

379
NB1
No. 5299

A STUDY OF GEORGE CANNING'S SUSTAINED CAMPAIGN FOR THE
RECOGNITION OF LATIN AMERICA FROM 1822-1826

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

John B. Prior, B. S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1976

Prior, John B., A Study of George Canning's Sustained Campaign for the Recognition of Latin America from 1822-1826. Master of Science (Speech Communication and Drama), December, 1976, 105 pp., bibliography, 61 titles.

This thesis analyzes George Canning's persuasive campaign to gain British recognition of Latin America. The modification of an exigence capable of change through persuasion was emphasized, and the audiences which had the power to bring about the change were identified.

The campaign was broken into seven discernible, but dependent, stages which were examined to test the progress of the campaign. Canning was the prime mover of the campaign, and through a series of petitions, speeches, and press releases plus other strategic maneuvers, gained the necessary public and political support to successfully achieve his goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose of the Study	
Methods and Procedures	
II. IDENTIFICATION AND LEGITIMACY	18
Identification	
Identification of the Leader	
Identification of the Issues	
Legitimacy	
Legitimacy of Established Power	
Legitimacy by Acquired Power	
III. POLICY LINE	40
Policy-Line Goals	
Policy-Line Methods	
Policy-Line Tests	
Policy-Line Revisions	
IV. PARTICIPATION AND AUDIENCE.	62
Participation	
Audience	
V. PENETRATION AND DISTRIBUTION.	81
Penetration	
Distribution	
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	102

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On December 12, 1826, George Canning presented the King's Message before the House of Commons. This speech in which he "called the New World into existence,"¹ was the culmination of over four years of work on the part of Canning to have the government of Great Britain recognize the independence of Latin America. He began his campaign in September, 1822, when he took office as Foreign Secretary in Lord Liverpool's cabinet. He saw the attainment of his goal, the recognition of Latin American Independence, when he delivered the King's message on December 12, 1826.

Recognition of the Latin American countries and their establishment as autonomous countries has been thought to be the product of the Monroe Doctrine. A careful investigation of the world-wide political situation has indicated, however, that the Monroe Doctrine had very little to do with Latin American Independence. In reality, Great Britain, under the Foreign Ministry of George Canning, maneuvered various segments of the global political situation to a point where Britain was the first major world power to recognize Latin American autonomy. Because of the Holy Alliance and Alexander I of Russia, the Napoleonic Wars and France's subsequent control of Spain, the economic condition of Britain in the

early 1800's, and the growing influence of the United States in Latin American politics, George Canning felt that Great Britain must recognize Latin American independence. To this end, George Canning conducted a sustained persuasive campaign. The primary target of Canning's persuasion was Parliament, since it was the body which could officially recognize Latin American independence, and the secondary target was the rest of the world, with special emphasis on Latin America.

In 1815, Britain was a member of a group of European powers called the Quadruple Alliance. The members of the Alliance had originally joined together to defeat Napoleon. With the the admittance of France into the group, the name was changed to the Quintuple Alliance or, what is referred to as, the European Pentarchy. One of the aims of this group was to set up a congress system that would attempt to suppress the spirit of liberty that had been created by the French Revolution. Alexander I of Russia led the formation of the Holy Alliance. This Alliance was to be made up of all Christian countries to uphold the tenets of Christianity. The purpose of this Alliance has often been misinterpreted. The statesmen and journalists of the day, for rhetorical effect, referred to all the groups collectively as the Holy Alliance. This paper will use the term Holy Alliance to refer to the Alliances and their goals.

The original members of the Holy Alliance were Alexander I of Russia, Francis I of Austria, and Frederick William III of Prussia. France was admitted into the Alliance on November 9, 1815, just before the signing of the Second Treaty of Paris. The Netherlands and Spain also acceded to the treaty. The United States declined to join the group. The major blow to the Alliance was the rejection of it by Great Britain. The members knew that Britain had virtual control of the seas and without her support the Alliance could not effectively survive. Canning's primary purpose in his foreign policy was to destroy the Alliance and keep Britain as the single strongest European power. The historian Harold Temperly believed that Britain's recognition of Latin America was a major blow to the Alliance.

The mulish Ferdinand of Spain could not be expected to approve any measure granting recognition to rebels. The French government was angry because it might not have been displeased to follow suit but could not break with the Neo-Holies. Metternich exaggerated his displeasure to gratify Alexander. None the less the recognition of Spanish America was, and was intended to be, a severe blow to the Congress System.²

The second reason for Canning's decision to recognize Latin America was France's aggression toward Spain. In 1823, France, in defiance of the European Alliance, invaded Spain for the purpose of restoring order. The King of Spain had been imprisoned in Cadiz by an insurgent group. The rebels wanted to restore the constitution of 1812. After liberating the King and defeating the rebels, French forces

remained in Spain. Canning, at this time, felt that France's next move would be to invade Latin America. Agents from France were already in Mexico, Chile, Colombia, and other Latin American countries preparing for the invasion. Canning saw that economic, political, and military control of Latin America would soon lead to war. The supremacy and power of the Holy Alliance had to be challenged, or it would soon control the world.

The third factor for the decision to recognize Latin America was an economic one. As a result of the Napoleonic Wars, Great Britain had depleted much of its treasury. Part of the result of the Holy Alliance was an economic boycott of English goods on the Continent. The United States did not consume much of England's produce, and the Commonwealth could not consume it all. Latin America, on the other hand, had a large population and virtually no industries to supply it with goods. Spain and Portugal still "owned" South America, but they could not supply it with the needed goods. An independent Latin America would have been an ideal consumer for English produce. Temperly stated that "with Canning the paramount consideration was, as always, to secure the unimpeded intercourse of British trade with the Spanish American colonies. His way of looking at the whole matter, as he constantly told the Allied Ambassadors, was commercial rather than diplomatic."³

Canning's last reason for recognizing Latin America was the rise of the United States as a world power. Canning feared the takeover of Latin America by the United States. There was some sentiment in the United States to invade Mexico and incorporate it into the United States. The United States was also trying to set up economic trade routes to Latin American that would compete with the proposed English ones. Politically, the emerging countries were searching for a form of government that would benefit them the most. They looked to the U.S. for guidance. Canning hoped that they would adopt some form of government similar to the British Parliament. Canning, in a letter sent to American Minister Richard Rush on August 20, 1823, expressed a fear of the growing influence of the United States on Latin America. Canning told Rush, "We could not see any portion of them [Latin America] transferred to any other power with indifference."⁴ Canning's fear and dislike of the United States, like the rest of his political beliefs, were the result of his childhood.

George Canning was born on April 11, 1770. After the death of his father one year later, his mother Mary Ann began a long and unsuccessful career as an actress. In 1778, Canning was sent to live with his uncle Stratford Canning, who raised and educated him. At the age of twelve, Canning entered Eton and graduated five years later at the top of his class. While at Eton young George helped write, edit,

and publish a newspaper Microcosm; this subsequently brought him to the attention of King George III. Canning's uncle, an ardent Whig, often entertained party leaders such as Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Charles James Fox, and through these men Canning first came into contact with politics and politicians. In the fall of 1787, Canning began studying at Christ Church, Oxford. He and his new friend Robert Jenkinson soon became the leaders of a debating society. By this time, he had already decided to enter Parliament as soon as he could. In 1791, George Canning read for the bar at Lincoln's Inn; however, he never completed his studies. The next year, the Association of the Friends of the People was formed by a radical faction of the Whig party. Controversy over the Association caused Canning to break with the Whig party. George Canning soon met Prime Minister William Pitt, who helped Canning decide to join the Tory party. Even though he had never been involved in politics and was only twenty-two years old, Canning had come to the attention of many of the Whig and Tory leaders because of his activities at Eton and Christ Church. This shift of parties was virtually unheard of and led to many of the political problems that he experienced as Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister. Soon after Canning celebrated his twenty-third birthday, he was elected to the House of Commons as a member from Newton on the Isle of Wight. Newton was a "safe" district which Pitt had arranged for Canning to represent. William Pitt soon became

the mentor for the fledgling minister and guided Canning for many years thereafter.

George Canning gave his maiden speech in Parliament on January 31, 1794. He soon became recognized as one of the most effective, if not feared, speakers in the Commons. In 1796, Canning became one of the two Undersecretaries of State for Foreign Affairs during the period when Britain was at war with Napoleonic France. The Foreign Office consisted of the Secretary, two Undersecretaries, and a handful of diplomats and aides. Canning was in charge of the Southern Department, which included France, Spain, Portugal, and Austria. He set records for his work, often staying in his office for two days straight. He occupied the post for three years and became thoroughly familiar with the foreign involvements of the British Empire. In 1799, he became a Commissioner of the Board of Control for India, and in 1800 he entered the Privy Council as Joint Paymaster-General. George Canning resigned his post in 1801 out of sympathy for the resignation of Prime Minister Pitt. By 1804, he had reentered the government as Foreign Secretary. He served for six years and became Prime Minister in 1826. Barely six months later, on August 8, 1827, George Canning died in office at the age of fifty-seven. Canning's second term as Foreign Secretary was dominated by the campaign to recognize Latin American independence.

George Canning began his campaign in September, 1822, when he became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The major barrier to recognition of Latin America was the British Cabinet. When Canning became Foreign Minister, he entered a Cabinet of enemies, which included Lord Eldon, the Lord Chancellor; Earl Bathurst, Secretary of State for War and Colonies; Earl Westmoreland, Privy Seal; Lord Sidmouth, Secretary of State for Home Department; and the Duke of Wellington, the Master of Ordnance. Furthermore, he could not trust five other Cabinet members. He only had support from three members of the Cabinet, which, however, included Lord Liverpool, the First Lord of the Treasury, and Prime Minister. Canning's problems were further complicated because King George IV hated and distrusted him.

In October, 1822, the Congress of Verona met to consider the Spanish problem. Canning sent Wellington to represent the British interests. On December 1, 1822, Dom Pedro, the eldest son of King John VI of Portugal, proclaimed himself Emperor of Brazil and declared Brazilian independence from Portugal.

The year 1823 brought war, then peace, and finally the "Polignac Memorandum." On March 13, 1823, a French army under the auspices of the Holy Alliance invaded Spain to "liberate" the Spanish king from insurgent rule. On March 23, Canning warned France that Britain would remain neutral as long as Portugal was not attacked. Canning made two

their mother country Spain the previous year. On December 31, 1824, a dispatch was sent to Spain announcing this decision.

The year 1825 was one of peace and independence. Recognition of the three South American countries was announced in the King's Speech on February 7th. In August, a treaty between Brazil and Portugal was signed, and, in November, the King formally received the Colombian envoy.

The final phase of Canning's campaign was the recognition of Brazil and the other Spanish colonies. Portugal was regarded by Canning as a special case. Old treaties had tied Britain and Portugal together. One of these old treaties bound Britain to defend Portugal against any foreign power; thus the recognition of Brazil, if she went to war with Portugal, would force Britain into waging war against Brazil, a country that she had just recognized. Events had to be maneuvered so that Britain would not be drawn into any such conflict. When Britain finally recognized Brazil, she proclaimed to the world that Latin America was indeed independent.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the persuasive campaign of George Canning to gain British recognition of the Spanish and Portuguese possessions in Latin America.

Methods and Procedures

The methodology that has been used to analyze the persuasive campaign has been adapted from two major books on persuasive campaigns: The Psychology of Persuasive Speech, by Robert T. Oliver⁵, and Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility, by Charles U. Larson.⁶ Two other sources have been used to help define parts of the problem. The first one, "The Rhetorical Situation," by Lloyd F. Bitzer⁷, has been used to help identify the exigencies, constraints, and target audiences of the campaign. The other, The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control, by John Bowers and Donovan Ochs, has been used to help define the methods that can be used during a campaign to achieve its ends.

These two books by Oliver and Larson may be the only ones in the field of persuasive campaigns. Other books deal with political campaigns for office and social protest movements and do not apply to this situation.

Little investigation has been done in the area of the sustained campaign. These two definitive works argue that rarely do people support a movement because of just one incident or speech. While a single incident may formalize public conviction in a cause, the incident's success is the result of a sustained campaign. Oliver claims that "neither human nature nor society as we know them would be possible except for two conditions: first, that persuasion operates slowly and with difficulty, and second, that it can and does have

a considerable effect."⁸ The campaign must be organized and planned in detail. It must traverse a series of stages from the conception to the conclusion or acceptance. Each stage is essential and must be completed for a campaign to be successful.

According to Larson, there are seven stages through which a campaign travels. While each stage is identifiable, they are not separate. A sustained campaign may move from one stage to another rapidly or with agonizing slowness. A careful study must be made to determine the beginning and end of each stage.

1. Identification

At the inception of any campaign, the leader or leaders must identify themselves and the problems. The leader must adopt an identity that will be equated with the cause. This may be done with the adoption of a flag or phrase which is symbolic of the campaign or with the symbols of "truth" or "liberty." Charles U. Larson states, "Initially a campaign must establish its identity--it must give to the uninformed audience it wishes to persuade some kind of handle or label by which it can be identified."⁹ A second part of the identity stage is to identify the problems which brought about the need for the campaign. The prospective audience will want to know why the campaign is taking place. If the issues are properly identified, then the audience will know where the leader stands on the issues and what he intends to do.

2. Legitimacy

The legitimacy stage is a power stage. Legitimacy can be established by showing that the leader has the power to support its identity. The campaign may show that it has power established already or that there are means to gain the power. The legitimacy stage exists, according to Larson, to "establish a base of legitimacy for the now clearly defined identity."¹⁰ If the power of the campaign is established, then the potential supporters can realize that their supportive efforts will not be futile. With sufficient power, the goals of the campaign may be achieved.

3. Policy Line

The policy line must next be established. Oliver notes, "The policy line sets forth the goals to be achieved, indicates acceptable methods that may be employed, and constitutes the ultimate test for determining whether all aspects of the campaign are actually contributing to its success."¹¹ The policy line, once established, can be revised all along the campaign trail to adjust to the changes in the issues of the campaign.

4. Participation

Participation and resources constitute the fourth step in a sustained campaign. Oliver explains, "What can be accomplished, and the means of doing it, must be dependent in a large degree upon available resources."¹² All the resources that are available for a campaign must be realized.

