

*An Answer to*  
REV. WALTER McDONALD

Dunboyne Establishment, Maynooth

APOLOGIST FOR ENGLISH RULE

---

The new and widely-advertised book, "Some Ethical Questions of Peace and War with Special References to Ireland," found to be a compilation of errors, misstatements and eccentric views, is being frequently quoted by those opposing independence and freedom for Ireland; consequently its true character should be clearly understood in America.

---

By DANIEL T. O'CONNELL, LL.D.

Member, American Bar Association

Director, Friends of Irish Freedom National Bureau of Information

DREW  
THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY

JUN 16 1920

LIBRARY

MADISON, N. J.

FRIENDS OF IRISH FREEDOM  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF INFORMATION

Washington, D. C.



## INTRODUCTION

Those who clutch at any straw, as support for opposition to giving liberty and independence to Ireland, are of late quoting liberally from a book written by the Reverend Walter McDonald of Ireland. The title is *Some Ethical Questions of Peace and War with Special References to Ireland*. The enemies of Ireland rejoice at the opportunity of quoting an Irish priest, who placed himself in opposition to practically the entire hierarchy and priesthood of Ireland. That the author was one individual priest, standing alone and apart from approximately six thousand other Irish priests and bishops, is carefully hidden by those who, like the recently visiting Carson delegation of clergymen, make frequent reference to Doctor McDonald as an opponent of independent nationhood. These pro-English well-wishers are satisfied that they have at least one priest to quote.

The English supporters are striving to obtain widespread circulation in America for Doctor McDonald's writings. Ireland as an independent nation follows the United States in enunciating and enforcing the right of free speech. It is, however, an unfortunate and deadly parallel, that, while the government of the Irish republic accords liberty of speech and writing to all, the English authorities who Doctor McDonald believed should continue in control of Ireland, throw into prison men, women and even youths who, like Doctor McDonald, publicly express their political thoughts. These advocates of freedom and independence are imprisoned, or hounded with the apprehension that a prison will be their lot; whereas Doctor McDonald, the opponent of freedom and independence was "signally distinguished" by the authorities as a "man of independent mind and action."

The Friends of Irish Freedom National Bureau of Information would pay little if any attention to the book under discussion, were it not for the malign dangers lurking within its pages. To disregard it further is invitation to Ireland's enemies in America to continue quoting errors, misstatements and eccentric arguments of the author who, among his fellow-clergy, while respected for his priestly virtues and scholarly attainments, was like many American scholars, unfortunately on the wrong side of a great public question.

Since the writing of this review and while this pamphlet was actually on the press the news of the death of Dr. McDonald, at Maynooth, reached this country. It is realized that this pamphlet must now go unanswered by the author of the book which it exposes. But it is none the less certain that the book will continue to be used by those opposed to Irish freedom as a basis for unfair argument. For this reason it is deemed necessary that all Americans who believe in fair play be given an opportunity of estimating the work at its true value.

DANIEL T. O'CONNELL.

## AN UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT AT ETHICAL PROPAGANDA

### The Prophet of Maynooth

The Reverend Walter McDonald, is Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, Maynooth. His book was published in London and bears the 'Nihil Obstat' of Thomas Bergh, Abb., O.S.B., and the 'Imprimatur' of Edm. Can. Surmont, Vic. Gen., Westmonasterii.

One lays down the book with a sense of perplexity that anybody calling himself an Irishman could have composed such an indecent diatribe against the history and the hopes of his own people, and that a man, presumably engaged in scholarly pursuits, could have attached his name to such a senseless excursion into the region of Ethics and Politics. It is an ineffective book: a combination of Berserker fury and fishwife incoherence. It exhibits that 'war-madness', that lust for killing and destruction with which drill-sergeants sought to imbue the hapless recruits who fell to their ministrations in the war time. Philip Gibbs describes it. (*Now It Can Be Told*, page 111).

