thrown. In France, where it was less strong, though still mighty,[1] it made head against the enemy in a series of desperate civil wars. In Germany, as in Scandinavia, it was markedly weaker, and there the interests of predatory nobles and frugal laymen sufficed to realise the ideal of anti-Papalism which had been forced on the real Reformers by the Papal policy of resistance to all criticism. In England, where the ecclesiastical interest was probably stronger than in Germany, it perhaps needed the personal equation of the king—employing the avarice of burgesses and nobles, and drawing on the irritation of the common people against the Pope's delays over the divorce as well as against the greed and licence of the priesthood—to break through the Roman bond; for in England the mere spirit of moral criticism had visibly failed to overpower the general bias to Catholicism. In Scotland, again, the land-hunger of the nobles (who to begin with were no more Lutheran than Henry) sufficed to overthrow a wealthy Church which had lost the respect of the common people, and which the crown, its enricher and normal ally, was too weak to sustain. But in Ireland the conditions were wholly different. The Church had little wealth wherewith to tempt the baronage or alienate the peasantry; there was almost no town population among whom any form of critical doctrine could take root; and there was no occasion to complain of the Pope any more than of sacerdotal exactions. Chieftains were indeed found ready enough to grab the monastery lands that were offered them; and it is on record[2] that the king's renunciation of the supremacy of the Pope was acquiesced in with something like absolute indifference by nobility and clergy alike. But such indifference only proved that in Ireland there was no ecclesiastical question whatever, and that the churchmen themselves had no idea of what the new proceedings involved, having had no experience of hostility from their parishioners. There was in short, comparatively speaking, nothing to "reform" in ecclesiastical polity; and where partially educated England had not yet attained to any heresy of thought, uneducated Ireland could still less have done so.

[1] It seems to be forgotten by the theorists of race that King Francis himself was long inclined to effect some measure of Reformation, but that, as Herbert puts it, "he feared it might cause a division in his realm, as he saw it had done in the empire" (*History of England under Henry VIII.*, Murray's reprint, p. 528).

[2] So Green, *Short History of the English People*, p. 438; but the point is not clear, on the face of his own narrative.

And when, in the following generations, the new Hebraizing Bible-readers of England began to frame for themselves, with the help of Luther and Calvin, a new system of dogma wherewith to organise intellectually their schism, it lay as plainly in the nature of the case that Ireland should remain outside of the Protestant movement. The Puritanism of Elizabethan and Caroline England was above all things a matter of the ferment of the critical spirit in sedentary town populations, living industrially and at peace; just as Dissent has been in later times, and Secularism in later times still. The Bible being the sole culture-force for those of the commonalty who turned away from the theatre, it became their one social and moral standard, supplying them with a set of sanctions on which they could stand against the Popery which had been politically repudiated by their Government. But in Ireland there was no sedentary and introspective industrial population, no ecclesiastical grievance, and therefore no critical ferment.[1] The country was still almost wholly pastoral. To be thus behind England, however, in order of social development, and so in order of preparation for intellectual change, meant for Ireland the being definitely bound up with the Catholic cause as against the Protestant. Where in normal course there would have been gradual change, there was a sudden and violent check to adaptation. A series of fatalities drove the Irish population more and more into the arms of the Papacy and the Catholic States. Gerald, Earl of Kildare, the Lord Deputy at the date (1531) of Henry's assumption of the headship of the Church, does not seem to have had the slightest thought of taking pro-Papal action; and his former imprisonment and narrow escape from death for offending Wolsey were not likely to have left him so disposed. But when, called to England to answer unspecified charges, arising out of family feuds,[2] he was cast into the Tower (1534), the rumour of his execution set his son, whom he had appointed to hold his place, upon a wild course of insurrection, involving an appeal to Charles V. and the Pope for aid. Eleven years before, Kildare's rebellious kinsman Desmond had con-

[1] From the later proceedings in the matters of translating the Prayer Book and Catechism, it would appear that even within the English Pale the common people mostly spoke Irish. As there were no Irish books, they can have read nothing. Cp. *The Early History of Trinity College, Dublin*, by Rev. W. Urwick, 1892, pp. 30, 33, 48. In any case, only the counties of Dublin, Meath, and Louth were English in 1530. See Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, 10th ed., iii. 360, *note*.

[2] Cp. Herbert's *History of England under Henry VIII.*, as cited, p. 537, and Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 363.

certed an alliance with King Francis, and more recently he had been in treaty with the emperor; but what had formerly been recognised as futile plots now began to wear the air of possible international complications, Fitzgerald having offered the Pope, should the crown of Ireland be given him, to make a crusade against Henry. On Fitzgerald's execution, with his five uncles, trapped at a banquet by his successor, Lord Gray, the Irish Parliament was duly made to go through the forms of renouncing the Pope, suppressing monasteries, and making over tithes to the king. All this affected only the Pale, yet even there there was soon felt tacit resistance and priestly plotting, followed by fresh revolt, all duly crushed by Lord Gray, who proved his sufficiently anti-Catholic temper by destroying many monuments to St. Patrick and burning the cathedral of Down. When he after all shared the common fate of Henry's servants, being beheaded on the charge of having connived at the escape of the youngest Fitzgerald, the Irish people were well on the way to determined Catholicism, though the later revolts failed like the earlier. The English king's assumption of the title of king of Ireland, and the bestowal of church lands on those nobles who acquiesced, left the country only more definitely Catholic, the forms of worship being left all the while unchanged.

It is needless to follow in detail the strifes of the following reigns. The Protestantising measures of the English Government under Edward VI. were naturally resisted. Henry VIII. had sought to enforce the English language on the people through the clergy, and the Council of his son sought to enforce an English Prayer-Book. To this day the Presbyterians of Scotland take pride in the refusal of their ancestors, with less cause, to accept an English Service-Book; and what is held patriotic in Scotland cannot be reckoned otherwise in Ireland. The revolts were suppressed, and the leaders executed in breach of faith; but the people clave to their old priests, exactly as did the Presbyterians of Scotland in the next century. Only gradually, indeed, did the sense of utter religious severance grow up in Ireland, since it was only by degrees that Protestant fanaticism developed itself in England, after Henry's death. That was the fountain of the evil. Lord St. Leger, as Lord Deputy, seems to have worked zealously enough for the promotion of the Protestant interest; but inasmuch as he tempered his zeal with a little local discretion, he was recalled, and a more uncompromising zealot put in his place. Then came the rising of Shane O'Neill, civil war being only averted by the accession of Mary.

But so far was Ireland still from being fanatically Catholic, that despite the ascendancy given by Mary to the Catholic interest, under a Catholic Lord-Lieutenant, there were no reprisals against individuals; only those ecclesiastical endowments being restored which had remained in the hands of the Crown, while not only were there no martyrdoms, but the Protestants had perfect freedom to worship in their own way in Dublin itself,[1] a height of tolerance of which the Protestants of the next generation showed themselves everywhere incapable. Catholic Ireland, in fact, was absolutely a refuge for terrorised English Protestants. On the other hand, the normal English incapacity to treat fairly a dependent people came out in atrocious tyrannies even under a Catholic rule. The chiefs O'Moore and O'Connor having rebelled on a political grievance, their estates were confiscated and bestowed on English colonists; and when the native tenants refused to give way, insisting that under Irish law the land belonged not to the chief but to the entire clan, they were massacred wholesale, and the English settlers duly installed. Thus were constituted the new shires, King's County and Queen's County, in name of Philip and Mary.

With Elizabeth, driven into political Protestantism by the tactics of the Catholic States, there came the religious reversal, with still worse measures of social policy. The Earl of Sussex, who as a Catholic Lord-Lieutenant had massacred the tribesmen under Mary, returned to enforce Protestantism under Elizabeth, and year by year the people become more devoted to their proscribed faith. The Bishops, mostly ready to change creeds with a change of crowns, represented for them only English tyranny and avarice; the curates, mostly Irish-speaking,[2] clung the more warmly to the old religion; and the Government of Elizabeth was utterly unable to carry out its aspirations in the way of providing a Protestant clergy. Protestant rule accordingly meant for the mass of the people only futile oppression, rousing semi-savage chiefs to blind insurrections, repressed by horrible massacres. There is nothing in modern history to compare with the story of the suppression of the Munster rebellion by "the good Lord Graye,"[3] (the second Lord Deputy of that name)

[1] Hassencamp, p. 18.

[2] Even in the diocese of Meath, "one of the best regulated districts in the country," there were in the year 1576 only 18 English-speaking curates; and of 244 parish churches, only 144 had a resident clergyman. See Hassencamp, pp. 21-22.

[3] Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland*, Globe ed. of Spenser's Works, p. 654.

unless it be the stories of later abominations committed in the same land by later English leaders. It outwent most contemporary horrors. As Mr Froude has put it, in a moment of relapse from patriotic sentiment,

"The English nation was shuddering over the atrocities of the Duke of Alva. The children in the nurseries were being inflamed to patriotic rage and madness by tales of Spanish tyranny. Yet Alva's bloody sword never touched the young, the defenceless, or those whose sex even dogs can recognise and respect."[1]

It was left to the Protestant commanders of Elizabeth, of James, and of Charles, to slay "not the armed kernes only, but the aged and infirm, the nursing mother, and the baby at the breast." Sir Nicholas Malby, President of Connaught, being commissioned to ravage the Burkes' country, avowed in writing that he spared "neither old nor young;"[2] others have told how in Desmond's country, after all resistance had ceased, the soldiers would drive men and women into barns and burn them there; how they would toss and twirl infants on the points of their spears; how the bands of Pelham and Ormond "killed blind and feeble men, women, boys and girls, sick persons, idiots, and old people." And after the massacres came the direr deaths of the computed 30,000 men, women, and children, who died of famine, and who were found in the ditches "with their mouths all coloured green by eating nettles, docks, and all things they could rend above ground," yea, and who in their extremity "did eate the dead carrions, happy where they could find them, yea, and one another soone after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape from their graves." Englishmen looked-on, it seems, giving no succour; the policy of destroying all food having been deliberately adopted.[3] It is worth the while of present-day English Christians, when thrilling with anger at the atrocities of Turks, to remember that their Protestant ancestors of but three centuries ago wrought bloodier deeds than those of the Moslem Sultan and his Khurds, on the same sort of inspiration. For nothing but a concurrence of the two malignities of race and of creed, surely, could have led men so wont to denounce the cruelties of others thus to surpass their worst foes in systematic

[1] *History of England*, ed. 1875, x. 508.

[2] *Id.*, xi. 197. Cp. x. 500, 507, 512.

[3] Spenser, *View*, as cited, p. 654; Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, new ed., i. 8. See p. 9 for mention of worse horrors still; also the collection of testimonies made by Mr Fox, *Key to the Irish Question*, ch. xxix.

ferocity. Gray was Spenser's patron, the Arthegal of the *Faerie Queene*,[1] the representative of ideal justice in the poem; and the poet declares that all who knew him "knewe him to be most gentell, affable, loving, and temperate; but that the necessitye of that present state of thinges enforced him to that violence, and almost chaunged his very naturall disposition."[2] He was either a weak man turned into a savage, as weak men may be, or a zealot beside himself. And even in England there was so much of recoil from his deeds that he was recalled; so that, as Spenser (his former secretary) complains, Gray's settlement was

> "all suddaynly turned topsy-turvy; the noble Lord eft-sones was blamed: the wretched people pittyed, and new counsells plotted, in which it was concluded that a general pardon should be sent over to all that would accept of it, uppon which all former purposes were blaunked, the Governour at a baye, and not only all that greate and long charge which [the Queen] had before bene at, quite lost and cancelled, but also that hope of good which was even at the doore putt backe, and clean frustrated."[3]

Such were at that juncture the feelings of the English idealist poet, who with others received an estate out of the 574,628 acres confiscated in Munster, well manured with slaughtered men, women, and children. Yet he was saner and more humane than the English rulers, who, whether before or after the recall of Gray, had parcelled out the land to English bidders on the condition that they should not sublet any of it to natives.[4] The idea was to exterminate the race. Spenser, though he preached the policy of starvation for the crushing of insurrections, proposed on the other hand that when peace was restored the Irish should be placed as tenants under English landlords;[5] and he planned the systematic extension of agriculture, as being more favourable than mere pasturage to civilisation.[6]

[1] Hallam, iii. 371, *note*. [2] *View*, p. 655. [3] *Id.*, *ib.*

[4] Leland, *History of Ireland*, 3rd ed., ii. 301. Lecky and Hassencamp follow Leland in describing the arrangement as absolute, without considering whether Gray's recall did not cancel it, as the above-cited words of Spenser, and his complaint against Perrot, would seem to imply.

[5] *View*, p. 663.

[6] *Id.*, p. 678. Mr Lecky does Spenser a serious injustice by stating (*History of Ireland*, as cited, i. 19) that "after the lapse of ten years from the commencement of the Settlement, Spenser *complained* that the new proprietors, 'instead of keeping out the Irish, doe not only make the Irish their tenants in

To some extent the spirit of humane statesmanship was actually brought to bear after Gray's recall. Sir John Perrot, his successor, gave out the general pardon; and he effected in Connaught a land settlement which, by providing for the natives, kept that province tranquil for a generation.[1] Among the better-placed survivors from the massacres, too, there was a certain readiness to accept the English speech and English ways;[2] and the towns, though they were almost wholly Catholic, had remained all along politically loyal to the Crown. As early as 1573, Speaker Stanihurst, a Catholic, speaking at the prorogation of the Irish Parliament, on the proposal to establish grammar schools and a university, gave the testimony:—

"In mine experience who have not yet seen much more than forty years, I am able to say that our Realme is at this day an halfe deale more civil than it was, since noblemen and worshipfull, with others of ability, have used to send their sonnes into England, to the Law, to Universities, or to Schooles. Now when the same Schooles shall be brought home to their doors this addition discreetly made will foster a young frye likely to prove themselves good members of the Commonwealth. . . ."[3]

Some such gains may have to some extent gone on in the towns, or at least in the capital, from this time forward, gradually leading up to the degree of intellectual development which we find in the Dublin of Molyneux and Swift. But for the peasantry, making nine-tenths of the whole population, there was to be no possibility of peaceful and prosperous evolution for centuries yet to come. The conciliatory Perrot was in his turn recalled, and executed on a charge of treason; and his successor, Fitzwilliam, wrought

those lands and thrust out the English, but also some of them become mere Irish.'" The passage here quoted (*View*, as cited, p. 675) is in express reference to "*the great men which had such grauntes* [of land] *made them at first by the Kinges of England*," and does not at all refer to the recent settlers. Spenser was really pointing to the past conduct of the Anglo-Irish lords as a reason for disregarding their present vexatious claims. The last clause cited by Mr Lecky might have served to guard him against such a misconception as he has fallen into. He cannot have read the rest of the *View* with proper attention. Spenser has had enough of odium for his part in Irish affairs without this added injustice. Certainly his devotion to Gray made him obstinately hostile to Perrot (p. 656); but his own proposals are specific.

