

Alastair Bonnett

## Nostalgia and Anti-Nostalgia in English Radical History

The case of Thomas Spence (1750-1814)

This article explores and explains the rediscovery and reinvention of an early English radical (Thomas Spence) in the late nineteenth and twentieth century. It shows that Spence's backward-looking and nostalgic radicalism was displaced in order to serve a movement increasingly dominated by themes of state socialism and progressivism.

In this paper I explore a rupture in the politics of the past: a transition from a politics of continuity and natural rights to an emerging 'anti-nostalgic' and self-consciously 'progressive' perspective. This argument is developed around a portrait of the work and, then, the late nineteenth and twentieth century "rediscovery" and "reinvention" of one of the foundational figures in English socialism, Thomas Spence (1750-1814).



Figure 1. Thomas Spence

First, I discuss Spence's politics in terms he would recognise: not in the anachronistic language of socialism or class struggle but in terms of the natural and historical right of the people to the common ownership of the land.<sup>1</sup> I emphasise the role of continuity, memory and tradition in Spence's radicalism.<sup>2</sup> When we turn to the *rediscovery* of Spence, from the early 1880s to the present day, we see these themes being put aside. They were neglected in favour of a vision of Spence as a proletarian, an

embryonic class warrior. Thus, in tracing the socialist invention of Spence, I chart a developing anti-nostalgic political orthodoxy. It is an orthodoxy that demanded that the early heroes of a maturing movement be duly celebrated but also that the backward-looking components of their contribution be either ignored or identified as residual.

As this implies, I offer the difference between the way Spence and his later admirers represented the political heritage of the past, as evidence of a schism between the populist radicalism of the former and the progressive world of the latter. Whilst for Spence, radicalism was a ‘bottom-up’ process that emerged from and built on popular memory, ‘nature’ and established traditions, many of those who sought to appropriate his name from the late nineteenth century onwards, cast it as a ‘top-down’ emancipation.

### The Politics of Loss in English Socialist History

The history of nostalgia might allow us to look back at modern history not solely searching for newness and technological progress but for unrealised potentialities, unpredictable turns and crossroads.<sup>3</sup>

(Svetlana Boym, 1966-2015)

Boym’s aspiration offers a provocative message. In Britain the search for “unrealised potentialities” grew to prominence with the rediscovery of the diverse political heritage of the working-class associated with E.P. Thompson and kindred historians. In celebrating early English radicals, Thompson offered them as attractive, yet primal, figures at the beginning of a story which concludes with the accomplishment of a recognisably modern socialist identity. Nostalgia, if admitted at all – for even Cobbett was said by Thompson in *The Making of the English Working Class* (first published 1963) to be only “seemingly ‘nostalgic’” – becomes a strategic device; the weapon of memory against capitalism.<sup>4</sup>

The progressivism found (but also sometimes questioned) in Thompson had much bolder expression in Hobsbawm, for whom “primitive rebels” are “*pre-political people*”.<sup>5</sup> A key figure in the expression of such supposedly anachronistic attitudes is the journalist and farmer William Cobbett (1763-1835). In the 1810s and 1820s, Cobbett was the most widely-read and influential radical in English politics. His *Political Register* campaigned against the immiseration of the labouring population as well as the corrupt

nature of the new commercial society Cobbett saw growing around him. “Nowadays the limits of Cobbett’s outlook are obvious”, John Derry confidently informed us in 1967: “he idealised the England of his youth”.<sup>6</sup> This verdict accords with the widespread late modern assumption that Cobbett is part of an inherently conservative tradition of rural and national mythology.

Ian Dyck effectively challenged many of these associations in *William Cobbett and Rural Popular Culture* (1992) by making the case that, by 1805, Cobbett was “an unqualified Radical”.<sup>7</sup> Dyck links the modern difficulty in accepting this political identity to the fact that “folk tradition and cottage politics ... have become increasingly estranged from the theory and practice of left-wing radicalism”.<sup>8</sup> Dyck opens out Cobbett’s nostalgia to show that, idealised as it undoubtedly was, it nevertheless referred to concrete experiences and specific memories. Dyck’s argument also finds support in my portrait of Thomas Spence. He too had “grounded” experience to draw on when he criticised the changes he saw around him. However, in turning to Spence we can also make a broader attempt to evidence the interplay of nostalgia and radicalism. For unlike Cobbett, whose thumping rhetoric and ruddy farmer’s demeanour allow him to be easily rendered as “really a Tory”, Spence is the poorest and most determined militant in English history: an unassailable icon of revolutionary integrity.