The resources can be money, advertising, positions of power of the helpers, and any other help. The participation of people is essential to any campaign. As the movement progresses, it "involves more and more people in the campaign in real or symbolic ways."¹³ By helping, the people feel that they are a part of the campaign. Their help adds to the legitimacy of the campaign. A successful sustained campaign must have the advantage of resources and participation.

5. Audience

The fifth segment of a sustained campaign includes the audience and their motivation. The audience of a campaign must be accurately analyzed. Oliver believes that an accurate analysis of the audience is essential for a successful campaign. "However general the campaign may be, it normally will succeed best if segments of the public are selected for particular and specialized appeals."¹⁴ Different segments of an audience will respond to different persuasive techniques. What the audience want and how they expect the campaign to give it to them must be determined. The leaders of a campaign must also determine just how much of the audience they are going to appeal to. If the numbers of the audience are too great, then too much effort will be spent on them at the expense of other parts of the campaign. If too narrow an audience is affected, then there will be a lack of support. A careful analysis of the preceding stages

will aid in the determination of motivation. Oliver explains, "Those who are already fully convinced need no persuasion. And those who are strongly opposed or completely indifferent can hardly be persuaded without very direct and highly personalized appeals."¹⁵ If an organization can determine what the audience wants or does not want, then it can formulate plans on how to motivate the audience into accepting the campaign goals. Without a successful analysis of the audience, the campaign may be defeated due to lack of support.

6. Penetration

Once the campaign has been established, then the penetration and mechanics stage begins. A sustained campaign, by definition, takes place over a period of time. The campaign leaders must determine what the audience wants, "but until a large proportion of the masses support it or until the campaign achieves the change in the status quo which it desires, it, too, has failed to complete the penetration stage of its development."¹⁶ In the minds of the promoters of the campaign, two concurrent considerations need always to be present: "(1) how to phrase appeals that will have an application to all those who should be affected; and (2) how to indicate what each of them, as individuals, should do about it."¹⁷ Hopefully, a favorable attitude toward the campaign will be established. Larson says that "the real point at which penetration occurs is when the campaign has succeeded

and has power."¹⁸ When the goals of the sustained campaign become part of the status quo, then the mechanics and penetration stage has been completed.

7. Distribution

The final stage of the sustained campaign is distribution. After the campaign has achieved its goals, has public support, and is institutionalized, the leaders must live up to their promises. Larson believes "this stage is rarely instituted except in symbolic ways."¹⁹ This means that, although the law of the controlling group says that change has taken place, the change is not necessarily a fact but may take time to have effect. By changing the status quo, the credibility of the leaders is established so that support will be given the next time help is needed. Distribution is the final stage of a successful sustained campaign. Once the campaign is successful in achieving its goals, it will probably cease to exist.

The following chapters include an analysis of each of the seven stages of Canning's campaign to give recognition to the Latin American countries. Each stage reveals the strategies which Canning and his supporters used to promote their cause.

NOTES

¹Great Britain, Parliament, Parliamentary Debates (House of Commons), 16 (12 December, 1826), 395-398.

²Harold Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning, 1822-1827 (London: Frank Cass and Co., Ltd., 1966), pp. 152-153.

³Temperly, p. 133.

⁴William W. Kaufmann, British Politics and the Independence of Latin America, 1804-1828 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951).

⁵Robert T. Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasion (New York: David McKay Co., 1957), pp. 442-456.

⁶Charles U. Larson, Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility (Belmont, Calif.: L. Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 162-191.

⁷Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1 (1968), 1-14.

⁸Oliver, p. 443.

⁹Larson, p. 168.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 168-169.

¹¹Oliver, pp. 449-450.

¹²Ibid., p. 452.

¹³Larson, p. 170.

¹⁴Oliver, p. 452.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 453.

¹⁶Larson, p. 173.

¹⁷Oliver, pp. 455-456.

¹⁸Larson, p. 172.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 173.

CHAPTER II

IDENTIFICATION AND LEGITIMACY

The first part of any program or campaign which has as its aim to alter the status quo is to organize its members and identify the problems that it faces. These early maneuvers are known as the Identification and Legitimacy stages. Before looking into these stages, a review of the exigence of the situation in Britain, Continental Europe, and Latin America is necessary in order to understand the historical aspects of the rhetorical problems which Canning faced.

An exigence, as defined by Lloyd Bitzer, is "an imperfection marked by urgency. It is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be. An exigence which cannot be modified is not rhetorical. An exigence which can be modified only by means other than discourse is not rhetorical."¹

The leaders of a campaign have already determined that there is a problem that needs to be solved and that a defect must be removed. The exigence must be carefully analyzed so that the specific problems can be dealt with. These problems need to be analyzed exactly to be able to decide the means that will be employed in solving the situation.

George Canning looked at the recent history of Great Britain and Europe. He discovered the causes that led to

the problems of the Holy Alliance and the Latin American situation. He reviewed the exigence and began to determine the course of the campaign.

Great Britain had recently ended a long and costly war against Napoleon. The war had cost Britain a great deal, both in finances and in lives. France had been defeated and a Quadruple Alliance had been formed. The Alliance between Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Britain was designed to maintain a military balance on the continent of Europe. Alexander I of Russia, in an effort to unite the major powers into a more cohesive unit, organized the Holy Alliance. This Alliance was to include all the Christian countries in the world. Britain, at this time, had undisputed control of the high seas. "The sun never sets," the saying went, "on the British Empire." The only continent that England did not have interests in was South America. Her ships had free access to any port in the world. The Industrial Revolution had enabled Britain to become the world's leader in manufactured goods. These products were shipped all over the world in trade for raw materials and food that were needed to support England's teeming population. The problem was that the world could not consume all of England's goods.

Politically, England was in a turmoil. The Catholic Question, the desire of the people to expand the franchise, and the tariff restrictions caused by the Corn Laws were problems that were splitting the country apart. The

conservative Tories and the liberal Whigs were battling for control of Parliament. The next few years were to be a great turning point for Great Britain.

On the continent, the situation was even more confused. Many of the smaller countries were trying to rebuild after the wars. Their governments were trying to abolish the republican sentiments which Napoleon had fostered. In Spain, the rebels captured the King and imprisoned him. In Portugal, the King's eldest son joined a mutiny against him. Both of these countries' colonies in Latin America were threatening to revolt. France wanted to regain some of her lost glory and reestablish herself as a world power. Metternich, in Austria, saw the world being swept by waves of republicanism. Alexander I of Russia saw his chance to expand his empire by controlling the Holy Alliance. The European states were trying to establish their places in the world and regain some of the stability that they had before the wars. R. F. Leslie, in his book The Age of Transformation, states, "Prussia, Austria and Russia, however, were determined to maintain the political stability of Europe in order that they might recover from the stresses and strains of the war."²

Latin America wanted its freedom. Virtually all of Central and South America was a colony of Spain or Portugal. During the Napoleonic Wars, the government of Portugal had located itself in Rio de Janeiro. The Spanish government was too busy during the Wars to assert any control over her

speeches, on April 14 and 30, in the House of Commons, that helped bring public opinion to bear on the question of recognition. Dom Miguel, the second son of John VI, began a revolution in Portugal. On August 16, Canning proposed a mutual understanding between the two countries on the Latin American question. On September 23, the Portuguese minister Villa Real asked for British mediation between Portugal and Brazil. The first major breakthrough in Canning's problems came as a result of talks between Canning and the Prince de Polignac, the French minister. These talks took place between October 9 and 12, 1823, and resulted in the Polignac Memorandum, which disavowed any French interests in the New World. The Memorandum also left the impression that Britain would go to war to protect Latin America from foreign aggression. By the end of December, Canning made his first proclamation calling for the independence of Latin America.

Canning's prestige as well as his influence with King George IV began to improve in 1824. By July, Canning felt that his position was strong enough to press for commercial negotiations with Buenos Aires (Argentina). In December, Canning sent a Minute, a formal note, to the King, calling for Latin American recognition. In December, Canning announced, over the objections of some of the members of the Cabinet, the recognition of Buenos Aires, Colombia, and Mexico. The recognition of these three Latin American countries was a direct result of the French invasion of

colonies. By custom and law, these colonies could only trade with their mother countries. Neither Spain nor Portugal was able to supply them with the goods they needed and wanted. Yet they forbade any other country from trading with the colonies. Thousands of miles and weak home governments led the people of Latin America to strive for freedom and autonomy.

George Canning stepped into the arena when these problems were becoming acute. He brought with him a plan to retain British superiority, maintain the balance of power on the continent, and obtain Latin American independence.

Identification

During the Identification stage, the leaders must let the public know who is waging the campaign and why. If a solid base is established, then the public or audience can begin formalizing their support (or rejection) of the campaign. If the leaders of a campaign can be readily identified, then the audience has an easier task of relating to the campaign. A highly visible leader tends to wage a highly visible campaign. The issues of the campaign, on the other hand, need to be identified carefully. The symbols and slogans that are chosen must be agreeable to the largest possible audience. They must be chosen so as not to endanger the cause.

Identification of the Leader

Selecting the leader of a campaign is one of the first steps on a campaign trail. The leader often becomes the symbol of the campaign. A leader who is honored and respected will bring honor and respect to the campaign.

Often the leader creates the campaign. The campaign begins (and sometimes ends) according to the will of the leader. A powerful leader can carry the campaign far beyond the limits of a weak leader. A strong leader does not necessarily get involved in arguments with others. A strong leader who is respected by others is a definite asset to a campaign. A weak leader, on the other hand, hampers the campaign. He can be influenced easily and is probably not respected; thus, a campaign with a weak leader is in trouble from the start. A group of leaders or a committee can be very helpful to a campaign if they can cooperate with each other. Each of the members adds his knowledge and individual support to a program. A political party is a good example of a committee-led campaign. If the group is in conflict, however, the results can be disastrous. The campaign will probably be divided and end up stalemated while the committee argues.

Sometimes the campaign creates leaders. The current Women's Movement in the United States is a good example. Concerned people join the campaign and rise to a position of authority. Their popularity is linked with the campaign.

A campaign-created leader may even supplant a weak campaign leader.

The leader of a campaign is usually the most visible member in the organization. The audience sees him as the representative of the goals and achievements that the campaign is aimed at. He is normally the spokesman and guiding spirit of the campaign. The leader must identify himself as the epitome of the organization. He must be willing to represent the goals of the campaign at all times. He, in effect, becomes the scale that the audience can look to to judge the campaign. There is no definite rule on leadership in a campaign because each campaign is different. The campaign exists to solve various kinds of problems and the leadership may create the campaign or evolve from the campaign itself.

George Canning was the leader of the campaign to give recognition to the Latin American countries because he formed the campaign. He was the originator and the only leader. The seeds of the campaign existed when he took office and he cultivated them into the campaign. He was the undisputed leader of the campaign. Prince von Metternich, the Austrian Foreign Minister, and one of Canning's major opponents, called him "a revolution in himself alone."³

Canning was a member of the Tory party and, as such, had certain ideals that he upheld. He believed in Catholic Emancipation and an expanded franchise. He fought for these ideals on the floor of Parliament. He was already known for

these beliefs when he began his campaign, and it was a relatively easy task to identify himself as the leader. Canning was in favor of personal liberty, but "liberty" was a dangerous word in the 1820's. Liberty was equated with Jacobin France and Napoleon. The words "recognition" and "independence" soon became the watchwords of the campaign. While they did not become slogans, the words were constantly used in conjunction with Latin America. The words "free trade" became a beacon for the merchants of Britain. Free trade represented money in their pockets. Free trade would create new jobs. The public and the newspapers soon began to equate these words with Canning and his campaign.

Identification of the Issues

During his four years as Foreign Secretary, George Canning was confronted with and solved many problems that threatened the security of the British Empire. He was an adroit statesman who knew how to play power politics and intrigue. He even had the cabinet rearranged to oust his enemies.

One of the first problems that Canning encountered was the several congresses which were called in the early 1820's to discuss and solve the democratic revolutions of the Continent. Spain was in the midst of a civil war. The Congress of Verona was called to discuss the suppression of the rebels. Canning saw that a unilateral invasion of the

European powers could lead to the dominance of the German states over England. Paul W. Schroeder, in his book Metternich's Diplomacy at Its Zenith, 1820-1823, discussed the aims of the British foreign policy:

Great Britain's post-Vienna policy was a simple one. The British wished, first of all, to cooperate in the Concert of Europe without, however, seeing it expanded to include guarantees other than the existing ones and without becoming involved in further entangling commitments. Second, they wanted to preserve the Continental balance of power, staying on guard against both a revival of French power and too great an extension of Russian influence into the center of Europe; last of all, the British desired to maintain the maritime supremacy upon which England's insular security depended and to promote and retain markets for English goods and manufactures in Europe and the New World.⁴

Canning saw that Britain could not join the Concert and oppose its ideals; therefore, he decided to withhold England's support.

The problems of French invasion of Spain presented itself in 1823. The democratic sentiments of the Spanish rebels had led to a civil war and the imprisonment of King Ferdinand VII. France, without the approval of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, raised an army to invade Spain in order to free the Bourbon king. After the fall of Cadiz and the restoration of the King, French forces remained in Spain. Envoys were sent to Latin America to determine whether France should try to conquer Latin America for French rule.

Canning viewed this move as another attempt by France to gain a foothold in the New World. Russia, still in

possession of Alaska, was also looking for new territories to dominate. Latin America could have been very useful for Russia's cause as well. Harold Temperly described the three-sided threat that Canning faced.

The question of Spanish America had three aspects in 1823. First there was the attitude of Russia, whose Tzar was extending a long arm over the Pacific. There was next the policy to be pursued towards Spain herself, whose nerveless grasp was relaxing on her old-time possessions, and who seemed to be falling under the influence and arm of France. There was the third question of French designs in the West Indies and Latin America.⁵

In Canning's opinion, the Latin American countries could develop into a powerful military force if they were given the time and autonomy to do so. He felt that with British support and aid, these countries could help Britain maintain a world balance of power. William W. Kaufman claims that

Canning, like Castlereagh, apparently labored under the impression that the new states would develop into militarily influential Powers. Attached to Great Britain by ties of friendship, they could thereafter be used both as counterweights to the United States and as reserves to be thrown into the European balance should he find himself in need of additional power there.⁶

There were many problems relating to the immediate recognition of the Latin American countries. First, the problem of English law virtually prohibited recognition. Second, while British ties to Spain were weak, the ones to Portugal were strong. Great Britain and Portugal had a mutual aggression pact that called for either country coming to the

aid of the other in time of war. Thus, if Britain recognized Brazil amidst a war, then England would have to go to war in support of Portugal. Third, because most of the Latin American countries practiced slavery, Canning hesitated over the recognition of any new nation that condoned slavery. Britain had abolished slavery and was trying to lead the rest of the world to do likewise. This problem, however, was minor and could be easily solved. A fourth threat to the immediate recognition of Latin America was the aggressive nature of France, Russia, and possibly the United States. Canning feared that the new countries would be too weak to defend themselves and that Britain might have to go to war in support of Latin America. This he could not agree to.

