

armour, we shall feel that the victory is won, and that we march onward over the necks of slaughtered foes. He will not stoop whose gaze is always upward. He will not be poor-hearted who revels in sublimities. His health will thrive who dwells in the bracing climate of pure truth. In Jehoshaphat's spirit we shall rejoice in victory before a blow is struck. Our war-cry will be thanksgiving. If these resolves of January 1, 1881, strengthen and animate and fortify our souls, a resolute band of Christian champions will wave high the banner of the Cross: be bulwarks for England's Reformation, and valiantly storm the strongholds of superstition and infidelity.

H. LAW.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE LAND WAR IN IRELAND.

IT may prove worthy of attention if some reflections are offered upon the attitude taken by the Hierarchy and Priesthood of the Roman Mission in Ireland, on so momentous an occasion as the Irish Land League movement.

But first it will be necessary to take a review of the general situation of affairs, and to bring out the salient points of this question into a clearer light. A hundred years ago saw Ireland banded in the brotherhood of the Volunteers and led by her nobility and gentry to oppose English oppression and misrule. Twelve years later, the Society of United Irishmen report on certain "laws in force in this realm," and the Committee denounces these statutes as "a galling yoke and unexampled for their severity." All these, however, have long since been swept away, and in their place liberal measures substituted from year to year. But now Mr. Gladstone's Land Act of 1870, Mr. I. Butt's advanced measures, Judge Longfield's easy plan, and Mr. Shaw Lefevre's generous proposals to facilitate peasant purchase, are all pronounced inadequate solutions of the Land Question. And something far beyond all these is demanded—in fact, there is demanded what Mr. John Bright has just pronounced

A violent and impossible scheme, where tenants were apparently to fix their own rents, under which a landlord is an object to be got rid of or banished, or where the Government is to undertake some gigantic transaction of raising two or three hundred millions of money to buy them out of their estates, and to convey those estates over to the farmers who now cultivate them.

If it be naturally enough inquired what has taken place thus to pile up the demands of the Irish farmer, and to exasperate the country into an alarming attitude to enforce these inordinate

cravings? we point in reply, first, to certain *motive powers* at work, and find that some forty-six years' teaching in National schools bears fruit, especially in connection with a free press adapted to the fiery tastes of the Celtic or Roman Catholic population. We find, also, among these a strong reaction from blind submissive credulity, running fast and free in the direction of Atheism and Communism. Besides, we find, that direction, sympathy, and support, are looked for from America. Indeed, what La Fayette was to the French Revolution the same Mr. Parnell is, in a degree, to the Land League; the main contention in both cases being an imported idea. And further, if due estimate be made of the *restraints removed*, contributing in part to the present state of affairs, we must not overlook the fact that certain lessons as to immunity of crime have been learned under the New Jury Law, while there must be superadded the moral effects of the recent non-renewal of the Peace Preservation Act, and of the abrogation of the Convention Act. And then come the well-remembered declarations made by such influential personages as Messrs. Gladstone, Bright, Forster, and, we may add, Mr. Chamberlain. Is it any wonder, then, that the Irish peasant, with all this before him, should have arrived at the conclusion that the way was undoubtedly cleared for a great change in his favour, and that his rejoinder to cautions as to danger being incurred by agitation and so forth should be "There is no fear at all; haven't we got a good back now in England?"

Another point deserves a passing word—namely, What may have been the *immediate occasion* seized upon for opening the present hideous political drama with any prospect of success? For this we must go back and unravel the curious state of things working in Ireland since the enactment of Free Trade. The effects of this great measure in depreciating the value of the agricultural produce of Ireland have not been felt or, indeed, realized at all, owing to the fact of an almost continuous rise of prices, partly natural, but partly artificial and reckless, down to the three bad seasons ending in 1879. Meanwhile, the Irish farmers had gambled deeply in land and in live-stock, the banks accommodating. This insane competition of tenants thus forced up prices, until another South-Sea Bubble was formed, to burst when the bad harvest, the slack demand from England, the Glasgow Bank failure, and the glut of foreign importations concurred in that sad year.