As Dyck’s intervention suggests, over recent years the history of socialism in Britain has become far more receptive to the complexity of radical identity. One of the most exciting interdisciplinary contributions to this new mood was Craig Calhoun’s intervention from 1982, *The Question of Class Struggle*. Calhoun unpicks the fabric of Marxist analysis by arguing that it was not the factory worker but the artisan, deeply embedded in locality and tradition and rebelling against the destruction of his whole way of life, that provided the most active revolutionary agent.<sup>9</sup> The “reactionary radicalism” of such workers, best exemplified for Calhoun by the Luddite movement of the 1810-1820 period, was a fight for survival: “what they sought could not be granted except by fundamentally altering the structure of power and rewards in English society”.<sup>10</sup> Hence, such “workers were not fighting for control of the industrial revolution as much as against that revolution itself”.<sup>11</sup> Contrary to Mill’s and Marx’s idea that radicalism emerged from deracination (when people have “nothing but their chains” to lose), Calhoun suggests that “revolutionary and other radical mobilisations take place when people do have something to defend”.<sup>12</sup> Calhoun has recently developed these themes in *The Roots of Radicalism*, published in 2012, which focuses on the bonds

of place and community that shaped and enabled resistance to capitalism.<sup>13</sup>

One of the most comprehensive revisions of English popular history has been offered by the social historian Patrick Joyce. In his 1991 book *Visions of the People* Joyce questions the existing ‘emphasis on the onward march of class, or class as the only or the main outcome of historical change’.<sup>14</sup> Over recent years, the names of E.P. Thompson and Patrick Joyce have often been used to mark out opposing poles in the debate on the evolution of radical politics. The difference between them has been starkly framed as an argument between materialist and postmaterialist/postmodern approaches to the nature and production of political consciousness.<sup>15</sup> However, our interest in the dilemma of radical nostalgia points to cultural connections rather than theoretical distinctions. The dispute over the interpretation of radical history between materialists and postmaterialists should not blind us to the fact that Thompson and Joyce and Calhoun all seek to rescue forms of popular resistance from the “condescension of prosperity”.

#### From “Defender of Natural Rights” to Proto-communist: The Re-invention of Thomas Spence

Spence was born in 1750 on the Quayside in Newcastle upon Tyne. He was one of 19 children. His mother sold stockings, his father made fishing nets. Spence received no formal education. At the age of ten he joined his father’s trade. When Spence was thrown out of the Newcastle Philosophical Society for hawking his pamphlet – *Property in Land Every One’s Right* – on the streets of the city it was the start of a long and impoverished life on the margins of British politics. One of his biographers, Francis Place (1771-1854), observed that Spence was “a typical specimen of those political poor preachers” and that he was “as poor as any man could well be. With some trifling fluctuation in his affairs he continued in this state to the day of his death”.<sup>16</sup>

Spence’s politics centred on his “Plan”, which he set out in this early work and stuck to throughout his life. Spence’s Plan was a scheme to take the ownership of land away from individuals and place it under local (parish) ownership as common property. The model of self-government Spence foresaw was, as Mary Ashraf notes, based on the “well-tested experience of the common people in organising their numerous benefit clubs and societies”.<sup>17</sup> For Spence, who saw himself as “the poor man’s advocate”, autonomy was part of the political heritage of ordinary people.<sup>18</sup>

The term “Spencean” was, in the first two decades of the nineteenth

century, synonymous with ultra-radical opinion. Such was the Government's fear of the spread of his doctrines that three years after his death, an Act of Parliament was passed prohibiting "all Societies or Clubs calling themselves *Spenceans* or *Spencean Philanthropists*".<sup>19</sup> In the same year, 1817, Thomas Malthus observed that, "it is generally known that an idea has lately prevailed among some of the lower classes of society, that the land is the people's farm".<sup>20</sup>

Spence's intransigent hostility to aristocrats and landlords was based on two historical claims. First, that they had stolen the land from the people and second, that the power of this "band of robbers" was a transgression of the people's "native state" of natural, God-given freedom.<sup>21</sup> The former argument was based on Spence's personal experience, the latter on a sweeping sense of rights being established and defended "from the beginning".<sup>22</sup>