"Colonel Ronald Campbell was a great lecturer on bayonet exercise. He curdled the blood of boys with his eloquence on the method of attack to pierce liver and lights and kidneys of the enemy. He made their eyes bulge out of their heads, fired them with blood-lust, stoked up hatred of Germans—all in a quiet, earnest, persuasive voice, and a latent power and passion in him. He told funny stories—one, famous in the army, called 'Where's 'Arry?'"

"It was the story of an attack on German trenches in which a crowd of Germans were captured in a dugout. The sergeant had been told to blood his men, and during the killing he turned around and asked, 'Where's 'Arry?' 'Arry 'asn't 'ad a go yet.'"

"'Arry was a timid boy, who shrank from butcher's work, but he was called up and given his man to kill. And after that 'Arry was like a man-eating tiger in his desire for German blood."

Some malign influence must have been at work to induce this 'Arry of the Dunboyne Establishment to take his initiation in blood-letting by a perverse and perverted attack on the helpless nation to which he belongs. It must be admitted, in justice to Dr. McDonald that he draws no blood. He deals only with stuffed dummies. The Ireland he assails is not the Ireland of fact or history. The figures at which he aims his rusty ethical bayonet have no semblance of reality and might pass for anything at all only that they have labels. It is a sort of Charlie Chaplin contest: something to be laughed at, not to be taken seriously.

### Unscientific Propaganda

The book is divided into two parts: one dealing with Questions of Peace, the other with Questions of War. The first part consists of eleven chapters and a supplement; the second of seven chapters and an 'author's apology'. As far as can be judged the writer intended that the book should pass as an academic discussion on current Irish politics and on certain problems arising out of the recent war. It is presumably an effort to view these matters from the standpoint of Catholic Ethics. The position which Dr. McDonald holds, at Maynooth, may, rightly or wrongly, be regarded as giving him some standing as an authority on the subject of Ethics, but every page of his book makes it abundantly clear that he is utterly incompetent to speak on any matter involving a knowledge of History or of



Politics or of the Science of Government. By a strange and incomprehensible obliquity of intellectual vision he makes the admission himself, time after time, that he does not know the facts or the situations under discussion, but by some equally strange perversion of purpose he attempts to apply general principles to them.

The reason for writing the book seems to have been to combat and to controvert the position of the people of Ireland that English interference should cease because Ireland is a nation and therefore entitled to the status and treatment of a nation. A large number of quotations are given in the first chapter expressing this view—quotations from the statements of Bishops, Members of Parliament, the Sinn Féin clergy and others, and from Dr. Coffey, Professor of Philosophy in Maynooth College, who seems to be the villain of the piece. In the most approved fashion of the scholastic disputant, and with Dr. Coffey directly in the line of fire, the author moves on to battle thus: "His [Dr. Coffey's] argument, which seems to represent the mind of Sinn Féin, may be reduced to the following syllogism: No fully independent nation ceases to be so *de jure*, except by the free consent of its people; but Ireland was at one time a nation fully independent, while its people never fully consented to resign that status; therefore she is *de jure* fully independent now."

#### Unity of Sovereignty

The valiant Prefect of the Dunboyne continues: "Here we have as major premiss what purports to be a universal principle of Ethics; particularized in the minor by two statements of fact. And although, perhaps, criticism should begin with the major, as to which alone I can claim any special competence, I will ask the reader's forbearance, while I deal with the statements of fact in the first place; under promise of criticizing the ethical principle in due course."

Without admitting that any Sinn Féiner would put the case for Irish independence in this fashion, it must, in all fairness be admitted that that author does no damage to Dr. Coffey or his supposed syllogism in either of the two chapters he devotes to the purpose. McDonald opens his attack by attempting to define what he refers to as "conditions of nationhood". He breaks down at the very beginning. He betrays his ignorance of Political Science in the first paragraph, and shows clearly that he does not know even the ordinary terminology of the subject. He makes no distinction between 'nation' and 'state'; he speaks of 'unity of rule' when apparently he means 'unity of sovereignty'; he confounds racial ties with political allegiance. His argument that Ireland was never a united and fully independent nation is as follows: Unity of rule is a requisite of nationhood; Ireland never had 'unity of rule'; therefore Ireland was never a nation.

