–67 and *passim*. See, for example, Vernon, *Politics*, 79; Although Vernon emphasizes the popularity of the 'flag-waving, monarchy-loving, patriotic celebrations', his interpretation of the celebrations as an opportunity for those who were legally or socially excluded from the political nation to protest against the official national identity echoes M. Harrison's argument.
7. M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 257–59. Importantly, Harrison's comments on the situation in Manchester are drawn exclusively from reports in the liberal press as he neglects to take into consideration the conservative account of the festivities in *Wheeler's Manchester Chronicle*.
8. *Ibid.*
9. On the tradition of studies of crowds, see J.S. McClelland, *The Crowd and the Mob: From Plato to Canetti* (Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman, 1989). While decidedly from a more positive perspective in terms of the uniformity of the crowd, E. Canetti, *Masse und Macht* (Hamburg: Claassen, 1960) emphasized the disappearance of the individual within the crowd.
10. See E. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959); Rudé, *The Crowd*; and E.P. Thompson, 'The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century', *Past and Present* 50 (1971), 76–136. On the debate surrounding the concept of 'moral economy', see Dickinson, *Politics*, 125–53; on the influence and spread of this concept, see A. Randall and A. Charlesworth (eds), *Moral Economy and Popular Protests: Crowds, Conflicts and Authority* (Basingstoke: St Martin's Press, 2000).

11. Rudé, *The Crowd*, 4. On critiques of this definition, see R.J. Holton, 'The Crowd in History: Some Problems of Theory and Method', *Social History* 3 (1978), 219–33.
12. See, for example, J. Stevenson, 'Social Control and the Prevention of Riots in England, 1789–1829', in A.P. Donajrodzki (ed.), *Social Control in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Croom Helm, 1977), 27–50; idem, *Popular Disturbances in England 1700–1870* (London: Addison Wesley Longman, 1979); D. Richter, *Riotous Victorians* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1981); and J. Bohstedt, *Riots and Community Politics in England and Wales, 1790–1810* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983). Harrison counts seventeen further studies published in the 1970s and 1980s alone that link crowds and social unrest. More recent examples include: J.E. Archer, *'By a Flash and a Scare': Arson, Animal Maiming and Poaching in Norfolk and Suffolk, 1815–1870* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); idem, *Social Unrest*; N. Rogers, 'Crowd and the People in the Gordon Riots', in E. Hellmuth (ed.), *Transformation of Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 39–55; A. Randall and E. Newman, 'Protest, Proletarians and Paternalists: Social Conflict in Rural Wiltshire 1830–1850', *Rural History* 2 (1995), 205–27; R. Wells, 'Resistance to the New Poor Law in the Rural South', in J. Rule and R. Wells (eds), *Crime, Protest and Popular Politics in Southern England 1740–1850* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1997), 91–127; idem, 'Southern Chartistism' in J. Rule and R. Wells (eds), *Crime, Protest and Popular Politics in Southern England 1740–1850* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1997), 127–53; idem, 'Crime and Punishment in a County Parish: Burwash 1790–1850', in J. Rule and R. Wells (eds), *Crime, Protest and Popular Politics in Southern England 1740–1850* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1997), 169–237. On critiques of this tradition, see A.V. Westermayr, 'Public Festivities in England during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars', PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1999; and F. O'Gorman, 'The Paine Burnings of 1792–1793', *Past and Present* 193 (2006), esp. 133–34.
13. M. Harrison, 'The Ordering of the Urban Environment: Time, Work and the Occurrence of Crowds, 1750–1835', *Past and Present* 110 (1986), 134–68; and idem, *Crowds*, 40–45.
14. M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 260–61. The interpretation of ceremonies in E. Durkheim, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (Paris: Alcan, 1912), 295ff., inspired a corresponding interpretation of contemporary coronations in E. Shils and M. Young, 'The Meaning of the Coronation', *Sociological Review* 1 (1953), 63–81. A similar interpretation of funerals for the English royal family can be found in O. Bland, *The Royal Way of Death* (London: Constable, 1986).
