





ARCHIBALD HAMILTON ROWAN.

THE
UNITED IRISHMEN
THEIR
LIVES AND TIMES

WITH SEVERAL ADDITIONAL MEMOIRS, AND AUTHENTIC
DOCUMENTS, HERETOFORE UNPUBLISHED: THE WHOLE
MATTER NEWLY ARRANGED AND REVISED

BY
RICHARD R. MADDEN, F.R.C.S., M.R.I.A.

*Edited by JAMES J. O'NEILL,
Librarian, University College, Dublin.*

WITH NUMEROUS ILLUSTRATIONS



MARTIN LESTER, Ltd.,
78 HARCOURT STREET, DUBLIN

920 ~~091~~.
BK.

36, 20

MEMOIR OF ARCHIBALD HAMILTON ROWAN.

CHAPTER I.

A. H. Rowan was descended of a Scotch family, whose earliest representative of any note was Hans Hamilton, Vicar of Dunlop, in Cunningham. From this person the Hamiltons of Killyleagh have their descent. The first settler of this family in Ireland, in Lord Bacon's poetical phraseology, had his "honours most plentifully watered" with extensive grants of territory in Ireland, which had been forfeited to the crown in former reigns, a great part of which was in the County Down, and amongst these, the castle and lands of Killyleagh, which had formerly belonged to the Irish sept of the O'Nial. Strange to say, the old Anglican colonists in Ireland, whose honours were watered most plentifully with grants of forfeited estates, furnished descendents amongst whom are to be traced at least two-thirds of the principal leaders of the United Irishmen.

The father of Archibald Hamilton Rowan was Gawen Hamilton of Killyleagh. His mother was the only daughter of William Rowan, and widow of Tichborne Aston, Esq., of Beaulieu, near Drogheda, in the County of Louth—a lady also of Scotch descent, whose family had settled in Ireland in the reign of James I. Gawen Hamilton and his lady having removed to London, their eldest child, A. H. Rowan, was born there the 12th of May, 1757. He spent some time at a preparatory school in London, and was then sent to Westminster School, and in due time to Cambridge, where he became intimately acquainted with the Rev. John Jebb, a fellow of Peterhouse College, whose religious and political sentiments interfering with his profession in the church and position in the University, he resigned his living and abandoned his college, rather than "*act a lie weekly in the presence of the God of truth*". In the winter succeeding his matriculation, A. H. Rowan made a tour into Holland, accompanied by his fellow-students, Sir John Borlase Warren and Mr. Newcomb. On his return he was prevailed on to accompany to America, Lord Charles Montague, who had been appointed Governor of South Carolina, invested with the character of his Lordship's private secretary. He arrived there during the bickerings that were going on between England and her colonies. After three months sojourn in Charleston, he returned to England, being then twenty-four years of age. A fellow-student, Mr. Topham, who at this time edited a paper called the *World*, gave a

series of characters of young men about town who had figured at Westminster or Eton, and amongst them is to be found a very graphic portraiture of the subject of this memoir.

"About this time (says Rowan in his autobiography), Mr. Topham, who had been my contemporary at Cambridge, and who was the editor of the *World*, a new and fashionable paper, gave a series of characters of the young men who had figured about London, and who had been educated at Westminster or Eton schools. The following appeared under the head of

" ' Westminster.

" ' Hamilton.—Everything is the creature of accident. As that works upon time and place, so are the vicissitudes which follow: vicissitudes that reach through the whole allotment of men—even to the charm of character, and the qualities which produce it.

" ' Physically speaking, human nature can redress itself of climate, can generate warmth in high latitudes, and cold at the equator; but in respect to mind and manners, from the law of latitude there is no appeal. Man, like the plants that grow for him, has a proper sky and soil: with them to flourish; without them to fade. Through either kingdom, vegetable and moral, in situations that are equatic, the Alpine nature cannot live !

" ' All this applies to Hamilton—wasting himself at Westminster !

' Wild Nature's vigour working at its root'.

His situation should have been, accordingly, where he might have spread wide and struck deep.

" ' With more than boyish aptitudes and abilities, he should not thus have been lost among boys. His incessant intrepidity, his restless curiosity, his undertaking spirit, all indicated early maturity—all should have led to pursuits, if not better, at least of more spirit and moment, than the mere mechanism of dead language !

" ' This, by Hamilton disdaining as a business what as an amusement perhaps might have delighted him, was deemed a dead letter ! and as such neglected, while he bestowed himself on other mechanism presenting more material objects to the mind.

" ' Exercises out of school took place of exercises within. Not that, like Sackville or Hawkins, he had a ball at every leisure in his hand; but preferably to fives or cricket, he would amuse himself in mechanical pursuits, little in themselves, but great as to what they might have been convertible.

“ ‘ In the fourth form he produced a *red shoe* of his own making; and though he never made a *pocket watch*, and probably might mar many, yet all the interior machinery he knew and could name: the whole movement he took to pieces and replaced.

“ ‘ The man who is to find out the longitude, cannot have beginnings better than these. Count Bruhl, since Mudge’s death, the best watch-maker of his time, did not raise more early wonder.

“ ‘ Besides this, Hamilton was to be found in every daring oddity. Lords Burlington and Kent, in all their rage for pediments, were nothing to him in a rage for pediments. For often has the morning caught him scaling the high pediments of the school door, and at peril of his life, clambering down, opening the door within, before the boy who kept the gate could come with the key. His evenings set upon no less perils: in pranks with gunpowder, in leaping from unusual heights into the Thames! As a practical geographer of London, and Heaven only knows how many miles round, *omniscient Jackson* himself could not know more.

“ ‘ All this surely was intrinsically right—wrong only in its direction. Had he been sent to Woolwich, he might have come out, if not a rival of the Duke of Richmond, at least a first-rate engineer. In economic arts and improvements nothing less than national, he might have been the Duke of Bridgewater of Ireland. Had the sea been his profession, Lord Mulgrave might have been less alone in the rare union of science and enterprise.

“ ‘ But all this capability of usefulness and fair fame was brought to nought by the obstinate absurdity of the people about him. Nothing could wean them from Westminster. His grandfather, Rowan or Rohan, fellow of Trinity College, and afterwards King’s Counsel in Ireland, having quitted that kingdom, resided in Rathbone Place, possessed of great wealth, tenacious of his opinions, and absolute nonsense was his conduct to his grandson. He persevered in the school, where, if a boy disaffects book-knowledge, his books are only bought and sold. And after Westminster, when the old man died, as if solicitous that everything about his grave but poppy and mandragora should grow downwards, his will declared his grandson the heir, but not to inherit till he graduated at Cambridge.

“ ‘ To Cambridge, therefore, he went; where, having pursued his studies, as it is called, in a ratio inverse and descending, he might have gone on from bad to worse, and so, as many do, putting a grave face upon it, he might have had his degree. But his animal spirits and love of bustle could not go off thus undistinguished; and so, after coolly attempting to throw a tutor into the Cam—after shaking

all Cambridge from its propriety by a night's frolic, in which he climbed the sign-posts and changed the principal signs, he was rusticated, till the good humour of the university returning, he was readmitted, and enabled to satisfy his grandfather's will.

" 'Through the intercourse of private life he is very amiable. The same suavity of speech, courteous attention, and general good nature he had when a boy, are continued and improved. Good qualities the more to be prized, as the less probable, from his bold and eager temper, from the turbulence of his wishes, and the hurry of his pursuits' ! "

In the winter succeeding his matriculation in Cambridge, during vacation, accompanied by his fellow-students, Sir John Borlase Warren and Mr. Newcombe, he made a tour in Holland; and on his return he accompanied Lord Charles Montague, Governor of South Carolina, then on leave of absence in England, to America, and in the nominal office of private secretary of his lordship, was taken on board the *vessel of war appointed to convey the governor to his destination*.

The commencements of revolutions are stirring subjects of meditation for a young man of any temperament; but for one of Rowan's ardent feelings, chivalrous sentiments, and enthusiastic nature, the spectacle of those vast interests and opinions of opposed classes, coming into collision in the old and the new world, in France and America, could not fail to leave very deep and lasting impressions. However, after having spent nearly three months at Charleston, he returned to England, and was soon figuring in a martial character, "quartered at Gosport, as captain of grenadiers in the Huntingdon militia". After some months of campaigning in country towns, ball-rooms, public-promenades, race-courses, &c., he again visited France, and made a lengthened sojourn in Paris, and, subsequently, made a tour in Portugal and some parts of Spain and Italy.

In 1781, Rowan, then residing with his mother in France, married a young Irish lady of the name of Dawson, daughter of Walter Dawson of Lisanisk, near Carrickmacross. The marriage was celebrated in the Dutch Ambassador's chapel in Paris.

In 1784 Rowan left France for Ireland, and henceforward made that country his settled place of abode. He first established himself in a small cottage near Naas, in the County Kildare, but after a short residence there, purchased Rathcoffy* in the same County.

Mr. Rowan is truly described by Topham as an able man, of great energies and heroic courage, chivalrous to an extent hardly credible in those times—a bold and original

* Rathcoffy was formerly the residence of the Wogan family.

thinker, of strong convictions, resolute in upholding his views of what he conceived to be the right, and needing only to have his noble energies properly directed, to become a great public character, an ornament to his country, and a man most useful to the state.

This promising young man returned to his native land at a critical period of its history. Ireland was a bad field for the energies and principles of a man like Rowan. To manifest any feelings hostile to oppression of any kind was to become a marked man, dangerous to the faction that ruled the Irish state—a man to be closely watched, to be ensnared if possible, and inveigled into some course of action which the law could reach, and to be made away with in due time.

A young girl, of the name of Mary Neil, aged fourteen years, was kidnapped by a woman of bad character, named Mary Llewellyn, and placed in the power of a person of high rank. The gentleman contrived to keep himself safe from a prosecution, by persuading the unfortunate agent of his crimes that she had nothing to fear from a trial.

Mary Llewellyn was tried and sentenced to death, but by the interest of her influential friend she obtained a reprieve on the day she was to be executed.

Though no prosecution could reach the cautious and powerful gentleman, the public knew the man, and common fame, which is sometimes correct in its surmises, laid the crime to the account of a noble and gallant loyalist of the day.

Mr. Hamilton Rowan took an active part in the conviction of the procuress, and Dr. Boyton, who attended the injured child, wrote a pamphlet and a narrative of the case, which was so plainly worded, as to amount to a demonstration to Lord Carhampton, that he was the person alluded to as the accomplice of Llewellyn.

["We give great honour in these parts to our northern friend, Hamilton Rowan, for his manly and spirited exertions in that monstrous business of Llewellyn, which has sunk with us the reputation of the chief governor much below par, and it never was above it".

Haliday to Charlemont. Charlemont Correspondence, vol. 2, p. 86.]

His lordship sent a Mr. Toomey to Dr. Boyton, to demand an apology for the injury offered to his lordship's reputation. Dr. Boyton received the messenger with becoming spirit and politeness, and, perhaps, would have condescended to meet the chief of the Luttrells; but, unfortunately, at the moment, Mr. Hamilton Rowan rapped at Boyton's door, and as he was interested in the business, the doctor explained the nature of Mr. Toomey's visit. Mr. Rowan, with the presence of mind which distinguished

him, expressed his surprise that Lord Carhampton could expect that Dr. Boyton should be called on by his lordship to apologize for an offence which did not exist, only by the application of his lordship of certain words which he chose to consider as directed to himself. The pamphlet was silent as to Lord Carhampton, and must be supposed as not bearing any allusion to his lordship. "Therefore", said Mr. Rowan, "it would be indecorous and absurd in Dr. Boyton to account for an offence not committed, nor warranted by any expressed allusion to Lord Carhampton. But", said Mr. Rowan, "if Lord Carhampton admits that he is the culprit, it is my opinion that Dr. Boyton should entertain the message, and in this view of the business, we shall wait until Mr. Toomey consults his lordship on the propriety or prudence of claiming a reparation of his honour from Dr. Boyton, by acknowledging his guilt and pleading to infamy". Mr. Toomey retired with this answer, but never returned.

However, the affair did not end here. Mr. Rowan waited on his lordship next day with a message from Dr. Boyton, demanding an explanation for the intrusion made on the doctor, and the demand made for an apology for an offence which his lordship appeared to admit, by retracting his accusation, and retiring from the investigation which he provoked, when he was not able or willing to meet it. Mr. Rowan received a satisfactory explanation; his lordship made a written apology, and the affair thus terminated.

Rowan set out on his political career in Ireland as a reformer, a Catholic emancipationist, and a whig, though of democratic principles. In 1790 we find his name, and that of the Honourable Robert Stewart (the future Lord Castlereagh), in the list of the members of the Whig Club. They were fellow-members, likewise, of the Volunteer Association. But Castlereagh abandoned his early principles, and became prime minister of England. Rowan retained his, and very narrowly escaped being hanged for the maintenance of them.

In 1792, we find Mr. Rowan a member of the Club of United Irishmen—a society which then sought only a reform of parliament.