Spence's active interest in politics appears to have begun in 1771, when the Corporation of Newcastle attempted to enclose and, hence, privatise, the city's largest area of common land, the Town Moor. Lessee's fences were knocked down by irate town folk whilst the city's Freemen challenged the legality of the Corporation's actions. The defeat of those seeking to enclose and sell-off the city's common land took two years to achieve. When it came it was celebrated as a victory of common ownership over private interests. Signed rings issued to mark the occasion were inscribed "*vox populi vox dei*" ['the voice of the people is the voice of God']. The fight for the Town Moor had a tremendous impact on Spence. His lifelong conviction that the common ownership of land is possible was based on his experience of the way common ownership had been defended in his native city. In later life he recalled that he "took a lesson" from the Town Moor affair "which I shall never forget".<sup>23</sup>

For Spence, the enclosure of common land represented an attack on the traditional rights of the people. "Today", he explained in his lecture of 1775, "men may not live in any part of this world, nor even where they are born, but as strangers".<sup>24</sup> Under his plan this situation would be reversed, for "All would be little farmers and little Mastermen".<sup>25</sup> Despite being a city dweller himself, Spence's model for the future was almost entirely agrarian. As the historian of English eighteenth century politics, H. T. Dickinson, notes, "Mines, factories and cotton mills had no place in Spence's vision of Britain's green and pleasant land".<sup>26</sup> Spence's idealised images of egalitarian and autonomous village communities, in which land was held in common, emerged from, and appealed to, a predominantly rural society in which attachments to the land remained strong. In his 1775 lecture he looks forward to a time when there

is “perfect freedom from every imposition”; “a time when, there no more nor other lands in the whole country than the parishes; and each of them is sovereign lord of its own territories”.<sup>27</sup>

It is important to note, in the light of later interpretations of his work, that Spence explicitly ruled out land nationalisation. His experience of political struggle and belief in popular democracy expressed itself as a distrust of national government.<sup>28</sup>

When Spence looked forward to the implementation of his “Plan” he was applying and developing his direct knowledge of cooperation and common ownership. This aspect of his nostalgia, like Cobbett’s, offered a critique of the present that was based upon knowledge of the recent past. However, there is another, broader, aspect to Spence’s nostalgia, an aspect which arose from the idea that there once existed a Golden Age of freedom and that the people had been brought low from this state by being deprived of their natural and God given rights.<sup>29</sup> When we listen to Spence we hear an unselfconscious, “common sense” assertion of the people’s political heritage:

The country of the people, in a native state, is properly their common, in which each of them has an equal property, with free liberty to sustain himself and family with the animals, fruits and other products thereof.<sup>30</sup>

Spence conflated his Plan with “Nature’s plan”.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, one notices again and again in his work a sense of nature that goes beyond Biblical teaching or political imperative and suggests a specific identification with animals as a repository of incorruptible freedom and defiance against novelty. The title of Spence’s journal *Pigs Meat*, was a response to Burke’s dismissal of the revolutionary masses as the “swinish multitude”. But Spence’s frequent use of the image of an angry hog, stamping upon the symbols of authority (a motif also



Figure 2. Spence token. Text: ‘Pigs meat Published by T. Spence, London’ Note, at top of coin is a cap of liberty; below the pig are symbols of monarchy and papal authority.

found on many of the hundreds of political tokens he minted and distributed) and the abundance and diversity of references to other animals throughout his work, suggests that he found within the animal kingdom the kind of unchanging, primordial integrity that he wished to find in people [see figure 2]. When Spence – who liked to describe himself as “free as a cat” – writes about dispossession it is towards a comparison with other creatures that he turns:

A worm pays no rent: The Earth while he lives is his portion, and he riots in untaxed Luxuries. And, if perchance, a Crow, or other creature, should pick him up, why that is only Death, which may come in some shape or other to us all as well as he. But in this respect he had the advantage of us that while he lived he paid no Rent! And herein are all the Creatures to be envied.<sup>32</sup>

Spence took the idea of natural rights further in *The Rights of Infants* (1796). Like many of Spence's tracts this pamphlet portrays a dialogue, on this occasion between a contemptuous Aristocrat and a 'Spencean' woman.

"AND pray what are the Rights of Infants?" cry the haughty Aristocracy, sneering and tossing up their noses.