15. L. Colley, 'The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760–1820', *Past and Present* 102 (1984), 94–129; and D. Cannadine, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition" c. 1820–1977', in E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 101–64. See also Colley, *Britons*, ch. 5; E. Hammerton and D. Cannadine, 'Conflict and Consensus on a Ceremonial Occasion: The Diamond Jubilee in Cambridge in 1897', *Historical Journal* 24 (1981), 111–46; D. Cannadine and S. Price, *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); and D. Cannadine, 'From Biography to History: Writing the Modern British Monarchy', *Historical Review* 77 (2004), 289–312. Coming from a different perspective, Golby and Purdue came to similar conclusions in J.M. Golby and A.W. Purdue, *The Monarchy and the British People, 1760 to the Present* (London: Arcopagitica Press, 1988). For an overview of existing scholarship, see A. Olechnowicz, 'Historians and the Modern British Monarchy', in A. Olechnowicz (ed.), *The Monarchy and the British Nation, 1780 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), esp. 24–26. See also D. Craig, 'The Crowned Republic? Monarchy and Anti-Monarchy in Britain 1760–1901', *Historical Journal* 46 (2003), 167–85.
16. L. Colley, 'Whose Nation? Class and National Consciousness in Britain 1750–1830', *Past and Present* 113 (1986), 97–117; and Colley, *Britons*, 227–28. Colley concedes that participation in celebrations of the monarchy cannot be counted unquestionably as evidence of a loyalist

- attitude among those taking part, although she also presents examples that seem to lean rather heavily in that direction. See also N. Rogers, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 184–88; T. Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture: Old Regime Europe 1660–1789* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 322–56; and S. Semmel, ‘Radicals, Loyalists, and the Royal Jubilee of 1809’, *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 543–69.
17. The Queen Caroline Affair ensued upon the return of Caroline of Brunswick, the estranged wife of George IV, to England in June 1820. While Caroline, who had been living on the continent for the past six years, demanded to be crowned queen alongside her husband, George was determined to obtain a formal divorce through Parliament. The parliamentary proceedings in autumn 1820 led to an intense opposition campaign throughout the country.
 18. See Cannadine, ‘Context’, in which he draws his interpretation of the development of Victoria’s popularity from two earlier studies by K. Martin; see K. Martin, *The Magic of Monarchy* (London: A.A. Knopf, 1937); and idem, *The Crown and the Establishment* (London: Hutchinson, 1962).
 19. Alongside W. Arnstein, W. Kuhn in particular has criticized Cannadine’s methods and his ‘invented thesis’; however, Kuhn’s own study of the monarchy and ceremony after 1860 from the perspective of the country’s elites fails to propose any kind of fundamental revision in terms of the course of the Crown’s popularity. See W. Arnstein, ‘Queen Victoria Opens Parliament: The Disinvention of Tradition’, *Historical Review* 63 (1990), 178–94; and W. Kuhn, *Democratic Royalism: The Transformation of the British Monarchy 1861–1914* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996).
 20. See R. Williams, *The Contentious Crown: Public Discussion of the British Monarchy in the Reign of Queen Victoria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997). Other studies that have been published in the last decade or so dealing with aspects of the monarchy and its public reception have also left Cannadine’s interpretation unchallenged. See M. Wienfort, *Monarchie in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft: Deutschland und England von 1640 bis 1848* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1993), 149–68; F. Prochaska, *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); S.C. Schrendt, *Royal Mourning and Regency Culture: Elegies and Memorials of Princess Charlotte* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997); M. Homans, *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837–1876* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); S. Poole, *The Politics of Regicide in England, 1760–1850: Troublesome Subjects* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); and S. Gunn, *Public Culture*, 163–86. E.A. Smith, *George IV: King of Great Britain*, Yale English Monarchs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), sketches a more positive image of George IV in his biography than that of earlier works, and he questions the king’s unpopularity; this perspective has been refuted by S. Parisien, *George IV: Inspiration of the Regency* (New York: St Martin’s Press, 2002). In contrast, A. Taylor, *Down with the Crown: British Anti-Monarchism and Debates about Royalty since 1790* (London: Reaktion Books, 1999); and idem, ‘An Aristocratic Monarchy and Popular Republicanism 1830–1940’, in A. Olechnowicz (ed.), *The Monarchy and the British Nation, 1780 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 188–219, describe widespread, fundamental critique of the Crown up to the late nineteenth century.