"I must do the society", says the unfortunate Theobald Wolfe Tone, "the justice to say, that I believe there never existed a political body which included among its members a greater portion of sincere uncorrupted patriotism, as well as a very respectable portion of talent. Their publications, most of them written by Dr. Drennan, and many of them admirably well done, began to draw the public attention, especially as they were evidently the production of a society utterly disclaiming all party views

or motives, and acting on a broad, original scale, not sparing those who called themselves patriots, more than those who were habitual slaves of the government, a system in which I heartily concurred, having long entertained a more sincere contempt for what is called the opposition, than for the common prostitutes of the treasury bench, who want at least the vice of hypocrisy. At length the solicitor-general, in speaking of the society, having made use of expressions in the House of Commons extremely offensive, an explanation was demanded of him by Simon Butler, chairman, and Tandy, secretary. Butler was satisfied; Tandy was not; and after several messages, which it is not my affair to detail, the solicitor-general at length complained to the house of a breach of privilege, and Tandy was ordered in the first instance into custody. He was, in consequence, arrested by a messenger, from whom he found means to escape, and immediately a proclamation was issued, offering a reward for retaking him. The society now was in a difficult situation, and I thought myself called upon to make an effort, at all hazards to myself, to prevent its falling, by improper timidity, in the public opinion. We were, in fact, committed with the House of Commons on the question of privilege; and, having fairly engaged in the contest, it was impossible to recede without a total forfeiture of character. Under these circumstances, I cast my eyes on Archibald Hamilton Rowan, a distinguished member of the society, whose many virtues, public and private, had set his name above the reach of even the malevolence of party; whose situation in life was of the most respectable rank (if rank be indeed respectable); and, above all, whose personal courage was not to be shaken—a circumstance, in the actual situation of affairs, of the last importance. To Rowan, therefore, I applied. I showed him that the current of public opinion was rather setting against us in the business, and that it was necessary that some of us should step forward and expose themselves at all risks, to show the House of Commons, and the nation at large, that we were not to be intimidated or put down so easily; and I offered, if he would take the chair, that I would, with the society's permission, act as secretary, and that we would give our signatures to such publications as circumstances might render necessary. Rowan instantly agreed; and, accordingly, on the next night of meeting, he was chosen chairman, and I secretary, in the absence of Tandy; and the society having agreed to the resolutions proposed, which were worded in a manner very offensive to the dignity of the House of Commons, and, in fact, amounted to a challenge of their authority, we inserted them in all the newspapers, and printed 5,000

copies with our names affixed. The least that Rowan and I expected in consequence of this step (which under the circumstances was, I must say, rather a bold one), was to be committed to Newgate for a breach of privilege, and, perhaps, exposed to personal discussion with some of the members of the House of Commons; for he proposed, and I agreed, that if any disrespectful language was applied to either of us in any debate which might arise on the business, we would attack the person, whoever he might be, immediately, and oblige him either to recall his words or give battle. All our determinations, however, came to nothing. The House of Commons, either content with their victory over Tandy, who was obliged to conceal himself for some time, or not thinking Rowan and myself objects sufficiently important to attract their notice; or, perhaps (which I rather believe), not wishing just then to embroil themselves with a man of Rowan's firmness and courage, not to speak of his great and justly merited popularity, took no notice whatsoever of our resolutions; and in this manner he and I had the good fortune, or, if I may say, the merit, to rescue the society from a situation of considerable difficulty, without any actual suffering, though certainly with some personal hazard on our parts. We had, likewise, the satisfaction to see the society, instead of losing ground, rise rapidly in the public opinion by their firmness on the occasion. Shortly after, on the last day of the session, Tandy appeared in public, and was taken into custody, the whole society attending him in a body to the House of Commons. He was ordered by the speaker to be committed to Newgate, whither he was conveyed, the society attending him as before; and the Parliament being prorogued in half an hour after, he was liberated immediately, and escorted in triumph to his own house. On this occasion Rowan and I attended of course, and were in the gallery of the House of Commons. As we were not sure but we might be attacked ourselves, we took pains to place ourselves in a conspicuous situation, and to wear our Whig-club uniforms, which were rather gaudy, in order to signify to all whom it might concern, that there we were. A good many of the members, we observed, remarked us, but no farther notice was taken; our names were never mentioned; the whole business passed over quietly, and I resigned my pro-secretaryship, being the only office I ever held in the society, into the hands of Tandy, who resumed his functions".

Rowan was engaged in a duelling affair in the early part of 1792, between Peter Burrowes and Mr. Matthew Dowling, on which occasion he acted as second to Dowling.

This duel of Peter Burrowes and Dowling was followed, in the month of October, 1792, by an interview which Mr.

Rowan had with the Earl of Clare, then Lord Fitzgibbon, on behalf of the Honourable Simon Butler, of which the memoir of Rowan contains the following account:—"He and Oliver Bond, an eminent merchant, as chairman and secretary to the United Irish Society, had signed a paper, for which they were called before the House of Lords, were voted to have been guilty of a breach of privilege of that House, and were ordered to pay a fine of £500, and to be imprisoned six months in Newgate.

"In delivering the sentence of the Lords, Lord Fitzgibbon, addressing Mr. Butler, said, 'That he could not plead ignorance that his noble birth, and professional rank at the bar, to both of which he was a *disgrace*, had aggravated his crime'. Mr. Butler was not of a temper to bear insult; he determined to call on Lord Fitzgibbon for an apology as soon as he should be liberated. Mr. Sheares was to be his friend on the occasion; but he was in the country at that time. The business was such as could not be delayed, and Mr. Butler applied to me to act in Mr. Sheares' place. In consequence I wrote to his lordship, requesting an appointment to wait on him on behalf of my friend Mr. Butler, and his lordship appointed the next day. When I waited on him, I called to his recollection the expressions he had made use of in passing the sentence of the House of Lords on my friends Messrs. Butler and Bond, and those which he had particularly directed to Mr. Butler, which I hoped to be permitted to say it was not his lordship's intention should be taken personally, and had been made use of unreflectingly. Lord Fitzgibbon said, that he thought the circumstances of the case called for the expressions he had used, that he never spoke unreflectingly in that situation, and under similar circumstances he would again use similar words. I then said, that in mine and Mr. Butler's opinion the sentence of the Lords did not authorize the words he had made use of, and that if it had occurred between two private gentlemen, my conduct would be plain and easy, but his lordship's situation of chancellor embarrassed me. Here I paused. After some further conversation his lordship said I knew his situation, and he wished me to recollect it. I then took my leave, saying his lordship's situation prevented my acting as I must have done with a private gentleman. Immediately I wrote a note of this conversation, which I gave to Mr. Butler, who thought it necessary for his character to publish it. I requested him to delay the publication until I should have submitted to Lord Fitzgibbon a copy of the report of the conversation with him, and had given him to understand it was Mr. Butler's intention to publish it in the newspapers. Lord Fitzgibbon returned the copy to me the same day,

thanking me for the communication, adding, that 'it was not for him to advise Mr. Butler'. The next morning I received a visit from a very old friend, Colonel Murray, who accosted me with, 'So a pretty piece of work you have made, Hamilton, taking a challenge to the Chancellor'. 'How the deuce do you know that?' 'Why, to cut the matter short, I breakfasted this morning with Fitzgibbon, and he told me the whole affair'. To this old friend I had said, that I regretted my having come to Ireland when I found party ran so high, and I intended, as soon as the present prosecution was over, to return to England; my friend told me that he had repeated this to Lord Fitzgibbon, who, he said, had commissioned him to tell me, that if I would promise to go to England and remain there for a few years, he would issue a *nol. pros.* on the present prosecution. To this I readily assented, on condition that it should be issued immediately. My reason for making this stipulation was, that it had been reported some short time previous (when on my mother's death I had been obliged to go to England to arrange her property in that country), that I as well as Napper Tandy had fled from the prosecution commenced against us. This compromise was, however, finally put an end to, by its being required that I should strike my name out of the United Irishmen's Society—a measure to which I could not consent.

"A correspondence", says Mr. Rowan, "had taken place in 1792, between me and Mr. Muir, a Scotch advocate, who had taken a very leading part on the subject of reform in that country, and who had been prosecuted by the Lord Advocate under the Scottish Leasing Act. He had been in France, and on his return home, had called on me in Dublin. The National Convention was to assemble shortly in Edinburgh, and our correspondence became more frequent. Though the government seized his papers and person, in their seizure only one letter from me was found and produced on his trial. The Lord Advocate described it as having been written by a most ferocious person, and said it was sealed with the emblem of a human heart transfixed by a spear, and that the United Irishmen's address was composed by one of those wretches who had fled from the justice of their country. The seal was the cap of liberty on a pole, supported by two hands, that of the Protestant and Catholic united in the grasp of friendship. Two letters were written to the Lord Advocate by me in remonstrance, and no answer having been received to either, on the evening of the 31st of October, 1793, Mr. Rowan, accompanied by the Hon. Simon Butler, set out for Edinburgh, *via* Donaghadee and Portpatrick, and, after a most tempestuous passage in a

small sloop, arrived there on November the 4th. *On the 5th of November 1793* [most appropriate day for a gun-powder affair of this kind], Mr. Butler waited on the Lord Advocate, put his hand in his pocket for the letter which he was commissioned to deliver; but while he was in that act, his lordship said, that before any letter was delivered, he would inform him that he had some days before written a letter to Mr. H. Rowan, which he presumed had not been received, and then gave Mr. Butler the following answer to his letter:—

“ ‘Edinburgh, November, 5, 1793.

“ ‘Sir,—I wrote some days ago to you in Dublin a letter which I presume you have not received, and of which the following is an exact copy:—

“ ‘I have received your first and second letters, and I have only to inform you that I do not hold myself accountable to you or to any person for any observations which in the course of my official duty I felt it proper for me to make with respect to the publication alluded to by you. I have only to add, that my opinion on this subject remains perfectly the same.

“ ‘I am, Sir, &c.,

“ ‘R. DUNDAS’ ”.

In the evening of the 8th November, Mr. Butler and Mr. H. Rowan left Edinburgh on their return to Dublin. Rowan on his arrival in Ireland had the following notice published in the London and Edinburgh newspapers:—

“ The Lord Advocate of Scotland (R. Dundas) having asserted on the trial of Thomas Muir, that an address from the United Irishmen of Dublin to the Delegates for Reform in Scotland, to which my name was affixed as secretary, ‘was penned by infamous wretches, who, like himself, had fled from the punishment that awaited them’; and all explanation having been avoided under the pretext of official duty, I find it now necessary to declare that such assertion of the Lord Advocate, is a *falschood*.

“ A. H. ROWAN.

“ Dublin, Dominick Street, Dec. 16, 1793 ”.

[When the Brissotins declared war against England, they sent a confidential agent to Ireland, with offers of succor, if it would attempt to liberate and separate itself from their enemy. This gentleman arrived in Dublin sometime in the summer of 1793, with an introduction

to Lord Edward Fitzgerald. His offers were made known to Messrs. Butler and Bond, then in Newgate, to Mr. Rowan, Dr. Reynolds, and some others; but those persons, then so obnoxious to government discountenanced the proposal and it was dropped. Emmet: Thos. Addis Emmet and Robert Emmet, vol. 1, p. 115.]

"In 1792 (says Rowan in his autobiographical memoir), I was arrested by a warrant from Judge Downes, on a charge of distributing a seditious paper; and crediting his lordship's assurance that the examinations upon which the warrant was granted should be returned to the clerk of the crown, to be laid by him before the next term grand jury, I followed the advice of my law friends, and instead of going to jail, in pursuance of my own opinion, I gave bail for my appearance in the King's Bench, to answer such charges as should be there made against me. I had at first declared my wish to employ no other counsel to defend me than those who belonged to the Society of United Irishmen; but Messrs. Emmet and Butler both declined the task, as they said it might look like arrogance in junior counsellors to conduct so great a cause as that which would probably ensue. The known unbending patriotism of Mr. Fletcher, who (though afterwards raised to the bench) always declared the necessity of parliamentary reform, pointed him out to me as one under whose guidance I should wish to place myself; but this suggestion was again overruled by the entreaty of Mrs. Hamilton Rowan, and of almost all my friends, that I should employ Mr. Curran. His high character, which never deserted him as a friend to the people, occasioned my asking him whether he would employ his talent rather in defence of the paper for the distribution of which I was prosecuted, than on any minor object. Having answered in the affirmative, he became my leading counsel.

"During the succeeding Hilary term I daily attended in the Queen's Bench. On the last day of that term, finding that no examinations had been laid before the grand jury against me, counsel on my behalf moved that the examinations should be returned forthwith, particularly as Mr. Attorney-General had in the course of the term filed two informations *ex officio* against me, the one for the same alleged offence of distributing a seditious paper, and the other for a seditious conspiracy! Mr. Justice Downes, who was then on the bench, asserted that he had on the first day of term returned the examinations to the clerk of the crown, who said, that from the multiplicity of the examinations returned to him on the first day of term, he had not time to look at them, and requested the court would make no order. My hopes of a speedy trial were therefore at an end.



The R.^t Hon W.^m Pitt

"My mother shortly afterwards died, and I was obliged to go to England on private business, which required me to stay there some time. During my absence from Ireland, every runner in office, supported by the newspapers in the pay of government, connected the name of Hamilton Rowan with that of Napper Tandy, and proclaimed both as *dishonoured fugitives from justice*.

"A few days before the Easter term I returned to Ireland, and daily attended the King's Bench, until the term was nearly spent; and finding that no bills were sent up by the grand jury against me, counsel on my behalf moved the court that the recognizance entered into by me, and by my bail, should be vacated; at the same time publicly declaring that if the motion was not agreed to, I was then in court for the purpose of surrendering myself in discharge of my bail. The recognizance was vacated accordingly. The above mentioned examinations having also charged Mr. Tandy with a similar offence, his recognizance was estreated, and a green wax process ordered against his bail. Had I been absent, my recognizance also would have been estreated; but on my having appeared and declared my readiness to meet the charge, the government filed fresh informations, *ex officio*, and refused to proceed upon the former examinations, and denied to me all knowledge of the person by whom they were sworn. A motion on my behalf was then made to fix certain days for the trial of the information *ex officio* against me; the Attorney-General agreed to the appointment of two days in the ensuing Trinity term, viz., the 3rd and 7th days of May. In the Easter vacation the Attorney-General served on me a notice that he would not proceed to trial on the days appointed, and would apply to the court to appoint other days, grounded on an affidavit to be filed, of which notice would be given. Nothing further was done upon this notice; no affidavit was filed, or motion made thereon; and the process necessary for the empanelling of juries on the days appointed having been (after being issued) kept by Mr. Kemmis, the crown solicitor, instead of being delivered to the sheriff, a notice was made on my behalf that the necessary process should be forthwith delivered to the proper officer, in order that the trials might be had on the days appointed. My motion was opposed by a phalanx of crown lawyers, headed by the Attorney-General, who declared that there was an error in the information for distributing a seditious paper. I now offered to agree to an immediate amendment of the information, or that a fresh one should be filed and pleaded to *instantly*, or that I would release all errors. All these offers were severally refused, as the object of

Government seemed to be to gain time; and my friends strongly suspected that the motive for postponing the trial was the expectation of packed juries, through the means of the sheriffs for the ensuing year, Jenkins and Giffard, both notoriously under the influence, and even in the pay of the government.

