Between the 1830s and 1880s European problems had a profound impact on British politics. In The Politics of Patriotism Jonathan Parry examines the effect on the British Liberal movement of the most significant of these, including the 1848 revolutions, the unification of Italy, the Franco-Prussian War and the Eastern question. Dr Parry argues that these European problems made patriotism a major political question: governments were judged not only by their success in promoting British interests abroad, but also by the purity, potency and ‘Englishness’ of the political values they represented. The Politics of Patriotism makes a major contribution towards understanding three important aspects of nineteenth-century British history: British attitudes to Europe, contemporary notions of national identity, and the nature and dynamic of British Liberalism. Setting foreign and domestic policy discussions in a patriotic framework, Dr Parry offers a new analysis of the ideas that influenced the Liberal Parliamentary coalition and the turning-points that affected its vigour and unity as a political movement.

In two previous books Dr Parry has re-examined many of the central tenets of Victorian Liberalism, and its operation as a political force. The Politics of Patriotism takes this reinterpretation of the British Liberal movement significantly further, as well as offering a stimulating and original demonstration of the variety of ways in which European events affected British political debate. For both reasons it will be of interest to a wide range of scholars and students of British history.
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'And Do You Find, Sir,' pursued Mr Podsnap, with dignity, ‘Many Evidences that Strike You, of our British Constitution in the Streets Of The World’s Metropolis, London, Londres, London?’

The foreign gentleman begged to be pardoned, but did not altogether understand.

‘The Constitution Britannique,’ Mr Podsnap explained, as if he were teaching in an infant school. ‘We Say British, But You Say Britannique, You Know’ (forgivingly, as if that were not his fault). ‘The Constitution, Sir . . . We Englishmen are Very Proud of our Constitution, Sir. It Was Bestowed Upon Us By Providence. No Other Country is so Favored as This Country.’ . . .

‘And other countries,’ said the foreign gentleman. ‘They do how?’

‘They do, Sir,’ returned Mr Podsnap, gravely shaking his head; ‘they do – I am sorry to be obliged to say it – as they do.’

‘It was a little particular of Providence,’ said the foreign gentleman, laughing; ‘for the frontier is not large.’

‘Undoubtedly,’ assented Mr Podsnap; ‘But So it is. It was the Charter of the Land. This Island was Blest, Sir, to the Direct Exclusion of such Other Countries as – as there may happen to be. And if we were all Englishmen present, I would say’, added Mr Podsnap, looking round upon his compatriots, and sounding solemnly with his theme, ‘that there is in the Englishman a combination of qualities, a modesty; an independence, a responsibility, a repose, combined with an absence of everything calculated to call a blush into the cheek of a young person, which one would seek in vain among the Nations of the Earth.’

Charles Dickens, Our mutual friend (1864–5), book 1, chapter 11

The English [political] system has too precarious a foot-hold in reason . . . is too penetrated through and through with fiction, for any great contest in the western world to be indifferent either to those who revere, or to those who despise and hate it. There is sure to be some side of such a contest with a lesson or a warning for England. We thus fight our battles vicariously in other countries, and hence the otherwise unaccountable warmth and sincerity with which foreign concerns are discussed by the keenest English politicians.
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