Pressure was being brought to bear on Canning from several sources to recognize the Latin American countries. The merchants of England needed new markets for their goods. England had been converted into a country of manufacturers and traders during the Industrial Revolution, and she was producing far more goods than her present markets could consume. A free and underdeveloped Latin America presented itself as the answer to the economic problems of Britain. Kaufmann saw the economic problem in Britain as an important influence on Canning.

If Canning's first ambition was to shatter the Concert, his second objective was to recognize the Latin American states. The economic arguments for

doing so impressed themselves upon him with some strength, for, as the parliamentary representative of Liverpool, he had become particularly responsive to the doctrines of laissez faire. Latin America must be brought into the family of nations, so as to give unrestricted scope to British trade.

The recognition of Latin American Independence would please the British merchants and also give Canning military support if Britain went to war with Continental Europe.

Canning's most immediate problem, however, was to overcome his critics in the British Government. Canning had incurred both the hatred of King George IV and the distrust of many of the members of the Cabinet. Canning had incurred the wrath of the King earlier in the century when George IV had attempted to divorce Queen Caroline. Canning had been an admirer of Caroline and during his first years as a member of Parliament he had spent many hours with her. The King, during the divorce hearing, said that he believed Canning was Caroline's lover. The divorce effort failed, partly due to Canning's efforts, and the King, in turn, hated him. Countess Lieven, in a letter to Metternich dated March 5, 1823, quoted King George as saying, "I do not like him [Canning] better than I did. I recognize his talent, and I believe we need him in the Commons; but he is no more capable of conducting foreign affairs than your baby. He doesn't know the first thing about his job: no tact, no judgement, no idea of decorum."⁸ Many of the cabinet members also distrusted Canning. Some of them had become targets of his sharp tongue on the floor of Parliament. Others

saw him as a commoner and a mere son of an actress. When he entered the Cabinet as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, he had to overcome or alleviate the mistrust and dislike by its members before he could begin working on the problems of the Holy Alliance and Latin American independence. Fortunately, Lord Liverpool, the Prime Minister, also supported Canning's policies, and between them they had the dominant influence in Parliament and were able to push the campaign through Parliament at a faster pace than would normally be accepted.

Canning also had to identify the problems of the British people if he expected their support. He had to gain their trust so that when he called for their cooperation they would readily give it. As previously stated, Canning supported two causes, Catholic Emancipation and expanded franchise, that were popular with the masses but not with the aristocracy. The newspapers and journals of the day reported on the debates in Parliament and on Canning's stand on the issues, and the people were able to read about the events. Britain in the 1820's had a limited franchise. Only the wealthy merchant class and the landed aristocracy had any vote in the government, and the Tory party was in favor of reform. Canning had gained the admiration and trust of the populace by his stands on these reform issues, so when his campaign began he had the support of the majority of the people. In his speeches before Parliament and in Liverpool

before his constituents, Canning used the term "free trade." This brought him the support of the voters. He, at this time, was also the Leader of the House of Commons and was able to use his influence on his fellow Ministers.

Thus, the issues of the campaign were (1) to overcome the criticism of the British Parliament and the hatred of the King, (2) to effectively destroy the Holy Alliance, (3) to block any possible aggressive attempts into Spain or Portugal by France, (4) to prevent any of the Allied powers or the United States from invading Latin America, and (5) to recognize the independence of the Latin American states peacefully and in such a way that they would look to Great Britain as their benefactor.

Legitimacy

Once the issues of the campaign have been established, the leader can proceed to the Legitimacy stage. This is the power stage during which the leaders must be able to show that they have the power or ability to bring the campaign to a successful conclusion. Power can be established in several ways. The leader may be the recognized leader or ruler of a group of people. He may have influence in the proper areas to effect a change, control the news media, or have enough money to buy the needed support. In extreme situations, he may have an armed force to help support the campaign. Claiming power, however, is not enough. The

potential supporters must have confidence in the leader and his power. They must be able to feel that their efforts and support will not be in vain. Once a sufficient amount of power has been established, the leader and his followers can be confident that the aims of the campaign can be realized.

Legitimacy of Established Power

When George Canning became Foreign Secretary, he gained legitimate power by assuming a position of established power. Upon accepting this office, he was able to direct and, at times, dictate the foreign affairs of England. Tsar Alexander I of Russia had already called for the Congress of Verona (one of the purposes of which was to discuss the Spanish Question) when Canning assumed office. He distrusted the motives and the leaders of the Congress. He decided that the Duke of Wellington, Castlereagh's envoy, should be sent. Canning knew that Wellington shared his distrust of the German states and would do anything in his power to nullify or destroy the conference. Wellington did exactly what Canning wanted. Paul W. Schroeder described what happened at the conference.

Wellington warned at the conclusion of this meeting [Congress of Verona] that he would be compelled to make a solemn protest against the whole direction which the Spanish question was taking. At the next five-power ministers' conference of Nov. 1, he made good his warning, delivering a sharp protest against the Austrain memoir of October 31 and insisting that England would not be a party to any such attempt to

interfere in the internal relations between Spain and France. He also opposed holding any more sessions with the other plenipotentiaries present, causing the scheduled full conference of Nov. 2 to be adjourned without meeting.

With the support of the British Empire behind Canning, the other members of the Congress were powerless to attempt an invasion of Spain at that time. The crisis was to come later and have a minimal effect on Canning's plans.

Canning, as Foreign Secretary, had at his disposal numerous diplomats and agents that he could send throughout the world on various missions. Accordingly, he sent agents to Latin America to determine the advisability of recognizing those countries. Those agents also investigated the desires and needs of the Latin American countries. Other dignitaries were sent to Spain and Portugal to find out how responsive they would be to recognition of their colonies. Those agents reported directly and secretly to Canning. They kept him informed on the moods, shifts, and desires of the concerned foreign countries. Through his agents, Canning saw that if war between the Latin American states and their mother countries was to be averted Great Britain must play a major role in mediating between them. Kaufmann tells of Canning's maneuvers.

To protect himself from the accusation of traveling too fast, to exhibit his extraordinary patience, Canning at the same time took another and even more familiar step. On Nov. 30, 1822, he offered Spain the services of Great Britain as mediator in the Latin American dispute. . . . In the privacy of the Foreign Office he also drew up a list of the consuls to be sent

to Latin America. The stage was being set, and events in Europe were rapidly approaching the ripe state of confusion which Canning needed in order to act.¹⁰

The offer of mediation was to be accepted a few years later. Spain, Portugal, and their Latin American provinces were to use Canning's mediation abilities in peacefully settling their disputes. Because George Canning was the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, he had an established power base that few men in the world could equal. He was also able to use this established power to acquire more power.

Legitimacy by Acquired Power

To have established power is usually not enough to wage a campaign. By definition, a campaign takes place over a period of time. If a leader has all the established power that he needs, then he would probably not have to wage the campaign. The problem, therefore, is to acquire enough power to meet the demands of the campaign. Acquiring power can be a campaign in itself. The leader must determine just how much power he needs and where he can get it. He must find out what power is available immediately and what can be obtained in the future. He must discover who has negative power, or power in opposition to his own, and how he can overcome it. He must also investigate avenues of creating new power.

Canning was a master of power politics. The problem of negative power was the first one that Canning was to confront. As previously stated, Canning took office in a Cabinet of his enemies. Five ministers were openly hostile to him, and five more could not be trusted. Canning, therefore, set out to eliminate this negative power. P. J. V. Rolo described how Canning was able to do that.

In order to consolidate his own position, Canning's first move was to persuade Liverpool to reshuffle his Cabinet. In January, 1823, Huskisson replaced Robinson at the Board of Trade and became a member of the Cabinet. Robinson succeeded Vansittart as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Vansittart took Bragge-Bathurst's place at the Duchy of Lancaster. The manoeuvre was completed in Oct. with the removal of Lord Maryborough. Thus Canning gained one valuable friend, Huskisson, while two certain enemies,¹¹ Bragge-Bathurst and Maryborough, were eliminated.

Other members of the Cabinet saw that Canning's influence with the Prime Minister, Liverpool, would be used against them if they interefered too strongly in Canning's plans. They wisely decided not to oppose him too openly.

Another form of negative power that Canning had to overcome was the hatred of King George IV of England. The only reason that the King had offered Canning the post of Foreign Secretary was due to Canning's popularity in Parliament. When Canning took office, the King's power was enormous. George IV sent envoys of his own, without Canning's knowledge, to the courts of Europe. These envoys reported to the King, and Canning was often left out of the decisions of those meetings. The King's secret police also kept constant

surveillance on Canning and his activities. It took Canning more than three years to overcome this negative power.

Canning had to regain the confidence of the King and did so by appointing Lord Francis Conyngham to the post of Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Conyngham was the son of Lady Conyngham, the reigning favorite of King George IV. Canning's popularity with the people frightened the King. In April, 1823, King George was outspoken in his support of the French army's invasion of Spain. Canning spoke in defense of his foreign policies, and The Times had numerous articles on the Parliamentary debates concerning independence. The Times favored the ideologies of the Tory party and, at times, was the recipient of inside party information. P. J. V. Rolo surmised that "by this oblique method of reprisal Canning had in fact uncovered the weakness of his royal adversary's position: fear of increasing already distressing unpopularity."¹²

Canning also used his position as Foreign Secretary to gain even more support from the people. He was the first government official to publish policy decisions made by his office and write open letters to the newspapers explaining his decisions. Canning released news of the Polignac Conference only six months after the meetings took place. Canning was a great advocate of public pressure. Rolo wrote that

"Canning used public pressure by exploiting his own carefully cultivated popularity; he would parade policies at which the "Ultras" (Tories) balked either

in the House, or on public platforms or by the publication of dispatches and then, strong in popular approbation, would claim to his Cabinet colleagues that retreat was impossible.¹³

Canning used this public support as a foil against the King's hatred and opposition by the members of Parliament. By 1825, however, Canning had recruited the King as a supporter and the negative power at home had been eliminated.

The negative power abroad was another problem. Canning could not eliminate them from their governments, and he could not show them that he was working for their benefit. Canning had to nullify their power. His first move was to send Wellington to the Congress of Verona. This, as previously discussed, caused a stalemate in the decision to invade Spain. Next, Canning announced that Britain would defend Portugal against invaders. This made the belligerent countries, France backed by the Holy Alliance, hesitate to start another European war. Canning's third move was to offer mediation between Spain and her colonies. He anticipated Russia's and Austria's moves and started the Latin American countries thinking of Britain as their friend. He did this by announcing the results of the conference between the Prince de Polignac and himself that led to the Polignac Memorandum which kept France from invading Latin America. Canning's last move was the recognition of the Latin American states, which began a scramble for the other European countries to follow. Canning had subtly, but persistently, redirected

the European states from a policy of belligerence to one of following Canning and his campaign.

Canning not only had to nullify the negative power that opposed him, he had to establish substantial positive power. He did this in several ways. On the floor of Parliament, he gave several speeches concerning the problems of Spain, Portugal, and the Latin American countries. He spoke in Parliament on April 14 and 30, 1823, and March 5, 1824, for example. In these speeches, he called for support of the governmental policies. The Parliament then supported Portugal and called for the independence of Latin America. Sir Charles Petrie, in his book George Canning, 1770-1827, described the occasion for the April, 1823, speeches.

As the breach between Great Britain and the Holy Alliance widened, the representatives of the latter redoubled their pressure upon George, and there was what Canning called a defiant "plot to change the politics of the Government by changing me." His reply was to deliver, in April, 1823, two speeches in the House of Commons in defense of his policies which evoked so much enthusiasm in the country as momentarily to dismay his enemies at Court.¹⁴

This enthusiasm was to become one of the powerful forces in the campaign. The support that Canning had gained by 1824 encouraged him to deliver a Minute to Parliament in support of his policies. The Minute was given over the objections of King George IV.

Canning's support came mostly from the grass roots. When he first entered the Cabinet as Foreign Secretary in 1807, he established a policy of open government. He advertised his

decisions in speeches and in the newspapers. Harold Temperly related that when Canning "became Foreign Minister in 1822 and leader of the Commons, the world continued to hear what it had never heard before, except at a Mansion House dinner--a British Minister addressing meetings beyond the sacred walls of Parliament."¹⁵ This style of government was later recognized as a powerful force to use (or abuse) in publishing the efforts of politicians.

When Canning became Foreign Secretary, he also assumed the position of leader of the House of Commons. This position was another boost to his increasing power. He had by the end of his campaign gained power in three ways. He had gained established power, succeeded in blocking or altering the negative power that opposed his own, and created a new source of power.

George Canning was successful in identifying the issues that confronted his campaign. He had identified himself as the leader of the campaign. He had advertised the campaign to his potential supporters. Canning had also been able to legitimize the campaign. He had shown that he had established power and that he could acquire more power. Next, he was ready to establish his Policy Line.

NOTES

- ¹Bitzer, pp. 7-8.
- ²P. F. Leslie, The Age of Transformation, 1787-1871 (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), p. 148.
- ³Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning 1822-1827, p. 1.
- ⁴Paul W. Schroeder, Metternich's Diplomacy at Its Zenith, 1820-1823 (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1962), p. 10.
- ⁵Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning 1822-1827, pp. 103-104.
- ⁶Kaufmann, p. 139.
- ⁷Ibid.
- ⁸P. J. V. Rolo, George Canning (London: Macmillian, 1965), p. 118.
- ⁹Schroeder, p. 217.
- ¹⁰Kaufmann, p. 114.
- ¹¹Rolo, p. 132.
- ¹²Ibid., p. 119.
- ¹³Ibid., pp. 133-134.
- ¹⁴Sir Charles A. Petrie, George Canning, 1770-1827 (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1930), p. 175.
- ¹⁵Harold Temperly, "George Canning," Prime Ministers of the 19th Century, ed. T. J. C. Hearnshaw (Freeport, N.Y.: Libraries Press, 1970), p. 8.