[1] Lecky, i. 17, citing Sigerson, Leland, and Strafford's Letters. See Froude, *History of England*, ed. 1875, xi. 265, as to Perrot's ideals.

[2] See the passage from Robert Payne, cited below, p. 158, and cp. Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603-1642, ed. 1893, i. 380, 406.

[3] Cited by Urwick, *Early History of Trinity College*, p. 2.

against the chiefs with a shameless treachery which left their primitive cunning far in the rear. The see-saw of conciliation and coercion was resumed. In the last years of Elizabeth, and of the century, came the rising of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, whose English training had left him as hotly bent as any of his ancestors on maintaining his barbaric status and barbaric powers, and whose grievances against the English Government do not seem to have been worse than the grievances of his vassals against him. As usual, the clan suffered for the chief, and the sagacious Lord Mountjoy mowed them down by sword and famine in Ulster as the "good" Lord Gray had done in Munster. The quarrel was emphatically between the chief and the Government; and if the Government had but followed up the chief and shown favour to his vassals and clansmen, they might have rapidly loosened the old ties of clan devotion, so tyrannous in general were the chieftains towards their own people. But the Government must needs seek to destroy the tribe as well as its ruler; and a common memory of misery kept chief and people still at one. The end was that after the face of the land was covered as of old with ashes and corpses, O'Neill was allowed to make his peace, and live to plot another day.

Then it was that, under King James, the English Government had its great opportunity to root its rule in justice and wisdom. Once more the people of Ulster were separable from their chief, who had kept his earldom on the footing of an English landlord, but treated his vassals as lawlessly as of old.[1] Mountjoy, in overrunning Ulster, had anticipated the step that was to be taken two centuries later in the Scotch Highlands: wherever he went he made his hold sure by well-placed forts. The military problem was thus simple; and Sir Arthur Chichester, the Deputy under whom was effected the settlement of Ulster, had the will and many of the faculties for a good solution. Yet his Protestant bigotry set him astray at the outset. To him the Catholic religion was "wicked,"[2] and, not content with gratifying the wish of the English ruling class to banish Catholic priests and discountenance Catholicism, he set about dragooning the recusants, high and low, till he brought upon himself from the English Privy Council itself a request to justify his action in issuing "precepts under the Great Seal to compel men to come to church."[3] Fear of such oppression had caused insurrection among the southern towns in the last days of Elizabeth; and

[1] See Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603-1642, ed. 1893, i. 381.
[2] *Id.*, p. 394. [3] *Id.*, p. 396.

only the memory of the late war, and the arrest of Chichester's persecution, prevented a general insurrection in the north. He saw as much,[1] and reluctantly set himself to other courses, counting on educating the young. But nothing could henceforth avert the fatal and ever-intensifying war of the two creeds. An excellent historian tells us that the English ruling class "had a strong feeling of the benefits which would result if the Irish could be induced to accept the religion under which England had grown in moral stature," and that Chichester persecuted "not from any persecuting spirit, but because he had believed that the religion of the Catholics made them enemies to order and government."[2] Yet the same historian shows repeatedly that one of the worst obstacles to good rule and Protestant progress in Ireland was the utter unconscientiousness of the Protestant clergy;[3] and that another was the inveterate chicanery of the Protestant lawyers;[4] and a historian of another stamp, a eulogist of the Reformation, gravely suggests that one of the causes that broke down the mind of Elizabeth was the sense of the decay of character in Protestant England in her day.[5] We had better just describe fanaticism by its name, and recognise it henceforth as the force for evil it has been.

It varied, of course, from time to time. When, after the collapse of minor risings, the English had it all their own way in Ulster, Chichester aimed at something like fairness in the redistribution of the land. But by this time the councillors at London[6] who had recoiled from bullying Catholics into Protestant Churches, had no scruple about taking away from the bulk of the people of Ulster their old sept-rights in the land, and giving the greater part of it out of hand to English and Scottish colonists, who seem mostly to have been of the evil old "adventurer" class, and were thus much less worth cultivating as inhabitants than the natives.[7] The Government

[1] Cp. Vol. ii., p. 284, *note*.

[2] Gardiner, vol. i., pp. 389, 399.

[3] *Id.*, pp. 401, 419. Cp. Froude, *History of England*, ed. 1875, x. 534.

[4] *E.g.*, pp. 422, 439.

[5] Froude, *History of England*, i. 61. Yet in another passage (xi. 201) Mr Froude goes far beyond Mr Gardiner in enlarging on the moral blessings that "England" wanted to bestow on "her wayward sister."

[6] They included Bacon. See Gardiner, i. 435, as to his attitude.

[7] Cp. Gardiner, i. 440, as to the rapid improvement of the natives, and Lecky, i. 22, for contemporary testimony as to the colonists from England and Scotland being generally "the scum of both nations."

had now "lost all sense of feeling for the natives,"[1] and hoped to thin them down either by "venting them out of the land" or by driving them into its wildernesses. In large part the intended cruelty was not accomplished. The colonists wanted labourers, and they hired natives perforce. "The mass of the inhabitants remained in their own homes. They made themselves too useful to be removed."[2] But they remained on the footing of a disliked and inferior race, held down by the ill-conditioned aliens who had robbed them of the land, clinging all the while determinedly to their old faith, which the intruders insulted and would fain have destroyed. Thus there grew up a double heritage of hate, determining the destinies of the generations to come.

As time went on the character of the intruding Protestant element revealed itself mainly in the working of further iniquity under the name of law. What small provision of land had been made for the natives was in all directions frustrated by the machinery of English law, which, vaunted as an instrument of progress and security as against the native system, in reality lent itself to systematic wickedness in a way that no barbaric code ever did or could. Titles were everywhere broken down by the professional creation and exposure of technical flaws, so that it was actually a profitable trade to cause confiscations. At length, seeing the profits made by private persons in the business, James and his advisers deliberately planned to undo the whole of the titles set up by Perrot in Connaught in the previous generation, on the score that, though £3000 had been paid for the enrolment of the patents, the officials had omitted to register them; and at James's death his ministers were about to take £10,000 as a fine from the holders collectively, with a doubled annual composition. Finally, Charles I. in 1628 actually received £120,000 from the Irish landlords all round, as payment for an enactment that all titles undisputed for sixty years should stand good, that the people of Connaught should be registered as lawful proprietors, and that Catholic disabilities should be withdrawn. Yet, after the payment of the money, under pressure of the English Parliament, the Lord Deputy Lord Falkland in 1629 prohibited afresh the Catholic worship; and a few years later the Lord Deputy Wentworth, not yet known as Strafford, actually cancelled the legalisation of the Connaught titles, and the sixty years' prescription. While these infamies were fully endorsed by Charles, the English Parliament

[1] Gardiner, i. 438. [2] *Id.*, p. 441.

on its part pressed on to the utmost of its power the expulsion of Catholic priests and the suppression of the Catholic worship, the Puritan party loudly proclaiming its intention to make an end of toleration.

After all this, we are asked to regard the Irish rebellion and massacre of 1641 as a monstrous crime on the part of the Irish people; and such a moralist as Carlyle has solemnly adjured the Irishmen of to-day, in view of that event, to say nothing more about "the hoof of the Saxon." The adjuration is to be met with the derision due to all the English heroics on the subject. The English nation had simply reaped as it had sown, devilry for devilry. Modern research has gone to show that the element of massacre, to begin with, has been grossly exaggerated, as it was sure to be by a nation which had let pass the wanton slaughter by sword and famine of myriads of Irish, at the hands of its own rulers, with barely a protest, while heaping habitual execration on the cruelties of Spaniards in another hemisphere. It is quite certain that there was no fore-planned massacre, and that nothing of the kind occurred at the beginning of the rebellion. As it went on, many savage murders were committed. What else was to be expected? The marvel is that instead of random ferocities there was not "a murder grim and great" as that of the Niblungs' song. There had been exasperation enough, wrong enough, to have moved a half-civilised people to plot the utter extermination of the aliens who had for generations figured for them more and more as a race of brigands, destitute alike of mercy, justice, and truth, and who were avowedly seeking to compass the destruction of the religion of the mass of the subject race. Even a nominally civilised nation gives abundant play to the passions of the primary human beast when its masses are lashed up to revolt; and we have seen that the Protestant aristocrats of the court of Elizabeth wrought wholesale horrors which to-day would mark them for infamy in Turkey itself. They had slain women and babes, old men and idiots; and they had gleefully schemed the extinction of the people of half a province by slow starvation. In all the massacres of 1641-43, it would seem, there may have perished, by murder or by exposure, from 4000 to 12,000 persons.[1] The "good" Elizabethan commanders had caused the death of as many women. What then was to be looked for at the hands of rude men driven mad by perpetual wrong? For most of the deaths in the later strife,

[1] See the investigation of Mr Lecky, vol. i., pp. 41-104, and his summing-up at p. 79. Cp. Gardiner, x. 69; and Hassencamp's notes, pp. 59-61.

indeed, the blame lies with the English Parliament, which, instead of meeting the rebellion as such, proceeded at once to vote that no toleration should henceforth be permitted in Ireland. Such an insensate enactment was simply a signal for extremities of savagery on both sides; and they were duly reached. The savageries of the Irish could not possibly exceed those on the other side. "In one day eighty women and children in Scotland were flung over a high bridge into the water, solely because they were the wives and children of Irish soldiers."[1] The Protestant beast could hold his own with the Catholic. Writers who, in full view of all that went before, have still no other verdict to give in the matter than one against Popery and Irishry, are only surviving illustrations of the insane unrighteousness which brought about the whole hideous history.

For the rest, Cromwell's ending of the war is the end of all pretence that the savagery in it was special to the Irish. For our modern Cromwellian school, his conduct in this as in other relations is exemplary, the manifestation at once of perfect religious sincerity and of a genius for action. It may here suffice to say that many generals might similarly have shortened many wars by resorting to demoniac methods with a sufficient force at command. Napoleon might have destroyed for many years the resisting power of the countries he overran if he had massacred all who resisted him, and all their priests. But Napoleon, though he is never cited as a moral model, did not, after Egypt, do these things. Tamerlane seems to have achieved great effects by such methods, but he does not usually rank as a great moral force. The simple truth is that Cromwell, a civilised soldier in home warfare, sank several degrees nearer the savage when he passed to Ireland, his racial hate and his religious hate combining to make him furnish very fair justification for a sufficiency of Catholic atrocities on the Continent. He, who put the garrisons and inhabitants of whole towns to the sword because they would not surrender without a blow, and caused friars to be slaughtered like dogs,[2] could wax indignant over the

[1] Lecky, i. 83, citing Carte's *Life of Ormond*, i. 481. Cp. Prendergast's *Cromwellian Settlement*, pp. 67, 68.

[2] This was by Cromwell's express order. His men, so primed, slew women and children, and were vile enough, when following the enemy up to the towers and galleries of churches, to take up children and use them as shields, thus preventing their antagonists from striking in self-defence. Nothing more atrocious is recorded in the history of the time. See the testimony of Anthony à Wood, got from his brother, in his autobiography, ed. Oxford, 1848, pp. 51-52.

slaughtering of foreign "saints" nearer his own way of thinking; and Milton, who could wildly falsify the facts as to the Irish rebellion, produced fervid prose and poetry on behalf of the Waldenses. It would be easy to misjudge the psychological problem which such men thus present; but we might at least be spared some declamation over their ethical excellence.

When Cromwell had done his work, it was estimated that out of a population of 1,466,000, some 616,000 "had in eleven years perished by the sword, by plague, or by famine artificially produced;" 504,000 being reckoned Irish, and 112,000 English.[1] Then there were the thousands sold into slavery in the West Indies by authority of Cromwell or his Government, and the tens of thousands allowed to enlist in foreign service—all going to make such a depopulation that "in some districts the traveller rode twenty or thirty miles without seeing one trace of human life." And now once more the English Government was free to "settle" the greater part of the land with inhabitants of its own stocks; and a Puritan colonisation was duly effected, the remaining Irish being either driven into Connaught or left to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the English colonists. It is on record that a period of prosperity followed, as might well be in a country which had lost nearly half its population in ten years. There can at least have been no surplus labour. But there had been sown afresh all the requisite seeds of strife, and misery, and frustration. At the Restoration, some hundreds of Catholic landlords were reinstated in whole or in part, in the teeth of a furious Protestant outcry, which prevailed against any further readjustments; and whereas two-thirds of the best land had been formerly owned by Catholics, it was now fast in the grip of their enemies. Naturally, a vigorous attempt to right the wrong was made when James II. set about restoring Catholicism. The proceedings of the Catholic Parliament of 1689, as cleared up by the research of Thomas Davis, were certainly on the whole "more moderate and honest, and essentially fairer,"[2] than those of the English Parliaments of that age, and of the Protestant Parliament which followed it. But Protestantism definitely triumphed in England in 1688 for the main reasons for which Catholicism

[1] Lecky, i. 104, citing Petty.