Woman: Ask the she-bears, and every she-monster, and they will tell you what the rights of every species of young are. — They will tell you, in resolute language and actions too, that their rights extend to a full participation of the fruits of the earth.<sup>33</sup>

Spence's precise impact on later radicals is difficult to gauge. In his wide-ranging study of popular radicalism in mid-nineteenth century England, *The People's Farm*, Malcolm Chase argues that Spence's agrarian radicalism, including elements of his Plan, fed, in the late 1830s and 1840s, into the mass movement for extending the vote to all adult males known as Chartism. Another influence that has been identified is on anti-slavery, land reform and emancipatory movements in the Americas.<sup>34</sup> Matilda Cazzala, a PhD student in the History of Political Thought at the University of Bologna, has recently argued that “One way or the other, the Plan of Thomas Spence managed to land in the West Indies a few years after his death”.<sup>35</sup> Jean-Yves Tizot, a lecturer in British history at the University of Grenoble, makes the case that Spence's focus on co-operative land holding helped shaped Ebenezer Howard's 'Garden City' movement.<sup>36</sup>

Spence's fundamental conviction – that the land should be returned to



the people as common property – retained a place in English socialism into the last century.<sup>37</sup> However, by the late nineteenth century, this idea had been largely absorbed by campaigns for the nationalisation of land. Moreover, the interpretation of Spence was increasingly shaped by progressivism and the embrace of industrial modernity. These interpretations suggested that Spence was, at best, an embryonic figure in a maturing class identity. Spence's nostalgic concern with the popular experience of co-operation and with reviving a Golden Age of natural rights were filtered out. What remained was an early working-class militant, fumbling towards the future. This image was open to both negative and positive representations. Spence was rendered by some critics into a simple-minded misfit. Thus, in *The Socialist Tradition* Alexander Gray writes that Spence was “in himself a poor creature of little capacity and less gifts”. Gray adds that “oddly, he became a symbol and played a certain part in history”.<sup>38</sup> The idea that Spence was an oddity is repeated by E. P. Thompson and G. D. H. Cole. Thompson says that “[i]t is easy to see Spence ... as little more than a crank”<sup>39</sup>, whilst for Cole he had “little practical bearing on the contemporary development of British radical or working-class thought”.<sup>40</sup> A final stinging blow comes from Knox, who argues, because of Spence's localism, that he was “less a harbinger of modern revolutionism than a mutation of the past”.<sup>41</sup>

However, more positive interpretations could call on the authority of Marx. In *The German Ideology*, Marx included Spence in his short roll call of early English communists. In *Theories of Surplus Value* he speaks warmly of him as the author of a tract called *Private Property in Land* and as a “deadly enemy” of this form of property.<sup>42</sup> The emergence of land nationalisation campaigns in the 1880s also provided fertile soil for Spence's rehabilitation.<sup>43</sup> The English Marxist Henry Mayers Hyndman came across Spence's work in the early 1880s and immediately identified it as an important indigenous statement of socialism. Hyndman's discovery of Spence shaped the interpretation of Spence for the next one hundred years. Hyndman issued a work, in 1882, called *The Nationalisation of the Land in 1775 and 1882*, which reprinted Spence's 1775 lecture.<sup>44</sup> Spence was to become a key figure in Hyndman's patriotic argument that “In England...there was perhaps more practical Socialism than in any other nation.”<sup>45</sup>

From generation to generation the idea of nationalising the land has been kept alive among the people. A hundred years ago, Thomas Spence of Newcastle formulated a complete scheme to bring about this result through the action



of parishes and municipalities. The time was not ripe.<sup>46</sup>

Friedrich Engels enthused to Hyndman (in a letter of 13th March 1882) that he was “very glad that glorious old Tom Spence has been brought out again”.<sup>47</sup> But what had happened to Tom Spence? He had developed what the Marxist historian Max Beer eulogised as a “thoroughly honest, proletarian and consistent character”.<sup>48</sup> He was being turned into an authentic working class revolutionary.

To understand the growth of interest in Spence it is also useful to be reminded that Hyndman’s main concern was to translate Marx into the common language of ordinary people. His worry was that Marxism was too theoretical to be readily comprehended. Indeed, in his *The Historical Basis of Socialism in England*, Hyndman notes that even the *Communist Manifesto* “is by no means written in a popular form”.<sup>49</sup> With his no-nonsense rhetoric and irascible style Spence had the kind of common touch Hyndman considered to be absent from Marx. Hence, within an increasingly intellectual and abstract radical discourse, his plain speaking populism took on a class value. Yet it is a value that reinforces the argument that Spence was being cast in the role of rudimentary forerunner; a primitive prototype that confirmed the more educated and advanced status of later radical thinkers.