CHAPTER III

POLICY LINE

The policy line establishes the rules and evaluations for the campaign once the leader has identified himself and the issues and has tried to establish the campaign's legitimacy. Identification and Legitimacy represent the who and why of the program; the policy line establishes the how. During the policy line stage, the campaigners must establish their goals, they must agree on the methods that they will employ to achieve their ends, and they must evaluate the campaign as it progresses to determine if the various parts are contributing to the whole of the campaign. This stage is a flexible one that can be altered and revised as the campaign progresses if changes must be made because of new situations that have occurred outside the campaign or because the leaders had made errors in their reasoning of the problems. The goals, methods, and tests of the policy-line stage must appear to be reasonable and obtainable to the spectators. The continuing support of the public must be balanced against the more radical methods that can be employed so that a groundswell of public support can take place when it is called for later in the campaign. The leaders must, therefore, determine how the campaign is going to be run and by what rules.

Policy-Line Goals

The Policy-Line Goals need to be the first thing that the leaders do at this stage of the campaign. The leader needs to determine just what, specifically, the campaign needs to achieve to be considered successful. The goals may be of a general or a specific nature. They probably need to be put into a set of priorities so that the more easily obtainable and primarily important goals will be considered first. The methods that will be used to achieve the goals can be tailored to fit, and any revisions that need to be made can be determined after the leaders have set their Policy-Line Goals.

The goals of a campaign were probably one of the easiest and hardest things that George Canning had to determine. They were the easiest because Canning knew generally what he wanted to accomplish. A list of what he wanted to accomplish was discussed in an earlier chapter. The decisions were also his hardest ones. Newton's third law of motion states that "for every action, there is an opposite and equal reaction." Canning, while not knowing of the theory, knew its principle. He knew that any action that he took with regard to the Alliance and trade would result in a reaction by the affected party. George Canning, in establishing the goals for his campaign, understood the various possible effects of his decisions.

Canning realized that his first objective had to be to gain the acceptance and approval of the Cabinet and the King. Without the aid, or at least the lack of open opposition, of the British government, Canning would have been unable to operate with the free hand that he needed. Once he had secured the home front, Canning could begin working as the Foreign Secretary.

A minor goal that he set here was to win the cooperation of the merchants and manufacturers of Britain. They were the ones who would profit the most from an independent Latin America, and they were the ones who had the most influence in the British Parliament. They were the ones who could force the government to change the old Navigation Laws that prevented open trading with Latin America.

The second major problem that Canning had to deal with was the Holy Alliance. George Canning had always been fearful of a united Europe. He had seen the growing power and conquests of Napoleon as a major threat to British autonomy and world security. He saw the Alliance of Christian Monarchs as another form of unifying Europe under one system. He felt that the nullification of the Alliance was of paramount consideration in his foreign policy. He feared the Alliance because of the implied powers of its charter. The charter assumed the right of the member nations to invade any country, member or not, that was becoming too democratic. Canning knew that each step must be carefully planned so that

the Alliance would not have cause to wage war against the British Empire.

Canning's third goal, that of containing the French invasion of Spain, will be discussed in the Revisions section of this chapter.

Recognition of Latin American Independence presented Canning with a myriad number of alternate considerations. Britain could not arbitrarily grant recognition to the Latin American countries. First, as was mentioned in the opening chapter, British law and international custom prevented recognition. Canning had to find a way to change the law and to circumvent the custom. Next, Canning realized that Spain and Portugal would object to any move on the part of the British unless they had given at least tacit approval. He had to find a way for Britain to appear to help the mother countries and at the same time make them realize that their colonies in Latin America should be independent. Third, Canning realized that recognition was not enough. The new nations had to be able to defend themselves against one another and any aggressors from Europe and North America. He had to determine whether the emerging countries could defend themselves from attack by potential enemies. Canning also believed that given time the new nations could be strong enough to help Britain in any future Continental wars. He was a realist and knew that they would need time to be able to build their economic and military strength to a

point where they would be effective. He had to secure their autonomy in the face of outside interference. Canning knew the leaders of the world powers and had dealt with them while he was Foreign Secretary earlier in the century. He knew that the emerging countries of Latin America were ripe for foreign invasion. He saw that Spain and Portugal, even though they could not maintain control over their provinces, would not release them without a struggle. Canning also feared that the United States and Russia might have designs on Latin America. After France invaded Spain, Canning foresaw another imperialistic attack, this time in Latin America. He had to convince the aggressive powers that Britain would not stand for any interference in Latin American politics. Next, Canning wanted the new countries to be a friend and ally of Britain. Britain needed new markets for her manufactured goods and new sources of raw materials for production. Fifth, Canning wanted to influence the types of governments that the new countries would be forming. He was a monarchist and believed in a government that was ruled by a strong king and an effective parliament. He hoped to persuade the Latin American states that a government patterned on the British system would be beneficial to them. The last goal that Canning set for recognition concerned the slave trade. Britain had led the world in abolishing slavery. George Canning knew that Latin America was a major link in the slave-trading chain. Therefore, one of the stipulations

for recognition was that the emerging countries should abolish their slave-trading practices.

Canning's political maneuverings to achieve his goals took place on four fronts. He had to convince the British merchants and politicians that he was working on their behalf. He wanted to nullify the power of the Holy Alliance on Continental Europe. He wanted to contain the French in Spain and keep them and the rest of the world out of Latin America. And he wanted to be able to recognize the Latin American countries without any reservations. Canning recognized the goals that he wanted to achieve and began his campaign to accomplish them.

Policy-Line Methods

The methods that a campaign leader has available to achieve his goals are usually in direct proportion to the position of power that he holds. A person working within a system has available to him the means to achieve an end that is not available to someone who is outside the organization. The greater the position of influence a person has, the greater the means of achieving the goals of the campaign. The campaigners need to determine whether the methods will be peaceful or not. If the campaign is to be peaceful, the leaders must determine what specific methods should be employed for each specific goal. Oratory is often a viable method to achieve a goal. Speakers may attempt to persuade

from soap boxes or pulpits; they may hold mass meetings or speak before government assemblies; or they may use the mass media to further their message. The leaders can use persuasion at every stage of the campaign. The leaders of a campaign may also use pamphlets, letters, or public announcements to achieve their goals and help generate public support.

When the leaders are campaigning on an international scale, alternative methods can be used. A declaration of intent by a powerful government may be sufficient to further a cause. The leaders may resort to a policy of trading support for different causes. One country may remove support, or threaten to, in order to achieve their ends. Treaties and trade agreements can be negotiated or broken. If there is internal conflict in a country, foreign governments can support the side that promises the most in return. Envoys and ambassadors may be sent or recalled to support a cause. These methods are peaceful ones and can be used to persuade a foreign power that the campaign should be seriously considered.

The campaigners may decide to use violent methods to achieve their goals. They may hire agents or supply organizations to commit political assassinations or kidnappings. They may support rebellions and civil wars. They may supply insurgents or governments with arms, food, and money in return for favorable agreements. A government may decide to send in its own troops to help decide the issue.

The overriding concept, however, is that the campaign will be identified with its methods. A movement that wishes to alter or readjust the present system will probably choose the peaceful methods to accomplish its goals. A movement that wishes to replace the status quo will probably use violent methods. John W. Bowers and Donovan Ochs in their book The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control call these two methods vertical and lateral deviance. They have defined the differences as follows.

The nature of an agitation based on vertical deviance is likely to be "hot," to use Marshall McLuhan's term. The issues, because they are based on a single value system, are easy to understand, and the aim of the agitator is to win support by making his case as clearly as possible. An agitation based on vertical deviance will end as soon as the establishment makes the appropriate concessions, concessions to demands that are explicit, realistic, and publicly available.

An agitation based on lateral deviance, on the other hand, is likely to employ "cool" strategies. The agitators' ideology and demands are difficult to understand, and the agitators are likely to display symbols, engineer events, and behave in ambiguous ways.

Canning's aim was to modify the status quo, not to completely abolish it. He had a completely outlined plan and had made his aims explicit. To this end, he waged a campaign of vertical deviance.

Canning had the full scale of options, up to and probably including open warfare, available to him in his campaign. Llewellyn Woodward, the author of one of the most definitive works about this period, believed that Canning would not have used warfare as a method to achieve his goals.

British statesmen were unlikely to disturb the peace of the world by a policy of territorial acquisition. They wanted nothing in Europe except markets in which British merchants could buy and sell. The public at large, as well as the small governing class, knew that British interests required peace, and that the maintenance of peace depended upon the general stability of the European state system.²

Canning had to tailor his methods to each problem and goal that he set.

Canning's first goal was to win the approval and help of the Cabinet and the King. His methods had to be peaceful so that a counter-reaction would not set in. His friend Prime Minister Liverpool was a great asset in achieving this goal. Canning was able to persuade Lord Liverpool to reshuffle the Cabinet to exclude several of Canning's opponents. This move left Canning as the dominant member of the Cabinet. To obtain the approbation of the King, George Canning had to work for several years. First, he appointed the son of Lady Conyngham, the King's favorite, to the post as Under-Secretary in the Foreign Office. Canning's next move was to begin showing the King selected papers and correspondences from the Foreign Office. He made George VI believe that foreign affairs were interesting and fun to deal with. Canning's popularity with the general public also helped because the King wanted some of it to spread to himself. These subtle methods proved to be effective, and, by 1825, both the King and the Cabinet were supporters of Canning's policies.

To preserve the "state system," Canning felt that the Holy Alliance needed to be nullified. In order to achieve the

nullification of the Alliance, Canning had sent the Duke of Wellington to the Congress of Verona to boycott and threaten any conferences that were held on the Spanish Question, and thus the Congress was soon dismissed without deciding on any solution.

After France invaded Spain, without the approval and support of the Alliance, Portugal was threatened with invasion. Canning sent an army to Lisbon and threatened war if Britain's ally was invaded. This threat was enough to change the minds of the French leaders. The European continent was in the same economic state that Britain was. Several years of war with Napoleonic France had drained the treasuries of Europe. A war with Britain would bankrupt several countries. The Alliance, after this fiasco, was never again a threat to British interests. J. Bagot, noted Canning biographer, described the situation by quoting from a speech given by Canning at Plymouth in the autumn of 1823.

He [Canning] declared that "England is not called on to mix itself on every occasion. . . . in the concerns of the nations which surround us"--a broad hint to the Holy Alliance. In this speech he justifies his action in refusing to allow England to be drawn into war by public feelings in favour of Spain when threatened by France. "While we thus control even our feelings by our duty, let it not be said that we cultivate peace either because we fear or because we are unprepared for war. . . . The resources created by peace are a means of war. . . . Such is England herself: while apparently passive and motionless, she silently concentrates the power to be put forth on an adequate occasion."³

Canning made a similar speech in the Commons on April 14, 1823, and repeatedly warned the Alliance that England would stand for no interference in Portugal. In March of that year, Canning told the French government that British neutrality depended on French withdrawal from Spain and no attempt to invade Spanish America. As previously stated, while Canning might not have been able to bring Britain into a war, the threat was enough to discourage France and the Holy Alliance. Irby Nichols in his definitive book The European Pentarchy and the Congress of Verona, 1822, states that

the commerical motivation of Britain's Latin American policy was so well understood by the continental allies that they were willing to credit the rumors, which circulated at Verona and Paris, that Britain had a secret agreement with Spain to support her cause at the Congress [of Verona] in return for an advantageous treaty of commerce, and that Britain would take Cuba, Puerto Rico and whatever else she could get, if France attacked Spain. Wellington, Stuart, and Canning were hard pressed to prove these reports false, for denials meant nothing to those who had come to equate England with commerical enterprise.⁴

As far as the European leaders were concerned, Britain would go to great lengths to support her commerical enterprises.

Recognition of Latin America was to take longer and prove to be a greater test for Canning's statesmanship abilities. He used the powers of the British government and his abilities as a statesman to convince the Spanish and Portuguese governments to agree to recognition.

On October 18, 1822, he wrote to Sir William a Court, British minister to the Court of Spain, about the problem of recognition.

The time and mode of such a Recognition must still be a matter of grave deliberation and may be governed by considerations of more general policy. But Spain has forfeited any right which she might have had to complain of it, by such proceedings as these against which we have so long remonstrated in vain.

I repeat, however, that you cannot too confidently assure the Spanish Minister, that any step which the King may take for vindicating British rights and interests in a quarter of the globe over which Spain has practically and, to all appearance irretrievably, lost all authority, implies no dissolution of those bonds of amity by which the crowns of Great Britain and Spain are connected, nor any disposition in any degree averse to the rights, the interests or the honor of His Catholic Majesty or of his people.⁵

In other words, Canning was defending the right of Great Britain to trade with Latin America and, at the same time, to try to keep the friendship of Spain. This tightrope was one of several that Canning walked. A month later he offered the services of the British Empire as a mediator between Spain and her colonies. This strategy proved ineffective at the time, for Spain believed that she could retake her Latin colonies. The offer, however, was accepted two years later.

Canning's position on the Portuguese situation was essentially the same as the Spanish one, but with several important differences. Portugal was a long-time ally of England. Great Britain had signed the Treaty of Windsor in 1386; this had permanently bound the two countries together. Many treaties, alliances, and navigational pacts followed. This relationship did not exist between England and Spain, who had fought several wars against one another. Another difference was that the fight between Portugal and Brazil

was a fraternal one. Dom Pedro, the eldest son of King John VI of Portugal, had declared himself Emperor of Brazil. The son was in rebellion against the father. Recognition of Brazil could only take place if the two belligerents were not fighting. Otherwise, Great Britain would be forced to fight a country that she had just recognized. Canning also offered his offices as mediator between the two parties.

Canning had decided that he could not use warfare as a method to achieve his goals. The effect of another Continental war would be disastrous. The threat of military support was sufficient to forestall French interests in Portugal. He had determined that the peaceful methods should be used if England was to successfully lead the emerging countries of Latin America along the road of peace and convince them that Britain typified the best of the world's governments. Canning had decided on the methods. Next, he would put them to the tests.