 21. See A. Tyrrell and Y. Ward, “‘God Bless Her Little Majesty:’ The Popularising of Monarchy in the 1840s”, *National Identities* 2 (2000), 109–25; J. Loughlin, ‘Allegiance and Illusion: Queen Victoria’s Irish Visit of 1849’, *History* 87 (2002), 491–513; and P. Pickering, “‘The Hearts of Millions’: Chartism and Popular Monarchism in the 1840s”, *History* 88 (2003), 227–48. On the rule of the monarchy in the media within this context, see J. Plunkett, *Queen Victoria: First Media Monarch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). See also the critique in D. Mares and J. Neuheiser, ‘Review of John Plunkett: *Queen Victoria: First Media Monarch*’, *Neue Politische Literatur* 49 (2004), 509–10.

22. Up to now, celebrations of the monarchy and the participation of broad sectors of the population in the nineteenth century have not been examined in depth. See the few comments in R. Glen, *Urban Workers in the Early Industrial Revolution* (London: Croom Helm, 1983), 63–64; Arnstein, ‘Queen Victoria’; and R. Williams, *Contentious Crown*, 266 and passim. Williams ends his discussion of the debates surrounding the monarchy with a strong plea for further local studies. M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 234–68, only looks at the respective festivities in Bristol, Norwich, Manchester and Liverpool in 1809, 1820/21 and 1831. Pickering, “‘Hearts of the Millions’” only takes the celebrations in 1838 into account. The interpretation of the coronation festivities of 1821 in G. Tresidder, ‘Coronation Day Celebrations in English Towns, 1685–1821: Elite Hegemony and Local Relations on a Ceremonial Occasion’, *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies* 15 (1992), 1–16, echoes Harrison’s perspective. Vernon, *Politics*, 74–79, only cursorily describes the numerous celebrations of the Crown in the voting districts under question; he primarily interprets them as moments in which a local public was constructed that allowed for the city to criticize symbols of the nation and, alternatively, the nation to criticize symbols of the city. C. Whatley, ‘Royal Day, People’s Day: The Monarch’s Birthday in Scotland, c. 1660–1860’, in N. Macdougall and R. Mason (eds), *People and Power in Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1992), 170–88, only examines the case in Scotland and describes the birthdays of the monarchs as a popular occasion for largely unpolitical, rowdy demonstrations. M. Wienfort, ‘Zurschaustellung der Monarchie – Huldigungen und Thronjubiläen in Preußen-Deutschland und Großbritannien im 19. Jahrhundert’, in P. Brandt et al. (eds), *Symbolische Macht und inszenierte Staatlichkeit: “Verfassungskultur” als Element der Verfassungsgeschichte*, Politik- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte 65 (Bonn: Dietz, 2005), 81–100, only deals with the Crown jubilees of George III in 1807 and Victoria in 1897.
23. See *Wheeler’s Manchester Chronicle*, 19 February 1820; and *Bolton Chronicle*, 10 September 1831. As in Bristol, Liverpool, Norwich and Manchester, the coronation festivities in Bolton in 1831 were also clearly dominated by liberal positions and imbued with hope for electoral reforms.
24. See *Bolton Express*, 24 April 1824; *Bolton Chronicle*, 28 April 1827, 26 April 1828, 25 April 1829. On James Slade and Ralph Fletcher, the anniversary of whose deaths were celebrated annually in the 1830s and 1840s by the Tories in Bolton, see P. Taylor, *Popular Politics*, 66–67 and passim. Fletcher’s role in the fights against the Luddites and the radicals before 1819 is described in: F.O. Darvall, *Popular Disturbances and Public Order in Regency England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), passim; J.L. Hammond and B. Hammond, *The Skilled Labourer 1760–1832* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), passim; and M.I. Thomis, *The Luddites: Machine-Breaking in Regency England* (Newton Abbott: Schocken Books, 1970), 128.