[2] Sir C. Gavan Duffy, in editorial introd. to new ed. of Davis' *Patriot Parliament of* 1689, p. 7. "I invite the reader to note," says the same editor, "that the identical offences charged on James's Catholic Parliament by partisan writers (and here disproved) were committed without shame or reserve by the Protestant Parliaments of the same era in both countries."

had triumphed in Italy and Spain: it had come to represent a great preponderance of vested interests: and it was accordingly the fate of Ireland to feel for the next hundred years all that Protestant malice could inflict on the adherents of the Pope, and all of iniquity that the English commercial interest, supported by the religious motive, could plan by way of destroying Irish trade.

§ 2. *The Modern Problem.*

Thus were laid the bases of the Ireland of modern times; and it is well that at this point, where mediæval Ireland is virtually done with, and when not only had the English Government acquired complete hold of all Irish political institutions but the very population had been in large part transformed, to sum up the general facts arrived at, as regards the influence of race qualities on the destinies of the people.

It has thus far sufficiently appeared, then, that nothing in the course of things up to the utter embitterment of the religious schism is rationally to be set down to any special qualities of "race" in the Irish people. The political developments, be it repeated, were such as would have been set up in the same conditions in any race, and actually were set up in groups of English birth. As we have seen, the Irish people like the English were a blend of many stocks; and as a matter of fact the "English" blood introduced into Ireland from the twelfth century onwards was notoriously one of the main sources of disaffection. Spenser testified[1] of the descendants of earlier English settlers that

> "They are much more stubborne and disobedient to lawe and government then the Irish be, and *more malicious to the English that daylye are sent over*. . . . They say that the lande is theyrs onely by right, being first conquered by theyr auncestours, and that they are wronged by the new English mens intruding therunto, whom they call Alloonagh with as greate reproche as they would rate a dogge."

As regards the mass of the people, it is clear from Spenser's testimony that they were as good raw material as any.

> "I have heard some greate warriours say," he writes,[2] "that in all the services which they had seene abroade in forrayne countreys, they

---

[1] *View of the Present State of Ireland*, Globe ed. of Works, p. 675.
[2] *View*, as cited, pp. 639, 640.

never saw a more comely horseman than the Irish man, nor that cometh on more bravely in his charge. . . . Sure they are very valiaunte and hardy, for the most part great endurours of cold, labour, hunger, and all hardiness, very active and stronge of hand, very swift of foote, very vigilaunte and circumspect in theyr enterprises, very present in perrills, very great scorners of death. . . . The Irishman . . . when he cometh to experience of service abroade, and is putt to a peece or a pyke, he makyth as woorthy a souldiour as any nation he meeteth with."

Nor did they show any moral unfitness for a reign of law. Robert Payne, an English settler, author of *A Brief Description of Ireland* published in 1589, gives as good a character as could be wished to the more fortunate survivors of the Munster mas sacres :—

"The better sorte are very civill and honestly given; the most of them greatly inclined to husbandrie, although as yet unskillful, notwithstanding through their great travell many of them are rich in cattle. Most of them speak good English and bring up their children to learning. I saw in a grammar-school at Limbrick one hundred and threescore schollers, most of them speaking good and perfect English, for that they have used to construe the Latin into English. They keep their promise faithfully, and are more desirous of peace than our Englishmen, for that in time of warres they are more charged. . . . They are quick-witted, and of good constitution of bodie: they reform themselves daylie more and more after the English manners. Nothing is more pleasing unto them than to hear of good justices placed amongst them. . . . They are obedient to the laws, so that you may travel through all the land without any danger or injurie offered of the very worst Irish, and be greatly releaved of the best. . . . I myself divers times have seen in severall places within their jurisdictions well near twenty causes decided at one sitting, with such indifferencie that for the most part both plaintiff and defendant hath departed contented."[1]

So too Sir John Davies, who on his own part helped to show the Irish how much more immoral civilised law could be than barbaric custom, avowed what has been noted ever since, that private crime in Ireland was remarkably rare.

"For the truth is that in time of peace the Irish are more fearful to offend the law than the English or any other nation whatsoever. . . . There is no nation or people under the sun that doth love equal or

---

[1] Cited by Lecky, i. 20, from the Irish Archæological Society's *Tracts relating to Ireland*, vol. i.

indifferent justice better than the Irish, or will rest better satisfied with the execution thereof, although it be against themselves."[1]

On the other hand it has appeared that, while the main insurrections before 1641 were led by Irish chiefs of septs, sometimes of Norman descent, Catholicism was clung to by the whole population, English and Irish alike, there being no sign whatever of any innate Protestant bias in the "Teutonic" element any more than in the Celtic. The English-speaking and English-descended middle class of the towns were as determined in their recusancy as the Erse-speaking peasantry: indeed they resisted the more direct pressure. There is then not a jot of evidence for the theory of a Celtic proclivity to Popery.[2]

The resistance offered in Ireland to English ecclesiastical coercion was much less recklessly violent than that offered in Lowland Scotland;[3] but the temper which refused dictation in such matters was primordial in the two cases alike.

As regards real faults of character, again, the history of the next century reveals in the case of the descendants of the Cromwellian settlers exactly what the history of the previous centuries had done in the case of the descendants of "Norman" settlers. Assuming the Commonwealth settlers to have been average or "good" English types (and many of them must have been, though

[1] Cited by Lecky, i., 25. Compare the narrative of Gardiner, i. 380, 406, &c.

[2] Mr Gardiner, recognising the causation of Irish Catholicism, yet thinks (i. 389) "it may well be doubted whether the impressionable Irish Celt would ever have been brought to content himself with the sober religious forms which have proved too sober for considerable bodies of Englishmen." I venture to suggest that this remark proceeds on a misconception. It is possible to make any service humdrum, and for many Catholics the Catholic service has been and is so. At the same time it is possible to make any service fervid, and the "Celts" of Wales and the Scotch Highlands seem to get out of Methodism and Presbyterianism whatever religious excitation they require, remaining averse to the Anglican service, which attracts the more cultured of the "non-Celtic" populations, so called, much more than it does the unsophisticated "Celts."

[3] Dr Hassencamp so far countenances the conventional notion of Irish character as to pronounce the riot in a Catholic Church in Dublin in 1629 a "truly Irish excess." Yet his own page narrates that it was caused by the Anglican Archbishop attempting to break up a congregation at worship; and the people involved on both sides were mainly of English descent. Perhaps Dr Hassencamp will balance his doctrine by pronouncing that the riot in an Edinburgh church in 1637 was a "truly *Scottish* excess"; and similar riots in Germany "truly German,"—this "in spite of all temptations to belong to other nations."

we have seen that many of their predecessors were black sheep) the descendants mostly degenerated into idle, drinking, brawling squireens of the type which discredited Ireland in the eighteenth century. Puritan stock and Puritan creed, then, availed nothing to maintain or promote civilisation under the conditions created in Ireland by England. What is more, we find that two generations had not elapsed after the Cromwellian settlement before the English rule had set up in the new Anglo-Irish population as bitter an anti-English feeling as had ever subsisted before, many of the Protestants being even more embittered than the Catholics. The new "constitutional" England was if possible more methodically iniquitous to her dependency, when its whole political machinery had been Protestantised, than the old monarchic England had been. The injustices of the past had for the most part been wreaked on native clans and small landowners, all identified with the Catholic interest: the new policy was to cripple or destroy the trade of Ireland in general, wherever it might seem to compete with that of England. In matters of trade, Trojan and Tyrian were much the same in the eyes of the traders of England. Hume has laid it down[1] as a general principle that free states always treat their dependencies worse than do monarchies, pointing to the rule of the Carthaginians in antiquity, and to that of England over Ireland as compared with that of France over her conquered provinces in modern times. Though the principle soon breaks down on scrutiny—in the case of Turkey, for instance—it is so far true that "free" states, when half moralised, give the freer play to the selfishness of their ruling and trading classes as against dependencies, caring for freedom only within their own borders. And in England for a century after 1688, even during Tory interludes, the trading classes were so far able to shape the policy of the Government, which owed so much to their support, that they could subordinate all the other trading interests of the empire to theirs. There was now no thought whatever of good government in Irish interests, such as had been cherished now and then by former deputies. Ireland was to exist only for the sake of England. Already in the reign of Henry VIII. a law had been framed forbidding the importation of Irish wool into England; and later, under Charles I., Strafford had deliberately sought to crush the Irish woollen trade because it competed with the English, though he strove at the same time to improve agriculture and

[1] Essay *That Politics may be reduced to a science.*

to promote[1] the linen manufacture. After the Restoration, the repressive principle was carried to incredible lengths.

Irish commerce had prospered, despite the evil handling of the land question, in the peace of the first four decades of the seventeenth century, under James and Charles I.;[2] and under Charles II., despite execrable laws for the repression of Irish commerce, there was a measure of prosperity, the natural but temporary result of peace and partial freedom in a country whose population had been in large part destroyed and then partly replaced by new colonists, bent on making their fortunes. None of it is to be credited to the English rule. Whereas Cromwell's Navigation Act had left Ireland, as a matter of course, on the same footing with England, the amended Act of 1663 excluded her, thus depriving her of her whole colonial carrying trade[3] and stopping once for all the development of her shipping[4] that would naturally have taken place with the

[1] Strafford is sometimes credited with "founding" this manufacture (so Lecky, i. 32, perhaps following the editor of Hutchinson's *Commercial Restraints of Ireland*, ed. 1882, p. 13); but there was an Irish linen trade long before his time. Mr Lecky himself notes this, p. 178. Strafford's stimulus came to nothing, and the trade, after being almost destroyed by English hindrance after the Revolution, was re-created only by means of systematic bounties in the next century from 1743 to 1773. In our day its existence is often credited to "Protestant energy and enterprise."

[2] Not, however, to the extent alleged in Provost Hely Hutchinson's work (1779) on the *Commercial Restraints of Ireland*—an untrustworthy performance, which has been unduly praised. It asserts (ed. 1882, p. 9) that the customs were farmed at the beginning of Charles's reign for only £500, and before his death for £54,000,—citing Cox's *History of Ireland*, ii. 91. I can find no such statement in Cox, who on the contrary shows that the Irish customs were farmed in the twelfth year of James I. for £9700, and in the seventh year of Charles I. for £31,050 (*Hibernia Anglicana*, ii. (1690), p. 68). In 1639 they were farmed for £23,500 to Strafford and his partners, who drew from them £55,582.

[3] See details in Lecky, i. 174.

[4] One of the minor absurdities of the anti-Celtic theory is the dogma that "Celts" are in virtue of their race bad sailors. As against this, it may be fitting to cite the anti-Celtic Mommsen:—"Not only were the Celts, to all appearance, the nation that first regularly navigated the Atlantic Ocean; but we find that the art of building and managing vessels had attained among them a remarkable development" (*History of Rome*, B. v., ch. 7, Eng. tr., ed. 1894, v. 15). The seafaring capacity of the Bretons will hardly be explicitly denied even by Celtophobes. As regards Ireland, it is to be noted, firstly, that the square shape of the land, making land communication as a rule the preferable one, would not originally develop sea-going habits as would the

growth of the American colonies. Soon came another blow. Ireland being pre-eminently a pastoral country, her natural exports were cattle, meat, and dairy produce; and the new settlers started a vigorous trade. England was practically the only accessible foreign market. But English landowners after the Restoration were suffering from a fall of rents, which they attributed to the Irish cattle trade; and in 1663 the English Parliament enacted that no Irish fat cattle should be imported after July in each year. The Irish farmers accordingly sent lean cattle, and dead meat; and the English landlords in 1665 enacted that neither dead nor living, fat nor lean cattle, should be imported from Ireland at all. Thus was one of the primary industries of the land wellnigh destroyed, as regarded foreign trade; and the English squires followed up the main blow by prohibiting the import of sheep, swine, pork, bacon, mutton, butter, and cheese.[1] Already the exportation of raw wool to foreign countries had been prohibited both in Ireland and in England, by way of encouraging English manufactures; and the export of Irish wool to England had been stopped by prohibitive duties in the interest of the landlords. Accordingly, as the Irish woollen *manufacture* had not been stamped out by Strafford, it was now revived, the landowners taking to sheep-raising, and the traders to wool-spinning and weaving. The Duke of Ormond, then Lord Lieutenant, secured that the importation of *Scotch* linens and woollens into Ireland should be forbidden; and he contrived to bring over 500 families from Brabant, as well as a number of refugees from Rochelle, to practise the linen trade; and 500 Walloons to work in woollen-weaving.[2] Artificial hindrance was

shape of England and the coast conformation of Norway. (Cp. Richey, *Short History of Ireland*, p. 11.) But when it became commercially profitable for the inhabitants of Ireland to do so, they took to the sea as readily as the Dutch and Portuguese. As to their service in the British navy, see Fox's *Key to the Irish Question*, pp. 310-313. As regards Irish merchant shipping, the text shows the causes of limitation. It had been rapidly increasing before England intervened. Long before the Navigation Act, indeed, the English Government had hampered the export trade by enacting that all ships leaving Irish ports, no matter which, should call either at Cork or at Drogheda, these being the only places where customs duties could be levied. Hardiman, *History of Galway*, 1820, p. 58. Galway had a "staple" for wool and leather conferred on it in 1375, but this was soon withdrawn, and customs had to be paid as before at Cork. *Id.*, p. 59.

[1] Lecky, i. 173, citing the Acts 18 Charles II., c. 2, and 32 Charles II., c. 2.