Policy-Line Tests

A campaign, like any invention, creation, or acquisition of knowledge, must be tested to see if it is effective. Knowing what must be done and how it should be accomplished is not enough. The leaders of a campaign must determine what methods of testing the program need to be used. Both supporters and detractors of the campaign need to be asked if the campaign seems to be succeeding. The methods need

to be tested to see if they are contributing to the overall success of the campaign as a whole. The needs of those who will be receiving the benefits of the campaign also need to be determined. There are many ways to test the success of a program.

The modern ways of testing the success of a campaign include surveys, questionnaires, and attitude-measurement scales. Cross-sections of the populace are questioned. Computers record and relate the information and print-out results. The mass media is examined to see what is being said for and against the campaign. How much of a product is being bought or how many people attend a rally can be used to determine the effectiveness of a campaign.

George Canning, however, did not have these modern methods available to him. He could, and did, however, consult the periodicals of the day. Journals such as Blackwood's, the Quarterly Review, and the Edinburgh Review each had several articles on the Holy Alliance and the Latin American problem in them during the period. The London Times carried many stories, sometimes daily, of the happenings on the Continent and in Latin America. Canning could hardly have missed these articles nor failed to realize the growing sentiment for independence.

Canning was able to test his power in the Cabinet. After a heated discussion in the Cabinet over recognition, both Canning and Liverpool threatened to resign. The rest of

the Cabinet, seeing that the two were serious, backed down and approved a note to be sent to the King calling for recognition.

The test of Canning's policies toward the Holy Alliance was only successful in supporting the French invasion of Spain. The Alliance was not able to persuade or force Britain to join them. It was not able to prevent the spirit of democracy from appearing on the Continent. The Alliance was not able to keep Spain from losing her Latin American provinces. And it was not able to force its will on any country with any degree of success.

Canning's fifth goal was to recognize the various Latin American states that were in revolt against their mother countries. He realized that an untimely recognition could be disastrous to his whole program. He knew that each step must be carefully evaluated so that the next step could be taken without fear of failure. Soon after taking office, Canning sent a memorandum to the Cabinet. Dated November 15, 1822, this memorandum stated that

the degree of Recognition must, of course, be proportioned to the degree of force and stability which the several States may have respectively acquired, and to the absence of struggle for ascendancy on the part of the Mother Country or of the parties into which each State may be divided. Neither in Buenos Aires nor in Chile is there any vestige of Spanish force. In Colombia the single point occupied by Spain is Porto Cabello. Nor is there, in either of these three States, such a contest for power as whether to endanger its independence or to disqualify it for maintaining external relations. Peru, not entirely cleared of Spanish troops, is also torn by conflicting

parties; and in Mexico, though Spain has but one inconsiderable post, the newly settled Government may be considered as not out of reach of revolution.

But in Peru, and even in Mexico, there are British commercial interests which require the superintendence of some civil agency on the part of the British Government.

Canning had established the conditions under which the government of the British Empire would consider recognizing the Latin American countries.

By 1824, Canning had formalized the conditions that had to be met by the new countries. To determine if they would qualify for recognition, Canning sent a questionnaire to the governments of the concerned Latin American countries. One such message was sent to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Chile. Dated May 15, 1824, the questionnaire asked

1st. Is the Government of Chile established as a single State, and that State independent, or is it connected by subordinate or any federal union or incorporation with any other State or system of States?

2nd. Had the Government, if constituted as an independent State, notified, by a public Act, its determination to admit no terms of accommodation with the Mother Country?

3rd. Is it in military possession of the country, and also in a condition of military defense against any probable attack from Europe?

4th. Has it abjured and abolished the Slave Trade, and by what public Act?

His Britanic Majesty Consul-General will feel obligated by a copy of the public Act or Acts referred to in the second and last queries.

This strategy was a good choice for Canning. It codified the terms by which he would consider recognition and it provided guidelines by which the campaign could be evaluated

by the prospective audience. Canning's questions had to be answered correctly if the concerned countries expected to be recognized and aided by England. Canning wanted the responses to his questions to be that first, the country was independent; second, the country intended to remain so; third, the country was strong enough to defend itself; and, fourth, the country had abolished slavery. He knew that if any of these questions were answered incorrectly the British government could not afford to recognize the independence of that country.

Canning realized the value of testing his programs as often as possible. He consulted his ministers and envoys to determine whether the Latin American countries were responding to his questions. He consulted with the ministers in the courts of Spain and Portugal about their reactions to England's support of independence. Locally, he read the journals of the day to determine the public reaction to his policies. He kept in touch with the concerned parties and responded to their needs.

Policy-Line Revisions

The policies of a campaign, once established, should not remain static. New events occur and public opinion changes. The policies of the campaign often need to be revised to reflect the changes. People in support of and opposed to the campaign also alter the situation because of

their sympathies. The campaign, or its leaders, may incur the animosity of certain segments of the audience. The goals of the campaign may be in opposition to the goals of the people. They may realize a fundamental difference in ideologies. A good example of this is the recent capital punishment controversy. Campaign opponents should be expected to create new arguments for their position. They will create a defense of their position and attack the campaign. They will, in effect, create a campaign of their own. If their position is more secure or their leaders more respected, then the original campaign will be hard pressed to keep alive. The original campaign will have to be adjusted quickly and accurately to meet this new challenge. A campaign that expects to succeed needs to adjust itself to these new occurrences.

George Canning realized that during the course of his campaign to recognize Latin America new elements would be introduced that would alter its course. Canning hoped that Britain's refusal to join the Holy Alliance and discuss the Spanish Question would lead to the failure of the Alliance. He was almost correct. The power of the Alliance, without Great Britain, was greatly reduced. When the rebellion in Spain broke out and the King was imprisoned, the Alliance saw this as a perfect excuse to test its strength. A French army was sent into Spain to restore order. After liberating the King of Spain, the French army stayed to help

maintain order. Canning saw this development as potentially disastrous to his plans. Plans were discussed for a French invasion of Latin America. Canning knew that if the French established themselves in Latin America they would defend their interests by war. He realized that to fight a war across the Atlantic Ocean, as Britain had twice tried to do with the United States, would be disastrous. To forestall this, he called a conference with the Prince de Polignac, the French Ambassador to Great Britain, to discuss the French plans. The meeting lasted from October 9 to 12, 1823. At the end of the conference, Canning presented a memorandum to the Prince that summed up what had been discussed. When asked to initial the memorandum, the Prince could not refuse. The memorandum, called the Polignac Memorandum, disavowed any French aims in Latin America. It also spelled out England's attitude toward the Spanish situation. Harold Temperly discussed the principles of the conference.

The main principles of the Conference are three. First, England would recognize the Spanish Colonies if any attempt was made to restrict her existing trade with them. Secondly, France was definitely warned off from any interference "by force or by menace," and, under stress, definitely abjured any such attempt. Thirdly, (and here is the revelation), Canning declined, on the ground of British interests, to enter upon joint deliberation on "an equal footing" with other European Powers, and said, in effect, that he would not do so unless the United States were invited to become a member.

Canning, while the conference was taking place, was negotiating with Richard Rush, the United States Minister to

Great Britain, about a joint statement of warning to the European countries to keep out of Latin America. The United States declined Canning's offer, primarily because of the slavery question, and President James Monroe issued his own message to the United States Congress. The message, known as the Monroe Doctrine, was a shock to Canning. Kaufmann tells of the results of the message.

To Canning the words [of the Monroe Doctrine] came as a harsh and unexpected blow. The United States had chosen the very moment when he was gathering strength to defy the Alliance to challenge British influence in Latin America. If the Monroe Doctrine were allowed to stand uncontroverted, the new states would surely look to North America instead of Europe for leadership. Preferential trade treaties might result. The whole Western Hemisphere might combine in a political league, with the United States at its head, to create a new and disturbing element in the balance of power. Such dangers as these must immediately be counteracted.⁹

Canning, however, was able to avert the disaster. He announced the Polignac Memorandum and declared that it had been written before the Monroe Doctrine. The people of Latin America turned to the British and began suspecting the motives of the United States. Pro-British sentiment was running high and Latin America did indeed turn to England as its benefactor.

Outside of the personal conflict with the Cabinet and the King, which Canning was able to overcome, there was no opposition in England. The people of Britain, because of Canning's policy of publishing state papers, were more interested in what was happening than in trying to influence the

campaign. The Holy Alliance, after the Polignac Memorandum, could not interfere openly with Canning. The Latin American countries, of course, were looking for all the support they could get, and Britain, being the world's most powerful sea power, was a most important ally.

George Canning had correctly analyzed the situation that existed in his campaign to recognize the independence of Latin America. He had established the goals that he wished to accomplish and determined the methods to achieve the goals. He was able to adjust his campaign to meet new situations. It was time for Canning to begin involving the public in his campaign and organizing his resources in a drive for a successful completion of his project.

NOTES

¹John Waite Bowers and Donovan J. Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1971), p. 8.

²Sir Ernest Llewellyn Woodward, The Age of Reform, 1818-1870 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), pp. 194-195.

³J. Bagot, George Canning and Friends (London: J. Murray, 1909), 1, p. 234.

⁴Irby C. Nichols, The European Pentarchy and the Congress of Verona, 1822 (The Hague: Martinus Mijhoff, 1971), pp. 157-158.

⁵Charles K. Webster, ed., Britain and the Independence of Latin America, 1812-1830 (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1938), II, p. 393.

⁶Webster, 2, p. 395.

⁷Ibid., 1, pp. 354-355.

⁸Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning, pp. 115-118.

⁹Kaufmann, pp. 162-163.

CHAPTER IV

PARTICIPATION AND AUDIENCE

Up to this point in the campaign, the leaders have identified the issues of the campaign and have tried to establish the campaign's legitimacy as well as the means that they will use to achieve the goals that they have set. Now the campaign must be carried to the public for support and evaluation.

These two stages, Participation and Audience, are closely related to one another. They both concern people and what needs to be done by the campaign to gain and keep their support.

Participation

Any campaign that needs to have a broad base of support must carry its arguments to the public. This support can be shown in the number of votes that are cast in an election or the number of people that show up for a rally or demonstration. Contributions of money and time are also good indicators of the support that a campaign has achieved. The absence of an organized opposition may be presumed by the lack of any counter-campaign. The campaign leaders need to generate the support from the potential audience or they risk failure.

The participation of the public is essential in any campaign, for the people who support the campaign must be convinced that their help is essential to achieve success. Resources of all kinds must be realized and utilized to have the maximum impact on the campaign and the prospective audience. An analysis of the existing supporters of the campaign can be made to determine if they can help persuade others to join. As each new person or group decides to support the campaign, a new analysis needs to be made to aid the campaign's progress. The personal resources of the supporters can be utilized to achieve the best results.

When George Canning began his campaign to recognize the independence of Latin American, he had a few supporters. Lord Liverpool, the Prime Minister, was a personal friend who was easily recruited. Through him, pressure and intimidation were brought to bear on the Cabinet. Further pressure was placed on Parliament when the merchants of Britain joined the campaign. Canning, through a series of speeches, was able to persuade the merchant class that their best interests called for support of a free and independent Latin America. After a majority of Parliament and the Cabinet supported the campaign, Canning was able to use their backing to put pressure on King George IV to also support, or at least not oppose, the goals of the campaign.

The newspapers and journals of the day also aided Canning. Interest in Latin America was great. The Quarterly

Review published two extensive articles on travel through Latin America during the early stages of the campaign. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine and the Edinburgh Review also carried several articles on the Holy Alliance and Latin America. The Times of London daily reported on parliamentary debates and carried excerpts from the state papers. Editorials were also presented which reviewed the problems with which the campaign had to deal. This reporting aided the campaign by allowing the great masses of people to read about the workings of their government. Publication of the details of the Polignac Memorandum also helped the people of Britain and Latin America to realize that George Canning was working on their behalf.

By judiciously releasing selected state papers, Canning was able to use the press to help his campaign become more visible to the general public. As the campaign progressed, more and more articles appeared in the journals, and more and more of the public became aware of the campaign and its goals.

The next section discusses how Canning recruited or blocked various segments of the audience and how he was able to utilize their resources.

Audience

Every person is different from every other person. He has different memories, desires, thoughts, and beliefs;

therefore, his conception of a campaign is different from any one else's and can be motivated only by specific appeals. Any leader of a campaign needs to discover how to phrase his appeals to recruit new members. There are ways that the leader may generally categorize the audience so that broad appeals can be designed to affect the greatest number of people. The leader can still reserve specific and individual appeals for important members, but for the great mass whose approval is needed, broad categories can be identified to encompass them. These potential supporters can be divided into the categories of supporters, detractors, and neutrals.

The first group consists of members and potential supporters of the campaign who already agree with the goals of the movement. They have preconceived opinions of the campaign as being "just" or "right" and do not need to be subjected to appeals that will cause them to join the campaign. Appeals to this group are needed, however, so they can be motivated to recruit new members or attend a rally. Their interest and support need to be kept alive and active, but specialized appeals related to the issues of the campaign are not needed.

The detractors are a second group that the leaders should not spend too much time on persuading. They, too, have preconceived ideas about the campaign. To this group, the campaign is "wrong" or "unjust." Only highly individualized and specific appeals can attempt to alter their point of

view. The leaders must decide if the individual opponent is potentially dangerous enough to be the subject of these specialized appeals. As a group, the detractors can be convinced not to actively oppose the campaign. They can be persuaded that the campaign is too minor to be opposed or that opposition to it will lead to unwanted results. The leaders need to be careful not to incur the wrath of the detractors. A strong campaign and an equally strong anti-campaign can polarize the audience to an extent that no permanent change can occur. The leaders of the campaign have the responsibility to discover these two groups and assign appeals that will maintain the support or neutralize the opposition.

The greatest number of people usually fall into the neutral category. It is possible that they may be mild supporters or detractors, but have no real impetus to do anything about the campaign. They are probably, for the most part, uninformed about the campaign and its goals. They may be disinterested or too busy with other issues that they feel are more important. The campaign leaders need to convince these people that the campaign needs and can use their support. The more people who can be enticed to join a campaign, the greater the chances of success the campaign has. The leaders of the campaign should not spend their time and energy converting all the people; rather, they should discover the key people or groups that can bring the greatest or most

important groups to the side of the campaign. As a campaign gains momentum, the leaders will find it easier to gain support.

Two notes of caution need to be mentioned here. First, the leaders probably can, given enough time and sufficient individualized appeals, convert some of the detractors into becoming supporters. The motivation will have to be discovered that will alter the point of view of the detractors. The key word here is time, for most campaigns do not have the time to spend on converting the opposition. Second, converting people is not enough. They must be mobilized and motivated into actively supporting the campaign. The more active the support, the higher the degree of visibility and the greater the number of people that are polarized. A campaign, to be successful, must have an audience that is sufficiently motivated to actively support the campaign.