"I must further take notice of some underhand transactions against me. When the idea of renewing the Volunteer system was embraced by several of its zealous friends, certain persons calling themselves soldiers, came to my house with offers of their assistance; but appearing to be sent as spies upon my conduct and expressions, I declined to see them, or have any concern with them. One of the name of Corbally came to my house, and proposed to teach my men-servants how to make up artillery ammunition. This offer having been declined, there was an attempt made to bribe this man to lodge examinations of some sort against me; and he having resisted, it was thought that something might be forced from him by fear. Accordingly he was apprehended on a warrant of high treason, and was told by the person who took him, that he had but one way to save his life, which was to swear against me. He was kept in jail for five months under this charge; and while in confinement, they attempted to cajole him into the king's service. When by law he became entitled to be discharged, or have proceedings preferred against him, the charge of high treason was withdrawn, and an indictment found against him for a misdemeanour, to which he gave bail, and thereupon obtained his liberty. One Maguire, a Defender, was confined with Corbally, to whom I understood similar proposals were made, and the following circumstance warrants the belief. Corbally lodged examinations against Mr. Justice Graham for an attempt to make him perjure himself. Mr. Justice Graham immediately went to the jail, saw Maguire, and accepted his bail, which he had refused the day but one before, and neither he nor his bail has since been heard of. Graham stood his trial, and was acquitted; and prosecuted Corbally, who was tried and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. At the time the attempt was made to bribe Corbally, the Speaker of the House of Commons asserted in company that Mr. Hamilton Rowan did not know the risk he ran, for they had evidence against him which would touch his life. And a noted partizan of administration said in the Four Courts, that a discovery was made that a gentleman and a man of some property had distributed money among the Defenders. This was also the charge against Napper Tandy.

"At length", continues the Memoir, "I was brought to

trial (January, 1794), Mr. Giffard being the acting sheriff for the current six months. On striking the jury, I objected to two of them, and offered to bring proof that they had declared '*Ireland would never be quiet until Hamilton Rowan and Napper Tandy were hanged.*' But this challenge was not allowed by the bench".

On this trial Mr. Curran* pronounced a speech which will for ever associate his name with that of Rowan. So splendid an exhibition of eloquence had never been witnessed in an Irish, nor perhaps in any other court of law. When Curran came to that part of the publication under trial, which proposed complete emancipation for persons of every religious persuasion, he expressed himself as follows:—

"Do you think it wise or humane, at this moment, to insult them (the Catholics) by sticking up in the pillory the man who dared to stand forth as their advocate? I put it to your oaths: do you think that a blessing of that kind, that a victory obtained by justice over bigotry and oppression, should have a stigma cast upon it by an ignominious sentence upon men bold and honest enough to propose that measure? to propose the redeeming of religion from the abuses of the church, the reclaiming of three millions of men from bondage, and giving liberty to all who had a right to demand it? Giving, I say, in the so much censured word of this paper, giving '**universal emancipation!**' I speak in the spirit of British law, which makes liberty commensurate with, and inseparable from British soil—which proclaims even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of **universal emancipation**. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced—no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down—no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery—the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain, the altar and the god sink together in the dust; his soul walks abroad in her own majesty; his body swells beyond the measure of his chains, that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled, by the irresistible genius of **universal emancipation**".

* Dr. Emmet says that Thomas Addis Emmet was invited to the important task of defending Rowan, but he declined from the best motives, and yielded that task to the firmness and devotion of Curran.

The concluding passage of this speech contains one of those fine scriptural allusions, of which Mr. Curran made such frequent and successful use:—

“I will not relinquish the confidence that this day will be the period of his sufferings; and, however mercilessly he has been hitherto pursued, that your verdict will send him home to the arms of his family and the wishes of his country. But if (which Heaven forbid) it hath still been unfortunately determined, that, because he has not bent to power and authority, because he would not bow down before the golden calf and worship it, he is to be bound and cast into the furnace—I do trust in God, that there is a redeeming spirit in the constitution which will be seen to walk with the sufferer through the flame, and to preserve him unhurt by the conflagration”.

Curran's graphic description of his client's character and conduct in private life was in keeping with the other portions of this unrivalled speech:—

“Gentlemen, let me suggest another observation or two, if you still have any doubt as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant. Give me leave to suggest to you what circumstances you ought to consider, in order to found your verdict: you should consider the character of the person accused; and in this your task is easy. I will venture to say there is not a man in this nation more known than the gentleman who is the subject of this prosecution, not only by the part he has taken in public concerns, and which he has taken in common with many, but still more so by that extraordinary sympathy for human affliction, which, I am sorry to think, he shares with so small a number. There is not a day that you hear the cries of your starving manufacturers in your streets, that you do not also see the advocate of their sufferings—that you do not see his honest and manly figure, with uncovered head, soliciting for their relief, searching the frozen heart of charity for every string that can be touched by compassion, and urging the force of every argument and every motive, save that which his modesty suppresses—the authority of his own generous example. Or if you see him not there, you may trace his steps to the abode of disease and famine and despair, the messenger of Heaven, bearing with him food, and medicine, and consolation. Are these the materials of which we suppose anarchy and public rapine to be formed? Is this the man on whom to fasten the abominable charge of goading on a frantic populace to mutiny and bloodshed? Is this the man likely to apostatize from every

principle that can bind him to the state—his birth, his property, his education, his character, and his children? Let me tell you, gentlemen of the jury, if you agree with his prosecutors in thinking there ought to be a sacrifice of such a man on such an occasion, and upon the credit of such evidence you are to convict him—never did you, never can you, give a sentence consigning any man to public punishment with less danger to his person or to his fame: for where could the hireling be found to fling contumely or ingratitude at his head, whose private distresses he had not laboured to alleviate, or whose public condition he had not laboured to improve?"

Giffard's skill in the packing of the jury was more potent in its influences and results than any power of eloquence of the Irish Demosthenes could possibly be over the minds of such men as Giffard had put in the jury box. The jury, in the course of ten minutes, brought in a verdict of *guilty*. Lord Clonmel, after conferring with the other judges, said, "We will not pronounce judgment till four days". Mr. Rowan was then ordered into custody of the sheriff, "and was conveyed to the New Prison, attended by both the sheriffs and a formidable array of horse and foot guards".

At the expiration of four days the prisoner was brought up for judgment. Before sentence was pronounced, Rowan, at his own request, was permitted to speak; and accordingly he addressed the court in language at once courteous and dignified. He observed that in some parts of the evidence, the court and the prosecutor seemed to be mistaken, and that, had some of his friends, Volunteers, who were present at the meeting, been summoned to give their testimony, the charge exhibited against him by Lyster would have fallen to the ground. As to the jury, he admitted that some of them were very honourable men, yet much prejudiced, and his avowed enemies. He acknowledged his wish, and his attempt, to revive the Volunteers, for they had done honour to the nation. As to the sheriff, in the capacity of editor to a newspaper he had been his constant calumniator; and now in the office of sheriff, he had empanelled a jury, by some of whom he (Rowan) had been prejudged. He avowed himself to be a United Irishman, and gloried in the name. He justified the terms **universal emancipation** and **representative legislature**, in opposition to a meaning imputed to them by the counsel for the prosecution. "I did imagine", says he, "that the British constitution was a representative legislature; that the people were represented by the House of Commons; that the Lords represented the territory, the property; and that the King represented

the power of the state, the united force, the power of the whole placed in his hands for the benefit of the whole. As a person, as a man, I know nothing of the king; I can know nothing of him except wielding the force of the nation; and if that force should be misapplied and abused, it then remains to the people to decide in what hands it ought to be placed".*

In conclusion he says:—"I really feel myself in an awkward situation, thus declaring my sentiments, seeing intentions different from those both of the author and myself are fixed upon that paper, for the distribution of which I am persecuted. From my situation, however, having an independent fortune, easy in my circumstances, and with a large family, insurrection of any sort would surely be the last thing I could wish for. I ask no favour, but I submit myself to the clemency and justice of the court, and trust that, whatever may be their sentence, I shall bear it with becoming fortitude".

The jury-packing system commenced as a regularly organized judicial proceeding on the occasion of this trial, as a justifiable stratagem in the circumstances of the country, when men, obnoxious to Orangeism, or the ascendancy of a faction, making loyalty a pretext for rapacity, were to be got rid of without any apparent outrage to justice or humanity. The holy Bible began to be made an instrument of state vengeance, a weapon in the hands of men who would assassinate opponents under the forms of law and with the appearance of the sacred sanction of oaths sworn on the Gospels of the Lord of Truth. The packing of Rowan's jury was performed by one Jenkins and the notable John Giffard,† who had been appointed sheriffs—the latter a few months only before the trial, the 1st of October, 1793, and

* These sentiments are corroborated in the report of the trial, by quotations from "Locke on Government", sects. 151, 158, 226, and from "Blackstone's Public Wrongs", b. 4, c. 33, s. 5.

† Giffard was a perfect specimen of the genus fire-brand, which never fails to make an appearance on the stage of politics in all bad times of civil strife: truculent and ferocious, there was no invention of slander, however egregiously wicked and mendacious, he was not capable of adopting as a public journalist, when an opponent of the Orange faction was to be disparaged: nor was there an act of baseness he would have shrunk from committing, in the exercise of those official functions with which he was invested in the reign of terror. His services were repaid with a post in the revenue, that refugium peccatorum of the subordinate state sinners of our reign of terror. He was dismissed, however, by Lord Hardwicke, from his place in the Custom House, but his merits were not allowed to remain unrewarded by the Duke of Richmond; he was restored to his post, and his salary increased.

apparently with a special view to the management of the jury-box.*

The packing of the jury was only one feature in the judicial arrangements made for the conviction of Rowan. The principal witness produced against him, George W. T. Lyster, *alias* Captain, *alias* Ensign Lyster, was a person whose evidence was unreliable in any case; but in this particular one it was utterly at variance with truth. The address to the Volunteers, which he swore had been distributed by Rowan, had been presented to the people at the meeting, and to Lyster, by a person of the name of Willis, a skinner, formerly a member of the Volunteer Association.

In December, 1794, Mr. Lyster had an action taken against him in the King's Bench, by his father-in-law, Mr. H. Hatchell, for the recovery of monies expended for the support of his wife, whom he had deserted, and there was a verdict found for the plaintiff. And a little later we read of an Ensign Lyster, for conduct unbecoming a gentleman and an officer, being disgraced and dismissed the army.

This gentleman was too bad for the army, but he was good enough for the jury packers, and the Giffards and Jenkins and Fitzgibbons of that period.

It would be now useless to refer to the foul means resorted to in Rowan's case to obtain a conviction; but that it shows the influence which the recourse to packed juries, and the employment of perjured witnesses, had on the minds of the people, and especially of their leaders, at that period. So long as the fountains of justice were believed to be even moderately pure—so long as it was unknown that they were poisoned at their very source, there were some bounds to the popular discontent. The language of the liberals of that day might be bold, violent, and intemperate—not more so, nay, not so much so, as the language used with impunity at political societies in the present day; but they still had privileges and advantages to lose by sedition, and the most valuable of all was the trial by jury, which from the time of Rowan's trial, in public opinion, had ceased to be a safeguard or a security to the people.

The Society of United Irishmen, on the 7th February, 1794, presented an address to Mr. Rowan, then undergoing the sentence of imprisonment in Newgate, in which, after expressing the obligations the country was under to him for his bold assertion of its rights, and its sympathy with his sufferings in its cause, the society observed:

* Marcus Beresford writing to his father in April 1794, says:—"Government are determined to hang Rowan if possible". Beresford Correspondence, vol. II. p. 26.

"Although corruption has been leagued with falsehood to vilify this society, we have reposed in honest confidence on the consoling reflection, that we should at all times find an impregnable barrier in 'the trial by jury', wherein character and intention should be regarded as unerring guides to justice. But while we have been earnestly endeavouring to establish the constitutional rights of our country, we suddenly find ourselves at a loss for *this first and last stake of a free people*: for the trial by jury loses its whole value when the sheriff or panel is under the influence of interest, prejudice, or delusion, and that battery which liberty and wisdom united to construct for the security of the people, is turned against them. However, in defiance of that system of proscription, which is no longer confined to a particular persuasion, but which visits with vengeance every effort in the cause of freedom, we trust you are assured of our inflexible determination to pursue the great object of our Association—an *equal and impartial representation of the people in Parliament*—an object from which no chance or change, no persecution, no oppression shall deter us".

Rowan had been nearly two months in Newgate when an emissary of the French Government, the Rev. William Jackson, arrived in Ireland, accompanied by his friend Cockayne, a London solicitor, in the beginning of April, 1794. Mr. Leonard M'Nally, the barrister, the "friend" of Cockayne, through another friend, Mr. Lewines, had got the French emissary and his companion, the spy and informer of Mr. Pitt, introduced to Rowan, Tone, and Dr. Reynolds. Rowan fell at once and without any apparent misgiving into the snare. Evidence was obtained against him of complicity with Jackson "sufficient to hang him". Jackson, all-unconscious as he was of the part he was performing, having been allowed to do the work of Cockayne and his employer, Mr. Pitt, was arrested the latter end of April, 1794.

"The same evening", says Rowan in his Memoirs, "Cockayne came to me in Newgate, lamenting his friends indiscretion, which he said was the sole cause of the discovery, and begged of me, if possible, to procure his admission to speak to Jackson. At this time nothing had transpired of my being concerned in the business, and being on good terms with the under-jailer, I procured a promise, that as soon as the sentry should be withdrawn from Jackson's room, he would admit Cockayne and me into it. At this interview Cockayne gave us a long account of his examination before a privy council; he said that he had acknowledged having written the direction of the letter by the order of Jackson, but knew nothing of the contents; that he had been interrogated

whether the papers were not in my handwriting; but he denied ever having seen me write; that the council seemed very inveterate against me; and he added that, having refused to sign his examination, he was threatened with Newgate, but had been given three days to consider; that his solitary evidence would not be legal, as two witnesses were necessary to prove high treason, and he assured us, if we were true to each other, we were perfectly safe. I said I thought it possible I might make my escape. I asked him whether it would injure Jackson's defence, should I succeed. He said it could not. I said no more on that head.

"Messrs. Emmet, Tone, and Dowling had called on me the day I expected to have been brought before the privy council, and it was determined I should tell the whole of the transaction without concealment, except of names of individuals. I mentioned to them my plan of escape, which I had commenced, after Jackson's arrest, in the *Fives Court*, with Mr. Dowell, jun., the under-jailer".