25. In 1828, there were six companies of the 67th Foot Regiment; a year later, the 50th regiment took part. See *Bolton Chronicle*, 26 April 1828 and 25 April 1829.
26. The reports of the celebrations do not reflect the power struggle described in detail in P. Taylor, *Popular Politics*, ch. 2, between a radically inclined rising middle class and the old Tory patri-cians who dominated the municipal institutions in Bolton at the end of the 1820s.
27. *Bolton Chronicle*, 26 April 1828.
28. *Bolton Chronicle*, 25 April 1829. Moreover, the *Chronicle* remarked with satisfaction that Colonel Fletcher only took part in the celebration as a private person and did not join in the cheers for the king. The organization and coordination of the festivities still lay in the hands of the city’s Tory establishment. Nonetheless, alongside the Tory magistrates, Reverend Slade took part in the parade in a prominent position.
29. On the other hand, for M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 251–60, the attendance or rather absence of the trades in Bristol is evidence for the respective participation or symbolic exclusion of the people from the celebrations.

30. On the debate surrounding Catholic emancipation and the significance of Protestantism for popular conservatism, see chapters 3 and 4.
31. In his interpretation, G. Tresidder, 'Coronation Day', goes even further than M. Harrison, *Crowds*, in that he sees the conflicts emerging out of the festivities of 1821 as the culmination of an opposition between municipal elites and the plebeian population that had been growing slowly since the beginning of the eighteenth century. He claims the people increasingly used the celebrations as 'an occasion for their counter-theatre of opposition and sedition' (p. 12) and reacted in particular to the exclusion of popular elements from the festivities.
32. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 18 June 1821.
33. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 7 February 1820; *Leeds Mercury*, 12 February 1820.
34. *Leeds Mercury*, 12 February 1820.
35. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 21 February 1820.
36. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 1 May 1820. The lack of coverage of the festivities in the *Leeds Mercury* hints at the fact that the celebrations were rather muted, but it also suggests that they passed without incident.
37. For example, the extent of radical agitation and the conservatives' fears of a revolutionary overthrow can be detected in the *Leeds Intelligencer's* rather hectic reporting on an uprising that took place around Huddersfield at the end of March in 1820. Indeed, a small group of radicals numbering around three hundred people made an attempt to occupy the city, but their plans were foiled beforehand. See *Leeds Intelligencer*, August 1820. On these occurrences, see also E.P. Thompson, *Making*, 725; A.J. Brooke, 'The Folly Hall Uprising, 1817', *Old West Riding* 4 (1984), 18–22; and J.A. Hargreaves, "'A Metropolis of Discontent': Popular Protest in Huddersfield ca. 1780–1850", in E.A.H. Haigh (ed.), *Huddersfield – A Most Handsome Town: Aspects of the History and Culture of a West Yorkshire Town* (Huddersfield: Kirklees Cultural Services, 1992), 189–220. On the Clothier's Union, see A.J. Brooke, 'Labour Disputes and Trade Unions in the Industrial Revolution', in E.A.H. Haigh (ed.), *Huddersfield – A Most Handsome Town: Aspects of the History and Culture of a West Yorkshire Town* (Huddersfield: Kirklees Cultural Services, 1992), 221–40; and M. Chase, *Early Trade Unionism: Fraternity, Skill and the Politics of Labour* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 145.
38. See, for example, the corresponding comments in the *Leeds Intelligencer* on 10 April 1820, 23 October 1820 or 25 December 1820. See also the speeches held at the annual meeting of the Leeds Pitt Club as reported in the *Leeds Intelligencer*, 29 May 1820, or the eight-part series in the *Leeds Intelligencer* about radical activities in 1819 printed from 10 April 1820 until 21 August 1820.
39. M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 254–56.
40. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 28 February 1820.
41. Hargreaves, 'Popular Protest'.
42. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 11 September 1820; *Leeds Mercury*, 9 September 1820.
43. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 20 November 1820 and 27 November 1820; *Leeds Mercury*, 18 November 1820 and 25 November 1820.
44. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 18 December 1820.
45. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 2 October 1820. Interestingly, there is no description of the parade in the *Leeds Mercury* in its report of 7 October 1820. Given that the usual game was one of reporting, contesting and reinforcing one's own version between the two papers, a liberal attack on the Tory corporation and William Hay was to be expected. The silence of the *Leeds Mercury* on the matter may indicate that the annual mayoral appointment ceremony, as an expression of the city's identity, represented the city as a whole on a fundamental level and was therefore uncontroversial; even in other years, there were seldom any reports about the celebrations. William Hay, however, managed to thoroughly divide the city thanks to a combination of his ultra-conservative politics and his numerous attempts to prevent or hinder rallies against the king

- during the Queen Caroline Affair. His official acts were heavily criticized by the *Leeds Mercury* time and time again. Consequently, the lack of protest surrounding his public appointment is quite remarkable. On the Leeds Volunteers, see E. Hargrave, 'The Leeds Volunteers (1820)', *Publications of the Thoresby Society Miscellany* 24 (1919), 451–68.
46. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 23 July 1821 and 30 July 1821; *Leeds Mercury* 21 July 1821. Both papers reported briefly, albeit similarly, on the celebrations in Huddersfield, Halifax and other towns and cities surrounding the Leeds area.
 47. See the report of the trial against the four supposed ringleaders of the mob in *Leeds Intelligencer*, 29 October 1821. Neither the *Leeds Mercury* nor the *Leeds Intelligencer* commented on the rioting in their own reports of the holiday festivities.
 48. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 29 April 1822, 24 April 1823, 29 April 1824, 28 April 1825, 27 April 1826, 26 April 1827; *Leeds Mercury*, 27 April 1822, 29 April 1826, 28 April 1827.
 49. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 2 May 1822 and 29 April 1823. On the popularity of similar performances of the coronation by theatre troupes in London, see S. Williams, 'The Three Coronations of George IV', *Theatre History Studies* 14 (1994), 3–10.
 50. Chase, *Trade Unionism*, 125–27.
 51. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 24 April 1828; *Leeds Mercury*, 26 April 1828.
 52. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 23 April 1829; *Leeds Mercury*, 25 April 1829.
 53. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 8 July 1830; *Leeds Mercury*, 10 July 1830.
 54. See Rudé, 'Warum'; W.D. Gruner, 'Großbritannien und die Julirevolution von 1830: Zwischen Legitimitätsprinzip und nationalem Interesse', *Francia* 9 (1981), 369–410; and R. Quinault, 'The French Revolution of 1830 and Parliamentary Reform', *History* 79 (1994), 377–93.
 55. The *Leeds Mercury* already complained on 4 June 1831 that the conservative vicar of the city had refused to let the bells toll in honour of the new king's birthday. On the other hand, in the days leading up to the local coronation festivities, on 8 September 1831, the *Leeds Intelligencer* accused the wealthy liberals of the city of being unprepared to bear the costs of a large-scale celebration.
 56. *Leeds Mercury*, 10 September 1831; *Leeds Intelligencer*, 15 September 1831 (quote).
 57. M. Harrison, *Crowds*, 257–56.
 58. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 31 May 1832; *Leeds Mercury*, 2 June 1832, 9 June 1832 and 16 June 1832.
 59. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 1 June 1833.
 60. The classical depictions of the Queen Caroline Affair come from J. Stevenson, 'The Queen Caroline Affair', in J. Stevenson (ed.), *London in the Age of Reform* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977), 117–48; and Prothero, *Artisans*, 132–58. In comparison, see the chapter on 'Caroline's Crowds' in N. Rogers, *Crowds*, 248–73, with a good overview of the quite extensive corpus of literature on the affair. Most recently, the events were sketched out by A. Clark, *Scandal: The Sexual Politics of the British Constitution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 177–207.
 61. See note 60. On the opening of Parliament, see the report in the *Observer*, 28 November 1819.
 62. So surmised *The Times* on 1 February 1820; the liberal paper had sharply criticized the events in Manchester in its pages in the autumn of 1819 and reported quite favourably on the nationwide protests and demonstrations against the measures taken by the Conservative government. On the events of the Proclamation celebrations, see also the reports in the *Observer*, 6 February 1820.