There were eight different groups of people and governments, divided into four broad categories, with whom George Canning had to communicate. Their opinions on the need of recognizing an independent Latin America divided them into the four categories. The first category consisted of the merchants and business groups of England, who were definitely in favor of recognition. The second category, those who were opposed to Latin American independence, naturally consisted of the governments of Spain and Portugal. The third category had a special interest in the problem. They were the King

of England, the Holy Alliance and France, and the United States of America. These groups, for various reasons, were in favor of recognition, but opposed to Canning's means of giving that recognition. The fourth category was made up of the British Parliament, the Latin American peoples, and, in a broad sense, the British peoples. They needed convincing on the ways and means of recognition.

When George Canning took office as Foreign Secretary in the early 1820's, Britain had a limited franchise. Only a select few could vote. This limited voting power was both a help and a hindrance in Canning's attempts to recruit an audience. It was a help in that it limited the audience to a manageable number, but that number was also, supposedly, the intellectual few who would be harder to persuade. Fortunately for Canning, many of these voters were also businessmen who realized that their interests lay in supporting a policy of a free and independent Latin America. These businessmen, already convinced of the need for trade with the New World, were a foundation from which Canning could convince Parliament of the need for independence. In a move to support the campaign, merchant groups from all over England began sending petitions to Parliament calling for independence. The Times, one of the most universally read newspapers of the day, on June 11, 1824, stated that

we recommend attention to the petition from the "Merchants of London," in favour of recognizing the independence of the new States of America. This is a

powerful enforcement of the Liverpool memorial, and will, no doubt, be followed up from every commercial body in the empire. The London petition is somewhat more specific than its prototype in describing the extent of the recognition which it prays for, pressing upon Ministers more distinctly and exclusively the States of Buenos Ayres, Chili, and Colombia, as being free, not only from any risk of subjugation, but from every pretext for imagining a re-action upon them possible; since they are each, and have been for a considerable time, in the regular and understood exercise of all the powers of complete sovereignty--not a Spanish soldier or functionary showing himself in any one of these provinces. We hardly think that his Majesty's Ministers can hold out much longer.¹

Other petitions did follow. One had the signatures of 117 Manchester--another manufacturing city--businessmen. Millions of pounds were at stake on the issue of independence. In the ten years following the recognition, Great Britain loaned over 18 million pounds to seven Latin American countries. Woodward states that "the Manchester chamber of commerce declared the textile trade with South American to be 'of the first magnitude'."² Canning was able to use this support in Parliament.

The forces that were opposed to British recognition were the governments of Spain and Portugal. These two countries, at one time, controlled much of the New World. Over the years, weak governments and the Napoleonic Wars had depleted their resources and broken the strong ties that had existed between the Latin American states and their mother countries. Canning could not show Spain and Portugal that it was in their best interests to agree to recognition. He was, however, able to neutralize their objections by a series of

threats and by offers of mediation. On November 30, 1822, he wrote to Sir William a Court, the British Minister to Spain, with an offer of British mediation of the problem.

Upon these principles, combined with those which you have already had to explain to the Spanish Minister as guiding the opinion of his Majesty's Government with respect to the probable expediency of an early Recognition of the New States of America, you will see that the answer to be returned on the part of your Government to a proposal to mediate between Spain and her Colonies must be, that we are willing to undertake that Mediation provided:

1st. That Spain is prepared to state at once all the conditions she requires, so that there shall be no delay on her part on enabling us to open the negotiation.

2ndly. That we shall not be expected to withhold our Recognition in consequence of our acceptance of the office of Mediation, nor delay it longer than we might otherwise think it expedient, but shall be at liberty, if we think fit, to make it a preliminary to the negotiation.

On any other grounds we must decline resuming an office accepted by us to no purpose, reserving to ourselves the right of pursuing our own course with respect to the Colonies, but promising with the utmost sincerity not to do anything (even in the acknowledgment of them when they may take place) which shall prejudice the interests of Spain in any future attempt at accommodation.

In effect, Canning was telling the Spanish that Britain would recognize the Latin American countries at any time and that Spain would have to rely on the British if they had any hope of a peaceful settlement of the problem. Kaufmann called the offer a "pleasant and meaningless gesture," but failed to realize that Britain did, in 1825, mediate and did bring about a peaceful separation. This offer of mediation between Spain and her colonies led to a petition by Portugal for

mediation. Irby Nichols, in his book The European Pentarchy and the Congress of Verona, 1822, stated as follows:

In September, 1823, Portugal requested British mediation and after much procrastination by John VI, the proposed conference on Brazil assembled in London (July 12, 1824) under Austro-British sponsorship. The conference was attended only by Austria, Britain, Brazil, and Portugal. Despite Franco-Russian intrigues in Lisbon which encouraged Portuguese duplicity and threatened to wreck the proceedings, the London conference in March 1825 commissioned Sir Charles Stuart to negotiate directly with Brazil and Portugal. In Lisbon Stuart explained that Britain's interests demanded that she recognize Brazil, but she wanted Portugal to take the first step toward acknowledging a fait accompli. John VI yielded in May, and Stuart set sail for Brazil, reaching Rio in July. After several sessions, he secured on August 29, a treaty which recognized the independence of Brazil under Emperor Pedro I.⁴

George Canning succeeded in his plan to peacefully mediate between Spain, Portugal, and their Latin colonies. He showed the mother countries that, while they could not prevent the separation, British interests could give them the best terms possible.

The next audience that Canning had to work with was King George IV of England. As previously stated, the King distrusted Canning because of his earlier friendship with Queen Caroline. The King's dislike meant that Canning would have opposition to every move that he tried to make. It took Canning almost four years to change the opinion of George IV. Canning was able to work on the King in several ways. First, he made Lord Conyngham an Under-Secretary in the Foreign Office. Next, Canning discovered that the King was

afraid of becoming even less popular with his British subjects than he already was. Canning's popularity would be a great asset if the King would agree to Canning's policies. Lastly, George Canning played on the King's boredom and fascination with intrigue. Rolo tells us that

Canning became a royal favorite. He began to show the King selected items of Foreign Office correspondence. This and the confidential discussions which ensued were much appreciated. Canning exercised his wit and the King was amused. As leader of the House of Commons he kept the King informed of the proceedings in brief and entertaining notes. In Canning the King discovered a refuge from boredom.

By June of 1826, Canning had the complete and total support of the King and was able to proceed to other adversaries.

The Holy Alliance, with France as their champion, presented another special problem to Canning. It must be remembered that France had sent an army to liberate the King of Spain and that the army was still in Cadiz. The French had also sent envoys to Latin America to determine whether or not France should try to make them into French colonies. In a letter dated October 10, 1824, Christopher Nugent, the British minister to the Court of Spain, told Canning that the French were doing everything in their power to scare the Spanish. The French argued that the British would try to destroy the Catholic Church in Latin America. Canning was able to force the French into a stalemate by means of the Polignac Memorandum. In the Memo, the French disavowed any interests in Latin America. With the Polignac Memorandum,

all threats of France and Holy Alliance interests in Latin America were removed.

The fifth special interest group that Canning had to contend with was the United States of America. The U.S. was rapidly becoming an industrial center that would need markets to which to sell their goods. The U.S., like Great Britain, saw the Latin American countries as potential consumers. While the North American country wanted independence for their southern friends, she did not want England to get the credit for recognition. On August 16, 1823, Canning met with Richard Rush, the American Minister to Britain, and discussed a joint proposal for recognizing Latin America. In a letter to Rush on August 20, Canning made five points that he wanted the U.S. to agree to. Temperly described the points as follows:

1. For ourselves we have no disguise. We conceive the recovery of the Colonies by Spain to be hopeless.

2. We conceive the question of the recognition of them as independent states to be one of time and circumstances.

3. We are, however, by no means disposed to throw any impediment in the way of an arrangement between them and the mother country by amicable negotiations.

4. We aim not at the possessions of any portion of them ourselves.

5. We could not see any portion of them transferred to any other Power with indifference.

Temperly goes on to state,

If we now consider the terms of Canning's letter . . . we find that, as regards points 1 and 3, the United States agreed entirely with Canning: as regards points 4 and 5, Adams was at one with principle, though he did not wish absolutely to pledge the United States not to annex any part of the Spanish America.

. . . The real crux of the question lay in point 2. The United States had already recognized these Colonies, while Great Britain had not. And the two policies differed in this respect. Adams (the American Secretary of State) believed in "the independence of nations." He believed also in the republican form of government and in the establishment and recognition of republics on the American Continent. Thus he was suspicious of Canning, and doubted if he believed in either ideal.

This doubt, along with the rumor of the Polignac meeting, led to the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine. Canning was taken by surprise by the Doctrine, but he soon recovered and used it to his own advantage. Kaufmann states,

Abroad the impression quickly spread that Great Britain had inspired the Monroe Doctrine. Early in January 1824, Chateaubriand [Minister of Foreign Affairs for France] remarked upon the similarity of purpose between the presidential message and the Polignac Memorandum and voiced the suspicion "that these doctrines were now set forth for the first time by the President by virtue of an understanding between the British and American Governments." Canning in reply to this presumption denied that there had been any concert with the Doctrine. But the whole tenor of his note, admitting, as it did, the conversation with Rush, left the impression that Great Britain and the United States were not far apart in their respective points of view. The entire campaign served to create an atmosphere of acute uncertainty on the Continent. Canning did not stress the apparent coincidence of American and British policies to a point where Europe would feel obligated to draw back from a congress upon Latin American affairs. He merely left sufficient doubt in the minds of the Allies so that they approached the idea of the congress with extreme wariness.

George Canning was able to turn potential disaster into another step toward success by quick thinking. As far as the world was concerned, the United States had followed

Britain's lead and announced the decisions of the Monroe Doctrine.

The sixth audience that George Canning had to persuade consisted of the members of Parliament. These ministers were the uninformed majority that needed to be educated about the problems of independence for Latin America. Canning had to persuade them to follow his lead and press for recognition. As previously stated, the major objections to Canning came from some of the members of the Liverpool cabinet. Kaufmann explains that

a majority of the cabinet opposed the inclusion in their ranks of a man whom they considered to be treacherous, unstable, ambitious, and above all, plebeian. Even the Whigs', wandering in the Parliamentary wilderness, objected. Brougham, himself an opportunist, referred to Canning as "the joker," and made quips about his gout and irritability. Creevey expressed the opinion that he was "as rotten as a stewed prune, or words to that effect." Hobhouse in a vicious speech accused him of having "talents without character."

These remarks showed the tenor of the dislike for Canning. J. Bagot, a historian and peer of Canning's, wrote that "with Peel on one side and Robinson on the other, Canning will have the advantage of efficient support, and will no doubt fight a most excellent battle" ¹⁰ Canning used every opportunity to speak in the House of Commons. Several of the speeches have been mentioned previously. Canning did not limit himself to public speaking alone. In describing the tactics that Canning used in Parliament, Rolo said

his methods varied between endeavours to convince by argument or to flatten by pressure. Arguments involved endless discussion at Cabinet meetings and voluminous correspondence, particularly with the indefatigable Duke [of Wellington].

When persuasion failed Canning resorted to pressure. This pressure was of two kinds: private and public. Private pressure was brought to bear in the Cabinet mainly through Liverpool's good offices in threatening his own resignation. Canning used public pressure by exploiting his own carefully cultivated popularity [with the public]; he would parade policies at which the "Ultras" balked either in the House, or on public platforms or by the publication of dispatches and then, strong in public approbation, would claim to his cabinet colleagues that retreat was impossible.¹¹

These methods left the ministers in a bind. They either had to agree with and support Canning's policies, or face public dissent. Rolo goes on to say that by December, 1824, all the major opposition was defeated and final approval for recognition was given. This was the major group that Canning had to convince. With their support, no other group could successfully defeat the move for recognition.

For Canning's plans, however, to give recognition was not enough, it must be received and utilized for the betterment of Latin America. Canning knew that if the Latin American countries were recognized yet unable to maintain their independence then the whole point of his campaign was useless. As previously stated, he made attempts to discover if the Latin colonies were and could maintain their independence. Trading ships had been traveling between England and Latin America for many years and treaties had been negotiated with several of the countries concerning trade.

By the mid-1820's, the various Latin American countries depended on the United States and Great Britain for much of their imported goods. Canning was a monarchist and wanted the new countries to adopt a form of government similar to the British system. He wished for the colonies to follow England's lead and the best way to do that was to make them see the benefits of trading with the British Empire.

Temperly noted that

it certainly was not an accident that Colombia, Mexico, and Buenos Aires [Argentina] all applied to Canning before the end of 1824 to mediate between them and Spain and to secure her recognition of their independence. As he was already acting in a similar capacity between Brazil and Portugal, he thus became the accredited mediator between Latin America and Europe. Finally, the decision to recognize Buenos Aires, Colombia, and Mexico on the last day of 1824 brought Canning again most definitely before the eyes of Latin America. For, while never concealing his preference for monarchy, he now announced his decision to recognize three Republics.¹²

While only one Latin American country, Brazil, was to adopt a monarchy, Canning felt that he had successfully achieved his goal in having Britain become the mediator for the new countries. Latin America would, for many years, look to Britain for help in times of need.

Canning's eighth and final audience was the people of England. While not all had a direct voice in their government because of the restricted franchise, they were able to influence the decisions. The King was afraid of public disfavor. Parliament did not want a rebellion on their hands nor discontent in the factories. Canning was working for

Catholic Emancipation and knew that eventually the franchise would be expanded. The public knew of the efforts that Canning was making because he leaked information to the press and published selected Foreign Office papers. This policy of an open government brought public approbation to Canning and increased the leverage he had with the King and the Parliament ministers.