[2] Hassencamp, p. 101.

thus, so far, successfully met[1] by artificial promotion. After the Revolution, accordingly, the English Government proceeded to destroy the woollen manufacture as it had done the trade in raw wool. There may have been a reinforcement of commercial egoism at this point by Protestant malice; for we know that the previous English dealings with the land had so forced Irish Catholics into Irish trade that a great deal of it was in their hands.[2] And this may have been a reason why, when the Irish Parliament was called upon in 1698 to pass a law imposing prohibitive export duties on Irish woollens, in the interest of England, it shamefully acquiesced. That Parliament would represent the Protestant landed interest, and the rotten boroughs set up by James I. and his successors. In any case, its action was followed up next year by an Act of the English Parliament, absolutely prohibiting the export of manufactured wool from Ireland to any country whatever. Thus the natural Irish manufacture was deliberately destroyed in the interests of the English manufacturers, as the natural Irish export trade had been destroyed in the interest of the English landlords. It was considerately suggested that the Irish should develop their linen and hemp trade—that is, that the more factitious industry should be pushed, when that had been destroyed for which the country had special advantages. And after all, the English Parliament imposed such prohibitive duties on Irish hemps and linens (in addition to excluding certain kinds from the colonial markets) that the hemp manufacture ceased and the linen trade was paralysed.

Thus did Protestant and constitutional England deal by Protestantised Ireland—the most deliberately wicked process of injury ever inflicted on a dependency by any civilised power in history. By this means were the people of Ireland, "Celtic" and "Teutonic," Catholic and Protestant alike, once more struck down into an inferno of misery, when they had been

[1] Thomas Sheridan, writing in 1677, notes that the Acts designed to injure the Irish cattle trade, navigation, and colonial trade, had caused a vast increase in the woollen and linen manufacture, and in the shipping trade with the Continent; the export of beef, tallow, hides, butter, and wool having alone yielded more profit latterly than they and the cattle trade formerly did together. *Discourse on the Rise and Power of Parliaments*, in vol. entitled *Some Revelations in Irish History*, edited by Saxe Bannister, London, 1870, p. 142.

[2] Petty, *Essays in Political Arithmetic*, ed. 1699, p. 186. Petty ingeniously argues that everywhere throughout the world, the heterodox and boycotted religionists tend to do the bulk of the trading.

making rapid progress in wealth and civilisation. Compared with the chronic famine of the eighteenth century, the massacres of the old time begin to seem inconsiderable episodes. The penal laws against the Catholics did whatever else was necessary to make the mass of the people the most ignorant and degraded population in northern Europe. The stronger spirits had fled to other lands, where they developed political gifts not excelled in the nation which had exiled them from their own, taking a brilliant part in the higher civilisation of Europe while their supplanters lived in bigoted ignorance.[1] Instead, however, of spending any fresh indignation on a procedure which beggars all invective, let us now simply state in a concise and schematic way what had been done, sociologically speaking, to Irish life, institutions, and habits, and how what was actually done contrasts with what could and would have been done by a fairly benevolent and fairly intelligent government.

1. Ireland being pre-eminently pastoral, it was necessary for its progress in civilisation that agriculture and other forms of industry should be developed.[2] A woollen manufacture would develop industry on the most advantageous lines; and an industrial population would stimulate agriculture by making a new market for produce. On the contrary the woollen trade was as far as possible suppressed; as was the linen trade, for which there was less primary advantage; and the population were thus thrown back on pasturage, yet at the same time refused the natural market for their cattle and pastoral produce.

2. The land being thus made the one sphere of industry for the people, it was highly expedient that that at least should be put under a wise system of law, promotive of industry and amity. Cultivation being backward, the peasantry should have been put in a position encouraging to industry. On the contrary, there had been forced on the land an alien landlord class, hostile in religion and prejudice to the common people; and the acquisition of land by men of their own religion was zealously prevented.

[1] Cp. Macaulay, *History of England*, ch. xvii., end.

[2] It is worth noting that Spenser, a hundred years before, had insisted on the social need for an addition of agriculture to pasturage in Ireland. "This keeping of cowes," says the Irenæus of his dialogue, "is of itselfe a verye idle life, and a fitt nurserye of a theefe. . . . To say truth, though Ireland be by nature counted a great soyle of pasture, yet had I rather have fewer cowes kept, and men better mannered, than to have such huge encrease of cattell, and noe encrease of good conditions" (*View*, in Globe ed., p. 678). This gives the gist of the sociological corrective to the economic doctrine of absolute *laissez-faire*.

There were thus a deep gulf between the landlords and the labourers, the former being thus developed as a matter of course into one of the most insolent and worthless aristocracies in the modern world,[1] while the people, made indolent by the hopelessness of their case, had artificial abasement added to their disadvantages.

3. For a peasantry so placed, the one moral antidote would be some measure of education. But the penal law expressly prevented Catholic education. That law was, as Burke decided in his Conservative period, "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."[2]

4. The mass of the Irish people having been made hostile in religion to that prevailing in England, the interest of the latter, when once the period of anti-Papal panic was past, would have been to conciliate them by toleration, and so do something to attract them to Protestantism and win them away from the influence of their priests. At the same time, whatever measures would maintain the Protestant population should have been taken as a matter of course. But on the one hand the penal laws were maintained in the full knowledge that they rooted the people more and more firmly in their Catholicism and in their devotion to their priests; and on the other hand the trade laws were maintained in the full knowledge that by multiplying poverty they forced thousands of the Protestant descendants of the English and Scotch settlers to emigrate, the native stocks being better able to live on beggarly sustenance.

5. A people thus situated, with no outlet save difficult emigration, with its trade of every description artificially repressed, tended to suffer in a peculiar degree from over-population; and extra misery on this score could only be averted by their learning in some way the lesson of family limitation. But no modern nation had as yet learned the lesson; and the Irish peasantry, instead of being in any way helped in the right direction, were specially pushed in the wrong. On the one hand, the land system, putting them as it did at the absolute mercy of their landlords, created shiftlessness as a morass breeds miasma; on the other hand, the anti-Catholic laws had the peculiar effect of

[1] Cp. Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, B. v., ch. 3, near end.

[2] *Letter to Langrishe*, Works, Bohn ed., iii. 343. Cp. other verdicts cited by Lecky, i. 170.

making the priesthood wholly dependent on the ecclesiastical fees paid at births, marriages, and confessions; and the priests accordingly encouraged early marriages and large families as a matter of course.[1] Further, the introduction of the potato supplied the people with the cheapest and most rapidly multipliable food that can be grown in northern Europe; and the utter lack of industry and of scientific agriculture left them to be attracted by such food to an extent seen in no other European country. Thus population increased at the highest European rate and at the lowest conceivable standard of comfort and culture. Finally, as if these stimuli were not sufficient, there came yet another. As soon as the creation of a small freehold franchise in 1793 made it possible for landowners to drive a trade in votes, they commenced multiplying small holdings, thus encouraging young people to marry at an earlier age than ever. So that the most rapid and fatal increase of population—that occurring between 1793 and the famine, was specially the result of the promotive action of the landlords, who afterwards charged the sin of over-population on the people themselves, as a matter of "race."

In fine, there was such a perfect coherence of evil in the conditions of Irish life for a hundred years that the marvel is, not that the people were backward, but that they yet made the progress they did in the towns. It was said by Sir John Davies of the old system of coyne and livery that it would "ruin hell, if set up in the kingdom of Beelzebub." It might be said of the far more comprehensive machinery of demoralisation under notice that it would ruin heaven, with a population of saints. That any species of civilisation at all survived under such conditions would seem to prove that the "race" was in itself superior and not inferior to others. For, as we have noted, one result of the chronic famine and wretchedness of the eighteenth century was that the Protestant and "non-Celtic" inhabitants were in large part starved out.[2] This turning of Irish misfortune to the visible

[1] This factor in Irish sociology, ignored by most historians, is well set forth by Newenham in his *Statistical and Historical Inquiry into the Progress and Magnitude of the Population of Ireland*, 1805, a work written independently of that of Malthus. See pp. 18-28. Compare the later testimony of the work *Ireland as a Kingdom and a Colony*, by "Brian Borohme," 1843, p. 100.

[2] This fact, which is fully set forth by Mr Lecky (i. 245-248) goes far to countervail the conclusion to which he and others have come, that in half of Ireland the "Saxon and Scotch" elements of race preponderate. As against the chronic influx of English into Ireland, there has to be set the constant efflux, from the "conquest" onwards. The statement of Sir John Davies (*Discovery*, p. 2) that in his day (1612) there were more people of English

disadvantage of England was doubtless one of the considerations that at length caused a slackening of the English effort to make Ireland wretched. The thousands who emigrated from Ireland to the American colonies were found to be ready promoters of the Rebellion there ;[1] and the growing signs of revived disaffection in Ireland,[2] especially among the Protestant population, forced the concession of octennial elections in 1768. Even the ruin of the Irish woollen trade had partly injured the trade of England, for the Irish had been driven to smuggling their wool to the Continent, and necessarily took goods in return, ceasing to buy from England to that extent; so that there had been already a lightening of the laws against Irish trade. And when in 1782 the Volunteers were visibly masters of the situation, and the Irish Parliament claimed independence, it obtained with that the withdrawal of all the principal trade restraints. But the general lesson was yet far too imperfectly learned to permit of the improved disposition of England standing the test of the panic after the French Revolution, heightened by that of a French invasion; and when in 1798 the Catholic population sought to secure their liberties as the Protestants had secured theirs, the undying religious enmity soon sufficed to embroil the masses in an abominable struggle, undoing all that had been wrought by rational philosophy towards the ending of intolerance among the more educated. As of old, the Catholics did bloody deeds, and the Protestants did bloodier, the suppression of rebellion being more lawless than rebellion itself. Not from ignorant Catholics and rabid Protestants could the political solution come; neither

than of native race, cannot well be accepted; neither can the similar statement in the Remonstrance against Strafford in 1640. The assertors of these things had no means of accurate knowing; they seem to have counted immigration without deducting remigration; and they seem to have assumed further that all clansmen of the name of Burke must be descended from the Norman De Burghs, and so on. Thus Spenser assumes (*View*, as cited, p. 637) that the MacMahons are all of the Norman family of the Fitz-Ursulas, of whose name MacMahon was the translation. But tribesmen would constantly take the name of their chief without being of his family. On the other hand it is abundantly clear that whatever elements of suceptibility to bad conditions existed in the pre-Norman stocks of the island were at least equally great in the immigrant English stocks, from first to last. Cp. Lecky, i. 400-401.

[1] Cp. Bouverie-Pusey, *Past History of Ireland*, 1894, p. 85.

[2] Mr Bouverie-Pusey (p. 82) has summed-up that four movements begin about 1760: one by the upper-class Protestants, against English oppression; one by the Protestant masses against the classes; one by the upper-class Catholics, for freedom; and one by the Catholic masses for betterment of life.

could the form of a Union, carried out by men without the spirit of union on either side, produce the unifying results that its promoters had promised. Another generation had to pass before the fear of fresh revolt could wring from the English ruling class the concession of Catholic Emancipation; and the lapse of a whole century was to leave Ireland still wretched, still disaffected, still misgoverned, still backward in civilisation.

In our own century, however, the essentials of the Irish problem have gradually forced themselves so far on the conscience and intelligence of the British public that the friends of democracy may at last take hope to see the way opened for a real rectification. The disappointment of hopes too lightly formed becomes at length a force of enlightenment. Those who had counted on curing the Irish trouble by Catholic Emancipation had to learn that there existed conditions of economic evil as well as of moral. New distress bred new disorder, always met by the old remedy of the bludgeon; till we sicken of the endless story of Coercion Acts. At length there fell the overwhelming blow of the potato famine, a deadly demonstration that with religious freedom a miseducated and misdeveloped people could still live on the verge of an abyss, and could be well-nigh engulfed therein. After the very stress of famine had seemingly relieved the remaining population, there came a further disillusioning. The new sedition of Fenianism arose to show well-intentioned Englishmen that the mere leaving of things alone could not cancel the heritage of injustice left in Ireland by their fathers.

> "An appalling famine, followed by an unexampled and continuous emigration, had, by thinning the labour market, alleviated that extreme indigence which, by making the people desperate, might embitter them, we thought, even against a mild and just Government. Ireland was now not only well governed, but prosperous and improving. Surely the troubles of the British nation about Ireland were now at an end."[1]

But all of a sudden came the explosion of Fenianism, "unlooked for and unintelligible," startling the people of England into panic. "That disaffection which they flattered themselves had been cured, suddenly grows more intense, more violent, more unscrupulous, and more universal than ever." The prompt concessions of Mr Gladstone's Government, the Disestablishment of the Irish Church and the partial improvement of the land laws, did but serve to make further concessions inevitable. The case

[1] J. S. Mill, *England and Ireland*, p. 5.

had been only superficially diagnosed. As Mill said: "The difficulty of governing Ireland lies entirely in our own minds; it is an incapability of understanding."[1] And yet there had latterly been an effort to understand, as Mill avowed.

"If there is anything sadder than the calamity itself, it is the unmistakeable sincerity and good faith with which numbers of Englishmen confess themselves incapable of comprehending it. They know not that the disaffection which neither has nor needs any other motive than aversion to her rulers, is the climax to a long growth of disaffection arising from causes that might have been removed. What seems to them the causelessness of the Irish repugnance to our rule, is the proof that they have almost let pass the last opportunity they are ever likely to have of setting it right. They have allowed what once was indignation against particular wrongs, to harden into a passionate determination to be no longer ruled by those to whom they ascribe all their evils."[2]

This was and is substantially true; and the present Irish problem may be definitively stated under two aspects. There is first of all the clear need for certain great political innovations in Ireland, to the end of rectifying evils of old standing; and there is further the no less clear necessity that the Irish people be now left to work out the solution for themselves, since the English governing class has not only failed utterly to achieve it in the past but is unable, in virtue of its own relation to social problems, to catch up with the developments of the Irish situation as they arise. For the economic situation changes from time to time, with the changes which go on so rapidly in the economic adjustments of the modern world; and a new Land Bill has hardly had time to be tried before it needs to be supplemented. It is not difficult, in view of past and recent history, to constate the main elements in the constructive problem; and they may be thus summarised.