 63. See Stevenson, 'Queen Caroline'; and T.W. Laqueur, 'The Queen Caroline Affair: Politics as Art in the Reign of George IV', *Journal of Modern History* 54 (1982), 417–66.
 64. Stevenson, 'Queen Caroline', 132–34.
 65. See *ibid.*; and J. Fulcher, 'Gender, Politics and Class in the Early Nineteenth-Century English Reform Movement', *Historical Review* 67 (1994), 57–74. N. Rogers, *Crowds*, 267, questions Fulcher's portrayal of a complete mood swing in early 1821, but he overlooks the evidence attesting to the queen's increasingly ambivalent reception at her public appearances.

66. *The Times*, 7 February 1821 and 8 February 1821; *John Bull*, 11 February 1821.
67. *The Times*, 21 March 1821, 8 May 1821 and 10 May 1821; *John Bull*, 25 March 1821 and 13 May 1821. E.A. Smith, *George IV*, 183, argues that the reception of the king in the theatres was too one-sided to serve as evidence of a mood swing in the public opinion of the queen; that said, however, he overlooks the great efforts that went into staging these visits on both sides.
68. *The Times*, 21 May 1821 and 25 May 1821; *John Bull*, 27 May 1821. As usual, both papers disagreed over the ratio between supporters and opponents, but they both described simultaneous cheers and boos coming from the audiences in the theatres and the crowds on the streets.
69. For a detailed description of the official festivities, see V. Cumming, 'Pantomime and Pageantry: The Coronation of George IV', in C. Fox (ed.), *London – World City, 1800–1840* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 39–50.
70. The prevailing interpretation that the coronation was a failure, as it were, and that it began a negative trend in terms of the popularity of the Crown and its celebrations until the end of the century in Cannadine, 'The Context', 115–17, rests on a one-dimensional assessment of the coronation festivities. Granted, the supporters of the queen, and above all *The Times*, which had taken sides with the queen over the course of the entire conflict, declared the coronation as a failure in its reports, citing the great success of the queen on the streets and the pervasive support for Caroline throughout the city. Both the conservative press as well as others who commented on the festivities, however, presented a similar picture of the celebration in which only a few supporters of the queen made themselves known, but met with some hefty objections from the crowd. See *John Bull*, 22 July 1821 and 29 July 1821. Reports of eyewitnesses can be found in Stevenson, 'Queen Caroline', 135; E.A. Smith, *George IV*, 189; and Parissien, *George IV*, 309–10. For a radical interpretation of the events, see *The Times*, 20 July 1821. Not even *The Times* contested the great enthusiasm for the festive illuminations in the city and the success of the festivities in Hyde Park.
71. *The Times*, 15 August 1821; *John Bull*, 20 August 1821.
72. *Observer*, 27 April 1828; *The Times*, 24 April 1828 and 24 April 1829; *John Bull*, 26 April 1829. The participation of the population in the annual celebrations of the king's actual birthday in August in Windsor was even more spectacular. See *John Bull*, 17 August 1828 and 16 August 1829; *The Times*, 14 August 1828 and 14 August 1829.
73. See, for example, the reports of the cheering masses at the visit of Don Miguel, Prince of Portugal, which was accompanied by a military parade in Hyde Park, in *Observer*, 6 January 1828 and *The Times*, 7 January 1828. The numbers attending the Ascot races grew over the course of the 1820s to hundreds of thousands, and they were celebrated by the press as bringing together the 'highest and lowest alike'; *John Bull*, 21 June 1829. For reports on the enthusiastic cheering for the king at Ascot, see also *The Times*, 4–7 June 1828 and 17–19 June 1829.
74. *John Bull*, 29 May 1831; *Observer*, 29 May 1831; *The Times*, 30 May 1831.
75. *The Times*, 9 September 1831; *John Bull*, 11 September 1831.
76. *Observer*, 11 September 1831.
77. *The Times*, 29 May 1832 and 4 June 1832 (quote).
78. *John Bull*, 24 June 1832.
79. *The Times*, 27 June 1832.
80. See O'Gorman, 'Paine Burnings'; and N. Rogers, *Crowds*.
81. See Canetti, *Masse und Macht*.