George Canning was successful in his attempts to influence the eight audiences. The businessmen of England supported his efforts in the House of Commons. Spain and Portugal were persuaded to use Canning's offices as mediator in the separation of their colonies in Latin America. King George IV of England was converted from an enemy into an ally. The Holy Alliance and France were warned against interfering in the New World and the United States of America did not become the leader of the new countries. The British Parliament approved of Canning's actions, and the Latin American countries looked to England for help. Finally, the English people viewed Canning as their champion for the cause of liberty. The Times carried extensive articles on the debates in Parliament concerning South America and the move for recognition. Several times, complete letters between Canning and his foreign contacts were reprinted in The Times. On May 17, 1824, for example, a Times editorial stated that "no person can assure himself to what extent the policy of Great Britain may be influenced by the direct or

circuitous machinations of other Courts, until the final step be taken by Mr. Canning, and the recognition of these new sovereignties placed beyond the most distant chance of recall."¹³

As soon as the audiences were identified and their motivation discovered, Canning moved on to the Penetration and Mechanics stage.

NOTES

- ¹The Times (London), 11 June, 1824, p. 3, col. 4.
- ²Woodward, pp. 208-209.
- ³Webster, 2, p. 400.
- ⁴Nichols, pp. 153-154.
- ⁵Rolo, p. 130.
- ⁶Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning, pp. 110-111.
- ⁷Ibid., p. 113.
- ⁸Kaufmann, p. 116.
- ⁹Ibid., p. 137.
- ¹⁰Bagot, 1, pp. 156-157.
- ¹¹Rolo, p. 134.
- ¹²Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning, p. 165.
- ¹³The Times (London), 17 May, 1824, p. 3, col. a.

CHAPTER V

PENETRATION AND DISTRIBUTION

After the campaign has gained and utilized Participation and Audience, it must make the final moves to gain the acceptance of the campaign and its integration into the status quo.

Penetration

The Penetration and Mechanics stage is the climax of the campaign. All the efforts of the leaders and supporters have been directed toward the acceptance of the movement into the status quo. During this stage, the campaign promoters need to orient their actions more and more toward the mass public. They need to appeal directly to the public for support and, at the same time, indicate what kind of support can be given to help the campaign achieve its goals. Many of the techniques of involving the public were discussed in the last section entitled Audience. These two parts run concurrently because an audience cannot be recruited without having some activity to keep them interested and active.

Penetration is the final active section of the campaign. Like its name, the purpose of this area is to penetrate the opposition's fortifications. The status quo must be breached and a change must take place. If the campaign loses

momentum, then it will fail. If it has sufficient momentum, then a change should occur and the movement should be considered, at least temporarily, successful. This section will investigate whether Canning was able to motivate his audience into the necessary action.

George Canning, at the time the campaign to recognize the Latin American countries was going on, was the Member of Parliament from Liverpool. Liverpool was one of England's greatest manufacturing and shipping cities. His constituents supported the campaign, as did the rest of the business community. Canning had no trouble in persuading them to support his campaign. They were able to use their influence with the other ministers and also circulated petitions in support of Canning. Their motivation was tied into their pocketbooks, and their support was a great aid to the campaign.

The forces that inherently opposed the campaign were the governments of Spain and Portugal. As shown previously in this chapter, Canning was successful in his attempts to neutralize the opposition. He was able to convince the Spanish and Portuguese monarchs that reconciliation was impossible. The colonies would become independent, whether or not approval was given by the mother countries. The degree of success that Canning achieved was shown in the fact that both Spain and Portugal used Canning's office as a mediator with their Latin colonies. Also, during this time, no

invasion of Latin America took place. During the negotiations, Henry Chamberlain, British Consul-General to Brazil, wrote to Canning on June 14, 1824. In the letter, Chamberlain stated that

he [Mello de Carvalho, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil] authorized me to state to you, Sir, that orders would be sent by the present Packet to the Brazilian agents to give the most positive, but confidential, assurances to His Majesty's Government that no hostilities of any kind shall be committed against Portugal or her Colonies, whilst the commenced negotiations are pending.

While there were hard feelings over the separation of Brazil from Portugal, there was no open warfare. Canning was also able to prevent a Spanish invasion of her colonies by threatening British military intervention. On the whole, the transition of Latin America from colonial possessions to autonomous countries was peaceful.

King George IV of England was the most powerful of the people that opposed Canning. This hatred was probably never completely overcome, but Canning was able to divert the King's attention. Canning's use of his power in the Cabinet and his ability to interest the King in foreign affairs soon took George IV's mind off of his personal animosity against Canning. In the end, while the King did not speak in favor of Canning and recognition, he did not oppose Canning's policies.

France and the Holy Alliance presented an entirely different problem for Canning. He could not force an issue

with the Continental governments that could lead to war. He had to find another way of countering their power. He did this in several ways. First, he refused to attend the Congress of Verona concerning the Latin American problem. This lack of support effectively blocked any move on the part of the Holy Alliance to openly support Spain and Portugal. The Polignac Memorandum, however, was the major move that stopped the Alliance. Kaufmann claims,

By means of the Polignac Memorandum the danger of using force to settle the Latin American dispute had, to all intents and purposes, been eliminated. What was more, he had accomplished this feat without discouraging the Alliance from calling a congress. He had only to wait now until the selfsame Alliance, without Great Britain, had revealed its impotence. Once the revelation had occurred and Europe had reverted to that wholesome state of anarchy which he so prized, he could recognize the Latin American states with impunity and thereafter play the balance of power to his heart's content.²

The Holy Alliance had its Congress, but without Britain, and, faced with the Polignac Memorandum, it could do nothing to help Spain in recovering her colonies. Canning had stopped the Alliance without resorting to war.

Canning felt that the United States would be a great help in his campaign. With the largest and most powerful American country on the side of independence, nothing could prevent Latin American recognition. Rush, the American minister, was contacted concerning a joint statement by the two governments. With a concert between the two governments, recognition could have taken place immediately and with

impunity. The United States, however, had a different idea. President Monroe announced the policy of the Monroe Doctrine in hopes that Britain would be displaced in the minds of the Latin American peoples. Canning successfully countered this strategy by disclosing the Polignac Memorandum with its earlier date. The Latin American countries viewed the United States as an interloper in the British campaign.

George Canning spent much of his effort in trying to convince the Parliament and the Cabinet to recognize the Latin states. His methods, as shown earlier, consisted of speeches before Parliament, intrigues in the Cabinet, and releasing documents to the press. Although Canning was not well liked as a person, he was a powerful and respected speaker. Joseph H. Park, in his biographies on the British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century, claimed that

although fame from oratorical abilities came, especially for the first half of the nineteenth century, from the delivery of speeches in Parliament, Canning himself made use of both the platform and the press. As regards his effectiveness as a speaker, there seems to have been a divergence of opinion. Lord Brougham, himself a great orator of the day, declared that "his declamation, though often powerful, always beautifully ornate, never deficient in admirable diction, was certainly not of the very highest class."

However as Canning's biographer [E. J. Stapleton] points out, these opinions are probably at variance with the impressions of the very great majority of those who listened to Canning. And he adds, "If ever an orator carried his audience with him, it was Mr. Canning in his celebrated reply on the Portuguese question. Never was an assembly of men warmed into a higher pitch of enthusiasm than were the members of the House of Commons when they broke upon that memorable night. He positively electrified his audience when he uttered those striking words, 'I called the New World

into existence to redress the balance of the Old.' The whole House was moved as if an electrical shock had passed through them; then all rose for a moment to look at him. This effect I witnessed from under the gallery."³

George Canning was an outstanding orator who knew how to move his audience. It appeared that some of his speeches helped bring the members of Parliament into his campaign. He urged them to support his campaign. Almost two years after the campaign began Canning was able on July 23, 1824, to get Cabinet approval to open official commercial negotiations with Buenos Aires despite opposition by the Duke of Wellington. Six months later, on Dec. 15, the Cabinet agreed to recognize the states of Buenos Aires (Argentina), Mexico, and Colombia. By December 31, 1824, Lord Eldon read the Minute to the opening of Parliament. The King, still sulking, had refused to read the Minute, but three Latin American states were officially recognized.

The reaction to Canning's campaign on Latin America was favorable. The peoples of the revolting countries saw Britain as their benefactor. Temperly reviewed the attitude of the Latin American peoples.

One Colombian newspaper, which perhaps was well informed, stated, in April 1824, that both England and the U.S. denied "this pretended right of intervention." Bolivar, who reviewed the Polignac Memorandum in Peru, commented thus: "The relations which Great Britain is desirous of establishing with America are worthy of her wisdom, and suited to ensure the destiny of the rising states of this hemisphere, which with a friend as powerful as Great Britain will be able to defy the rage of European tyrants." Peru, as a whole, thought all danger from Europe was over. Mexico

was much impressed, for she has as good a reason to dread French intrigues as had Colombia. An article in the Sol of Mexico, inspired by the British Commissioner, pointed to the manly declaration of England as denouncing "the machinations of the Court of Versailles." The Mexican Foreign Secretary addressed the Assembly on the 11th January 1825, and drew attention to the Polignac papers and England's determination to repel armed intervention, other than that of Spain, in America.

The peoples of Latin America were kept well informed about the intrigues going on in Europe and North America. Their sympathy lay with Great Britain and they looked to George Canning as their savior.

The people of Great Britain also saw Canning as a champion of liberty. While they could not vote, Canning wanted their support. He was building support for other campaigns to gain Catholic Emancipation and to expand the franchise to give more citizens of England a direct voice in their government. His policy of publishing Foreign Office documents let the people feel that the government was concerned about their opinions. Canning had gained the public support that he wanted.

There were eight audiences that George Canning had to impress. Through a successful series of maneuvers, he was able to gain support from those he needed and block objections from those who opposed his policies. Two years after recognizing the first three states, Canning delivered his famous "New World" speech recognizing the whole of Latin America. He was confident that no serious objections would arise to

block the recognition. He was correct, but recognition was not enough. The final test was whether the countries could maintain their independence.

Distribution

The final stage of the sustained campaign is Distribution. After the campaign has achieved its goals, has public support, and is institutionalized, the leader must live up to the promises that he gave during the campaign. Once a law has been passed, it should be enforced. Once the status quo is altered, the leader needs to be able to show that the new status quo is working effectively. The campaign may have to clean up some loose ends or solidify its position. The leader, if he plans to wage other campaigns, needs to show that the previous ones were beneficial so that, hopefully, any future campaigns will be readily agreeable to the audience.

This stage should really be viewed in a historical perspective. Questions need to be asked and answered. Was the campaign successful and did it meet its goals? Was it a temporary or a permanent change? Did this change lead to any other changes? How did the affected parties react to the change? Was the leader satisfied with the campaign as a whole? The answers to some of these questions can be found by looking at the results of the campaign.

The campaign to recognize the independence of Latin America, for the most part, was successful and it met most of its goals. Most of the Latin American countries had gained their independence by 1827. With the exception of a few of the island colonies and a short period of occupation of Mexico, Latin America was independent and would remain so. Most of the new Latin states ceased operations in the slave trade. Brazil was the only country that adopted a monarchical form of government and it was soon abolished. Latin America did not become the military power that Canning had hoped, but the British merchants made millions on the trade that resulted. Temperly sums up the campaign.

From this long survey the conclusion and the policy emerge compact and definite. Once a new State had been recognized, whether large or small, monarchy or republic, Canning accorded to it the full rights of statehood.

Canning's attention was first turned to Latin America by our immense commercial interests. Yet he never aimed at obtaining exclusive trade privileges from them for England. Still less did he harbour any territorial designs, or dream of English princes on Latin American thrones. The ascendancy he wished was a moral one, and he aspired to be their leader, but not their controller, in the ways of policy.

Though he would not have been sorry to make use of them in Europe, Canning's idea was to leave the Latin Americans to work out their own destinies, to protect them against undue influence either from the U.S. or from Europe, and to indicate to them, that England was a disinterested and powerful friend.

The change of the status quo led to several other changes throughout the world. Napoleon had been defeated several years before, but the liberal spirit had not been stopped. Austrian occupation of the Piedmont section and Naples and

the Greek Independence Question soon became new campaigns for Britain to fight. Britain, herself, lost direct control over major portions of her Empire. The fervor for national independence spread throughout the world.

The different parties that were affected by the outcome of the campaign reacted to its success in different ways. The merchants of Britain were elated at the success of the campaign. Their trade with Latin America grew to enormous proportions, at one point reaching the total of 18 million pounds. Latin America needed all the manufactured goods that Britain could produce. Everyone in Britain was satisfied with the campaign. The rich grew richer and the poor were working. The Holy Alliance quickly followed Britain's recognition. Spain and Portugal, while not liking the situation, could do nothing to prevent recognition. They never launched a successful attempt to regain their lost colonies. Rolo states that "eventually, on 21st January 1825, King John [of Portugal] responded by dismissing all of his old Ministers, including Palmalla. This was regarded as a triumph for A'Court and for British influence, which was now manifestly predominate at Lisbon."⁶ King George IV of England, at the end of the campaign, supported Canning's policies. Rolo relates, "On 21st November 1825 Canning again wrote in high spirits to Granville: '. . . the King's reception of Signor Hurtado, the Colombian Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, has been all that I could desire. . . . And so

behold! the New World is established, and, if we do not throw it away, ours.'"⁷ The countries that made up the Holy Alliance were quick to add their own, belated, recognition to Britain's. The United States, because of her own declaration, was disappointed that Latin America did not look to her for guidance. The Latin states felt a great sense of gratitude to Canning. Webster recounts the following.

The Pan-American Centennial Congress recorded its gratitude for British Assistance toward independence in these terms:--

"The Congress of Bolivar, Commerative of the Congress of 1826:

Considering:

That Great Britain lent to the Liberty of Spanish America not only the support of its diplomacy, represented by Canning, but also an appreciable contingent of blood, and it may be asserted that there was no battlefield in the War of Independence on which British blood was not shed.

That the heroic collaboration is made more brilliant by the decisive bravery of the British Legion in the battle of Carabobo; by the admirable loyalty of the British Aids of Bolivar, whose model was Ferguson, killed in defense of the Liberator, at the post of duty. . . .

It is resolved:

That the Bolivarian Congress, commerative of the Congress of 1826, gratefully pays tribute and homage to the memory of the British Heroes who gave their lives or fought without any compensation except their love of Liberty and Glory, in favour of the Independence of Spanish America."⁸

The Examiner, on August 12, 1827, wrote in its epitaph on the death of George Canning, the admiration of the British people for Canning.