In the meantime Dr. Reynolds, being duly apprised of his danger, fled the country and escaped to America. Rowan also, being duly apprised of the evidences of treason that existed in the hands of government against him, was afforded an opportunity of effecting his escape from prison and from Ireland. It is stated, and I believe with truth, that more than one member of the Privy Council was in the habit of communicating secrets of great importance to the members of the Directory of the United Irishmen. The fact of the secrets of government, on many important occasions, having been communicated to the Directory, has been distinctly stated to me by Arthur O'Connor and Dr. M'Nevin. On the 1st of May, Rowan prevailed on two subordinate officials of the jailer of Newgate, to allow him to go to his house in Dominick Street for the avowed purpose of signing certain legal documents, accompanied by one of the above mentioned prison officials, the younger M'Dowell undertaking to return when this legal business had been transacted. An offer of £100 for this service was made by Rowan. The jailer had no knowledge at this time of Rowan being implicated in the charges of high treason that had been brought against Jackson, but conceived, as Mr. Rowan's confinement was only on a charge for libel, that there was no danger of his meditating an escape. On reaching his house, Rowan, while apparently waiting the arrival of his man of business, proffered the £100 he had promised; and to use his own words—"Young M'Dowell at first refused the money; he thrust back the purse, saying he did not do it for gain; but on his (Rowan) remonstrating, he relented, and consented to put the

money in his pocket". Then on pretence of having a few words to say in private to Mrs. Rowan, he obtained permission to retire into the back drawing-room. At the jailer's request the folding-door was left open, and Mr. Rowan lost no time in availing himself of the advantage so opportunely afforded. His excellent lady had contrived the means of escape: by a rope he descended from the window into the back yard, and in the stable found a horse ready saddled. Disguising himself in a peasant's great coat, he proceeded to the residence of his attorney, Mr. Dowling, who was in the secret of his design. Unfortunately, that gentleman's house was filled with guests, and by his advice Mr. Rowan proceeded to the top of Sackville Street, opposite the Rotundo, where he continued to walk up and down, in the most anxious state of suspense, for an hour and a half. At length his friend appeared, and after a short conference, Mr. Rowan proceeded to the house of Mr. Sweetman, near Baldoyle, where he continued for a few days. The two M'Dowells, father and son, subordinates of Mr. Gregg, the head-jailer of Newgate, who had been privy to the escape of Rowan on the evening of the 1st of May, 1794, were arraigned the 10th of July following on this serious charge. Gregg, the head-jailer, deposed that it was only at eight o'clock on the morning of the 2nd of May, when he went round the prison, that he discovered Mr. Rowan had escaped. That he questioned the M'Dowells, the turnkeys of that part of the prison, and was informed that Mr. R. had accompanied Mrs. Rowan to the door of the prison, who had been there to visit him, "and in handing *Mrs. Rowan to her carriage*, rushed through the crowd and made his escape". Sheriff Jenkin deposed, that the elder M'Dowell had admitted to him his wife had let out Mr. Rowan, and that on passing the door he rushed down the steps and made his escape. The jury brought in a verdict of guilty against both traversers.

Immediately after Mr. Rowan's escape, the following proclamation was published by government:—

"By the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland.

A Proclamation.

"Westmoreland.

"Whereas Archibald Hamilton Rowan, late of Rathcoffey, in the County of Kildare, Esq., was, in the last Hilary Term, committed to the jail of Newgate, in the City of Dublin, under a sentence of the Court of Queen's Bench of imprisonment for two years, for publishing a seditious libel.

"And whereas, the said Archibald Hamilton Rowan has lately been charged with high treason; and whereas we have received information on oath, that the said Archibald Hamilton Rowan did, on the night of Thursday, the 1st of May instant, make his escape from said jail.

"Now we, the Lord Lieutenant and Council, being determined to bring the said Archibald Hamilton Rowan to condign punishment, do hereby offer a reward of *One Thousand Pounds* to any person or persons, who shall discover and apprehend the said Archibald Hamilton Rowan, wherever he may be found, or to so discover the said Archibald Hamilton Rowan as that he may be apprehended and committed to prison.

"And we do hereby strictly charge and command all justices of the peace, mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs, constables, and all other his Majesty's loving subjects, to use their utmost diligence in apprehending the said Archibald Hamilton Rowan.

"Given at the Council Chamber in Dublin, the 2nd May, 1794.

R. Dublin,
Chas. Cashel,
Clanricarde,
Shannon,
Bective,
Glandore,
Carhampton,
Mount-Norris,
Clonmell,
Ely,
Dillon,
G. S. Kildare,

Muskerry,
Carleton,
B. Yelverton,
H. Cavendish,
H. Langrishe,
Theo. Jones,
W. Cunninghame,
J. Cuff,
J. M. Mason,
A. Wolfe,
J. Fitzgerald.

"God save the King".

A very important document in Ms., having the autograph signature of the widow of Mr. Sweetman, by whose co-operation the escape of Rowan to France was effected, has been placed in my hands by Mr. Jackson; and to that authentic narrative of Mrs. Sweetman I refer for all the particulars of that occurrence.

"Particulars of the escape of A. H. Rowan, Esq., from the house of Robert Sweetman, of Sutton, County Dublin.

"On the 1st of May, 1794, my late husband, Robert Sweetman, retired to rest at an early hour. About one o'clock, the maid-servant was awoke by loud rapping at the hall-door; she inquired who was there, and was

answered by a person who said he wanted to see Mr. Sweetman. She said he was in bed, and could not be disturbed; after several applications, she was prevailed upon to tell her master that a person wished to see him. He was much displeased at being annoyed at such an hour, and told her to tell the person that he would not see any one at such a hour, and to call in the morning.

"The maid was prevailed upon a third time to tell her master that the business of the applicant was of great importance, and that he had a letter that should be delivered to Mr. S. in person. He consented, and put on a part of his clothes; opening the hall-door, he was greatly surprised at the appearance of his visitor; he was disguised in a fisherman's dress, and Mr. S. often told me that he looked like a robber. Mr. Rowan told him who he was, as also his escape from prison, and that he threw himself on his mercy. Mr. S. brought him up stairs. Mr. Rowan was greatly excited; after a while, he told Mr. S. of his desire to quit the country, and that he would give the half of what he was possessed of for a boat. Mr. S., the following morning, set off for Rush, Skerries, and Balbriggan, to procure, if possible, a boat; he offered £500 for anyone to convey a gentleman who was embarrassed to any part of France. No one could be found to run the risk for double the amount.

"When Mr. S. returned unsuccessful, Mr. R. was much dejected, not knowing what to do; he occupied a small room called the end room, with a case of pistols and razors on the dressing table, fully determined, in case he was discovered, to destroy himself. Mr. S. told him he had a pleasure boat, if he would risk his life in so small a boat. 'Put me in a cockle-shell', he said, 'if it would be the means of my escape'.

"There was a difficulty in procuring trusty men; after a deal of anxiety, he procured three staunch fellows, two Sheridans, brothers, and a third, of the name of Murray. The men were promised great remuneration for their arduous undertaking. Mr. S. went to Dublin to purchase maps, sea store, &c. At the time he was purchasing the maps at M'Auley and Hughes's, on George's Quay, the captain of one of his Majesty's revenue cruisers came to the same shop to renew his maps, and told Mr. S. he had orders from government to have a look out for Hamilton Rowan, not at all suspecting that Mr. S. was providing for the escape of the fugitive.

"It took four days to provide everything requisite for the voyage. From this period Mr. S. was a marked man. He was taken prisoner, and accused of keeping fire-arms; his house was much annoyed at the time Lord Edward Fitzgerald was hiding. When Mr. Rowan was leaving

Sutton, he gave Mr. S. a letter for Mrs. R., begging of her to provide for the families of the men employed to navigate the boat; she never complied with his request. All matters being ready, Mr. Rowan left Sutton on the 4th of May, 1794, at four o'clock in the morning. Previous to his departure, he went on his knees in the drawing-room to beg that Almighty God would preserve his deliverer from all harm, and that a blessing might descend upon him and his posterity; and that if he ever returned to his native land, he should have the half of what he was worth. This scene, Mr. S. told me, was very affecting.

"The boat got under weigh with a fair wind, until off the Saltees it came on to blow hard, when she was obliged to bear up from whence she started. The following morning under weigh again, and crossing the Bay of Dublin, a revenue cutter ran alongside, throwing handbills into the boat, offering a reward of £1,000 for Hamilton Rowan. The wind continued fair, and when off Wexford, the men found a leisure moment to read the handbills. Mr. Rowan, perceiving with what attention they read them, evidently saw that he was discovered. He left the cabin, and told the men that he was the person described in the handbills, and that he depended on their generosity as Irishmen not to molest him. They threw the handbills overboard, and told him to make himself perfectly easy, as they would not deceive him."

"The next memorable event was their having passed through the British fleet in a fog, in the Bay of Biscay. Mr. Rowan was safely landed in the night. The crew, having escaped unnoticed, were halfway home, when taken by a French privateer, and the boat was burnt. The men were put into prison, where they remained for twelve months; they made their escape to America, and arrived once more in their native land. During their absence, Mr. S. had to support their families, for which he never received compensation.

"The men made application to Mrs. Rowan, but she declined all intercourse with them. Mr. Rowan received

* The late Mr. Sheil, referring to this occurrence, observes:—"They had reached the mid channel, when a situation occurred, equaling in dramatic interest the celebrated *Cæsarem vehis* of antiquity. It would certainly make a fine subject for a picture". Rowan states, in his Autobiography, the affair took place on shore, not at sea, as many imagined. While staying at Sweetman's, he met his host one day returning from Dublin, and shortly after they were joined by the two Sheridans, one of whom, taking out of his pocket one of the proclamations, showed it to Mr. Sweetman, and said: "Is it Mr. Hamilton Rowan we are to take to France?" "Yes", replied Mr. Sweetman, "and here he is". Immediately the elder brother said: "Never mind it, by —, we will land him safe".

his pardon, and returned to Ireland one year after the death of Mr. S. I called on him, and he received me very kindly; he said he was sorry that he could not at the present time do anything for my family. I mentioned that my visit was not for anything gratuitous, but for compensation for the *loss of the boat*. He seemed much astonished at my application, and said that it was an act of kindness on the part of Mr. S., and that he had no idea of paying the demand (although previous to his departure he promised that Mr. S. should have the half of what he was worth). At last he desired me to furnish a bill, which I did for £100 only: the boat was worth *three hundred*. He said £50 was quite sufficient. I consulted several eminent men of the day, who advised me not to take less than £100. He still refused, and did not pay until I had very reluctantly proceeded against him.

* "Many years after, Mr. Rowan paid me a visit at Sutton, on his way to Mr. Evans of Portrane. He remained several minutes at the hall-door offering up pious ejaculations for the preserver of his *life*."

"I was at first determined to be cool to him; after a little I changed my mind, and asked him to walk in. He eat something, and took a glass of grog. I never saw him afterwards."

"ANNE SWEETMAN".

The biographer of Mr. Rowan, in reference to the remuneration of the boatmen, observes:—

"Mr. Rowan's generosity, even to those men who were instrumental in effecting his escape to France, could not, with justice to his family, and a thousand demands besides, be without a limit. He did not possess the purse of Fortunatus, which could never be exhausted. It appears from a preceding part of this memoir, that he felt a deep interest in the welfare of his little crew; that while in France he exerted all his influence in their behalf, and succeeded in procuring for them a profitable employment in Brest. On their return to Ireland, they received sums of money repeatedly, to what amount is not divulged; but it would be inconsistent with the whole of Rowan's character and conduct to suppose that it was not considerable.* Notwithstanding, it was affirmed by

* "Edward Clibborn, Esq., has assured the author that he has assisted Rowan, with whom he was intimate, in a search that proved successful, to discover either a daughter or grand-daughter of one of his sailors, and that he not only relieved her from a present embarrassment, but put her in the way to earn a respectable livelihood".—Note to above paper in the Memoir of Rowan.

some who knew nothing of the matter, but who could not forego the pleasure of inventing and propagating an evil report, that they had received no requital. In a letter from Dublin to Mrs Rowan, at Rathcoffey, dated October 15, 1822, Mr. Rowan gives a striking instance of such reports, accompanied with their refutation. He writes:—

“Between ten and eleven last night, Captain Fottrell called on me. After apologizing for the intrusion, he said he had risen from a supper table where it was proposed to advertise for a subscription for the family of Murray, who, you might have seen, lost his life the other night in assisting some vessel, as captain of the life boat at Clontarf. He said that I was spoken of very harshly, as having never given him or the sailors who had served me any compensation, and that it was proposed to allude strongly to that circumstance in the advertisement. He added that he could not conceive the fact to be so, and begged them to desist, for that he would go immediately to me, though he did not know me, to inform himself. I, of course, told him all I knew of Murray; and, as far as I could recollect, enumerated the different sums he had received, and that I had entries in my agent's account of sums given to the men. He seemed rejoiced that he could contradict the report, and retired. Now, as to the subscription, when it is set on foot, I think I shall send £5, without any other signature than from a person who has been falsely caluminated, or something to that purpose”.

With respect to the preceding statements, I am sorry to have to say, that the brave and faithful poor men who saved the life of Mr. Rowan, were, for a considerable time after their return to Ireland, left very inadequately recompensed for their services to Mr. Rowan and their sufferings on his account; and it was only after Rowan's return that any adequate sense of the magnitude of the services they had rendered to that gentleman was manifested.

Rowan mentions a third person, whose name was Murphy, who was one of the party who manned the boat; but Rowan was mistaken about the name, which was Murray, and not Murphy. From the son of this poor fisherman, who risked his life and liberty for Rowan in 1794, and who lost all he possessed in consequence of the part he took in effecting the escape, I had a communication in 1853, stating the result of an application he had then recently made through his son to a member of Mr. Rowan's family for some small assistance; and he states that his written application was returned to him with a brief reply to this effect—that the person applied to knew nothing of the transaction referred to by him,

-and was not born at the time, nor for nearly twenty years posterior to it. He might have replied to that statement, that in all human probability the person applied to would never have been born, had it not been for the part his father had taken in the preservation of Mr. Rowan.

Statement to R. R. M. of the son of James Murray, one of the boatmen who accompanied Mr. Rowan to France.