The most diligent attempt to pull Spence into a Marxist lineage was to come in the 1960s, with the research of Mary Ashraf, an English communist historian based in the German Democratic Republic. A number of Marxist historians in the USSR were already familiar with Spence. He was a reference point in an existing debate on the origins of revolutionary communist consciousness. Ashraf was attempting to challenge the view, associated with V. P. Volgin, that Spence was an egalitarian but not a socialist, because he did not reject private property in anything other than land.<sup>50</sup> Ashraf’s attempt to turn Spence into a modern socialist demanded that she counter this view and insert into his work her own conjecture:

It seems clear that Spence intended large-scale industry to be public property or if not managed by the Parish as a whole, to be run by ‘corporations’ of workers collectively. From land confiscation which included these larger industries intimately associated with land tenure but already long established on capitalist lines, there is not a great step to the concept of the workers’ ownership of the means of production.<sup>51</sup>

However, Spence will always disappoint this kind of appropriation. Indeed, there is an undertow of frustration in Ashraf’s attempts to corral him. For

Spence's backward-looking evocations of better times and natural rights, along with his determined parochialism, make him an unconvincing proto-Marxist. He is, says a suddenly unenthused Ashraf, ultimately part of an "inchoate tendency" of "working class eccentrics" whose "passionate denunciations ... made no distinction between one method of accumulation and another".<sup>52</sup>

## Conclusion

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, those forms of radicalism that claimed to be rooted in the history and the natural rights of the people were being displaced by modernist radicalisms that viewed nostalgia with intense suspicion. It was an awkward moment but the power of the modern project was, if not overwhelming, the stronger force of the two. The radical nostalgia of Thomas Spence became indigestible if not incomprehensible. As we have seen Spence escaped being labelled as a nostalgic only by being translated into the progressive language and ambitions of state socialists with whom he had little in common. In this way Spence's parochialism and traditionalism were stripped away and an image of an honest proletarian, a forward looking if embryonic communist, offered in their place.

The rupture between the street-level organic politics of Spence and the socialist modernity offered by his later critics and admirers, renders him incomplete and incoherent. It is only with the disintegration of Marxism's certainties, over the past few decades, that Spence's voice has re-emerged and been allowed to speak in terms which he might have recognised. The new attention he is receiving today is notable for its openness to the localist and anti-authoritarian aspects of his political message.<sup>53</sup> The commemorative Blue Plaque put up at the Quayside in Newcastle in 2010 to celebrate his birth symbolised a new interest in this once forgotten "poor man's advocate". It may also mark a new willingness to listen to Spence and his deeply rooted plans for the future.

---

## Notes

1. *Property in Land Every One's Right, Proved in a Lecture Read at the Philosophical Society in Newcastle, on the 8th of Nov. 1775*. In later editions Spence's first work was titled 'The Rights of Man' or "The Real Rights of Man". The original pamphlet had been presumed lost for many decades but was rediscovered in 2005. For a report of the discovery see Alastair Bonnett, "Thomas Spence, *Property in Land Every One's*

- Right (1775),” *Labour History Review* 74, no. 1, (2009): 134-136.
2. In England, the term ‘radicalism’ emerged as a political concept in the late eighteenth century. It spans a variety of perspectives but was often characterised by the assertion of democratic principles, parliamentary reform, press freedom and the rights and needs of the poor and/or labouring classes.
3. S. Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), xvi.
4. E.P Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), 836.
5. E. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 2.
6. J. Derry, *The Radical Tradition: Tom Paine to Lloyd George* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 46.
7. I. Dyck, *William Cobbett and Rural Popular Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), , 214.
8. Dyck, *William Cobbett*, 214.
9. C. Calhoun, *The Question of Class Struggle: Social Foundations of Popular Radicalism During the Industrial Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 55.
10. Calhoun, *Question of Class Struggle*, 60.
11. Calhoun, *Question of Class Struggle*, 55.
12. C. Calhoun, “The radicalism of tradition: community strength or venerable disguise and borrowed language?”, *American Journal of Sociology* 88, no. 5, (1983): 911.
13. C. Calhoun, *The Roots of Radicalism: Tradition and the Public Sphere, and Early Nineteenth-Century Social Movements* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
14. P. Joyce, *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1848-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 8.
15. See for example: Marc Steinberg, “Culturally Speaking: Finding a Commons Between Post-structuralism and the Thompsonian Perspective”, *Social History* 21, no. 2, (1996): 193-214.
16. Cited by P. M. Ashraf’s *The Life and Times of Thomas Spence* (Newcastle: Frank Graham, 1983), 287.
17. P. Ashraf, *Life and Times*, 128.
18. The full title of Spence’s journal was *Pigs’ Meat; or, Lessons for the Swinish Multitude: Collected by the Poor Man’s Advocate (an Old Veteran in the Cause of Freedom) in the Course of his Reading for More than Twenty Years*.
19. House of Commons, *An Act for the more effectually preventing Seditious Meetings and Assemblies*, 17th March, 1817.
20. T. Malthus, *Additions To The Fourth And Former Editions Of An Essay On The Principle Of Population* (London: John Murray, 1817), 40.
21. T. Spence, “The Rights of Infants Written in the Latter End of the Year 1796”, in T. Spence, *Pigs’ Meat: Selected Writings of Thomas Spence* (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1982), 116.
22. Spence, “The Rights of Infants”, 115.
23. T. Spence, “The Restorer of Society to its Natural State (1803)”, in T. Spence, *Pigs’ Meat: Selected Writings of Thomas Spence* (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1982), 163.
24. T. Spence, “The Rights of Man”, 61-2.