The sources from which the present land agitation came, and *the objects* aimed at, must now pass in brief review. First, then, we place, as the standard planted in the fore front of this contention, the letter to *The Freeman*, written from New York in February, 1879, by Mr. John Devoy, of the Fenian Brotherhood. This is "the new departure," as the writer aptly terms it. Nor did his

precious ideas slumber long. A Roman Catholic reverend "recommended and put them forward for the first time, at the Central Tenants' Association in Dublin, about April, '79." Then at Westport, on Sunday, June 8—having Mr. Michael Davitt now taking an open part in the movement—Mr. Parnell finally adopted the Fenian programme of Devoy, Messrs. O'C. Power and O'Donnell (now M.P.'s), also taking a prominent part in "the proceedings of the meeting" which set agoing so dangerous a policy under the specious pretext of the Famine of 1879-80. But what of the *policy itself*, and the *means* for working it out? The original projector having sad experience of many weak points in the Fenian system, framed a new scheme to escape them all. Having found treachery in a secret society bound with oaths, an open co-partnership is proposed. Invasion and war being unpleasant realities, wholesale plunder is substituted. Ferocious Nationalism not being generally attractive, cupidity is touched, and the lure of unjust gains put upon the hook.

Disclaiming with much rage all charges of countenancing murder, the Leaguers left life to hang on the hazard of rash zeal kindled to madness by fierce oratory, also *it must go forth* and guard itself from other combinations not defunct. Many at first were quite puzzled with the system. Not so, however, in the long run, the Attorney-General for Ireland, who has pronounced against the legality of

The several methods used by the League to alarm and terrify the landlords of Ireland, so as to prevent their seeking to enforce by legal means, or to obtain, payment of the rents, which by law they were entitled to have been paid, by their respective tenants.

But if the League be assumed to have worked without murder, so its boast was to discard bigotry and intolerance. And very truly and terribly was this the case. Protestants and Roman Catholics combined to make a prey of Protestants and Roman Catholics alike. And the great point was not the faith which their victims professed, but the farms of which they were to be robbed. This toleration was too sublime then to be questioned. But all these were only means to an end. And this end was (to use the words of Mr. Parnell at Longford)—

And when we have succeeded in destroying landlordism (the chief prop of English misrule), we may be able to go farther, until we have obtained the restitution of the legislative independence robbed from us in 1798 (loud cheers).

Such is the Land War of Ireland, in reference to which we must now inquire after what manner the Roman Catholics of Ireland conducted themselves, whether as hierarchy, priests, or people. If material considerations can be supposed influential here, we would anticipate a warm support of things as they are

and a general concurrence in averting change, especially if violent. The Church of Rome in Ireland has been enjoying great liberty and has made extensive strides on every side. Her members have been investing largely in real property, have vast sums lent on landed security for themselves, and doubtless also for their Church. They have advanced rapidly in trade and commerce, hold their place well in the learned professions, and use with effect the substantial opportunities of education open to them. Their cathedrals and colleges, their friaries and nunneries, have multiplied rapidly and filled every suitable and fruitful nook in the land, while charitable bequests and varied benefactions have poured a golden stream into their coffers. Why, then, encourage changes imperilling all this success achieved, and why leave Ireland desolated by the outpouring of a social volcano—easily kindled, not easily quenched? All this, however, is but one side of the case to be encountered, and supposes the members of this Church wealthy or well-to-do. But there is another section not to be despised or disregarded. Their offerings and dues, though individually slender, are in the aggregate considerable. These are the agricultural or tenant classes who have been entering into contracts for heavy rents, then complaining bitterly of grievous wrongs.

The Church of Rome, from her highest to her lowest ecclesiastical member, seems to have taken opposite sides in the Land War. And this is precisely what appeared in the Fenian affair. The Archbishop of New York, when the Irish vote was of value, allowed the body of McManus, the Fenian, to be brought into his cathedral, and made an oration over it, "harmonizing rebellion with the laws of the Church of Rome," as the author of "The Secret History of Fenianism" tells. But then the Roman Catholic Bishop of Cork would not allow the coffin into his cathedral nor Archbishop Cullen into his Dublin pro-cathedral; and yet all is wound up at the graveside by a well-known parish priest joining in the panegyric delivered to sympathizing thousands of Fenians. And so it was and is that in the Land War the highest ecclesiastics differ—some pleasing those who have property gained by industry, others pleasing the far larger number of those who would gain property through agitation, and not a few striving to please both, "running with the hare and hunting with the hounds." Accordingly we find, in connection with the recent famine, the Irish hierarchy unanimously reiterating the hierarchy's resolutions of 1859, to the effect that—

They recognize the rights and duties of landlords, but claim in the same spirit the rights and recognize the duties of tenants. They end with warnings against illegal remedies and principles and projects contrary to the teachings of religion and justice.