Abroad we apprehend that the death of Mr. Canning will be deeply, deeply indeed felt. His name was the very watchword of liberty, and oppression quailed at its ascendancy. The loss of him will cast down the good and elate the bad of all countries. The leaning

of our late Premier to liberality in his foreign policy cannot be disputed, and in certain grand principles which he asserted in his domestic policy it is equally undeniable; but it is remarkable that though Mr. Canning was often in the general the avowed enemy of oppression, we never in any one single instance found him so in the particular. From the earliest period of his history down to the close of the last Session, what case of oppression came before the House of Commons, and called forth Mr. Canning in any other character than that of the apologist or the advocate of the wrong-doer? From Kenrick up to Lord Charles Somerset, Mr. Canning has been the same man. The oppression of the peasant, the abuses at the Cape, the butchery of the people of Manchester, every kind of crime of authority has found a ready vindicator in him. His love of liberty and justice was on so great a scale that it could not be comprehended in an individual case. But better things were with some reason expected from him, and death has set the seal of doubt on his character!

On Canning's genius it is unnecessary for us now to dissent; our opinion of it has been sufficiently often expressed. He was the last of the rhetoricians. Had he been a less orator he would probably have been a greater man.

Canning himself was satisfied with the campaign. He had "called the New World into existence." George Canning's sustained campaign to grant the recognition of Latin American Independence can be called a complete success.

NOTES

¹Webster, 1, pp. 241-232.

²Kaufmann, p. 157.

³Joseph H. Parks, British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century (New York: N.Y.U. Press, 195), p. 13.

⁴Temperly, The Foreign Policy of Canning, 1822-1827, pp. 164-165.

⁵Ibid., pp. 184-185.

⁶Rolo, p. 222.

⁷Ibid., p. 128.

⁸Webster, I. p. 79.

⁹Raymond Postgate, England Goes to Press (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merril Co., 1937), pp. 23-24.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this thesis has been to analyze George Canning's persuasive campaign to gain British recognition of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in Latin America.

The methodology that was used to analyze the persuasive campaign was adapted from two major books on persuasion: The Psychology of Persuasion, by Robert T. Oliver, and Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility, by Charles U. Larson. These two books were the only ones in the field of persuasion which dealt in detail with sustained campaigns which were not in the realm of social protest movements.

Larson delineated seven stages through which a campaign must travel. The stages were identifiable, but not separate. George Canning's campaign was analyzed with the seven stages as a guide.

1. Identification

Before the campaign can begin, the leader must identify himself and the problem(s) that cause the campaign to be formed. This identity will be equated with the campaign so it must be firmly established. The leader needs to give the prospective audience a symbol with which they can identify the campaign. The existing problems that the campaign wishes

to correct must also be identified so that the audience can begin to determine their stand on the issues.

George Canning was fortunate in the fact that he had no other competition for leadership in the campaign. This allowed him to proceed without an internal struggle. "Independence" was the slogan that he used to attract his audience. In 1822, when he became the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain, George Canning saw several problems that needed to be corrected. This was the exigence that was other than it should be. Canning saw the growing need for new foreign markets for the British manufacturers and merchants. He felt that the Holy Alliance was a threat to the balance of power in the world. He saw the once great powers of Spain and Portugal failing and their Latin American colonies in revolt. He decided that the solution to all these problems was to grant recognition to Latin America. They could be used to oppose the Continental European powers and would help consume the goods that the manufacturers of Britain produced.

2. Legitimacy

The campaign needs to establish its legitimacy. In other words, it must show that the power exists, or can be obtained, to achieve its goals. The campaign and its leader need to have the power to achieve the goals of the campaign.

Because George Canning was the Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons, he had established power.

The offices that he held were power in themselves. He was able to acquire further power by his influence with the Prime Minister and the attention given to him by the press. Canning began a policy of publishing State papers that won the applause of the general public. The constraints on Canning's power were King George IV of England and the Holy Alliance. They had power that was in opposition to Canning's. He was able to overcome this negative power of the King and an unfriendly Cabinet by his political maneuverings. He overcame the opposition of the Holy Alliance by having the Prince de Polignac sign the memorandum from their conference. Once this was done, Canning had legitimized his campaign.

3. Policy Line

This stage establishes the goals that the campaign wants to achieve, the methods that it is willing to use, and constitutes a test to determine if the parts of the campaign are all working toward the same end. The Policy Line may be revised as needed.

Canning decided that his policy line had to be peaceful. He realized that war was impractical because no one could afford another conflict. He was, however, able to intimidate the Alliance by boycott and threats. He persuaded Spain and Portugal that it would be in their best interests to let Britain mediate the dispute. He spoke at great length in the Commons about recognition. Canning wrote letters to the journals of the day. In his official capacity as Foreign

Secretary, he convinced Latin America that he was working in their best interests. His policies were peaceful and often original. The campaign needed to be tested to see if all the parts were working toward the same goal. Canning had defeated the opposition in his own government and blocked the Holy Alliance. He sent a questionnaire to the Latin states that set forth the guidelines that he would accept for recognition and that also enabled him to determine each country's achievement toward independence. When new situations arose, Canning was able to effectively counter them. The Monroe Doctrine, for example, was countered with the earlier data of the Polignac Memorandum and convinced Latin America that Britain was working in their behalf.

4. Participation

This next stage is where the leader must attempt to acquire participation and resources for the campaign. A successful campaign requires all the help it can get. People must be recruited to work for and support the goals that have been established. Resources of all kinds need to be discovered. Money, advertising, positions of power of the helpers, or almost anything that can be used to further the campaign needs to be utilized to advance the campaign.

Canning was able to recruit an audience from many sources. The merchants of Britain helped him because his policies would help them. Spain and Portugal were mollified by Canning's policies. He promised to help them get the

best possible settlement from the dispute. He told the mother countries that independence was inevitable and that Britain was their only chance. The King of England and the Cabinet found it expedient to join Canning rather than oppose him. His power and influence were impressive. The plans of the Holy Alliance to unify the Christian nations of the world were effectively blocked by Canning. He was able to counter every move that the Alliance made. The United States hoped that the Monroe Doctrine would force England to grant immediate recognition and that Latin America would look to the U.S. for support; however, Canning was able to point to the earlier date of the Polignac Memorandum and thereby win the admiration of the Latin states. The British government soon realized the expediency of supporting Canning's policies. His speeches in the Commons were superb and the businessmen sent numerous petitions to their Ministers calling for recognition. The Latin American people, because of their admiration for the maneuvers of Canning, looked to Britain as their benefactor. The people of England saw in Canning a new type of leader, one who wanted their support and would respond to their wishes and needs. Canning was able to convert or nullify almost all the available audiences.

5. Audience

The needs and desires of the audience need to be analyzed. What the audience wants will determine how the

campaign needs to be organized to include the broadest spectrum of the audience. Specialized appeals will have to be made to different groups. Opposition will have to be overcome or blocked. The campaign then needs to motivate the audience into action on behalf of the campaign. The audience needs to be divided into groups so that the appeals can be tailored to affect them the most.

George Canning, once he had the support of most of the audience, had to direct them into action or block any opposition. The merchants of England were encouraged to petition Parliament for recognition. Spain and Portugal were convinced that opposition was useless and that Britain's help was their only hope. Canning won over the King by showing him selected Foreign Office papers, thereby interesting him in the campaign. The Holy Alliance was blocked and the French attempts foiled. Furthermore, the United States unwittingly helped Canning by announcing the Monroe Doctrine.

The British government now found it expedient to follow Canning's lead. The people of Great Britain saw him as a champion of liberty. The people of Latin America saw George Canning as the person who could best help them in achieving their independence.

6. Penetration

The Penetration and Mechanics stage is where the campaign, with the support of most of the audience, must effect a change in the status quo. Laws need to be changed or new

ones written, and society must redirect itself along the lines of the campaign's goals. The campaign must give the audience the change that is now desired.

Canning achieved partial success of his campaign in 1824 when Parliament recognized the independence of Buenos Aires, Colombia, and Mexico. In 1825, Brazil was recognized. The culmination of the whole campaign came on December 12, 1826, when George Canning presented the King's Message before Parliament and "called the New World into existence."

7. Distribution

The final stage occurs after the campaign has achieved its goal. The leader must live up to his promises. He must prove to the audience that his, and their, efforts were not in vain. The campaign, after achieving its goals, will probably cease to exist.

Independence was recognized but only time would tell if the Latin American states could maintain their independence. The new states of Latin America did maintain their independence, but they did not become the military power that Canning hoped. The merchants of Britain did extensive trading with the new countries and were satisfied with the campaign.

George Canning spent over four years on his sustained campaign to recognize the Latin American countries. He began the campaign by himself and was the prime mover throughout it. An overpowering volume of petitions, speeches, and

press releases gained public support and recognition by the British Parliament. Maneuvers on an international level led to blocking the moves of the Holy Alliance, the acceptance of mediation by Spain and Portugal, the signing of the Polignac Memorandum, the unwitting help of the United States, and the approbation of Latin America. He skillfully conducted the campaign from the inception to the conclusion. He adjusted rapidly to new developments and did not allow himself to be intimidated by outside pressures. He accurately analyzed the situations as they arose and effectively countered them. He successfully waged a sustained campaign for the recognition of Latin American Independence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aspinall, Arthur. The Formation of Canning's Ministry--Feb. to Aug., 1827. 3rd ser. London: Royal Historical Society, 1937.
- _____. Politics and the Press 1780-1850. London: Home & Van Thal, Ltd., 1949.
- Bagot, J. George Canning and Friends. 2 vols. London: J. Murray, 1909.
- Bowers, John W., et al. The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1971.
- Bullock, Alan L., et al., eds. The Liberal Tradition from Fox to Keyes. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1956.
- Cash, Norman. Mr. Secretary Peel. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1961.
- Greville. The Great World: Portraits and Scenes from Greville's Memoirs. Ed. Louis Kronenberger. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963.
- _____. The Greville Diary. Ed. Philip W. Wilson. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1927.
- _____. The Greville Memoirs. Ed. Henry Reeve. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913.
- Hill, Frank H. George Canning. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1887.
- Hinde, Wendy. George Canning. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974.
- Kaufmann, William W. British Politics and the Independence of Latin America, 1804-1828. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1951.
- Larson, Charles U. Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility. Belmont, Calif.: L. Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1973.

- Leslie, R. F. The Age of Transformation, 1789-1871. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Nichols, Irby C. The European Pentarchy and the Congress of Verona, 1822. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971.
- Oliver, Robert T. The Psychology of Persuasion. New York: David McCay Co., 1957.
- Park, Joseph H. British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century. New York: N.Y.U. Press, 1950.
- Petrie, Sir Charles A. George Canning, 1770-1827. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1930.
- Postgate, Raymond. England Goes to Press. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1937.
- Rolo, P. J. V. George Canning. London: Macmillian, 1965.
- Schroeder, Paul W. Metternich's Diplomacy at Its Zenith. Austin, Tx.: Univ. of Texas Press, 1962.
- Tatum, Edward H., Jr. The United States and Europe, 1815-1823. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press, 1936.
- Temperley, Harold. The Foreign Policy of Canning, 1822-1827. London: Frank Cass & Co., Ltd., 1866.
- Therry, R., ed. Speeches of the Right Honourable George Canning. London: Ridgeway, 1828.
- Webster, Charles K., ed. Britain and the Independence of Latin America, 1812-1830. 2 vols. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1938.
- Woodward, Sir Ernest Llewellyn. The Age of Reform, 1815-1870. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Articles

- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1 (1968), 1-14.
- A Constitutionalist. "The Holy Alliance versus Spain; containing the notes and Declarations of the Allied Powers, with the replies of the Spanish Cortes." Edinburgh Review, 39 (Jan. 1824), 467-488.

- Caldcleugh, Alexander. "Travels in South America, during the Years 1819-20-21, Containing an Account of the Present State of Brazil, Buenos Aires, and Chile." Quarterly Review, 32 (June-Oct. 1825), 125-152.
- Canning, George. "The Speeches of the Right Honourable George Canning, at Liverpool, on Friday the 23rd and Friday the 30th of August, 1822." Edinburgh Review, 32 (Nov. 1822), 379-406.
- Graham, Maria. "Journal of a Voyage to Brazil, and Residence There during Part of the Year 1821, 1822, and 1823." Quarterly Review, 31 (April 1824), 1-25.
- Huskisson, William. "Substance of Two Speeches Delivered in the House of Commons on 21 & 25 March, 1825, by the Right Honourable William Huskisson, Respecting the Colonial Policy & Foreign Commerce of the Country." Edinburgh Review, 42 (Aug. 1825), 271-303.
- Miller, John. "Memoirs of General Miller in the Service of the Republic of Peru." Quarterly Review, 38 (July-Oct. 1828), 448-488.
- Pradt, Par M. de. "L'Europe at t'Amerique en 1822 et 1823." Edinburgh Review, 40 (July 1824), 514-539.
- Taylor, G. R. S. "George Canning." English Political Portraits of the 19th Century. Freeport, N.Y.: Library Press, 1967.
- Temperley, Harold. "George Canning." Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century, Ed. F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Freeport, N.Y.: Libraries Press, 1970.
- Unknown. "The Holy Alliance versus Spain." Edinburgh Review, 33 (Feb. 1823), 241-263.
- Urban, Sylvanus. "Obituary: Right Honourable George Canning." Gentlemen's Magazine, 97 (Aug. 1827), 174-180.
- Y. Y. Y. "South America." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 15 (Feb. 1824), 133-144.
- _____. "The Recent State Papers Concerning South America." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 15 (March 1824), 317-333.

Public Documents

Great Britain, Parliament. Parliamentary Debates (House of Commons), 16 (12 December 1826), 395-398.

Newspapers

The Times, London. 28 May 1822, p. 2, col. d.
13 July 1822, p. 2, col. e.
15 April 1823, p. Supp. 1, col. a.
5 March 1824, p. 3, col. b.
6 March 1824, p. 2, col. b, d.
9 March 1824, p. 2, col. b.
16 March 1824, p. 1, col. d.
17 May 1824, p. 2, col. e.
11 June 1824, p. 3, col. e.
16 June 1824, p. 2, col. b.
19 June 1824, p. 6, col. a.
21 June 1824, p. 2, col. b.
22 June 1824, p. 2, col. c.
29 March 1825, p. 3, col. b.
24 Aug. 1825, p. 2, col. d.
27 Sept. 1825, p. 2, col. e.
17 Nov. 1825, p. 2, col. a.
17 Feb. 1826, p. 3, col. e.
12 Dec. 1826, p. 2, col. a.
13 Dec. 1826, p. 1, col. c.