The author finds confirmation of his assertion that Ireland never had 'unity of rule' in the statements of certain historians. He quotes D'Alton to the effect that: "In pagan times Ireland must not be regarded as one kingdom, governed by one king and one common system of laws; it was rather a *confederation* of small states or clans each making its own laws, and practically independent within its own limits." Professor MacNeill—whom he calls 'the latest and best authority' is his authority for the statement that Niall is possibly the first person who can possibly be recognized as *King of all Ireland*. Other authors are cited, but the tenor of what they say is the same.

#### Ireland a Nation

This attack on the postulate that Ireland has historical claims to the rank of nationhood may be taken as a typical example of the method of argument and proof found throughout the book, of the author's ignorance of the subject of Political Science and of his paucity of vocabulary. Let us see if we cannot

translate into intelligible language what he may have meant. In all probability what he could not say was, that 'unity of sovereignty' not 'unity of rule' is a requisite of nationhood, or better—of statehood. Unity of sovereignty, however is found in states that have a *federal* form of government as well as in those that have a *unitary* form of government. A study of any elementary manual on the subject might have saved the "Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment" from his blunder. Holt, for instance, is very clear. He says (page 11): "In unitary governments the system provides that one central organization shall administer the supreme authority." "In federal governments, on the other hand, the various powers of government are distributed according to their nature between (1) the central organization representing the whole state and (2) the several local organizations representing divisions of the state." "It must be remembered, however, that the *state*, by virtue of its sovereignty (*supreme power*), can establish and distribute the powers of *government* as it wills. Indivisible and independent sovereignty is an attribute of the *state* and not of the *government*."

#### The Act of Union

In an attempt to show that Ireland acquiesced in the loss of independence the author embarks on the very dangerous sea of history. His proofs, directed against the devoted head of Dr. Coffey his *bête-noire*, are very few. He first tries to show that the Irish submitted to Henry II. Professor MacNeill, "the latest and best authority" assures us that: "The most casual reader of Irish History knows that within a few centuries of the Norman invasion, the authority of the King of England had shrunk to within a day's ride of Dublin and the outskirts of a few other towns." (*Phases of Irish History*, p. 321). McDonald says the Irish submitted to Richard II. Green (*History of the English People*, Vol. 1, p. 520) speaking of Richard II, says: "The opening

of the campaign was indecisive, and it was not until fresh reinforcements arrived at Dublin that the king could prepare a march into the heart of the island. But, while he planned the conquest of Ireland, news came that England was lost." McDonald says the Irish surrendered to the Tudors and the Stuarts. If so this was nullified by the action of Charles II. "If he could not undo what the Puritans had done in England, Charles could undo their work in Scotland and in Ireland. \* \* \* In his refusal to recognize the Union, Charles was supported by public opinion among his English subjects." (Green, Vol. IV p. 345.)

Fortunately we are spared the task of denying that the Penal Laws were an acknowledgment of submission on the part of the Irish. But we do meet with the amazing statement that O'Connell recognized the validity of the Act of Union. McDonald says: "It may be argued with a fair show of reason, that O'Connell recognized the Union as valid, and the Parliament at Westminster as having jurisdiction over Ireland." Nobody possessed of a spark of reason and knowing anything about O'Connell would argue in any such fashion. O'Connell himself said just the contrary. In a speech at Mullaghmast in 1843 he said: "The Union is totally void of principle and of constitutional force. The Irish people nominated them (the Parliament) to make laws and not legislatures. They were appointed to act under the Constitution and not to annihilate it. \* \* \* The Union is not supported by Constitutional right. \* \* \* The Union therefore, is totally void—is an unconstitutional law, etc."