25. Cited by G. I. Gallop, "Introductory Essay: Thomas Spence and the Real Rights of Man", in T. Spence, *Pigs' Meat: Selected Writings of Thomas Spence* (Nottingham: Spokesman, 1982), 33.
26. H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), 268.
27. T. Spence, "The Rights of Man", 63.
28. See T. Spence, "The Restorer of Society to its Natural State".
29. See also C. Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* (London: Pimlico, 2001).
30. T. Spence, "The Rights of Man", 59.
31. T. Spence, "The Rights of Infants", 121.
32. T. Spence, "The Restorer of Society to its Natural State", 144.
33. T. Spence, "The Rights of Infants", 114.
34. M. Cazzola, "All shall be happy by land and by sea': Thomas Spence as an Atlantic thinker", *Atlantic Studies*, (2017).
35. M. Cazzola, "All shall be happy", 11.
36. J- Y. Tizot, "Radical legacy or intellectual indelicacy? Ebenezer Howard's use of 'the most admirable project of Thomas Spence' in the Garden City concept", *Miranda*, <http://miranda.revues.org/9173>.
37. M. Chase, *The People's Farm: English Radical Agrarianism 1775–1840* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).
38. A. Gray, *The Socialist Tradition: Moses to Lenin* (London: Longmans, 1963), 257.
39. E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), 177.
40. G.D.H. Cole, *Socialist Thought: The Forerunners 1789-1850* (London: Macmillan, 1959), 25.
41. T. Knox, "Thomas Spence: The Trumpet of Jubilee", *Past and Present* 76, (1977), 98.
42. K. Marx, *Theories Of Surplus Value*, Volume 1 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1969), 382.
43. The idea of land nationalisation was popular in the 1880s, influenced by the work of, amongst other, Alfred Russel Wallace, Henry George, The Land Nationalisation Society and the English Land Restoration League.
44. H. Hyndman, *The Nationalization of the Land in 1775 and 1882: Being a Lecture Delivered at Newcastle-upon-Tyne by Thomas Spence, 1775* (London: E.W. Allen, 1882). Hyndman later noted the pamphlet "has sold to the number of many thousands". (H. Hyndman, *The Historical Basis of Socialism in England*, London: Kegan Paul and Trench, 1883, 448.)
45. Hyndman, *Historical Basis of Socialism*, 409.
46. Hyndman, 448.
47. The letter is reproduced in Ashraf, *Thomas Spence*, plate XIX.
48. Beer continues: "and to the end of his days took part in all revolutionary Labour movements at the cost of heavy sacrifices and sufferings". M. Beer, *Social Struggles and Thought (1750-1860)* (London: Leonard Parsons, 1925), 27.
49. Hyndman, *The Historical Basis of Socialism*, 409.

50. see P. Ashraf, *Thomas Spence*, 141, note 2 (1), 143, note 18.
51. P. Ashraf, *Thomas Spence*, 121.
52. Ashraf, *Thomas Spence*, 139-40.
53. See for example, Brian Morris, "The agrarian socialism of Thomas Spence", in Brian Morris *Ecology and Anarchism* (London: Images Publishing, 1996); See also the website <http://thomas-spence-society.co.uk>.