1. Ireland is still in very large measure a pastoral country, the climate being less advantageous for the growth of cereals than those of the countries which chiefly produce these for the world's markets. But,

2. As of old, Ireland needs agriculture and industry to broaden the bases of her civilisation; and in order to develop these there must (*a*) be withdrawn the hindrance of perpetual friction between the idle rent-drawing class and the cultivators, and there must (*b*) be supplied some encouragements to industrial production.

3. The landlord system still remains economically irrational

[1] *England and Ireland*, p. 41. [2] *Id.*, p. 6.

and morally outrageous; and the country cannot conceivably prosper while it subsists. Irish agriculture needs the application of a great deal of capital to bring it abreast of that of other countries, which had gone on developing while everything Irish was kept in forced stagnation. A high authority has calculated that to put Irish soil, area for area, on an equality with that of other countries, there was needed, a generation ago, the enormous outlay of £320,000,000.[1] The third part of that sum will never be applied in a sufficiently short period under the present system. There is needed a new arrangement, under which labour shall be applied zealously and abundantly, and capital on the strength of the labour.

4. The country further needs the industrial development which it was wilfully prevented from making at the beginning of last century. Englishmen, among other vain judgments on the Irish question, sometimes set down to "Celtic indolence" that lack of manufactures which their own ancestors strove to bring about. The simple facts that English capitalism had so completely got the start, in the matter of the woollen manufacture for instance, and that Irish shipping had been so utterly destroyed by the Navigation Acts while that of England was multiplying, would alone constitute a tremendous hindrance to fresh Irish development, even if Ireland stood nearly equal with England in the matter of coal supply, which unhappily she does not. The denudation of her coal measures in the geologic past was another of her predestinate misfortunes; and to enable her to live industrially alongside of English competition there will be needed either the employment of a new fuel, or another motive power than steam, or a stimulation of trade by which she can profitably import fuel.

5. One of the most obvious natural advantages of Ireland, in modern times, is her situation as between England and the United States. Had this advantage been permitted development, there would have existed ere this an extensive trade and passenger service between the States and the Irish Atlantic coast; but to develop it now there would be needed special outlay, English capitalistic competition being able to crush or check any private enterprise of the kind.

6. Unless the habit of rapid family multiplication be checked,[2]

[1] Lavergne, *Economie rurale de l'Angleterre*, etc., édit. 1882, p. 370.

[2] Mr Bonar has pointed (*Malthus and his Work*, p. 205) to the fact that "even in 1875 the Registrar-General's Report showed that there were then fewer marriages in Ireland than in England, in proportion to population, *and*

the Irish peasantry must needs remain poor under any system. Perpetual forced emigration and perpetual decline of population mean perpetual failure to solve the problem of good government and right living. But there is little prospect of the Irish people learning the lesson of family prudence while the priesthood retains its present social philosophy and its present influence; and this it will certainly do while Ireland remains subject to English coercion. Even the later schemes of tenant-purchase offer no prospect of such a bestowal of land on the people as might modify their habits in the direction of those of the peasantry of France.

This, in short, is the formula of the case under every aspect: there will be no solution under English rule. The English people have not spare power of attention enough to master the changing Irish problem; and the English upper classes will always resist measures which point to the transformation of that social order under which they hold their wealth and status. The Conservative course is to go on offering a few palliatives in alternation with measures of coercion, letting the productive power of the country steadily dwindle. It is a noteworthy fact that the only two periods in modern Irish history when Irish industry and wealth went forward were (1) that after the Restoration, before the worst of the trade laws, when new capital and new blood developed the natural resources and trade of the land, and (2) that of the independent Parliament of the end of last century, when Irish agriculture and trade were artificially promoted, as was absolutely necessary after a century of artificial depression. That Parliament by its bounties on the exports of grain instantly created employment for idle capital and labour in all directions,

that they came later." He also points to the 1882 report, pp. 18, 19. The same statement holds good for more recent years, there being in 1890, for instance, only 20,990 marriages in a population of 4,681,173, while in England in 1891 there were 226,025 marriages in a population of 29,081,147. With a little over six times the Irish population, England had nearly eleven times the number of marriages. But this disparity is clearly to be explained by the *emigration* of so many young Irish people to the United States, to Scotland, to England and the colonies, where the people of Irish descent multiply, while the population of Ireland has steadily decreased since the potato famine, till it is now little more than that of Scotland. Between 1853 and 1891 there emigrated to the States alone 2,395,283 Irish, as against 2,107,324 English. This degree of relief cannot go on forever; and in any case, though the Irish decrease represents to a certain extent a raised standard of comfort in the remaining population, it also represents the perpetual pressure of poverty, and an absolute decline in the wealth-production of the country.

and employment of a kind which tended directly to raise the people. In comparison with this service to civilisation, the financial vices of its membership are really of small account, especially when we remember that the Castle administration had been one long process of shameless jobbery, the poor Irish revenues being charged not only with a multitude of sinecures but with endless pensions to men who had served not the Irish but the English Government. If even a corrupt Home Rule Parliament, giving but an imperfect representation of the mass of the people, could thus effectively aid them, in comparison with the worse than impotence of the rule of the English Ministry, there is at least a preliminary presumption in favour of a resumption of the method. Mr Lecky, after showing consciously and unconsciously that every form of sedition and discontent in previous centuries was a natural and substantially justified protest against bad government, breaks out, in his capacity of contemporary partisan, into hoarse vituperation against the agitators of to-day as a new and inexcusable species of malcontents. It is, he declares,[1]

"grotesquely absurd to suppose that the merits or demerits, the failure or success of the old Irish Parliament, has any real bearing on modern schemes for reconstructing the government of Ireland on a revolutionary and Jacobin basis ; entrusting the protection of property and the maintenance of law to some democratic assembly consisting mainly of Fenians and Land Leaguers, of paid agitators and of penniless adventurers."

The tone here tells its own tale of passion and unreason, with which it is useless to argue. The logical implication of the passage is that the Irish people, when given a hold on their own land, will deliberately elect a legislative body of quite lawless and untrustworthy representatives, penniless or pennied, for the sheer love of ructions. When elderly gentlemen talk in this apoplectic way about "democratic assemblies" in England, their antecedents do not secure for them more than the tolerance of compassion ; and even Mr Lecky's historical services cannot win him a respectful hearing when he thus passes from history to vaticination. As has been said above,[2] he is in a fair way to be driven by partisan bias, after all his rationalism concerning race, to the good old creed that race qualities are the source of all Irish evil. We have seen more than enough in the foregoing

[1] *History of Ireland in the* 18*th Century*, ii. 501.
[2] *Preamble*.

survey to deliver us, if we be capable of scientific thought, from the worship of that idol of the tribe. If the average of Irishmen were at any period in any way behind the average of their neighbours, we can see that it was their conditions that had made them so. If they were or are more superstitious, it is because they had been longer kept ignorant. If in last century their educated class was corrupt and unstable and riotous, and their lower class alternately abject and brutal, it is because the perpetual uncertainty of life and government, the denial of all the natural opportunities of self-development, and the imposition of every possible demoralising bond and demoralising bribe, had unhinged all moral conditions; because the strongest types had been driven forth; and because under English rule duplicity and servility were means to fortune. If in a later age the mass of the peasantry were indolent or even untruthful, it was because the systematic filching away of the fruits of their best labour by the idle landowner had made industry seem the vanity of vanities, and because there was no social and intellectual atmosphere in which the virtue of veracity could grow.[1] If Irishmen are still in the mass somewhat more excitable than Englishmen in the mass, it is because their country has never during three hundred years passed two generations without either civil strife or murderous famine, shaking the nerves and wringing the hearts of the mothers and fathers, and stamping the heritage on their children, whose very cradles were rocked to sobs and dirges.[2] Never within historic times has a generation of Irish been free to grow up prosperously and placidly, and to transmit stability of habit to the next.

But wherever Irish people in any number, of whatever presumed descent or ethnic affinity, have been free to profit by their industry, they have proved themselves in mass as industrious as the best; and wherever they have had free access to culture, unchecked either by Catholic priest or Protestant pastor

[1] It should be noted, in this connection, that Tourguénief has deliberately pronounced the peasantry of Russia to be habitually untruthful; and that Mill no less deliberately passed the same judgment on the English working-class. It would be worth while, instead of vending afresh the old fatuities about race qualities, to make a close comparison as between the upper and lower classes of all countries, and to seek for the causal factors.

[2] I leave this proposition standing, in the knowledge that it will be disputed by the school of Weismann. The record that in times of revolution in Paris the number of premature births and of neurotic cases has always been found to increase, must be held to outweigh thus far a doctrine mainly founded on the observation of the heredities of butterflies and rabbits.

and master, they have shown themselves at least as quick of intellect and as sound of judgment as the average of civilised mankind. Between Protestant and Catholic fanaticism, they are still relatively under-educated; and even as regards their own history, on which they are supposed to brood unprofitably, they are still in the main unstudious. Not a generation ago, one of their best historians wrote:—

"In every system of national education on the Continent the history of their native country is considered a necessary subject of instruction for the young. . . . The case is otherwise in Ireland. The young of this country are left in absolute ignorance of the history of their forefathers. There do not even exist books suitable for instruction in this department. The indifference of the middle classes upon this subject is so great, that no author with a reasonable prospect of success attempts to publish an Irish history. Two reasons are alleged for this anomaly. We are told that a knowledge of Irish history is *dangerous;* and further that the history itself is *useless and uninteresting*."[1]

This was said after there had been plenty of the signs and fruits of national renascence. If it needed a generation of Home Rule agitation to create a more intellectual frame of mind, that agitation will have been only the more wholesome. But the fact thus set forth might alone serve to show that the Irish demand is not a product of sentimentalism and of the outcry of "paid agitators," but an outcome of the constant and grinding pressure of a vital practical need. The people demand Home Rule because they feel their affairs will never go well without it; and we have lately seen a Unionist Government forced rather to offend its landowning adherents than the tenantry of Ulster, who stand for land reform as emphatically as those of the rest of Ireland. Said a Unionist observer in Ulster ten years ago:

"*If the sectarian element were eliminated*, there would scarcely be less discontent in the North than in the other portions of Ireland. The land question is just as pressing here as it is elsewhere; and there is not very much to choose between the city of Donegal and the city of Cork."[2]

---

[1] Richey, *Lectures on the History of Ireland*, 1869, p. 1. It was doubtless because of the conviction here expressed that these *Lectures*, and the posthumous *Short History of Ireland* in which they are re-embodied, were printed in such small number that both are now long out of print, and procurable second-hand only at exorbitant prices—a most unfortunate thing for the Irish cause.

[2] *Notes on Ireland*, by J. B. Greene, 1886, p. 54.

And the same onlooker has preserved the remark of an Orangeman "*that he was ready to walk as many miles in a day as any man to shoot a Papist, but all the same he wanted his land cheap.*"[1] The "cheap" does not suggest the strongest of moral positions, but it points to the root of the matter. At the same time, the rest of the utterance, so characteristic, so edifying, points to the great drawback of the Irish cause. To-day as of old, religion is the great sunderer, the great poisoner of hearts and thwarter of hopes. The Protestant clergy of Ulster are free to take credit to themselves for having cherished and fostered the worst growth of religious malignity that can now be seen in all Christendom; for having kept alive a brutalising hatred between two sections of the Irish people, and for having produced one of the most odious types of citizen in the three kingdoms. The spectacle presented to-day by Christian Belfast, where Protestants and Catholics live in separate streets, and where one of either sect venturing to try to live among the other is promptly "fired out," supplies a precious testimony to the civilising virtue of Christianity. It will certainly not be easy for reason and science to countervail all that.

But if the opponents of Irish Home Rule hope, as so many unworthily do, in virtue of this element of sheer evil, to thwart for ever the demand of the majority; or if they hope, as others more worthily do, that some compromise in the matter of the land laws will secure the same end, they have probably miscalculated, for the following reasons.

Firstly, even peasant proprietorship is now a belated solution of the Irish agrarian problem: the scientific solution must go further; and the English ruling class are still far in the rear of even the solution of peasant proprietorship. Only an Irish Parliament can be looked-to to come abreast of the case.

Secondly, prolonged religious strife tends ultimately, in despite of all priesthoods, to generate a recoil from zealotry and to discredit the theme. It did so in France, in respect of the Wars of the League; it did so in Germany in respect of the Thirty Years War; it did so in England in respect of the Civil War. The same tendency holds good of non-military antagonism. Orangeism, then, cannot forever sunder the Irish population.

Thirdly, all clear-headed Englishmen must ere long have begun to see that the priest-rule which they apprehend as dangerous to a self-governed Ireland can only be averted by the very operation of self-government — that so long as Irishmen are collectively

[1] *Notes on Ireland*, p. 55.

pitted against English rule they will in the main be at one with their priesthood, and that their way to undermine priestly power is just to leave the people to their own natural divisions of interest and character.

Fourthly, it is becoming clear even to English and Irish capitalists, as it has long been clear to American, that there is no chance of fruitful application of capital to Irish concerns under the present system of false-union, which keeps up chronic uncertainty and diffidence. Under a Home Rule Parliament, plenty of Irish-American capital, to name no other, would be ready to flow into Ireland, for the development of her resources and her advantages, to the gain of the English as well as her own people.

Against these considerations, prejudice and hallucination can hardly hold out forever. All reasonable hopes are on the side of the new plan as against the old, under which Irish life has for ages been a mere history of failure and downfall. And what Mill said a generation ago may now be said with a more obvious truth and a firmer confidence:

"*Rebellions are never really unconquerable until they have become rebellions for an idea.* Revolt against practical ill-usage may be quelled by concessions; but wait till all practical grievances have merged in the demand for independence, and there is no knowing that any concession, short of independence, will appease the quarrel."[1]

With no less truth we may say again, with the same humane and sagacious politician:

"Let our statesmen be assured that now, when the long-deferred day of Fenianism has come, nothing which is not accepted by the Irish tenantry as a permanent solution of the land difficulty will prevent Fenianism, *or something equivalent to it*, from being the standing torment of the English Government and people. If without removing this difficulty we attempt to hold Ireland by force, it will be at the expense of all the character we possess as lovers and maintainers of free government, or respecters of any rights except our own; it will most dangerously aggravate all our chances of misunderstandings with any of the great powers of the world, culminating in war; we shall be in a state of open revolt against the universal conscience of Europe and Christendom, and more and more against our own."[2]

It only remains to consider at a little further length the last of these propositions.