My father, James Murray, was one of the three boatmen who brought Mr. Hamilton Rowan to France in a boat or smack belonging to Mr. Sweetman of Sutton, near Howth, in the month of May, 1794.

My father belonged to Clontarf; the other two men were brothers, named Denis and Christopher Sherwin or *Shewan* [commonly known as Sheridan]. They belonged to Donabate or Portrane, near Rush.

I recollect my father telling me that when they left Mr. Rowan at *Brest*, in France, they put the little smack about, to return home, but were chased by a French cutter and taken. They were brought ashore and put in prison, until Mr. Rowan procured a change of their condition. They were removed to comfortable quarters, and the authorities offered them their liberty if they would go under French pay. This, I believe, they declined. They were allowed great privileges, and were not put under very strict surveillance. I do not recollect my father telling me how long they were in this state; but that there was an American vessel in the harbour, bound for *Elsinore* in Denmark. They found an opportunity, and got on board this vessel, and landed safe in *Elsinore*, from whence, in the course of some short time, they got home.

My father had command of the Clontarf life-boat, and went with his crew on the 13th October, 1822, to save a vessel in distress, near the North Dublin bar, on which day he lost his life, as the life-boat was split, and foundered. I went the next day or two to acquaint Mr. Rowan, who kindly assisted me with money to bury him.

THOMAS MURRAY,

November, 1853.

8 Upper Bridge Street.

In reference to this subject, I have to observe that in a published controversy between Mr. Rowan and an agent of his of the name of Hamilton, I find in a pamphlet written by the latter gentleman, an account of a sum of money to the boatmen who conveyed Mr. Rowan to France in 1794, amounting to £25, paid in the year 1800. 4



Encounter between the Kussovennan Peonies & Corcoran & Berpatrik

In reply to inquiries of mine recently addressed to Thomas Murray, the son of the fisherman above referred to, respecting a statement made in Dr. Drummond's biography, on the authority of Mr. Clibborn, that search had been made successfully, by Rowan's orders, for a daughter or a grand-daughter of James Murray, soon after his decease, with the view of rendering his family some assistance, the following statement was addressed to me by Thomas Murray, the son of the deceased fisherman, the 13th July, 1857:—

My father was superannuated by the board for preserving and improving the port of Dublin, after many years' service as a *sea pilot*. They also gave him command of the Clontarf life-boat.

He went, on the 13th October, 1822, with his life-boat's crew, to aid a brig which got stranded at the back of the North Bull. He there lost his life, being old and infirm, and not being able to exert himself; the life-boat was split from the heavy surge of the sea, the crew of which saved themselves, being young and active, by getting into the vessel in distress. My father's body was not found until the Tuesday following (the 13th was on Sunday), that was the 15th. I went to Mr. Rowan on the 16th (the next day); I had a note written for him; as soon as he saw me, he told me that he had seen an account of my father's death in the newspaper—he gave me £1 as a help for his interment.

I never heard any mention of a subscription being raised, and am quite sure that such was not the case, neither did any relative of my father's ever receive any remuneration from Mr. Rowan, or any other gentleman acting for him, after my father's decease.

Shortly after my father's death, a gentleman of the commissariat department (Captain Molassy), then living in Clontarf, sent for me, and told me to go and see if either of the Sheridans were still living, and if so, to get an accurate account from him of the manner in which they were remunerated by Mr. Rowan. I accordingly went to Swords on the following Sunday, and there met with the surviving brother, I forget now whether it was Denis or Christopher. I got a sheet of paper and put down as he told me.

He stated that they (the three boatmen) got about £100 each from Mr. Rowan in different sums at different periods—that they got three letters from Mr. Rowan, written by him during their passage from Sutton (Howth) to the beach of Brest (France). One of those letters was for the three men conjointly, stating that he would give them £20 a year each while they lived; the other two letters were for Mrs. Rowan: the three letters were

taken along with themselves by the French cutter, and they never heard of them afterwards.

It was Captain Molassy's intention to sue for the money; but he could do nothing for want of the captured letter.

THOMAS MURRAY,

140 Francis Street.

17th July, 1857.

Rowan no sooner landed in France, at the mouth of a small bay called Roscoff, under the Port of St. Paul de Leon, than he was seized and placed in *durance vile*, having escaped a prison in his own country to become a prisoner of state of the *Comite de Salut Publique* at Roscoff. The next day he was ordered to be sent to Brest, in the safe-keeping of a *garde d'honneur*. At Brest he was imprisoned in the military hospital, where he was looked on as an English spy; but after a short detention he was liberated, and directed to proceed to Paris and report himself to the *Comite de Salut Publique* of the capital. On his arrival he proceeded to the Committee, and was introduced to Robespierre, who received him with civility, and ordered him to be furnished with everything he required at the expense of the nation. Rowan had ample opportunities of witnessing the horrors of the Reign of Terror. These, however, ceased to a great extent with the downfall and death of Robespierre, "though in two days after the execution of Robespierre", says Rowan, "the whole *commune* of Paris, consisting of about sixty persons, were guillotined in less than one hour and a half in the *Place de la Revolution*; and though I was standing a hundred paces from the place of execution, the blood of the victims streamed under my feet.

"Being much discontented", he says, "with the distracted state of Paris, where they were too busy with their own intestine divisions to think of assisting Ireland, or anything beneficial to others, after spending almost a year there, I solicited, and with some difficulty obtained, through the assistance of an Irish Roman Catholic of the name of Madgett, who was employed in some of the offices of the Republic, passports to Havre, in order to embark for the United States of North America, under the assumed name of Thompson".

He accordingly determined to proceed to Rouen, embarked in a small boat on the 17th of April, 1795, and got down the river as far as the Port Royal Bridge, when a *sans culotte* gentleman noticed him, and denounced him to the people as "a deputy who was escaping with the money of the nation". This man procured a musket, and repeatedly threatened to shoot the supposed deputy.

whenever the boat came within range of him on that side of the quay along which he followed the fugitive.

"At length", says Rowan, "I came to the landing-place at the gate of Chaillot, when this man, who was evidently intoxicated, in his haste to seize me, stepped upon the gunwale of the little boat, and at the same time swamped it and threw himself into the water. I leaped out, and desired to be conducted to the guard at the barrier of Passy. By this time some hundred persons were collected, and the back ranks not knowing exactly what was going on in the front, began the usual cry of '*A la lanterne !*' The officer on guard came up from the gate; I showed him my passports, and particularly my certificates of having mounted all my guards in my section. He said my papers were all '*en règle*', and that I might proceed; but the mob still insisted that I was carrying off *l'or de la nation*, and I requested the officer, who was drawing off his guard, to allow me to take my small baggage to the guard-room, and open it there for the satisfaction of the people; but he peremptorily refused, and marched off, saying, '*ce n'étoit pas son affaire*'. At length one from among them proposed to take me before the mayor of Passy,* whither I proceeded, conducted by my first friend, who still held me, and followed by the crowd.

"We found the mayor at home. My conductor pushed into his room. I was somewhat assured as to his character, by his saying to this fellow, '*Ote ton bonnet; ne vois tu pas qui je suis decouvert ?*' The man obeyed, and then stated his suspicions of my story, one of which was, the improbability of intending to row to Havre, and yet wearing gloves at setting out for so long a distance. I again produced my papers to the mayor; they were re-examined, and it was declared that everything was *en règle*, and that they should permit me to continue my voyage. At the same time the mayor complimented my conductors for their zeal and attention to the safety of the republic. My persecutors, in some little dudgeon, now left me, while the crowd returned with me to the water side. Here, to my inexpressible surprise, I found everything in my boat exactly as I had left it—some bottles of wine, a little silver cup, my necessaire, and a gold-headed cane, all safe, though at the mercy of hundreds, who, while they would, without ceremony, have tacked me up to the lamp-post, would not touch an article of my property".*

Rowan arrived in safety in Rouen, where he had previously passed nearly two years, 1772 and 1773; and

* "Autobiography of A. H. Rowan", p. 243.

after spending a few days, proceeded by land to Havre, where he embarked for America the beginning of June, 1795. The 16th of July, Rowan was established at a boarding-house in Philadelphia, where several members of Congress boarded and lodged, among them the elder Adams and Jackson, subsequently President of the United States. Having determined on retiring into some country situation, he fixed on Wilmington, in the State of Delaware, about thirty miles from Philadelphia.

From the latter city he addressed to his wife, August 1, 1795, and refers to his old friend Tone as then residing at Princetown.*

"Mr. Tone has bought an hundred acres of ground. The situation is pleasant, and within two or three miles of Princetown, where there is a college and some good society. Tandy arrived here about a fortnight or three weeks since; he has got a lodging in the same house with me, and of course we mess together; but I need not tell you that his society does not make up for what I have lost, never perhaps to regain".

"September 11.—Tone seems determined to return, and Reynolds wishes it sincerely, but amuses himself with the politics of America, and is as busy, as sincere, and as zealous as he was in Kilmainham".

September 19, 1795, in a letter to her husband, Mrs. Rowan thus refers to one of the persons above mentioned:—

"The arch-deceiver, T——, has quit the country, and it is to be feared he may go where you are. I think it my duty to say that, if this should be the case, you ought to avoid all connection with him; and it is as well to say at once what is the fact—*his friend cannot be mine*; his wicked principles and artful manners have destroyed us. There let a subject which I detest end".

This discreet and good woman again recurred to the same subject, but in terms somewhat more subdued, and evidently in ignorance of the fact, that in the interval between her former and present letter, Tone's communications with the French government had been opened through the good offices of Hamilton Rowan.

"October 27.—I trust in Heaven we shall yet be happy with each other. As to the confiscation of our property, it cannot take place before next month at the very soonest, and on that subject my hopes are very good; and I do declare that, at this very moment, the greatest uneasiness and dread I feel are, lest you should come to Europe, or endanger yourself in some other way; so if you stay

* Tone states that he met Rowan and Dr. Reynolds in Philadelphia on the 7th or 8th of August, 1795.

quietly where you are, and do not meddle with politics, which I am sure you will not, all will be well, and the moment anything is determined on you shall know it. In my idea, you would be happier with Priestly than where you are; Reynolds and Tone are not exactly the people you ought to make your constant companions, though there is no reason for absolutely shunning even Tone; however, you ought to be aware of him, and I hope he will not again fall in your way". . . .

Rowan was obliged, in deference to his friends in Ireland, who were interfering for him, and in compliment to Mrs. Rowan's opinions, to write home letters which could be shown to persons in authority. Thus we find him in February, 1796, apologizing in a letter to Mrs. Rowan for his political sentiments:—

"As to my sentiments", says he, "they have been always nearly the same, as far as I can remember. The fact is, that from education and principle, I was led to assert and attempt to support a reform of parliament, and equal liberty to all religious sects. Association may have, and certainly did lead me more into an active life than I wished, was fit for, or will ever, in any case on this side of eternity, fall into again".

But we find him in another letter of his from Wilmington, of the same period (February 20, 1796), giving expression to sentiments which were entertained by him, and were part and parcel of his noble, generous, and chivalrous nature; and they might be commended especially to the consideration and attentive perusal of another exile of a later period—John Mitchell.

"Mr. Millar, who was introduced to me by Muir, in Scotland, as a man of principle, is concerned with a Scottish company, who have made a large purchase of lands here, and would be glad to induce some persons who are known to be among the first settlers. Mr. Russell also has lands in another part of America; but with neither have I made any agreement. Now, let me assure you that I am acting quite by myself, and contrary to advice, for one wants me to remain in Philadelphia, and another, to buy a small farm in a settled country; but I will do neither: I will go to the woods; but I will not kill Indians nor keep slaves. Good God! if you heard some of the Georgians, or the Kentucky people, talking of killing natives! Cortes," and all that followed him, were not more sanguinary in the South, than they would be in North America. . . ."

In one of his letters Rowan refers to the generous conduct of two celebrated lords, for the protection which his family experienced after his escape: "As to the *ex officio* prosecution under which I had been previously

sentenced to two years' imprisonment in Newgate, the being in custody eventually saved my life, and my wife's prudent conduct not only enabled her to pay the fine of £500 which had been laid on me, but also facilitated my return to Ireland. I am convinced that no modification in the circumstances of my civil existence would have taken place if Lord Castlereagh had opposed it. But I am bound in gratitude to the memory of Lord Clare to say, that I am equally certain that my family retained my property after my outlawry, and that I owe my pardon after his decease, to his previous interference in my behalf. However, although he did not afford me any previous assistance, Lord Castlereagh was very attentive to my different applications to him during two years nearly that I remained in London, while the scruples of the Lord Chancellor delayed the ratification of my pardon. In this interval he offered to place one of my sons in the college of Marlow, and gave him a commission in the Company's service, which though not accepted, ought not to be forgotten".

[Marquis Cornwallis to the Duke of Portland.

Dublin Castle, August 2, 1798.

My Lord,

A memorial from Sarah Anne Hamilton Rowan was, I believe forwarded to your grace by Lord Camden.

Lest, however, from the multiplicity of business which has been occasioned by the late distracted state of this country, it should have escaped your notice, I have been requested by the Chancellor and other persons to transmit a copy of it, and to request that your grace would recommend to His Majesty so far to consider the case of this very deserving and unfortunate woman, that she may be permitted to receive the rents of her husband's estate, being about six hundred pounds a-year, for her own support and the education and maintenance of her numerous family.

Many strong symptoms of contrition for his past conduct having been manifested on the part of Mr. Hamilton Rowan, he may perhaps, after the termination of the war, appear to be a proper object for His Majesty's clemency and pardon.

I have the honour, &c.

CORNWALLIS.]

"The year after my arrival in America", says Rowan, "but before I had made any essay towards independence, I received a letter (of which the following is an extract) from a most valued and sincere friend in Ireland, Richard

Griffith, Esq., though of very different political sentiments, advising me to petition government for a pardon; and he sent me a sketch of such a petition as *he* thought would restore me with honour to my friends and country, but which I could not subscribe".

Mr. Griffith's Sketch of a petition for Mr. R.