#### Futile Logic-Chopping

The author begins his fourth chapter with the observation: "It is a relief to pass from these comparatively unimportant questions of history to the broad ethical principle that serves as major premiss in Dr. Coffey's argument." To this his readers will gladly subscribe. He does not, however, abandon the his-



torical argument. He uses it, page after page in futile logic-chopping. He continues his attempt to prove that the Irish did acknowledge English domination. He discusses the purely speculative question whether nationhood can be lost without acquiescence, and then finds himself, by the force of his own arguments in a cul-de-sac. To escape, he denies all that he tried to prove in the preceding chapters, and he tries to corner Dr. Coffey. In justice to the Dunboyne sage, it is only fair to say that he *seems* to deny what he said. His words may mean anything or nothing. It would be a nice thing for Dr. Coffey to write a commentary on them. Here they are: "If it is silly to maintain that there can be no prescription between nations, it is just as silly to require as a condition of validity an acknowledgement of the usurped claims on the part of the victim nation. No plundered people ever yet made such an acknowledgement; except, as just explained, in the sense that, where a social upheaval has settled definitely, so that it cannot be unsettled now without general confusion, it is unreasonable, and therefore wrong, to be the cause of this." It is against the spirit of modern democracy to inflict cruel and inhuman punishments, but it was necessary to quote this passage at length in order to show the author in his favorite pose as Sir Oracle.

Chapter six is entitled, "Of the Effect of a Transfer of Jurisdiction Secured by Corruption". Translated into English the title of the chapter ought to be: Was the Act of Union Passed by Fraud? It is an interesting chapter because the author starts from nowhere and he arrives nowhere. He admits, in the first paragraph, that he has no theological authority for what he is going to say; in the second he speaks of analogies and makes the mistake of confounding the acts of boodle-aldermen with those of the men who voted for the Union; in the third he refers to the election of unworthy clergymen to ecclesiastical benefices; then he takes wing to discourse on

the "Ethics of Agency"; he comes back to earth to discuss the "Commission of Grattan's Parliament", and misses the point by confounding parliamentary corruption with constitutional authority; then he lays down a *principle*, and immediately proceeds to say: "I do not presume to say that this is the true *principle* that governs the question." Even in the edifying work of chasing his own tail Dr. McDonald is not a success.

#### The Ethics of Combination

Chapter seven embodies the author's Philosophy of History. This is expressed in what he modestly calls a Principle of Combination. It is as follows: "A time may come in the development of peoples, when their interest requires them to combine, for advance and protection; and when this happens they do wrong to maintain separate independence. It is, in my opinion, the mistake, amounting to crime, committed not only by the Red Indian and other uncultured tribes, but by the Irish clans, and by the ancient Greeks, the most cultured people known to history. It was a crime against patriotism; which, wherever committed, called down its own punishment." The author goes on to prove that this union and combination may "be secured by pressure". In other words he is an advocate of Imperialism and Militarism, and thus places himself, knowingly or unknowingly, in the position of upholding the evils which the world is praying to be rid of. The *principle*, however, is not without merit. It will serve Dr. Coffey as a kind of bomb-proof. Speaking a few pages earlier of the iniquities of the white man's conquest of peoples of a different color, and holding Dr. Coffey up to scorn and obloquy as a person who would condone all the crimes of all the conquerors, the gentle Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, shrieked at him: "perhaps if Dr. Coffey were made Archbishop of New York, or Boston, or Sydney, he would deem it his duty to hand over

to the natural heirs of its former proprietors the real estate of the diocese—churches and presbyteries; diocesan seminary; and so much other ecclesiastical property." Should Dr. Coffey ever be confronted with this practical difficulty (Dr. McDonald has, of course, no episcopal aspirations) he can fall back on the plea that the Red men of Manhattan or of Boston were guilty of sinning against one of Dr. McDonald's ethical principles, and that they deserved all they got.

Continuing his discussion of his principle of Combination, the author goes on to discuss the question of Irish trade. He asks triumphantly "Who Saved Our Trade?" He answers himself in several pages. We can answer the question in a sentence. The English saved it: they salted it for England.