Much in the same strain runs the Cloyne Manifesto. Such, also

(passing minor episcopal lights), is the manly denunciation of Archbishop McCabe against murder and those who incite thereto by rash speaking. But Archbishop McHale anticipated these eminent dignitaries, and, when the Land Campaign opened in Mayo, denounced the work and the workmen, at the same time advocating "Home Rule." So that, taking the utterances of the Roman Catholic hierarchy into account, Earl Cowper was perfectly correct in stating that—

There were many members of the Land League who were Protestants and publicly state so. On the other hand, many Bishops and Priests—and they deserve credit for it—have denounced these outrages in language quite as strong as could be employed by you. Any one of Christian feeling, no matter what church he may belong to, must denounce the crimes of murder and intimidation which prevail in many parts of this country.

But then, what have we on the other side of the question? An Archbishop, with his manifesto and critique on the "laborantem agricolam," is quoted by the Land Leaguers as theirs, and made a counterweigh to the Archbishop who came out so strong on the murder-stain question. Then an East of Ireland Bishop is lauded as "up to the high-water mark of land reform," to the disparagement of a Southern Bishop who made shipwreck of his reputation shamefully in Land League notions. And so, too, parish priests, administrators and coadjutors, whose names will never be known outside of their parishes, honestly and boldly and effectively opposed the Land League and all its doings. Some more of these also came forward on hostile platforms and refused to hear dangerous speakers, and with noble patriotic ardour warned against the frantic projects and the selfish projectors of the League.

But then, on the other side, whom do we find crowding the Land League platforms? Who are these as wild as the wildest of the professional agitators in advocating extreme measures, in denouncing obnoxious parties, in brazenly professing principles Communistic and Revolutionary? Alas! it is too true that such parties include a very considerable number of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, who, though rather luckily for them not included by name in the Attorney-General's Bill of Particulars, "*did attend and take part in the meetings and assemblies, &c., and did utter divers expressions and make divers speeches*" on the occasions used in furtherance of the illegal and insane conspiracy. And what must the sober, moral, educated and refined members of that Church have thought and felt at all this? Did they ever contrast all these sayings and doings, not of frantic frieze-coated Sabbath-breakers, but of men consecrated to God's altars, of men in whose case the Tridentine decree enforced on bishops to insist that they should rule their

people, being in conversation, speech, and knowledge exemplary, and be mindful of what is written, "Be ye therefore also holy, for I am holy," and "giving offence in nothing, that their ministry be not blamed?" Nay, if any of the worthy and devout lay members of this Church could have been supposed familiar with that picture of clerical life so recently drawn in the Vatican Decrees, in which the Council solemnly exhorts all (priests), in the name of the Lord, that they turn *from everything* that would be a *disgrace* to those dedicated to divine mysteries, and to become samples to the faithful—surely such persons must have felt deeply shocked and grieved to the heart at these sad exhibitions, and no doubt astonished beyond measure how such things could be, after the Vatican Decree had put such enormous power into the hands of the Chief Bishop to deal with clerical offenders in every branch of the Roman vineyard, but especially with the Irish, whom Archbishop Cullen found so dreadful. We had noted many things on this sad subject in respect of the relation of the Church to the State—in her relation to revolution in the bud—to popular conspiracy—to waging of wars—to property—as bearing on this present controversy. But let all this pass. It is an unpleasant piece of anatomy. It might be mistaken or misrepresented as the mere inferential censures of Puritanical narrowness and malignity. And relieved not a little, we now produce two witnesses, competent in their capacity and above reproach, and with them close this part of our Paper.

Sir George Bowyer, late M.P. for Wexford, writes thus :—

Mr. Parnell proposed, in a speech at Newry, that the position of landlords should be so disagreeable and disastrous as to make them glad to sell their lands on any terms, and then no one was to dare to buy but the tenants. . . . The tenant farmers have been told repeatedly, even in the presence of their priests, that if their landlords will not come to terms they are "to stick to homestead and land" and pay no rent at all, and this advice has been adopted widely. Those people are Catholics. I want to know how such a doctrine can be reconciled to the Catholic religion. I say advisedly, that no one priest or layman can produce any theological authority, from Thomas Aquinas to the Penny Catechism, to gainsay the proposition that a tenant who refuses to pay so much rent as he is able to pay, and deliberately sticks to homestead and land, is guilty of mortal sin, within the meaning of the Seventh (?) Commandment *Thou shalt not steal*.