*" To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the Humble Petition
of Archibald Hamilton Rowan.*

" May it please your Majesty,

" Misguided by false lights, and hurried away by presumptuous self-sufficiency, your petitioner dared for a moment to entertain the wild idea of endeavouring, by aid of your Majesty's enemies, to reform what he deemed the grievances of his native country; but by the intervention of Divine Providence the scheme of destruction was frustrated, and your petitioner, abashed and confounded, fled from the justice of that country. Fortunately for your petitioner, he took refuge with a nation whose maxims of liberty, and whose boldness in overturning every order in society, he had been taught to admire and revere. Your petitioner remained a year in Paris during the reign of Robespierre, and was in much less than half that time fully convinced by the most incontrovertible evidence, produced by each succeeding day's experience, that no evils in government can equal in severity and duration the calamities necessarily attendant on calling into action the power of the mob; a truth which, until it was proved by the concurring testimony of facts passing before his eyes, your petitioner was as far from believing as he is now from doubting. Disgusted by the scenes of carnage which hourly occupied the public attention during his stay at Paris, your petitioner at length obtained permission (after repeated entreaty) to leave a country doomed to misery by the same presumptuous confidence in false philosophy which had misguided your petitioner. Your petitioner having proceeded to America, and having had full time to reflect on the folly and turpitude of his conduct, is strongly impressed with the desire of making the only atonement in his power to his injured country, by a public confession of his guilt.

" He therefore humbly implores your Majesty graciously to accept the deep contrition of a heart truly penitent for past errors, and fraught with the warmest attachment to the British constitution and to your Majesty's person and government.

" And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will pray".

Mr. Rowan's answer respecting the foregoing petition,
through Mrs. Rowan.

" December, 1796.

" One of the enclosures which I have received by Mr. Reilly makes it necessary for me to trouble you with this letter. Expecting that I should comply with the advice of Mr. Griffith, you may neglect interesting your friends in your behalf. I must, therefore, be explicit; and as all the late news tend to peace, I cannot be suspected of secret hopes. I never will sign any petition or declaration in favour of the British constitution in Ireland, which embraces such flagrant abuses as I have witnessed, and of which I have been in some measure the victim; yet this seems requisite to be an integral part of any application to be made in my favour. I would have promised a perfect quiescence under the present government, and should have been sincerely grateful to those who had it in their power to crush my family through me, yet forbore. But my opinions were not hastily adopted; they were neither the result of pride, of ambition, nor of vanity; they were the result of the most mature reflection of which I was capable; they cannot alter; and though I might desist from acting on them, I never will disown them. If such conduct be expected from me, that I may be enabled to make over my fortune to you and to the children, you should consult your friends upon what mode would be the best for you to pursue, for I am determined".

Mrs. Rowan, finding that the hope of a free pardon at that time must be abandoned, she used all the interest in her power to procure permission for her husband to quit America, and to go to any country not at war with Great Britain. Mr. Griffith warmly seconded her efforts, by writing to the Lord Chancellor, and calling on him repeatedly to urge her suit. To the Chancellor's honour be it recorded, that he always evinced a cordial sympathy in the sufferings of Mrs. Rowan and her family. At length, in September, 1799, she received the following letter from Lord Castlereagh, with whom Mr. Rowan's father was well acquainted:—

Letter from Lord Castlereagh to Mrs. H. Rowan.

" Dublin Castle, 9th September, 1799.

" Madam,

" My Lord Lieutenant having, by desire of the Lord Chancellor, stated to his Grace the Duke of Portland,

that Mr. Hamilton Rowan was anxious to proceed to Denmark from America, but that he was afraid he might be apprehended in his passage by one of His Majesty's cruisers, I am directed to acquaint you that, in consequence of the favourable report made by the Lord Chancellor of Mr. Rowan's conduct since he resided in America, he will be secured (as far as His Majesty's government is concerned) in the refuge which may be granted to him in Denmark or elsewhere, as long as he continues to demean himself in such a manner as not to give offence.

"I have the honour to be, Madam,

"Your most obedient servant,

"CASTLEREAGH".

At last it was determined that Rowan should go to Hamburg; and accordingly he lost no time in making preparation for his departure; and sailed for Europe in July, 1800. After a short stay in Hamburg, where he found himself incommoded a good deal with "fools and knaves", he proceeded to Alcona, where there were many English and Irish residents and French emigrants of high rank. There he rented and furnished a handsome house. Having letters of introduction to many opulent merchants, both German and English, he soon found himself with his family in the midst of a pleasant society. From Sir G. Rombald, who succeeded Sir James Crawford at Hamburg, he received every mark of kind and polite attention. Here he remained till the year 1803; and in the interval various exertions were made by his friends to procure his pardon.

Referring to this subject in his memoir he says:—

"As I rejected the petition which I could not sign, I will now insert a copy of one which I transmitted to His Majesty in July, 1802:—

"May it please your Majesty,

"The humane protection afforded under your Majesty's government to your petitioner's wife and family, while crimes were imputed to him which might have rendered him liable to the severest penalties of the law, when he had taken refuge among your Majesty's enemies, has made an indelible impression on his mind. He could not avoid comparing, with the strongest feelings of gratitude, the situation of his dearest connections with the forlorn state which the families of emigrants experienced in the country to which he had fled. Under these impressions, in the year 1795, your petitioner withdrew himself from France, and retired to America, being

determined to avoid even the imputation of being instrumental in disturbing the tranquillity of his own country. During above five years' residence in the United States, your petitioner resisted all inducements to a contrary conduct, and remained there quiet and retired, until your Majesty, extending your royal benevolence, was graciously pleased to permit his return to Europe to join his wife and children. Impressed with the most unfeigned attachment to your Majesty's government, in gratitude for these favours, conscious of the excellence of the British constitution, in which your petitioner sees, with heartfelt satisfaction, his native country participating under the late happy union, effected by your Majesty's paternal wisdom and affection, and assured that his conduct will not belie these sentiments, your petitioner approaches your Majesty's throne at this auspicious moment, praying that your Majesty will condescend to extend your royal clemency to your petitioner, in such manner as your Majesty in your wisdom may think proper."

"My friend Mr. Griffith now wrote to Lord Clare concerning my petition, who returned him the following answer:—

"My dear Sir,—The weight of business which presses on me in the Court of Chancery at this time renders it impracticable for me to attend to any other subject. I can readily conjecture the object of the petition which you wish to show me, and do not hesitate to say that, patience under his most unpleasant situation, for a few months, will be the best policy on the part of Mr. H. Rowan, and whenever a definite treaty of peace is settled will be the time to petition the crown; and when that takes place, I should hope that his friends will be enabled to support his petition with effect.

"I am, dear Sir, &c., &c.,
"CLARE".

Rowan, from various passages in his correspondence in 1799, would seem to have been a strenuous supporter of the union.

The inconsistency of his conduct in this matter was more apparent than real. In 1794, we find him acting in concert, in Ireland, with an emissary of the French government, whose treasonable mission was directed towards the separation of Ireland from England. In 1795, we find him in America furnishing Tone with means of access to the French government, with the same views as in the preceding year. But in 1799 all change

of reasonable expectation of a revolution in Ireland was gone. In these altered circumstances of the country, he saw nothing for Ireland but a union, and believed a real *bona fide* union, beneficial to both countries, was intended. In 1799, he writes to a member of his family on this subject:—

“I congratulate you upon the report which spreads here that a union is intended. In that measure I see the downfall of one of the most corrupt assemblies, I believe, ever existed, and instead of an empty title, a source of industrious enterprise for the people, and the wreck of feudal aristocracy”.

March the 15th, 1799, he writes to Mrs. Rowan:—

“I begin to think that the only question a poor man should ask himself is, ‘Under what government shall I work least, get most, and keep what I get?’ In this view, to use an American term, I would advocate an union in Ireland, which will throw work into the cabin, and take triple taxes and tenth of income, &c., &c., out of the rich man’s house. In future times, however, I have no doubt but a mode will be adopted better than any now known, and I am fortified in this opinion from the great probability of a convulsion in this country, which has certainly, theoretically, the most free government existing”.

“Philadelphia, June 30, 1800.

“Mr. Dickinson asserts that the accomplishment of the union will bring further indulgence to the political sinners of your country. I have no such idea, notwithstanding the favours which I have received in your person from the Chancellor, its professed advocate. By the bye, I have read his speech on this subject, which proves one thing evidently, that the present, or rather the late government of Ireland, was disgraced by a shameless, corrupt, oligarchic aristocracy, whose power ought to be done away, as Robespierre said about Paine, for the good of both countries”.

In the beginning of June, 1800, Rowan took his departure from the United States of America for Hamburg, where he arrived after a tedious and perilous passage; and after a short sojourn there, proceeded to Alcona, where he established himself, and remained till the month of June, 1803. In the latter part of the preceding month he received a communication from Lord Castlereagh, informing him of the intention of the cabinet to recommend to the King to grant him a pardon, but prohibiting his going to Ireland without His Majesty’s

permission, and entering into recognizance, which it was usual to require in similar cases.

"Having arrived in London on the 16th of June, I went the next day to the Secretary of State's office. He introduced me to Mr. Pollock, who showed me the King's warrant for pardon, which contained all the beneficial clauses of re-grant, &c., and was as full in every respect as it could be, excepting the condition of requiring two sureties for £10,000 not to go to Ireland. Mr. Pollock said one week would be sufficient to pass the different offices, and Mr. Steele requested him to attend to it, and as soon as the document was returned to his office, to inform him, and he, with my friend Mr. Griffith, offered to become my sureties.

"My agent arrived from Ireland, bringing with him the opinions of eminent counsel, which all agreed that a pardon under the great seal of Britain alone would avail me no otherwise than as to my personal liberty in England".

While these efforts were being made in England, the opinion of counsel was taken as to the mode of accomplishing the desired object. Two of the most eminent men at the Irish bar gave an opinion that a pardon under the great seal of England alone would only avail Rowan for his personal liberty in England. The under Secretary of the Lord Lieutenant furnished Mr. Rowan's friends with a copy of the opinion of the crown lawyers:—

" Dublin Castle,
27th October, 1802.

"We are of opinion that the pardon to Mr. Hamilton Rowan ought to be passed under the great seal of Ireland; and we apprehend it is irregular in Mr. Rowan to solicit such pardon and the restitution of his lands in Ireland in the first instance, and that such application ought to be made to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.

" (Signed),

" STANDISH O'GRADY.
" W. C. PLUNKETT".

Acting on this opinion, when Hamilton Rowan was eventually pardoned in 1806, and obtained permission to reside in Ireland, he attended at the Court of King's Bench, and publicly pleaded the King's pardon. The following is the report of that proceeding:—

"Mr. Archibald Hamilton Rowan was brought up by *kebeas corpus*, to assign error upon the record of outlawry against him for high treason. His counsel then moved that the outlawry should be reversed, for errors which

were then delivered into the proper officer. The Attorney-General then, by virtue of His Majesty's warrant, confessed the errors; and the proceedings in outlawry were reversed accordingly. Mr. Rowan was then put to plead to the original indictment for high treason; upon which he pleaded His Majesty's most gracious pardon, which being read and allowed, he was told he was discharged.

"Mr. Rowan then addressed the court. He begged to be permitted in a few words to express his heartfelt gratitude for the clemency of his sovereign.

" 'When I last', said he, 'had the honour to stand in this court before your lordships, I said that I did not know the King otherwise than as the head of the state—as a magistrate wielding the force of the executive power. I now know him by his clemency—by that clemency which has enabled me once more to meet my wife and children; to find them not only unmolested, but cherished and protected during my absence in a foreign country, and my legal incapacity of rendering to them the assistance of a husband and a father. Were I to be insensible of that clemency, I should be indeed an unworthy man! All are liable to error. The consequences have taught me deeply to regret some of the violent measures which I then pursued. Under the circumstances in which I stand, were I to express all I feel upon this subject, it might be attributed to base and unworthy motives; but your lordships are aware how deeply I must be affected by my present situation, and will give me credit for what I cannot myself express'.

"Lord Chief Justice Downes—"Mr. Rowan, from the sentiments which you have expressed, I have reason to hope that your future conduct will prove that His Majesty's pardon has not been unworthily granted'".

Among the numerous persons who congratulated him on his pardon were many of his political opponents, who expressed their satisfaction publicly and privately at seeing him restored to his family and his country. "Lords Carysfort, Castlereagh, and Carhampton were foremost in expressions of kindness". Lord Clare was not then living, or his congratulations, in Rowan's opinion, would have been joined with those of the noblemen just named.

He returned to Ireland in 1806, on the death of his father and fixed his residence in the old castle of Killileagh, on his own estate in the County Down. Rowan now figured in the character of a good citizen, a good landlord, a good father of a family. The great business of his life was to be useful to those who were connected with him as tenants, labourers, and servants;

to promote the internal peace and concord of the country. He became the poor man's friend of the locality—the generous encourager of the manufacturers of Dublin, especially of the poor weavers of the liberties of the city.

“Mr. Rowan's benevolent exertions”, says his biographer, “to meliorate the circumstances of all round him who were in distress, did not so completely engross his time and reflections as to preclude him from indulging his favourite propensity to politics. It was not possible for him to be a dull-unconcerned spectator in the midst of great and stirring events. Though he felt the full weight of his obligation to the lenity of government, he did not feel himself precluded from an open and honest expression of opinions which he thought loyal and constitutional, though not always in exact accordance with those of the ruling powers. His acceptance of pardon involved no dereliction of principle; it did not oblige him to connive at glaring abuses, nor give an ostensible sanction to measures which he conscientiously condemned; it restored him to the full enjoyment of all his rights as a subject of the British constitution. It had been generously granted, and in the same generous spirit it was received—in the spirit of a gentleman and a man of honour, not of a mendicant or a slave. He therefore clung to such opinions and measures as he thought most consonant to the spirit of the British constitution, and which would best promote its permanence and stability. In a letter addressed to the Editor of the *Patriot* newspaper, in 1811, speaking of the sentiments adopted in his youth, he says—‘Of these His Majesty in his pardon had not required, nor my petitions promised, a renunciation’”.

Being always regarded as a distinguished friend of civil and religious liberty, he became a member of the Catholic Association, and took, as he was wont, a warm interest in its proceedings. A meeting of the Catholic Board, which was held in Fishamble Street, being dispersed, and having reassembled as an aggregate meeting, he addressed a letter to Lord Fingal, from which the following passages are taken:—

“The Catholics of Ireland were prepared this day to read a petition to parliament, in Fishamble Street, when they were prevented by a police magistrate, who chose to consider that meeting as an illegal one, and forced your lordship out of the chair. I was a spectator of that disgraceful scene, where legal quibble was tortured to entrap the feelings of a man of honour, unaccustomed to disguise, because his pursuits were honourable, and legal, and constitutional. That meeting, however, being

dispersed, the general sentiment of an injured and insulted population led to an assembly of individuals at Darcy's, at which I assisted. That meeting was also disturbed by the same magistrate; and I am not surprised; but I am concerned that those circumstances should have altered the ultimate object of the former meeting, from a petition to parliament into an address to the Prince Regent.