#### The Core of the Argument

The eighth chapter may, in all justice, be called the heart of the book. It is the heart of the book physically, and dialectically and constructively. Physically, not only because it is in the middle of book (it runs from page 90 to 99) but because all that the author says converges thereto or radiates therefrom; dialectically because the author reaches in this chapter a height of argumentative subtlety that he attains nowhere else; and constructively because this chapter is the most original, the most novel contribution on the subject of self-determination that has yet flashed across a war-darkened world. In his initial paragraph the author goes so far as to say that he admits there is such a thing as a principle of self-determination; but he complains that it is, as a rule, rhetorically worded, as for instance in two formulae which he gives. They are as follows: "Nations are entitled to govern themselves." "No government is legitimate without the consent of the governed." It must gall a stylist, like Dr. McDonald, to have to endure such rhetorical offences. But he does not name the guilty persons, and he does himself great honor in not doing so. The

principle was never so formulated in public and Dr. McDonald keeps the secret locked away in his own bosom. We suspect that is wasn't Dr. Coffey.

Having made it clear that he does hold to the principle of self-determination the good man moves on majestically to his next point which is, that the principle is "conditioned"; then he falls back on his favorite principle of Development, and having disposed of these necessary preliminaries he comes to the great revelation. He says: "It is not among nations only that the law of self-determination holds, but in every form of life; wherein also we may see how it is conditioned. Everyone knows how strawberry-plants sent out runners, with a tendency to develop roots at certain nodes; whereby when these rootlets strike in a suitable place, new plants are formed." Should the principle of self-determination be violated in the case of the strawberry-runner, tragedy follows. "Sever it before the time when the new roots have struck, and what might have been a fruitful plant will wither."

More heinous still is the effect of interfering with the due working of the Principle of self-determination (the rhetorical one) among bees. What happens to the bees is too tearful to mention.

This exposition of the doctrine of self-determination is a new Magna Charta. It means a new world with hitherto undreamt of possibilities. Self-determination for anything and everybody, that is, "conditioned" self-determination, for seals and bees and cockroaches, for cabbages and kings. Self-determination implies the possession of will; the possession of will involves responsibility; responsibility demands rules of conduct; rules of conduct are laid down by Possessors of Ethics. For these reasons, and for many others it is obvious that the Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment will not have done his full duty to the world until he has written a Handbook of Ethics for self-determining strawberry runners and a Treatise



on the International Obligations of Free-Will Bees. In fact it may be said without exaggeration that until these momentous matters are disposed of, man will continue to inhabit his truncated cosmos, and that he will run the risk of destruction through his failure to adopt the manners and customs of the kitchen-garden and the bee-hive.

### The Downward Curve

From this famous eighth chapter the quality of the work falls off both in theme and in treatment. As a preliminary to discussing the question of Home Rule the author sets forth his views on the subject of Majority Rule. He argues: "In democratic countries the holders of power are elected by the people, i. e., by the majority; and it is a further democratic principle that 'minorities must suffer': \* \* \* The consent of the governed, in this way, becomes the consent of the majority; while minorities are governed against their will. They consent, if you like, conditionally, rather than break away or leave the country. But would they be allowed to break away? Practically, they are forced to stay and submit to alien rule."

It is not surprising that a man with such retroverted views on popular government should find himself out of sympathy with the democratically-minded 'majority' in his own country, and hopelessly at variance with the ideals and purpose of the present. In a Democracy there is no such *principle* as "minorities must suffer." Minorities are not ruled against their will. Their will is that the majority must rule. By what means does the sapient "Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment" think that a disgruntled minority could effect its "get-away". And on the supposition that they did take it into their minds to move to a place where majorities were never heard of, who would try to prevent them? In all democracies there are minorities. Where and when did this reactionary from another age ever hear a representative of some

minority refer to the rule of the majority as "alien rule". Alien rule is foreign rule. Are there no dictionaries in the Dunboyne Establishment?