[1] *England and Ireland*, p. 7. [2] *Id.*, p. 44.

§ 3. *The Verdict of Europe.*

While the English view of the Irish problem was obscured as we have seen, generation after generation, by the fumes of one English passion after another—now commercial greed, now religious hate; now selfish enmity, now rancorous fear—foreign onlookers, whether or not they hated England, could easily see the case for what it was, absolutely about the worst, and relatively the very worst spectacle of misgovernment in Europe. Nothing could avail more surely to undo the prestige of England, as the land of free institutions, than the picture of their perversion to the constant oppression of Ireland. Foreign critics took it as giving the force of an axiom to the loose generalisation of Montesquieu's school, that the dependencies of free States are always worse governed than those of autocracies. And the few Englishmen who could rise above the vulgar self-satisfaction of their fellows, realising this, vainly sought long ago to open their fellows' eyes. "There is not," said Earl Grey in the House of Lords fifty years ago,[1] "there is not a foreigner, no matter whence he comes, be it from France, Russia, Germany, or America,—there is no native of any foreign country, different as their forms of government may be, who visits Ireland, and who on his return does not congratulate himself that he sees nothing comparable with the condition of that country at home."

That testimony holds perfectly good to-day. If the people of England, or a majority of them, fail to realise the part their ancestors and themselves have played towards Ireland, the peoples of Europe realise it very fully. When Mr Gladstone said that the voice of civilised Europe declared for Home Rule, even his own party hardly realised the force of the phrase. It passed for a rhetorical generalisation, resting on the hearsay of newspaper correspondents and the civilities of travellers. But it can be justified by a long series of grave and well-studied treatises, representing all shades of European opinion.

In the middle fifty years of this century no French name stood higher in English opinion than that of de Tocqueville,[2] the author of *Democracy in America*. It stood for a sagacious blend of Liberalism and Conservatism, for cool judgment, for thoughtful

[1] Speech of 23rd March, 1846, cited by Mr Fox, *Key to the Irish Question*, p. 322.

[2] Still cited by Mr A. V. Dicey as a "profound observer" (*A Leap in the Dark*, 1893, p. 112).

scrutiny, for honourable action. And it was the friend and comrade of de Tocqueville, Gustave de Beaumont, his companion and colleague in the United States, whither they went to report officially on the penitentiary system there in force,—it was de Beaumont who, fifty-seven years ago, drew up one of the solidest works theretofore written on the Irish problem, a work in which the English mismanagement of that problem is dispassionately and unanswerably set forth. That work represented the opinion of de Tocqueville's school in Europe. But at the same period an onlooker from another nation, of another school of thought, the Conservative Prussian von Raumer, came substantially to Beaumont's conclusions. De Beaumont criticised von Raumer's doctrine as revolutionary; but the two writers, as Mill later noted, offered practically the same prescription. He might have added that M. de Sismondi, a Liberal French economist of another school than his own, put the prescription still more emphatically. And while French Liberalism and Prussian Toryism were thus practically at one, French Catholicism chimed in. The more liberal side of that Catholicism was well represented by the Comte de Montalembert, the friend of Lacordaire; and the Comte de Montalembert, after actually seeing O'Connell at work in Ireland in his youth, could in his old age write of Lacordaire as "this liberal who has been among us the descendant and the continuator of Saint Dominic, of Bossuet, and *of O'Connell*."[1] I do not say that this estimate is a wise or judicial one, but it shows how the school of Lacordaire and Montalembert felt. Later, we have from Father Adolphe Perraud[2] two large volumes of *Études sur l'Irlande Contemporaine* (1862), a work published with a preface by the then Bishop of Orléans, and appealing to the orthodox Catholicism of France. Here we have a really industrious research, drawing on English official documents and all manner of English and Irish testimonies. The book is of course zealously Catholic, but it does not rely on mere clerical allocution to carry its point. On the contrary, it supplies to all classes of French readers an amount of exact insight into modern English discussion over and mismanagement of Ireland that they could have obtained in no other way. Such a book, following on de Beaumont's, must have convinced nine out of every ten Frenchmen who read it, be they Catholic or freethinking, that whatever may have been the truth as to Irish grievances in previous centuries, in this century they were the result of English

[1] *Un Moine au XIX^e Siècle*, éd. 1881, p. 3.

[2] Afterwards Bishop of Autun, and member of the Académie Française (1882).

tyranny, English selfishness, and English unintelligence. Montalembert might seem to many an extravagant zealot, but Father Perraud could not be so set aside; and he had de Beaumont's treatise behind him. Nor did he lack other French corroboration. Besides the documented treatises of de Beaumont and himself there had appeared a series of works on Ireland by French observers, such as the *Lettres sur l'Irlande* of M. Duvergier de Hauranne, and *L'Irlande*, by MM. Chavanne de la Girandière and Huillard-Bréholles, all bringing home to the intelligence of Europe the immense failure and wrong of English rule in Ireland. After the work of Monseigneur Perraud there appeared, in 1863, the revised and extended edition of that of de Beaumont, with a new *Notice sur l'état présent de l'Irlande*, still summing up against England, though without a scintilla of anti-English prejudice.

And still the play of criticism goes on. The Irish problem, alas! has survived the efforts of the English Liberalism of the last generation to solve it—efforts partly stimulated by foreign criticism, but never rising to the task in the fashion of the foreign reformers whose work had been held up to them as an example. Von Raumer, the Prussian Conservative, insisted that the woes of Ireland could never be cured save by turning the tenants into peasant proprietors. That was in effect what had been accomplished in Prussia in the previous generation by the measures of von Stein and Hardenberg—or, as von Raumer always puts it, of the King, Frederick William III. Here is his whole prescription:—

1. Provision for the schools and churches of the Protestants and Catholics equally, out of existing church property or new endowments.

2. Abolition of tithes.

3. Poor laws (though opposed by O'Connell), but free of the blemishes of the English.

4. Special taxation of absentees by poor-rates.

5. "The complete abolition of the system of tenants at will, and the conversion of all these tenants at will into proprietors."

"On reading this," says von Raumer, "the Tories will throw my book into the fire; and even the Whigs will be mute with astonishment. The whole battery, of 'pillage,' 'jacobinism,' 'dissolution of civil society,' is discharged at me. . . . Even the Radicals ask, with astonishment, how I would work this miracle. There is a 'Sibylline' book, a patent and yet hidden mystery, how this is to be effected; and there is a magician who has

accomplished it—the Prussian municipal law, and King Frederick William III. of Prussia."[1]

De Beaumont, while pronouncing von Raumer's proposal—apparently under a misconception of von Raumer's meaning—"purely revolutionary, proper to engender the most dangerous covetings and the most fatal passions,"[2] was equally emphatic for peasant proprietorship, and for radical reform. Specifying first the desirable remedies of new industry, emigration, and poor relief, he prescribed the "abolition of the civil, political and religious privileges of the aristocracy," to be accomplished in abolishing the feudal system of tenures in Ireland (1) by way of prohibiting sub-tenancies and (2) by abolishing the right of primogeniture; and further (3) the disestablishment of the State Church, and (4) the payment of stipends to the Catholic clergy.

The second and third of von Raumer's proposals were realised in that generation; but it was thirty years before the third of de Beaumont's was given effect to, and some years more before even a beginning was made in the direction of von Raumer's fifth; while his first, which concurs with de Beaumont's last, is still not even within sight of being adopted. And meantime the problem itself has developed. Had a system of peasant proprietary been established by the middle of the century, it would undoubtedly have worked great things for Ireland. Had it been established simultaneously with the reforms in Prussia, it might even have limited in some measure the fatality of the famine of 1848, for it would probably have had a restraining effect on population, or at least upon sub-division of holdings. Had it been established before 1860, it would have prevented the Fenian movement; and it would have fitted the peasantry to meet the bad years after 1870 much better than did Mr Gladstone's Act of that year. But with no further land reforms than the Land Acts of 1870 and 1880, the merely modified situation of the Irish peasantry left them unable to meet another series of bad seasons, and the old story of evictions and emigration is told afresh year by year. Thus it comes about that the English Government figures to the eyes of Europe very much as of old, the record of evictions and of emigration being for foreigners the most easily noted phase of the history of things Irish. The attempts of the Liberal party to undo the wrongs of the past seem trivial beside the amount of misery that

[1] *England in* 1835, Eng. tr., iii. 198.

[2] *L'Irlande, sociale politique et réligieuse*, 7e edit., I. lxxxiii.

subsists; and the foreigner shrugs his shoulders as of old over English misgovernment. This is the effect conveyed even by the careful work of M. Fournier, Professor in the Faculty of Law at Grenoble, who was sent to Ireland in 1880-81 by the French Ministry of Public Instruction, on the proposal of the Paris Faculty of Law, to report on the agrarian question. It may be said of the work of M. Fournier that while he has done the historical and technical part of his work with much industry and substantial success, he has failed to realise that the Irish agrarian problem is a changing one, and has consequently erred in attributing all the existing trouble directly to the wrong-doing of past time. It is quite true that but for that wrong-doing the Irish people would be much more able to meet new difficulties; but M. Fournier does not seem to recognise that new difficulties develop, setting all down to the legacy of the ages.

"Parliament has bettered the situation of the rural classes," he writes; "it was out of its power to clear away the prejudices, the rancours, the hatreds which the past has bequeathed to the present, and which, exploited by agitators, magnified by the popular imagination, will retard for yet a long time the re-establishment of public peace in Ireland. The legislator may well seek to organise for the future a more equitable rule: there is no magic ring by which he can make *tabula rasa* of the past. History does not recommence: we may truly say with the Roman juriconsults that no written law can efface things done: *Facti causae infectae nulla constitutione fieri possunt.*"[1]

Here, doubtless, there is a touch of national prejudice; for on such a view all history, French no less than English, would be but a record of inherited curses. That is not the final lesson to be learned. But it is important to realise how, the old misdeeds of England being thus represented as the actual causes of all present troubles, and the misdeeds themselves being freshly set forth with abundant learning, European public opinion regards the refusal of the English majority to let the Irish people grapple with their own problem. It is not too much to say that the retention of our grip over Ireland, with its eternal sequence of penury and hate, causes every display of English sympathy for oppressed aliens to figure in European eyes as a grotesque hypocrisy. When English meetings protest against the mishandling of Armenians by Turks, French and Germans ask whether the difference between direct massacre and the chronic "sentence of death" by eviction in Ireland justifies the English

[1] *La Question Agraire en Irlande*, 1882, *préface*.

attitude of disinterested philanthropy. They will not stop to ask whether the sympathisers with the Armenians do not also sympathise with homeless Irish; though indeed if they did they would find leading Unionists taking up the cause of the Armenians. It suffices that it is "England" that employs the crowbar brigade in Catholic Ireland and denounces the rule of the Turk over Eastern Christians.

On the question of the Irish demand for autonomy, finally, we have the work of M. Francis de Pressensé,—the son of the well-known French Protestant scholar, a trained diplomatist with an English experience, editor of one of the weightiest Parisian journals—declaring decisively for Home Rule.

"This book," he says of his treatise, "is an essay in political history. I have sought in the past the causes of the apparently irremediable division which arms against each other the two parts of the British empire. *I undertook this study with a prejudice favourable to the English supremacy and an unfavourable prepossession towards Irish autonomy: I conclude it, fully possessed by the principle of limited independence or of 'Home Rule,' as it has been defined by Mr Gladstone and accepted by Mr Parnell.*"[1]

It may be answered that there is an old tendency in France to take the Irish side; indeed M. de Pressensé admits as much, but it is without weakening his case:

"Ireland is tied to us by bonds of race, by common memories, by shared sympathies. And I may avow without circumlocution that I have been glad to establish the accordance of the result of impartial research with the instinct of French hearts. This book has been conceived and written in an entirely historic spirit. None the less I trust that it may present, in a fashion not too unworthy of the cause, the just claims of Ireland. The whole past of that country, especially since the iniquitous suppression of its independence, seems to me to testify in its favour. There are, if I do not deceive myself, reasons for believing that this great suit, already gained before the tribunal of history, is on the eve of being gained also before the tribunal of British democracy."

Nor is this tone special to France. The Prussian von Raumer, a specialist in history, who prescribed peasant proprietary for Ireland sixty years ago, and who had a distinct touch of Prussian ill-will to France, exhibited no Teutonic disesteem for the Irish people. His verdict was that

[1] *L'Irlande et l'Angleterre depuis l'acte d'union jusqu'à nos jours*, 1889, *préface*.

"Ireland is the most deplorable instance in modern history that a great and noble people may for centuries together be involved in the same injustice and infatuation, and all the highly-praised forms of the constitution be after paralysed by the forces of passion and prejudice. Kings, lords, and commons have alternately and simultaneously wronged Ireland; how should humanity, mildness, and obedience to the laws proceed from such education? What all the forms of the constitution denied, what even now the boldest minds in England conceive to be impossible, our kings have accomplished, for schools, churches, cities, towns, peasants, landed property, trade, tolls, military institutions, &c., and laid the basis of a freedom of which Ireland, if no quicker progress is made, will be destitute for centuries to come."[1]

"*There is no essential difference between the English and Irish in regard to their intellectual qualities;* and the defects which appear occasionally will be most easily remedied, and even wholly removed, by employment, education, mutual influence, and equal treatment."[2]

And one of the best of recent histories of Ireland, that by Dr Hassencamp, head master of the royal gymnasium of Ostrowo, gives another weighty German summing up against England's treatment of Ireland. It is after pronouncing in favour of the Union that, noting the breach of faith which followed it, in the withholding of Catholic emancipation, the historian writes:—

"Thus England at that period played the part of the legendary Roman king, who at first refused to purchase the sacred books for a small price, but who was afterwards compelled to offer a much higher sum for only a portion of them. In like manner England might in the year 1800 have procured peace and tranquillity for Ireland by the comparatively inconsiderable concession of Catholic emancipation; but the favourable opportunity was allowed to pass away; and now all concessions and all offers appear to be insufficient to purchase that priceless blessing."[3]

This may be taken as the prevailing attitude of continental opinion at any time for sixty years back.