"Appeals to persons are not equal to appeals to principles. One law ought to bind Catholic and Protestant, Jew or Mahometan, if Irishmen. This has ever been my creed, and will ever be the rule of action for,

"My Lord,

"Your respectful and obedient servant,

"A. H. ROWAN.

"December 23, 1811".

Of the cause of "Catholic emancipation" he had always been a strenuous advocate. He thought the success of that great question absolutely necessary to the tranquillity of Ireland; and in 1824, when he sent his subscription to the "RENT", he accompanied it with a letter expressive of his hopes and wishes. A resolution that both should be entered on the minutes was "adopted with a zeal and enthusiasm that had never been exceeded in that body".

In a debate in the House of Commons on the Catholic Association, February 14th, 1825, the proceedings of that body were severely censured by Mr. Dawson, who, referring to the part taken in them by Rowan, said—"Upon a recent occasion, a Mr. Devereux and a Mr. Hamilton Rowan had been admitted members of the Association, when the name of the latter was received with thunders of applause. Mr. Hamilton Rowan, it would be remembered, was one of the body called United Irishmen. He had been implicated in seditious practices in the year 1793, for which he was imprisoned. Previous to his trial he contrived to escape, and remained for many years in exile. He was attainted of high treason, but being afterwards, by the lenity of the government, allowed to return to Ireland, the best return he could make for the mercy which had been shown him, was by enlisting himself as a member of an association quite as dangerous as that of his own United Irishmen. The name of *this convicted traitor* was received with thunders of applause—and why? In order that this recollection of the disastrous period with which that name was connected might be revived in the minds of the deluded peasantry, and help the designs of this abominable association".

In a subsequent debate (February 18th) Mr. Peel followed the same line of argument as Mr. Dawson, and censured the Catholic Association for passing a vote of thanks to Archibald Hamilton Rowan—"an act which", he affirmed, "was sufficient to excite suspicion and alarm". He referred to the report of the Secret Committee of the Irish parliament in 1794, quoted part of the celebrated address, "Citizen soldiers, to arms", and entered into a minute statement of the trial and pardon of Rowan, whom he designated as an "attainted traitor". This expression excited the indignation of Mr. C. Hely Hutchinson and of Mr. Brougham.

"Mr. C. H. Hutchinson said he had more than once lamented and opposed the practice of introducing the names of individuals who were not here, and had not the means of defending themselves. The right honourable gentleman who had just sat down had carried this practice to a most unjustifiable length. He had mentioned the name of Hamilton Rowan. He (Mr. Hutchinson) was in Dublin when that gentleman fled the country, and no man ever left Ireland more respected and more regretted. He would tell the right honourable gentleman that the most enlightened and best men in Ireland, in 1793, had been among the United Irishmen, with the most constitutional views. The cause in which they were engaged was to benefit their country, and to produce that state of things which the colleagues of the right honourable gentleman professed themselves most anxious to establish. Never were men engaged in a more righteous undertaking. Had they been successful, they had prevented the rebellion of 1798. Sydney, Hampden, Russell, the greatest names, the most hallowed patriots in English history, would now have been stigmatized as traitors, had not the cause of liberty, for which we all are thankful, flourished here, and if that despotism had triumphed in England which had been continued in Ireland up to this hour. Had these men succeeded in Ireland in 1793, they would have been regarded as benefactors of that country, and they were even now receiving approbation; for the system pursued by the right honourable gentleman and his colleagues was that which they then wished to enforce".

Mr. Hutchinson was followed in a similar strain by Mr. Brougham, in the debate, on the 18th of February, 1825.

"The charge against the Catholic Association was this, that they spoke of Mr. Hamilton Rowan as a man entitled to the respect and love of his country; and yet, said the right honourable gentleman, Mr. Hamilton Rowan was not more nor less than a convicted traitor. [Mr. Secretary Peel—Attainted.] Well—an attainted traitor. The charge,

then, against the Catholic Association was, that they spoke with respect of an attainted traitor. The Catholics state, that he is a man of the highest respectability. There was not a man more dearly beloved in Ireland. If to hold Mr. Rowan as an object of respect and affection be a crime, they were all guilty. This was not misstatement, this was not exaggeration; they themselves join in the description, and admit it to be a fact. Of the two charges brought against the Association, this was the gravest. And he was instructed to assert, that it would be proved by witnesses at the bar of that house, that there was not in this country a man to whom all were more zealously attached, more respected, and more beloved, than Mr. Rowan. . . . This much-loved individual was a gentleman of large and princely fortune, respected by all around him, endeared to his friends by all the ties of domestic life, attached to this country by a spirit of the most ardent and irrepressible patriotism. He was one of those men who, in the agitated times of 1793, 1797, and 1798, when the wisest were often misled, and when the honestest, from the very excess of patriotic feeling, were roused to frenzy by the injuries which they conceived their country was enduring, under-went every species of vituperation, and in that wretched period were swept away in one general act of attainder, although many of them could never have been brought to trial with any hope of conviction. "*Fuerint cupidi*"—(for the character is applicable not only to Mr. Hamilton Rowan, but to the Fitzgeralds and others, who went too far in the times of which I have been speaking; and God forbid that I should deny that they went too far, although God also forbid that I should charge them with crimes of which they were guiltless)—"*Fuerint cupidi, fuerint irati, fuerint pertinaces, sceleris vero crimine, furoris, parricidii, liceat. Cn. Pompeio mortuo, liceat, multis aliis carere*". Such, Sir, are not my sentiments alone with respect to many of those unfortunate individuals. Pardoned by his prince, Mr. Hamilton Rowan returned to the bosom of his family. Again he became the dispenser of blessings to his attached tenants; again he drew around him all the tender and endearing connections of life; he exercised all the functions of a country gentleman; he attended all the charitable meetings which are so frequent in Ireland. By the manner in which he expended his liberal income and by the whole tenor of his conduct, he became the darling of his neighbourhood. Nay more, he attends the courts of the representatives of his sovereign, and is received with favour, with kindness, with courtesy by one viceroy after another—not only by Lord Wellesley, but by Lord Whitworth. And this, Sir, is the man, whom the Catholic

Association are to be attacked, vituperated, and denounced, unheard and without the means of defence, for declaring to be entitled to, and to be enjoying, the respect and affection of his countrymen ! Sir, I declare, that if I could not repel that charge against the Catholic Association, if I could not convince the house, from that unexpected quarter, if I could not commend the chalice to the right honourable gentleman's own lips, which he had prepared for his opponents, if I could not elicit new arguments from his assertion on this part of the subject, to show the necessity for inquiry, to prove the incalculable dangers which we are incurring in this course of hasty legislation, I would at once abandon the cause".

Mr. Brougham had spoken of Rowan as performing the duties of a magistrate and "holding the commission of the peace under the superintendence and protection of Lord Manners, the pink of loyalty ! the idol of the Orangemen's adoration—acting under the concurrence of their late tutelar saint, Mr. Saurin". Mr. Peel having ascertained, by application to the Hanaper Office, that no such person as A. H. Rowan had been admitted to the commission of the peace for the last twenty years, in a subsequent debate stated this fact as a triumphant confutation of the ignorance with which he had been charged of Mr. Rowan's situation in Ireland.

Mr. Brougham in reference to the words "attainted traitor", used by Mr. Peel said:—

"He appealed to the impartial, the calm-judging men of that house, who mingled neither with one side nor the other, whether such were not the right honourable gentleman's words; the words uttered by him in the face of the country, without respect to the feelings of the individual, of his country, or his son. But he (Mr. B.) appealed to the better feelings of the house, to the country, to the memory of the right honourable gentleman, after one week's recollection of what he had said; appealed to the right honourable gentlemen, as placing himself in the situation of one of those gallant officers whose distinguished bravery adorned a service, of which to be even amongst its lowest members was, in itself, a very high honour—he meant no other than Captain Hamilton—whether to hear it publicly, not privately, but in the face of parliament and the country, represented that his own father was an attainted traitor, was just or proper. As to himself, he would repeat his opinion of Mr. Rowan, from which he did not shrink. He would repeat his defence of the Catholic Association.



He would not enter into the details of this gentleman's case, with which he was not much acquainted. The charge of the right honourable gentleman was, that Mr. Jackson and another individual were tried, and Mr. Rowan was said to be implicated. But it seems he was tried for another offence, namely, the publication of a seditious libel. They were troublesome times when these occurrences took place, and the best and wisest of the children of Ireland, were liable to the same fate; and the charge against the Association upon this head is, that they respect an individual thus convicted. . . . He would not hesitate to say, that as an Irishman, a lover of his country, and a patriot, he would put his hand to the paper published by Mr. Rowan. It called upon the people to arm, but at the same time to maintain the public peace. It was published at a period when all was at stake from abroad, and much was at stake from within. It was published at a period when Ireland was erecting statues to the illustrious Grattan, when the Volunteers were proclaimed the saviours of the country. It was at this period Mr. Rowan called upon the people to arm, for the country was proclaimed by the government to be in danger; and if he called upon them not to stop here, but to go further, and when they had beaten back the enemy, to procure civil liberty, he would be only doing what the parliament allowed the Volunteers to do. If these men had not armed in 1782, Ireland would have been enslaved and degraded. She would be an unworthy part of the empire, or, perhaps, after a civil war, she would be separated entirely. In those troublous times, all the Irish patriots were subject to the same hazard; even that person whose name was never mentioned at the opposite side of the house without feelings of reverence and affection—Mr. Grattan—was not safe. The privy council had repeated sittings concerning him, and it was his departure alone from the country saved him from trouble. He left Dublin upon the first burst of that rage which filled the land with desolation. As to the comments made by the right honourable gentleman upon the conduct of Mr. Rowan upon receiving his pardon, they amounted to nothing; they merely referred to his grateful effusions upon that event. But, good God! are we to be told that a man receiving a free pardon, treated by his sovereign as Mr. Rowan was, is to be branded as an attainted traitor, when a sarcasm is to be pointed, when a period is to be rounded, or a cheer excited in that house? As to the circumstance of his not being in the commission, he (Mr. Brougham) had only the same opportunity of knowing such matters as others had; but whether Mr. Hamilton Rowan were a magistrate or not, I consider my defence to be

impregnable. The King himself restored Mr. Rowan to a free pardon; Mr. Rowan was restored to all the privileges of a free subject; Mr. Rowan was summoned and sat upon grand juries; and I ask, is that no function? Felonies, misdeameanours, cases even of high treason, came before him; he sat, and heard, and determined in all these cases. Is not that, I ask, enough? He is received at the King's levees by the representative of the sovereign; is that, I ask, nothing? He was received by one Lord Lieutenant after another; and the letter of his Grace the Duke of Bedford said nothing of an 'attainted traitor', although the honourable gentlemen at the other side, who so called Mr. Rowan, set themselves up the exclusive defenders of the King, the altar, and the constitution. It has been my practice and my habit to believe that the Duke of Bedford had and has as good a right to be looked upon as a loyal subject, as holding as deep a stake in the peace and tranquillity of the country, as offering in his conduct, talent, and property, as good a test of loyalty, as any honourable gentleman in this house. Then let the house hear what was the observation of the Duke of Bedford. 'The first act of the administration was to offer a pardon to Mr. Hamilton Rowan, for no man better deserved it, and no act could be more satisfactory, because a more honourable, a more respectable, or a more liberal man existed not in Ireland'. Well, then, for repeating this, the Catholic Association was blamed and branded. But I ask, who has a right to complain of this? who has a right to fling in the teeth of Mr. Rowan that he was, or is, an 'attainted traitor', when he was received by several representatives of his sovereign, and when his sovereign so smiled upon him? The sovereign of these realms so treated Mr. Rowan, and what more did the Catholic Association? I repeat and re-assert all I have said as to Mr. Rowan; and I envy not the feelings of those who, in despite of their sovereign's pleasure, humanity, and good feeling, can wantonly and unnecessarily, not privately, but in their places in parliament, brand that honourable, honest, though unfortunate gentleman with the name of 'attainted traitor'; and I still less envy the judgment of those who deem the Catholic Association culpable, because they hailed and treated Mr. Rowan as the King's representative had set them the example so to do".

"Mr. Rowan at this period", says Dr. Drummond, "had reached the age of seventy-four; but though his spirit slumbered under the weight of years, it had not died; 'still in their ashes lived their wonted fires'; the lion had grown old, but not so feeble as to be kicked with impunity. The old gentleman determined to act on the principles of

that code of honour to which he had been attached from his youth; and as Mr. Dawson had been the first to use the offensive epithets, to demand of him an explanation or apology".

On Rowan's arrival in the metropolis he wrote to Mr. Dawson in terms of more strength than suavity and thus for a time precluded such an amicable explanation as Mr. Dawson's subsequent conduct justifies the belief that he would instantly have given. Mr. Dawson's friend, Lord Hotham, whom Rowan describes as "a polite young man in the Guards, cool, clear, and temperate, who acted in a most gentlemanlike manner", informed Mr. Rowan, both by writing and conversation, that before he could expect any explanation from Mr. Dawson, his own offensive letter should be withdrawn. Rowan, being as far from wishing to give as to receive offence, acceded to the justice of this observation, and addressed the following note to his lordship:—

"My Lord—After thanking your lordship for your clear and temperate comment on my appeal to Mr. Dawson, and after apologizing for any warmth of expression on my part in our conversation of this morning, I have, as you desired, read your letter to a friend, whose opinion, in concurrence with your lordship's has convinced me that 'an appeal for explanation should be perfectly free from all language in any degree offensive to the party to whom that appeal is made'; and I regret that mine was in any respect otherwise. Under this impression, I have no hesitation in withdrawing my letter of the 23rd of May, containing the offensive passages noticed by you. As I am now persuaded that those passages were the only impediment to my receiving such an explanation as it was the object of that letter to request, I trust Mr. Dawson will be prompt to relieve me from the impressions under the influence of which I have been led to address him.

