

society he is undergoing a martyrdom sweetened only by his sense of patriotic duty—and by two hundred thousand dollars. Descended from a good English family and connected with the British aristocracy, it is probable that in his heart he holds himself above his followers and looks upon them rather as rapparees. His sympathy with agrarianism evidently is limited: he cultivates that sentiment and the Land League as its organ mainly for the sake of obtaining the force which, as multiplied experience has proved and as he well knows, is not to be found in the political movement alone. Mr. Davitt, on the other hand, being of humbler origin and station, is a thoroughgoing agrarian, and probably views Disunionism mainly as an instrument for the spoliation and expulsion of landlords. Between Mr. Davitt's aims, therefore, and those of semi-Socialists like Mr. Chamberlain, there is an affinity on which an alliance may possibly be based; and probably Mr. Chamberlain flatters himself that Mr. Davitt, upon receiving a full measure of agrarianism, may, in the political line, be satisfied with something short of the dismemberment of the nation, which as Mr. Chamberlain must know in his heart would, if the country ever came to its senses, prove the political ruin of every traitor who had a hand in it. With the land-owning aristocracy, on the other hand, of which Lord Salisbury is the leader, the supreme end of politics is rent. Most of them would be willing when it came to the point to make almost any sacrifice of national unity and greatness, provided it were decently veiled, if they could only keep their rents or obtain compensation for the loss. Some noble dissentients among their number there might be, but the number would be very small. For them, therefore, while it is impossible to make terms with Mr. Davitt, it is not impossible to make terms with Mr. Parnell. Terms with Mr. Parnell accordingly they seem inclined to make, and if they do their history will end as it began. It began in the sale of the national religion for a quiet title to the Church lands; it will end in a sale of the national unity for back rents. Once more it is due to the grand, though not spotless, memory of those Barons of the Middle Ages who framed the Great Charter and founded the constitution to bear in mind that they had nothing to do with the aristocracy which was founded on rapine, sacrilege and judicial murder by the minions of Henry VIII.

To give a tint of respectability to his compact with the Parnellites Lord Randolph Churchill is trying to connect it with the traditions of the Tory Party. This use of historic fancies for the justification of intrigue is a part of the mantle which is supposed to have fallen upon Lord Randolph's shoulders from those of the gifted author of "Coningsby." But a more complete figment was never coined. Were not Perceval and Eldon the leaders of the Tory party and the very incarnations of its spirit in their day? And was not the Irish policy of Perceval and Eldon a policy of exclusion and repression? Are not Tory "rigour and vigour" the perpetual butt of Ireland's patriotic satirist, Tom Moore? That the Stuarts intrigued with Irish Catholicism and strove to use its forces for the subversion of Protestantism and liberty in the rest of their dominions is very true; and the fact ought to be borne in mind by those who talk of the Penal Laws as if they had been a system of unprovoked oppression, and of Orangeism as if it had been the offspring of mere sectarian tyranny without any necessity for self-defence. In the Stuarts this was natural; for the Stuarts were Roman Catholics as well as absolutists, the two characters being closely connected, and, it may be said, almost identical with each other. Charles II. and James II. were actual converts to Rome. Charles I. was under the dominion of a Roman Catholic wife, and himself belonged to a party essentially Roman Catholic. But the Stuarts had no sympathy with liberty or toleration in Ireland any more than in England. The rule of Strafford was an iron rule: he was a confiscator of Irish land; and if Charles I. intrigued with the Irish insurgents, it was only when he was reduced to despair. George III., when he put his veto on Catholic Emancipation, had the ardent sympathy of every genuine Tory in the country. Pitt, who proposed Emancipation, was born and bred a Whig, and, though the nominee of the king, had held an essentially Liberal course till he was driven out of it by the tornado of the French Revolution. On questions unconnected with the Revolution his Liberal tendencies remained. Burke, in the same manner, when he advocated the Catholic claims in his Letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe, was still a Liberal in grain, though, like Pitt, driven out of his course by the storm. It was by Wellington and Peel, it is true, that Emancipation was carried at last; but these statesmen yielded only when further resistance had become impossible; and, by yielding, they forfeited the support of all the thorough-going Tories, who transferred their allegiance to Lord Eldon and the Duke of Cumberland. From the Liberals Ireland received Parliamentary Reform and a really representative government; from the Liberals she has received religious equality; from the Liberals she has received the reform, or what is

accepted as the reform, of the Land Law. To repress Irish disorder and assassination has been the lot of every executive government in turn, and Sir Robert Peel's ministry fell in trying to carry a Coercion Bill. Whether the Liberal policy has been successful is another question. That it has been one of emancipation, while the Tory policy has been one of exclusion and repression, will be admitted by every one who prefers historic fact to fiction.