As for opinion in America, despite the frequent outcrop in the States of a spirit of native dislike to the immigrant Irish, who unhappily but naturally figure pretty largely in the corrupt politics of their new environment,—or perhaps just because of resentment of this complication of American problems—there is an overwhelming agreement as to the perversity of the refusal of Home

[1] *England in* 1835, as cited, iii. 201.

[2] *England in* 1841, by the same. Eng. tr., i. 182.

[3] *The History of Ireland from the Reformation to the Union*, by Dr R. Hassencamp. Eng. tr., 1888, *end*.

Rule by the English majority. The only serious American objection to Home Rule, I believe, is that of my esteemed friend Mr Moncure Conway, who, seeing how the element of State rights in the American constitution was so long the support of slavery, and was finally the source of the Civil War—a fact too little appreciated by writers on the constitution, here and in the States—insists on the dangers that might arise under a similar constitution for Ireland. The infamous negro-lynchings in the Southern States in our own day Mr Conway traces to the same cause, the judicial authority of the Central Executive being powerless against the hatreds of race. But that is, I think, not at bottom an argument against Home Rule, but simply a consideration proving the need for care in forming the British Federal Constitution of the future. It would be a simple matter to make provision for the prompt repression by the Central executive of all transgressions on the part of the people of any component section of a federal State against any of the others; indeed such a State as ours would not be at all likely to leave that matter so ill arranged as it is in the constitution of the Republic.

In any case, a question about form of constitution is one thing and a question about the success or failure of a paramount State in governing a dependency is another; and in this respect there is only one voice throughout the non-English world as to the Anglo-Irish relation. Indeed it must needs be so. It must be obvious to any Englishmen capable of intelligently putting to himself the question, that if Ireland had attained her present state under the auspices of any other nation, the voice of England would unanimously declare that nation unfit to exercise its power. When misery and revolt are reported in Christian populations under the rule of the Turk, the average Englishman never dreams of suggesting mere perversity among the revolters: he at once ascribes the trouble to the misgovernment of the Porte. And if any other territory of northern Europe were seen to be capable of successful tillage, but forever a prey to destitution, he would take for granted not the incapacity of the inhabitants but some insanity in the laws with which they were always at strife. What the Englishman would thus do in any case similar to that of Ireland, foreigners do in the Irish case. Educated men in Europe are not to be persuaded that an intelligent people living on a fruitful soil remains in desperate poverty and burning disaffection age after age by reason purely of its own perversity. They are not be talked by unreasoning British Protestants into the belief that mere "Catholicism" is the cause of the misery of the

Irish peasantry, when Catholicism goes with fair comfort in France and Germany. They say with absolute confidence that the Irish results are results of misrule. They point to the vast change made in the condition of the peasantry of France, once so wretched, now on the whole so progressive, by the French Revolution. They point to the no less notable change made in the life of the peasantry of Prussia by land legislation at the beginning of the century—a change which went for much in enabling Prussia in a few years to rise from political ruin to energetic success. They say that Irish peasants are amenable to change of conditions like any other, and that the Englishman who denies it is a sample of the perversity which he imputes.

If argument and pressure of opinion throughout the civilised world could carry the point, Ireland would have had autonomy long ere this. Unfortunately, as Unionist comments on foreign opinion show, the majority of Englishmen pay too little heed to such opinion to be soon led by it to any course save one of mere defiance. There is, however, a consideration which may appeal to them in the matter, and that is, that should England ever be really embroiled in a war through some such complication as those which so rapidly accumulated on our hands a little while ago, the element of Irish hostility to England throughout the English-speaking world might be a very serious matter. When President Cleveland received thousands of telegrams congratulating him on his unhappy outbreak of bluster in the Venezuela dispute, we could be sure that most of them would come from American Irishmen. To Englishmen of the militarist school, who form the bulk of the Unionist party, and who confessedly cannot feel safe unless their navy be twice as strong as any two (or is it now three?) others, it can hardly be a comfortable reflection that their policy thus multiplies an eager enmity to them in one of the largest populations of the civilised world.

And it is not merely in foreign States that this enmity subsists. There is a chronic talk of Imperial Federation—a Federation between the mother country (a group of provinces *not* federated) and the colonies. But the colonies contain hundreds of thousands of Irishmen; and who shall say how many of them have been made determined haters of England by their experience of her rule? Why should *they* consent to federate with the so-called mother country, the unseemly group in which *their* mother land is chained to the wheels of the others, and insolently denied the right which the colonies are encouraged to claim? We have seen that the Irish immigrant element in the North American

colonies counted for much in their revolt against England. Who shall say that the larger and perhaps more embittered Irish element in the Australasian colonies, already greater by far than were the North American at the date of their independence, may not in our own time work the utter alienation of these? Surely the English majority would do well to make the Irish race a friend before it grows too dangerous an enemy. There is a possible Nemesis growing out of all the generations of Irish misery, out of the evictions, out of the over-population, out of the endless emigration. The Irish race, the breed with Irish memories, multiplies; and the so-called Anglo-Saxon race, outside of England, nay, even in England, is becoming more and more a race with Irish names, looking askance on the English race though speaking the English tongue. "Ten years ago," said an English politician twenty-eight years ago,

"Ten years ago the third and fourth cities of the world, New York and Philadelphia, were as English as our London; the one is Irish now, the other all but German. Not that the Quaker city will remain Teutonic; the Germans too are going out upon the land; the Irish alone pour in unceasingly. All great American towns will soon be Celtic, while the country continues English; a fierce and easily-roused people will throng the cities, while the law-abiding Saxons who till the land will cease to rule it. Our relations with America are of small moment by the side of the one great question, Who are the Americans to be?"[1]

These are the words of a Home Ruler, albeit one with anti-Celtic notions. But it was a Unionist, it was Mr Bright, who in his pre-Unionist days said this:—

"In America you have another Ireland, an Ireland which does not fear the government in Ireland, an Ireland full of passion with regard to what they believe to be the sufferings of the country they have left. . . . If the government of England and the government of the United Kingdom, as it is called, had been a government of statesmen, does any man in the world believe they would have allowed things to come to such a pass as this? . . . See what a position we are in. The whole civilised world points to our condition. The newspapers of France, of Germany, and even of Italy, and the newspapers of the United States . . . do not now write about Poland, or Hungary, or Venice, but they write about Ireland. . . . And if it were not a delicate subject to treat upon, which I now think it better to avoid, it would be easy to show how greatly we have lost in national power and moral influence

[1] Sir Charles Dilke, *Greater Britain*, 4th ed., p. 11.

with other nations, and especially with regard to our fears of defence. . . . If it were not for the moral sense of the people of the United States, and the good faith and honour of their government, there is no doubt but the great trouble—far greater than any we have yet seen—would have arisen on the Canadian frontier between the Irishmen in the United States and the subjects of the British Crown in Canada."[1]

To such testimonies as these, many Englishmen, themselves foolhardy to the point of bluster, return the answer that it is only the ignorant and noisy part of the Irish-American population that causes the American feeling to seem so largely anti-British. The charge of wrongdoing against themselves they meet by charging rowdyism and folly on the Irish-American population in the mass. Such charges dispose of themselves, on the old principle that he who indicts a whole nation does but indict himself. The Irish have their full share of blatancy, as have the Germans, the French, the English, and every other people in the world. But it is only the most blatant of Englishmen who can suppose that in the exiled Irish world there are not multitudes of men who judge the weaknesses of their fellows as sharply as do English anti-democrats the weaknesses of theirs, and who yet bear an enduring ill-will to England. "I have met," wrote an honest though effusive Irish observer during the Fenian period,

"I have met in many parts of the Union grave, quiet men-of-business Irishmen who, though holding their opinions with the resolute firmness common to their temperament and tone of thought, rarely take part in public matters, and yet are interested in what is passing around them, especially in whatever concerns the honour of their race and country. *From men of this class I heard the most strongly expressed opposition to the Fenian movement, and occasionally the bitterest contempt of its leaders.* Jealous of the reputation of their countrymen and . . . sensitive to ridicule, they were ashamed of the miserable squabbles and dissensions so common among the various branches or sections into which the Irish organisation is, or was then, divided; and they experienced the keenest humiliation as some new disaster rendered the previous boasting more glaring, or more painfully absurd. Yet among these grave, quiet men of business, these men of model lives, these men in whose personal integrity any bank in the country would place unlimited trust—amongst these men England has enemies, not friends. They are opposed to Fenianism not because it menaces England but because it compromises Ireland. So much alike do

---

[1] Speech of 23rd December, 1867, cited by Mr Fox, *Key to the Irish Question*, p. 323.

these men think and express themselves, though perhaps a thousand miles apart, that one would be inclined to suppose them in constant communication and intercourse with each other. Not to say in substance, but almost literally, this is the manner in which I have heard a number of these grave, quiet, steady business men refer to the Fenian movement :—'I strongly object to this Fenian organisation, for many reasons. In the first place, it keeps up a distinct nationality in the midst of the American population, and it is our interest to be merged in this nation as quickly as may be. In the second place, I have no confidence in the men at its head : how can I ? Which of them am I to believe ? If I believe one, I can't the other. Then what they propose is absurd. They talk nonsense about going to war with England, and England at peace with the world ; and every additional disaster only rivets Ireland's chains more strongly. If indeed this country were at war with England, that would be quite another thing ; and after all, of what good would that be for Ireland ? Would it better her condition ? Would it be worth the risk ? . . . But at the same time, I must say this for myself, if I could see my way clearly, if I thought that a fair chance offered of serving Ireland and making her happy, I would willingly sacrifice half of what I have in the world in the attempt.' . . ." [1]

If the English Unionist journals, in their way of imbecile self-glorification, make light of the enduring ill-will of such men as these, at least the mass of the English people is sane enough to feel that the policy is wrong which provokes it. And as the unconditional refusal of Home Rule to the orderly and constitutional demand of the great Irish majority, won to goodwill by the effort to meet them, has justified tenfold the resentment of the best and sanest of the Irish race against the apparent English majority, it is not to be believed that that majority can much longer remain Unionist, even in appearance. The faults and disasters which weaken the Irish parliamentary party cannot alter, for alien and impartial eyes, the merits of the issue. The *orbis terrarum* will not alter its estimate of the Anglo-Irish relation because Parnell, chancing to clash with the ethical superstitions of English Protestants and Irish Catholics alike, lost first his hold, and then his judgment, and then his life ; or because the scratch regiment which he despotically ruled has broken up as did Cromwell's host in vain dissension. That Parnell at his best was an imperfect man, or that his followers are imperfect in weaker ways, is, I repeat, a childishly irrelevant comment on the Irish problem, coming as it does from men who are only imperfect

[1] J. F. Maguire, M.P., *The Irish in America*, 1868, pp. 607-609.

with a difference, and that a difference for the worse, seeing that their aim is wholly negative and repressive, and in nowise constructive.

Either the lately awakened forces of political intelligence and social aspiration are doomed to end in all-round frustration, or the cause of the Irish people, as against English enmity, is destined to be gained. Either the English nation is to sink ever deeper in social corruption and political torpor, growing more and more a populace of gross toils and gross joys, passing further and further from the very dream of equality and of elevation of life, or the fabric of the State is to be new made and its life blood purified by the righting of the ancient wrong which so fatally flaws both. By the beginning of the twentieth century we ought to have some clear notion of how the tide of things is turning.

III.

MOMMSEN AND RICHEY ON GAULS AND IRISH.

I.

THE typical voice in the propaganda of Teuton against Celt is that of Theodor Mommsen, the German archæologist and historian of Rome. He is a very learned man in his special walk; and there has been a natural tendency to assume that a scholar who has all Latin archæology at his fingers' ends must be a first-rate historian, not only in the sense of knowing and telling all the facts, but as a judge of men and events, and a commentator on the course of things. Certainly he ranks highest among the modern historians of Rome, there being no such competition for the front rank there as is seen in the historiography of Greece, in which Englishmen, Germans, and Frenchmen have vied with each other throughout the century, proceeding one weighty history after another with zealous industry. In Roman history, though he is already felt by students to belong to a past generation, he may still be said to have it all his own way. I have indeed heard portions of his work discussed among specialists with scant respect, some describing portions of it as simply stupid, the work of a scholar who had the ambition to make a name as a writer, though lacking some of the qualities of mind most essential to the historian's task. And of some of the parts of his work which I have seen specialists praise, I am prepared to affirm the superficiality. But our business here is to consider in particular the character and weight of the verdict he has volunteered on what he regards as the "Celtic" race.