Concern for the minority leads the author into some strange perversions of fact. He says: "There are people who, though numerous, educated, wealthy, and very able, have a majority nowhere, practically. Where, for instance, is any government in the hands of Jews? \* \* \* As Hebrew Nationalists they rule nowhere." We might ask: where is any government not in the hands of the Jews. The question is obviously not one of Nationality but of citizenship. The Jew does not desire political power as a Jew, but as a citizen in the country to which he belongs. He is usually very ready to express his appreciation of the liberty he enjoys where majority rule prevails, and if he aims at political reform, his plea is in the interest of political progress not of Judaism.

### An Embarrassing Position

The author's utter ignorance of the fundamentals of democratic theory and practice lands him, as might be expected, in what he is pleased to designate as "conflicting principles." This *impasse* he describes as follows: "Self-government is right and due where and in so far as the people concerned are ripe for it, by development; and where and in so far as it does not interfere with any larger union which, as we have seen, the law of development may require." After all this rodomontade he admits "it is not for Ethics to determine the proportion in which both those principles should be applied in any particular case". He then, caught as he is in the meshes of his own fallacies, casts Ethics and principles aside, and makes the humiliating admission: "It is a question of business-statesmanship. \* \* \* Ethics accepts and ratifies the conclusion at which statesmanship arrives." Thus it seems the matter was one of practical politics not of principle or of conflicting principles. It is a peculiar

conception of Ethics, however, which divorces politics from morals and from Ethics, and which reduces the work of the moralist and the Professor of Ethics to the duty of giving formal consent and approval to whatever has been done in the name of statesmanship and politics. The King can do no wrong.

The deeper the author attempts to penetrate into the workings of the democratic principles of government the more deeply does he involve himself in difficulties of his own making. Speaking of "Majority Rule and the Ulster Question", (Chap. X) he states as his general inference that: "It may be said with truth that democratic local government, in every form, is based on the principle of *minority* rule, as well as on that of government by the majority." He goes on to say, in spite of his previous assertion, that: "in all democratic countries the holders of power are elected by the people; that is, by the majority." "It may be well to note that the principle does not apply to those who form but a minority in any realm or district." On the basis of this method of argumentation he contends that Ulster should be cut off from the rest of Ireland. But if Ireland is a realm—and it is so designated in English Law—under the same principle and with more logic Ulster should not be cut off from the rest of Ireland. The trouble with the squint-eyed man is that one never knows whether he is going to go where he is looking, or whether he is looking where he is going to go.

The last chapter of the first part of the book is entitled: "Of the Basis of Taxation; and of the Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland." The author makes an observation to which all his readers will yield ready assent. "Here the student of Ethics, however expert, has little competence." That statement, as far as it applies to the Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, is absolutely and unqualifiedly exact.

### Academic Flights

In the second part of the book the author seems to draw his robe of professorial aloofness around him and to touch on the merely terrestrial with repugnance while he expresses himself on questions of a purely academic character. He takes up such matters as Conscription, the Causes that Justify War, the Pressure that may be applied to secure Local Self-Government, the Conduct of War, and Some Consequences of War. This whole section of the book is a repository of strange and bizarre views and opinions. For instance, under the heading, Causes that Justify War, we are treated to disquisitions on such topics as, German Invasion of Belgium, Anticipating Aggression, the Boer War, the United States and Japan, Protection of Missionaries, the Monroe Doctrine, Missionaries of Commerce, etc.

One of the strangest attempts to justify the presence of the English in Ireland is that which occurs under the heading 'Protection of Missionaries.' The English under Henry II it would appear came to Ireland as missionaries, by virtue of a papal commission. This method of spreading the light is also represented as being in conformity with papal policy and traditional papal doctrine. The same sacredness or nearly the same sacredness which attaches to the persons of missionaries of religion ought, in the opinion of the author, to attach to the persons of missionaries of commerce.

Most of the matters touched on in the chapters on the "Conduct of War" are usually dealt with in the Articles of War drawn up for the guidance of soldiers in the field by civilized governments. Dr. McDonald does not seem to have any idea that such regulations are in existence. Under some of the headings in his various chapters he might have included a short discussion of his own conduct in writing such a book as the present. It might come in for notice very aptly in connection with such matters as the use of gas-bombs,



or the methods to be followed in dealing with Traitors, Cowards, and Deserters.