Rev. Canon Griffin, parish priest, Mill Street, is reported by telegram to have "explained his reasons for not identifying himself with the Land League." He said that if the land question were settled to-morrow satisfactorily he believed troublesome adventurers would be found who would endeavour to disturb the

peace and the minds of the well-disposed. He protested also as a priest against the gross insults heaped upon three Catholic bishops at Castletown by an agent of the Land League, and pointed to the sympathy which a notorious Atheist met with from parties connected with the Land League.

The effects which the Land League movement has already produced, and their bearing upon the Church of Rome, are very striking and serious. When Mr. Parnell opened the autumn campaign, he suggested that village committees were to be formed in every parish, and should virtually promulgate and enforce the sentence of the major excommunication against land offenders, whether these were in full communion with the Church of Rome or not. This amounted to the taking from the hands of the Church and its highest officers one of their most peculiar and highly-prized privileges and powers, as the following memorial line exemplifies :—

Os, orare, vale, communicio, mensa, negatur.

Here was an authority rudely superseding that of the Church; and it was in terror and resentment against this that the Cloyne Manifesto seems to have been issued. But this was not all. Direct and open attacks have been made by the League's agents and members against such honest and patriotic priests as refused to sanction its dangerous proceedings. They were in particular subjected to intimidation in the very sore and tender point of their fees and dues. And on their chapels notices were posted threatening to coerce or starve them into compliance. This agitation, then, if played with by some or ignored by others, has proved a very dangerous weapon, and as yet far more so to the Church of Rome in Ireland than to the Church of Ireland, which it was to starve out with the landlords. We only say, *as yet!*

The present relations of pastor and people in the Church of Rome are not harmonious, and if an Irish Delegate Apostolic is appointed, he will not be envied in his honours or in his task. If he puts down the movement by authority, he will raise a storm and perpetuate and widen the split now existing. If he lets the movement alone, where is the authority of the Church, where the independence of its pastors?

And even compromises will be seen through, and those appearing to lead, but watching to follow, will have but little respect from their flocks and less from their own sense of honour.

And thus it has come to pass that the influence of the Irish Roman Catholic Priesthood, which was the strongest (indeed the only effective) power left to restrain the wild and lawless portion of the population, has been thrown overboard and be-

come of no account. Irish Democracy now has it all its own way. What all this will end in, or pass through, who can tell? Meanwhile, every Patriot and Christian should pray, "God save Ireland"—from herself and her sons.

PHILIP DWYER.

ART. III.—UNBEATEN TRACKS IN JAPAN.

Unbeaten Tracks in Japan: an Account of Travels in the Interior, including Visits to the Aborigines of Yezo and the Shrines of Nikkô and Isé. By ISABELLA L. BIRD, Author of "Six Months in the Sandwich Islands," "A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains," &c. &c. Two vols. with Map and Illustrations. John Murray. 1880.

THE lady to whom we are indebted for this exceedingly interesting work is well known as a traveller and an author. Her graphic and pleasing sketches of the Sandwich Islands, and "A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains"—reviewed in *THE CHURCHMAN* a year ago—have taken a good place among the best books of travel written in recent years. The welcome work before us, "Unbeaten Tracks in Japan," has within a few weeks, we observe, reached a second edition, and it will attain, no doubt, a very large circulation, inasmuch as it supplies a want and is also eminently readable. It is not a "Book on Japan," but a narrative of travels in Japan; and, as the preface tells us, from Nikkô northwards the author's route was altogether off the beaten track, and had never been traversed in its entirety by any European. She lived among the Japanese, and saw their mode of living, in regions unaffected by European contact. Miss Bird, in fact, was the first European lady who had been seen in several districts through which her route lay, and her experiences differed, of course, more or less widely from those of previous travellers. She gives a fuller account of the Ainos, the aborigines of Yezo, obtained by actual acquaintance with them, than has hitherto been offered. The "beaten tracks," indeed, were left almost unnoticed; and, as the description appears in the form of "home" letters written on the spot, the reader is placed in the position of the traveller, and shares the vicissitudes of travel, discomfort, difficulty, and tedium, as well as novelty and enjoyment.¹

¹ "Having been recommended to leave home, in April, 1873," writes Miss Bird, "in order to recruit my health by means which had proved serviceable before, I decided to visit Japan, attracted less by the reputed excellence of its climate than by the certainty that it possessed, in an