It is after telling the story of the conquest of Gaul by Cæsar that he thinks fit to bestow on his readers his Germanic opinion of not only the Gauls of antiquity but the modern Irish, whose "kinship" with the former he takes for granted, without a moment's scholarly reflection on the ethnological questions involved. Here is the passage, a little condensed:—

"This was no accidental destruction, such as destiny sometimes pre-

pares even for peoples capable of development, but a self-incurred and in some measure historically necessary catastrophe. . . . In the mighty vortex of the world's history, which inexorably crushes all peoples that are not as hard and as flexible as steel, such a nation could not permanently maintain itself: with reason the Celts of the continent suffered the same fate at the hands of the Romans, as their kinsmen in Ireland suffer down to our own day at the hands of the Saxons—the fate of becoming merged as a leaven of future development in a politically superior nationality. . . . In the accounts of the ancients as to the Celts on the Loire and Seine we find almost every one of the characteristic traits which we are accustomed to recognise as marking the Irish. Every feature reappears: the laziness in the culture of the fields; the delight in tippling and brawling; the ostentation . . .; the language full of comparisons and hyperboles, of allusions and quaint turns; the droll humour . . .; the curiosity . . .; and the extravagant credulity . . .; the childlike piety, which sees in the priest a father . . .; the unsurpassed fervour of national feeling . . .; the inclination to rise in revolt under the first chance-leader . . . but at the same time the utter incapacity . . . to attain or even barely to tolerate any organisation, any sort of fixed military or political discipline. It is, and remains, at all times and all places, the same indolent and poetical, irresolute and fervid, inquisitive, credulous, amiable, clever, but—in a political point of view—thoroughly useless nation; and therefore its fate has been always and everywhere the same."[1]

Let us first take the series of propositions on its merits, as a pretended differentiation of the Celtic race from others, before considering the value of the identification of ancient Gauls with modern Irish.

1. *Laziness in agriculture.* As a special description of the Gauls of antiquity, this, as every student knows, is untrue. The Gauls were indeed behind the Romans in agriculture, but they were ahead of the Germani. Slothfulness in agriculture is one of the characteristics specially given to the Germani by Tacitus.[2]

2. *Delight in tippling and brawling.* This too is one of the features noted in ancient German life by all observers. It is no less noted in mediæval German life. Some say it is sufficiently notable in the German life of to-day, to say nothing of the English.

[1] Mommsen, *History of Rome*, B. v., ch. 7, Eng. tr., ed. 1894, vol. v., pp. 98-100.

[2] *De moribus Germanorum*, cc. 26, 45.

3. *Ostentation.* A feature of the life of a score of peoples in the same culture stage; and one abundantly seen in the history of the German aristocracy, who answer to the upper-class Gauls of whom Cæsar wrote.

4. *Figurative language.* The special characteristic of the Teutonic Eddas and Sagas.

5. *Droll humour.* Without definitely answering in the affirmative the old question of Bouhours, "Whether a German can have wit," we may impartially note that Germans in modern times have made rather more pretensions to "droll humour" than any other European nation; and that such mediæval works as *Till Eulenspiegel*, *Reynard the Fox*, (albeit borrowed from the French), and the productions of Hans Sachs, and such works as some of Richter's in modern times, give some basis for the claim. It is not to be denied that a modern collection of German jokes, as Mr Lowell put it, makes life seem more serious, and has a tendency to make it more precarious; but still the habit of joking seems as common in Germany as anywhere else.

6. *Curiosity.* As against the special testimony of Cæsar regarding the Gauls I do not recall any concerning the ancient Germani. But every student knows that an eager interest in the advent of any stranger with news is one of the commonest as it is one of the most natural features of the life shown in Anglo-Saxon literature. And I may add my personal testimony—which can be borne out by that of many others—that when travelling in Germany I have been questioned by chance fellow-passengers with a zest of primitive inquisitiveness which I have never seen equalled in any "Celtic" country.

7. *Extravagant Credulity.* If Herr Mommsen refers to superstition, he may be accommodated with many proofs that in Germany in all ages, down to that in which a German journalist is imprisoned for jesting at the Holy Coat of Trèves, there has been as much religious credulity as anywhere else. Buckle and others in his day held the German people to be more superstitious than either the French or the English. In regard to other sorts of credulity, the land of Baron Munchausen surely ought not to waive its just claims.

8. *Childlike Piety.* Wherein Celtic piety is more childlike than any other at the same culture stage, it is impossible to discover without some assistance from the historian's suppressed knowledge.

9. *Subservience to the priest.* No Catholic people was ever

more subservient to its priesthood than the "Teutonic" Lowland Scotch have been since the Reformation. The filial attitude towards the priest is visibly common to the Italian, the Spanish, and the Russian peoples; and in no Catholic country is Catholicism more effectively organised than in Catholic Germany and Austria.

10. *Fervour of National feeling.* Obviously a quality of non-Celtic stocks in at least as high a degree.

11. *Inclination to revolt under any chance leader.* Does this mean that Vercingetorix was a "chance leader"? Was he any more so than Arminius? And under how many "chance leaders" have the Irish people revolted? Is the expression any more than a piece of chance verbiage?

12. *Incapacity to attain any organization or fixed discipline.* Exactly the account given by Tacitus of the Germani, who never did "attain any sort of fixed military or political discipline" till modern times, and who remained for centuries disorganised while France was highly organised. If France is to reckon as a Celtic country, Dr Mommsen's proposition is a farce.

13. Apply the closing sentence, finally, to the divided Germany of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, down to the era of Bismarck, and compare the effect. This was a Germany which could not unite on any ground between 1790 and 1866, could not effectively resist Louis XIV. without the help of England, could not unite against the first Napoleon, could not unite at all save in resistance to the foolish attack of Napoleon III. All the epithets of Dr Mommsen could plausibly have been applied, and were applied, to Germans, often by Germans themselves, with the exception of the last, which is a kind of blatant aspersion that no judicious writer would cast on any nation in any stage,—not to Spain or Turkey in their lowest hours.

So much for the items of the differentiation. Every one turns out to be worse than worthless as a distinguishing mark of the race aspersed. The passage is a string of journalistic phrases, strung together with as little science and as little sincerity as go to the work of any Chauvinist leader-writer in Berlin. What then is to be said of the bearing of the whole passage on the case of Ireland, and what of the political sanity of the doctrine laid down? What is the scientific content of the formula on "historically necessary catastrophes"? Does it amount to anything more than the empty deliverance that when a nation

is beaten it is beaten? If anything else, it is as good for one case as for another; and we are led to the instructive conclusions that the assassination of Cæsar himself, the fall of the Roman Empire, the later rotting-down of Teutondom in Italy, the conquest of Anglo-Saxondom by Danes and by Normans, and of Teutondom in Spain by Saracens, the fall of Germany into anarchy after the Reformation, the agony of the Thirty Years' War, the age of impotence which followed, and the beating down of the insolence of Prussia into the dust by Napoleon at Jena, "were all in some measure historically necessary catastrophes." So with the fustian about the vortex which crushes all people not as hard and as flexible as steel. Since Spain and Italy and Turkey and Morocco and China and Persia have all continued to subsist as nations, century after century, despite periods of impotence and stagnation, they are all, on Dr Mommsen's principles, as hard and as flexible as steel in comparison with the Gauls, who were "necessarily" conquered by Cæsar, and in comparison with the Germans, whom Cæsar did not attempt to overrun, though whenever he met an army of them he annihilated it in an hour, as Marius did the Cimbri and Teutones. Dr Mommsen, in fine, is childish enough to assume that the Gaulish people was "destroyed" because it was definitely absorbed in the Roman civilisation, and that the Irish people is destroyed because it still remains at the mercy of English misgovernment. On the same principle, Alsace and Lorraine were destroyed when France annexed them, and were destroyed afresh when Germany got them back.

When we rationally consider the past history and present position of Ireland, the Teutonic declamation of Dr Mommsen on the subject falls away from our thoughts like the quotidian brawling of the hired newspapers of his Fatherland. The Irish land, the Irish people, have stood for seven hundred years at a relative disadvantage such as the so-called Germanic peoples never underwent—a disadvantage long ago fully recognised by intelligent writers of his own nationality who took the trouble to study the case. If the Irish people in modern times have ever on a large scale been indolent, it was visibly because the fruits of their industry were systematically wrested from them under the worst land laws in Europe. That they are signally industrious, whether at home or abroad, under fair conditions, is admitted even by enemies, the fact having been established by the testimony of a series of observers who had in this matter the decisive advantage over Dr Mommsen of knowing that whereof

they speak. And since he penned his paragraph, the Irish people has shown that it can organise for political purposes so efficiently as to paralyse the English Parliament and force the two main English parties in turn to come to terms. For the rest, if the Irish Nationalist political organisation disrupted at the fall and death of Parnell, it did no more than the German Socialist organisation did at the death of Lassalle,—and may do again.

One makes these comparisons specially between Celtica and Germany because it is so plain that Dr Mommsen's handling of the character of the Celtic race is an expression of mere vulgar racial vanity on his part. He has not made the most ordinary study of the ethnological problem: he does not seem to be aware that one exists. He speaks of the Irish as the Celtic kindred of the Gauls in apparently complete ignorance of the presumption that the blood of the Irish people was largely "Teutonic" in the period before trustworthy history begins, and of the fact that it was certainly much mixed with Scandinavian and English elements in the historic period. In the same way he takes as unquestioned an absolute racial distinction between Cæsar's Gauls and Germani, when many writers of his own nation have maintained that the Gauls were Germanic. Dr Mommsen was not analysing a scientific problem. He was delivering himself of catchpenny patriotic rhetoric in the name of historical science.

And this fact itself, which must be perfectly well recognised by many sensible students in Germany, is instructive to those who really study the conditions under which nations advance and retrogress in true civilisation. From the critical sagacity of Von Raumer before 1850 to the uncritical Chauvinism of Mommsen after 1850, the process is not one of advance in political wisdom. And it may not be out of place to say here that the mere pre-eminent documentary specialism which is the main product of the German scheme of culture is a different thing from eminence in judgment on any subject whatever. Dr Mommsen is a prominent illustration of the success with which men may accumulate historical information without reaching historical understanding; but it is not in his sphere alone that Germany presents the spectacle of knowledge without insight, and of oracular emphasis without wisdom. Into the writing of a multitude of his zealous fellow-scholars of all departments there enters the same egoism, the same disregard of critical scruple, the same headlong affirmation of presuppositions, the same law-

less wresting of evidence to the support of an obstinately maintained theory. In philosophy, in mythology, in theology, in Shaksperology, in economics, in history, in æsthetics, the same forms of egoism and industrious incapacity yield cognate results, so that in no country is laborious and learned literature as a rule less durable than in the country which produces most of it. Men like F. C. Baur and K. O. Müller, men who to knowledge unite the genius for using it, are as rare in Germany, proportionally speaking, as anywhere else. And under the regimen of military unity, Chauvinism, and "success," it does not appear that they are relatively multiplying. For the services constantly rendered to the world by mere German industry, every student must be grateful; but if we discriminate between accumulation of material and advance in philosophic comprehension (as distinguished from arbitrary system-spinning and mere verbal profundity) we shall not find, I think, that the alleged superiority of the Teutonic character is evidenced by the average of results. We find such products of special organisation as special organisation may anywhere yield in a given culture-stage. We find no evidence of a special racial genius, in any sense of the term, save perhaps in so far as the uncured cumbrousness of the German speech seems to impart a cumbrousness to the general run of German utterance.

II.

That the foregoing remarks on German specialism are not, as some may suspect, mere irrelevant recrimination, will appear when we follow up the analysis of Dr Mommsen's anti-Celtic oracle with an analysis of the very different utterance of the late Professor Richey in reply to it. It was in the first of his *Lectures on Irish History* that, after citing Mommsen's deliverance by way of letting an Irish audience hear foreign criticism, Professor Richey met the German's attack with a species of defence which is in large part a surrender. To judge from his critical handling of such fallacies as the view that "the Celt" is innately unfit for seafaring, and the old falsism that Celts are innately prone to dissension, Mr Richey would have seemed to be the last man to admit innate racial defects of any other sort. He was not, I believe, of Irish paternity; but whatever his own race, he seems in the greater part of his work to stand aloof from all forms of race prejudice. Yet here, where he has to deal explicitly with the doctrine of fixed racial characteristics, he proffers admissions which not only yield to the Celtophobists much of what they assert

but seem to take the ground from under his own most rational explanations of Irish history. I transcribe the passage :—

"It may be fairly contended that the failure of the Celtic race is not so much attributable to the inferiority of their organization to other races, as to the fact of their possessing, to a certain degree, a higher organization. . . . As contrasted with the Teuton, the Celt possesses a peculiar susceptibility of emotion, and a peculiar rapidity of perception, so much that it may be almost said that an idea has passed away from the mind of a Celt before a Saxon begins to understand it at all. But this has an unfortunate result in practice, because it too often amounts to an incapacity of holding an idea for a long period. . . . The Celt conceives ideas rapidly and clearly, but forgets them as easily. He is brilliant, but not persevering ; his thoughts are vivid but not enduring. This is marked in the whole history of the Gallic race, and particularly in the want of tenacity exhibited by them in their struggles with Rome, and in modern history by the half-Celtic French in many of their wars. . . . At the end of the fifteenth century, the French swept all resistance before them in Italy. The Italians dreaded the astonishing *furia Francesca;* but after a few months every French conquest collapsed, from the want of a steady perseverance. The same characteristics appear in Celtic art and literature. Irish poetry consists of exquisite lyric outbursts ; but, alone of all nations of Europe, the Celts do not possess an epic poem which takes an acknowledged place in universal literature. As to Celtic music, the separate airs handed down from remote antiquity are unequalled in variety, tenderness, and expression ; but Irish mnsic has never risen beyond an air ; operas, oratorios, and concerted pieces have been produced by people of inferior sympathies, but greater industry. . . . The toil of now nigh six centuries expended on Cologne Cathedral testifies the faith and perseverance of the German people. The fierce impulse of Celtic art expended itself in the carving of a doorway, or the illumination of a manuscript. The chief political characteristic of Celtic nations is a want of perseverance in exertion to attain a given end, and inability permanently to unite for any definite object ; but want of active perseverance must be distinguished from what we may call the passive resistance in old ideas. Though the Celts do not exert a continued effort to accomplish a given object, yet they will cherish a fixed desire to attain that which they have failed to accomplish. Ancient traditions and national longings form the staple of their political ideas to such an extent that they do not appreciate existing circumstances, and fail to adapt themselves to an altered state of things."[1]

---

[1] Richey's *Lectures on the History of Ireland*, 1st Series, 1869, pp. 8-11.