#### Peroration

The work is brought to a close with an Appendix, in which the author undertakes to show that Ireland has been benefited by the Act of Union. He discusses in particular the subject of 'Diminishing population' and that of 'vanishing industries'. In both matters he gives England and English administration in Ireland a clean record. "It was not the Union that caused either emigration or immigration; but the development of steam-power, with the opening up of so much new territory." He does not say why those two causes operated so differently in Ireland and in other countries. Population increased everywhere else. Neither does he allow Irishmen to hug the illusion that it was the spirit of adventure or the laudable desire to risk one's fortune in a new country that drew the Irishmen away from Ireland. He does not seem to have a high opinion of the men who crossed the seas at a time when "land was to be had for nothing in the Mississippi valley, and when gold could be picked up by California rivers." He knows little of the pioneer frontiersman and the Argonaut. The country to which they came, however, knows their quality and their character. In the opinion of Dr. McDonald the Irish fail in Ireland because they have not the qualities, in Ireland or elsewhere, which make for success. He says: "The fact is, I fear, that we Gaels have not the business turn of mind, and so do not build factories even now, anywhere: on the banks of Hudson or Mississippi any more than on Suir or Liffey." The fact is that "we Gaels" do build factories by the Hudson and the Mississippi, and by the Missouri and the Monongahela, and by the Gulf and the Great Lakes. Great factories have been built and great mines have been opened by "Gaels", in fact some of the leaders in the development of the greatest com-

mercial and industrial nation of them all have been Gaels.

Through the entire book there runs the same lamentable unfamiliarity with fact, the same uncertainty in regard to actual conditions in Ireland and elsewhere. The author never seems to be sure of his footing, never sure of the things about which he is trying to pass judgment. He bridges his uncertain progress with the phrases, "I believe," "I fancy", "I have no competence", "I leave it to," etc. He fancies the relations between Germany and Belgium were like the relations between individual landlords, (159); he fancies that American jurists do not dispute this, (162); he fancies few Catholic Irishmen complain, (168); he believes there was once a Pope, (163); he is unable to decide, (164), etc., etc.

The book as it stands will be of no interest, no value, to anybody who seeks a little light on the Irish Question in a quarter from which it might naturally be expected to come. The author seems to be quite satisfied to ensconce himself in a nest of fragments of political wisdom and rags of ethical theory, and from there to croak his maledictions on the world, especially on that part of it round about him. When he does spread his wings over the abysmal depths lying under such questions as the Monroe Doctrine, the Basis for Taxation, Do Separate Tariffs make for Imperial Strength, he is hardly to be blamed if his eyes, blinded with pique, do not see these problems even in outline.

#### Inept Propaganda

The book will arouse pity, not resentment. Pity because the author employed his unskilled pen in such a bad and unworthy cause. He has had no training in the field of politics nor in that of history. He has picked up a certain number of the terms in common use among writers and speakers on social and political topics, and these terms he throws around with apparently the same sense of values that a native of the Adamnan Islands would display

with a pocket full of silver and copper currency. The tone of the book is bad. Its direct attack on the opinions of others, its sour sciolism, its peevish anilities, its futile questioning, its manifest purpose to manoeuvre opponents into a false position, its disjointed dialectics, its lack of critical exactness, its bombastic parade of superior knowledge, all tend to arouse in the reader a spirit of hostility and antipathy, which the purpose of the book will intensify. The arguments are too futile, the lan-

guage too crude to give any ground for the belief that the book will aid the cause which it upholds or injure that against which it is directed. No penny whistle can add much to the volume of anti-Irish propaganda which now fills the world, and the unskilled player who forces himself into the band can hope for nothing, when he has ceased to be a laughing stock to the bandsmen and their employers but to be taken by the scruff of the neck and kicked out without guerdon or thanks.