It is coolly assumed by the partisans of dismemberment both in Ireland and here that Mr. Parnell's cause and the cause of Ireland are one and the same, and that a man must be an enemy of the Irish people if he is opposed to the designs of Mr. Parnell. Of the hundred representatives of Ireland in the Commons not more than thirty can be called Parnellites. Mr. Lowell, the late American ambassador, who is not likely to exaggerate in favour of Great Britain, reports that a fourth of the Irish are loyal to the Union. If he were to include passive as well as active loyalty, counting all as for the Union who are not against it, he might double his estimate at least; for the political movement, as distinguished from the agrarian, has always been factitious, the creation of demagogues with objects of their own, and sustained by the funds of the American Fenians. What the mass of the people want is not a change of political institutions, but more bread, which nothing but the depletion of an overcrowded country will give them. Not only is the Union actively supported or passively accepted by at least a moiety of the people; it is most actively and most ardently supported by that portion of the people which is best qualified to represent the interests of the whole. The population of Ulster is in intelligence, in energy, in prosperous industry, the flower of Ireland. If you wished to know what was the real interest of Italy, you would go, not to the Calabrian or the Sicilian, the inhabitants of the most ill-starred and backward parts of the country, but to the vigorous Piedmontese or the keen-witted Florentine. The Irishman of Ulster sees that separation from the rest of the United Kingdom would be a descent into littleness from a greatness which, as a long roll of illustrious names proves, he fully shares. He sees that it would also be a change from a position of perfect security into one of perpetual peril. He understands that the destinies of the two islands are linked together indissolubly by nature, and that the choice must lie between Union and a constant enmity which could not fail to be ruinous to the weaker. His commercial activity makes him keenly alive to the fact that the islands are economically the complements of each other, one having the coal for manufactures, the other the pastures for the supply of meat and butter, so that severance, with the Protective system which Nationalists threaten to introduce, would simply deprive Ireland of her market. He well knows, moreover, that instead of an increased measure of liberty, separation will bring either the anarchic tyranny of the demagogue or the reactionary tyranny of the priest, and that, instead of being the co-equal partner of England and Scotland, his country, perhaps after a murderous struggle between priestcraft and revolution, would become a moral dependency either of American Fenianism or of the Vatican. That Disunionism is identical with Liberalism, and that a Liberal who speaks against Disunion must be a renegade, is another assumption equally cool. Is the disruption of the greatest power of real liberty and progress in the world a thing which a Liberal is bound by his creed to seek? Is Irish Catholicism a manifest embodiment of the Liberal spirit? Was it Liberal to support Slavery in the United States, and to crusade in favour of the Papacy against Italian independence? Among the renegades from Liberalism is now to be numbered Mr. Bright.

SIR CHARLES GAVAN DUFFY, in an open letter to Lord Carnarvon, undertakes to assure him that Ireland will be satisfied as soon as she has a Parliament of her own. Judging from experience we should say that he was a bold man who would undertake to assure anyone that Ireland, that is Fenian Ireland, would be satisfied with anything. Hitherto as often as the gulf of importunity has been filled up a new gulf has yawned. To exhaust discontent you must exhaust the demagogues, whose succession is endless. An Irish Parliament means separation, as has been demonstrated a hundred times. The power of the Crown having been constitutionalized into non-existence, the two Parliaments would practically be two sovereign assemblies, and their divergent action would soon burst the nominal bond between them. They might, and, in the temper in which they would set out, probably would part company on questions of peace and war. It would be far better in fact to come to separation at once than to go through the intermediate process of wrangling and ultimate rupture, which would only embitter feelings already bitter enough. This point has been raised, argued and decided over and over again. Sir Charles Gavan Duffy as a colonial politician, is probably haunted by the idea of putting Ireland