"I have the honour to be, &c.,

"A. H. ROWAN".

This was succeeded by the following note from Mr. Dawson:—

"16 Upper Grosvenor Street,
"June 30, 1825.

"Sir—The letter which you have addressed to Lord Hotham, bearing date the 28th of June, enables me to assure you, that in introducing your name into the debate in the House of Commons, I was influenced solely by considerations of public duty, and that nothing was

further from my wish than any intention to wound your feelings, or offer you any premeditated insult.

"I have the honour to be &c.,

"G. R. DAWSON".

An American friend of Rowan's, William Poole, a Quaker, a wise and a good man, addressed a letter to "the fine old" Irish "gentleman all of the olden time", wherein he refers to the recent display of his still unsubdued fighting propensities:—

"The account relating to thy (foolish shall I call it?) excursion to England is not sent me, as my friends think that I had better not see it. However, I have heard enough of it to be surprised that at thy age thou shouldst suffer *anything* to put at risk thy own peace and the peace of thy family. But I cannot enter into thy feelings or views, perhaps, nor the warmth of the Irish character".

Subsequently he says:—

"I rejoice that my friend has escaped that distress which might have followed to himself and family from victory or defeat. To old men, such as we are, it appears to me to be of much more importance to preserve the quietude and innocence of our minds, than to take a very deep interest of any kind in the affairs of a world from which we are so soon to pass away".

Dr. Drummond sates that Captain Hamilton wrote a strong letter, though couched in polite terms, to Mr. Peel, expressing his indignant sense of the wrong done by him in his reference to his father, in his place in parliament in June, 1825. In that letter he stated that if any imprudence had been committed by his father in 1794, it had received the King's pardon, and was no fitting theme for parliamentary animadversion. If that indiscretion, he said, had left any stain, "that stain had been blotted out by the blood of his children, shed in their country's service: one had died of sickness and hardships; another fell in action on the coast of Spain; he had himself been severely wounded. He concluded by saying that he indulged a belief that if these circumstances had been taken into consideration, he and his family would have been spared the pain of an attack so unprovoked and so unwarranted". Peel, in 1825, not having cast off the Orangemen or rescued his character from the degradation of a close connexion with them, could only writhe in secret under such a remonstrance. He made no amends in public for an act most unworthy of a man in his position.

On Tuesday, January 20, 1829, a great meeting of the friends of civil and religious liberty was held in the Rotundo of Dublin, attended "by numbers of the first

rank, wealth, influence, talent, public and private worth, and of all sects of Christians; the Duke of Leinster in the chair”.

Mr. Rowan attended this meeting; and a resolution of thanks being moved by Mr. Challoner to the Protestant gentlemen and noblemen who promoted the dinner to Lord Morpeth, Mr. Rowan seconded the resolution in a speech, of which the substance was thus noticed in the daily papers:—

“He said, that he remembered, in early life, when the people of this country were armed and determined to preserve themselves against foreign invaders—then he became one of a body, now called the Old Volunteers. He remembered a period when the object was to remove domestic dissention—then he became a United Irishman; and he now came forward at a period when, if Irishmen were really united, they must be free. (Loud cheers)”.

It is also stated in the same document, that

“When the venerable Hamilton Rowan was leaving the Rotundo, after the meeting of yesterday, he was supported on each side by O’Gorman Mahon and Mr. Steele; and in going down Sackville Street, they were surrounded by an immense crowd of the people, cheering and huzzaing. They got into a hackney coach to escape, but the people would not permit it, and the horses were taken from the carriage, and they were drawn in triumph by the concourse to the house of the venerable patriot in Leinster Street, amidst enthusiastic cheering, shouting, and huzzaing”.

With respect to the subject of Parliamentary Reform, the political sentiments which he had entertained in youth he continued to cherish in his old age. He avowed them in a communication addressed to his friend, the able and upright editor of the *Northern Whig*:—

“Castle of Killyleagh,

“October 13, 1831.

“My dear Finlay—As I have ever adhered to the principle which dictated the original engagement of the United Irishmen, I take the liberty of proposing the test of that society, with some slight alterations, for the adoption of the friends of reform:—

“‘In the presence of God, I do pledge myself to my country, that I will use all my abilities and influence in the attainment of an impartial representation of British subjects in parliament, under our most gracious monarch William the Fourth, in the spirit proposed by his highly esteemed and respected ministers, Lord Grey, &c.’

"Entering my eighty-second year, and frail in body as in mind, such as I am, I am yours sincerely,

" A. H. ROWAN.

" F. D. Finlay, Esq."

Domestic trials and afflictions fell fast and heavily on this venerable man in 1834.

Mrs. Rowan died after a protracted illness, the 26th of February in that year. A clergyman of the Unitarian body, of which Mrs. Rowan was a member, the Rev. Dr. Armstrong, her intimate friend, published a notice of her character and career in a religious periodical in 1834, from which the following passages are taken:—

"This excellent lady was a character of no ordinary description. Endowed by nature with singular energy of mind and firmness of resolution, she blended with these qualities the kindest disposition and warmest benevolence. These traits were fully manifested in the various trials and duties of her long and useful life. As a wife, her heroic fortitude, courage, and presence of mind, on a memorable occasion in the history of Ireland, have given her a conspicuous place among those matrons who, in different ages and countries, have been distinguished for their noble contempt of personal hazard, and their generous self-devotion to conjugal duty in times of difficulty and danger. Entrusted for many years with the sole guidance of a numerous family of sons and daughters, her conduct as a parent was truly exemplary. Strict without severity, and indulgent without weakness, her precepts combined with her example to train them up in such high-minded and honourable principles, as might not only sustain the character of the race from which they sprang, but, what she valued infinitely more, might evince the genuineness of their Christian hopes and profession. And her maternal cares were not without their reward. Few mothers have been more loved and honoured by a grateful progeny. Few have had their decline of life more dutifully tended, or its pains more assiduously soothed by filial tenderness and affection. In friendship she was faithful, steady, and sincere; to the poor and afflicted, compassionate, open-handed, and humane".

In less than six months from the time of this excellent lady's decease, Rowan had to deplore the loss of his only surviving and eldest son, the gallant Captain Hamilton. Gawin William Hamilton Rowan was born at Paris, in March, 1783. He entered the navy in 1801 as midshipman, and made a voyage to China in His Majesty's ship *Lion*. In 1803, he served in the West Indies, and was at the capture of St. Lucia and Tobago. In 1804, he served in the Mediterranean in Lord Nelson's and Collingwood's

fleets. In 1807, he served in Egypt, having volunteered to land with the seamen at Alexandria, engaged in the attack on the lines, and capture of that place.

In 1809 he was promoted to the rank of lieutenant, and was engaged in several actions with the French, where his enterprising spirit and bravery were signally displayed. In 1811 he was appointed commander of the *Onyx*, and was employed on the coast of Spain; and the year following was raised to the rank of post-captain, and obtained the command of the *Termagant*. While employed on the Spanish coast, he destroyed twelve batteries and towers, one French privateer, and captured another, and was at the taking of several towns on the coast. In 1813 he was employed in the *Rainbow*, on the coast of Italy, during which service he took and destroyed twenty-four of the enemy's vessels, at Viareggio, and shortly after was wounded at Leghorn.

In the latter part of that year he was appointed to the *Havannah*, and served in Chesapeake Bay, at the attack on Baltimore, and in the expedition of boats up the Rappahannoc. In 1815 he was again employed in the Mediterranean, and in 1816 brought home Governor Wilks from St. Helena, when, his vessel being out of commission, he returned to Ireland. In 1817 he married a daughter of Lieutenant-General Sir George Cockburn. In 1820 he was appointed to the command of the *Cambrian*, and took out Lord Strangford as ambassador to Constantinople. From that period until the return of the *Cambrian* to England, he was constantly employed in the Levant, in the protection of the Greeks, in which service Captain Hamilton was first known, and on numerous occasions and in various places in the Archipelago the author had opportunities of knowing the devotion of this brave officer to the Greek cause, and the signal services he rendered to it. The Greek commanders had an absurd idea that his name, Hamilton, consisted of two distinct names. Some were in the habit of addressing him as Captain Hamel; others, and by far the most, as Captain Tony; a circumstance which he seldom failed to notice, and would often affect to be very indignant at. The Greeks looked up to him as the only hope of their cause. He certainly deserved well their love and gratitude. He fought for them; he ransomed their wives and children; he expended in so doing vast sums out of his private means; he treated them with the greatest kindness; in fact, they looked up to Captain Tony as if he were their father and natural protector. Some of his officers used to say he was as good as a grandmother to them. But when they behaved badly, or did not do what he expected of them, or desired to have done, he would rail at them in good round English

seafaring terms, and mingle the national malediction with a great many strangely pronounced Greek terms of reproach, by no means complimentary to the fathers, mothers, saints, captains, brigands, and rulers of his astounded Hellenist auditors. Soon after the *Cambrian's* arrival in England, she was again commissioned, and placed under his command. He was ordered to his former station, where, down to the battle of Navarino, his services to the Greeks can only be estimated by those who had a personal knowledge of them, and by them certainly cannot be exaggerated.

Not long after the battle of Navarino, the *Cambrian* was unfortunately lost, by running foul of the *Isis*, and striking on the rocks, off the Carabousa. On Captain Hamilton's return to England, as a matter of course, he was tried by court-martial for the loss of his vessel, and was honourably acquitted, and was shortly after appointed to the *Druid*, on the South American station, from which he returned to Ireland in February, 1832, greatly broken down in health.

He took up his abode in the Castle of Killyleagh, intending it to be his permanent place of residence. After a sojourn there of a few months, he went on a visit to his venerable father, then residing at Rathcoffy, in the County of Kildare, and there he was suddenly taken ill, and expired of water on the chest, on the 17th of August, 1834, leaving three or four children. Such was the man whose feelings Mr. Peel, in his bad days, so wantonly outraged in the House of Commons, on the occasion I have previously referred to.

The bad days of Peel's early political career were the subject of some comments in the House of Peers in a debate on the state of Ireland, 14th February, 1844. Lord Lyndhurst, in answer to some observations on Sir Robert's ignorance of Irish affairs, said, "Was not Sir Robert Peel in Ireland?" The Marquess of Normanby replied, "The knowledge which Sir Robert Peel gained in Ireland is not applicable to the present time".

When was the knowledge gained above referred to? In the interval between the 4th of August, 1812, and the 3rd of August, 1818, the six years of rampant Orangeism in Ireland, during which Sir Robert Peel was secretary.

Peel, in 1825, was still in the chrysalis form of statesmanship. He had not then emerged from the low grub condition of Orangeism through which he had entered into official life while secretary in Ireland.

From the time of the death of his only son, the gallant Captain Hamilton, his father's health rapidly declined. The constant care and attention of his two daughters, Miss Rowan and Mrs. Fletcher, occasional recreation in his

laboratory and library, sustained him for a short time; but the loneliness of his life, and the setting of its sun, in the death of that great hope which was centred in his eldest-born, and the dreariness of the house which his amiable wife had made for so many years a happy home, day by day seemed to weigh more heavily on his enfeebled strength. He died on the 1st of November, 1834, at the age of eighty-four years, having survived his beloved wife nine months, and his gallant son only as many weeks, and a daughter, Mrs. Beresford, rather more than a year.*

Rowan died in communion with the Unitarian church, by whose members, in common indeed with the members of all churches in his native city, he was held in the highest honour. His remains were interred in a vault in St. Mary's church.

Of his exterior, physical powers and accomplishments, his amiable friend and biographer, Dr. Drummond, says:—

“Mr. Rowan had a tall and commanding person, in which agility, strength, and grace were combined. His features were expressive and strongly marked. In his younger days he was universally regarded as handsome, and so attractive of admiration that the eyes of all were turned upon him whenever he came into public—a circumstance which must have greatly tended to foster his love of popularity, and stimulate him to the achievement of those feats for which he became so distinguished in his younger days. On one occasion he appeared in Paris as a Highland chieftain in proper costume, the very *beau ideal* of a Celtic hero. He was a good marksman, excelled in the sword exercise, and could send an arrow from a bow half as far again as any other man in France. Such accomplishments caused him to be respected by the men, while his noble Herculean figure and perfect politeness made him a favourite with the ladies. He was fond of driving a phaeton, and paddling an Indian canoe: few could match his dexterity in rowing, or the gracefulness or variety of his rapid movements in skating: whether on the Thames, the Delaware, or the Elbe, he,

‘With balance nice,’

Hung o’er the glittering steel and skimm’d along the ice’.”

He was remarkable for his fondness for animals, and especially for dogs.

“The citizens of Dublin”, observes Dr. Drummond, “who can carry back their reminiscences of remarkable cotemporaries a quarter of a century, will not fail to

* His residence at the time of his death was No. 1, Holles Street. Ed.

remember the venerable old man of gigantic stature, passing along the streets, accompanied by two dogs of enormous size, gaunt and formidable Danish hounds (not of the Irish wolf dog species, as commonly supposed). He was well versed in mathematics, and had a great turn for mechanics. He had a printing-press and a lithographic apparatus, a chemical laboratory, a turning machine, and a model steam-engine, in his house or on his premises. His manners were in the highest degree polished, courteous, and engaging. In his habits he was temperate, simple, and orderly. He indulged neither in the pleasures of the table nor the pursuits of gaming, the turf, or the stock market. But with all his blandness of manner and simplicity of character, Rowan was of a fiery and irascible temperament, prompt to feel and to resent an injury. He was over sensitive to the breath of public favour and applause, loved popularity, and courted it assiduously. These, perhaps, were the most striking defects in his character, but they were certainly overbalanced by some great and noble qualities, which belong only to superior and heroic natures.

"He was a man of a generous, manly, chivalrous disposition, of high principles and a strong sense of the obligations of truth, justice, and humanity. He loved liberty and hated oppression. He was steadfast, intrepid, and incorruptible in his public career, a brave and a good Irishman in the fullest sense of the term, persevering and consistent in his patriotism, the same in youth and age, in the worst of times, as in the better days of his country".

MEMOIR OF ARTHUR O'CONNOR.

CHAPTER I.

Origin, early career, and connection with the Society of United Irishmen.

A Memoir of Arthur O'Connor deserves a prominent place in a work of this description, on account of the position in which he stood in the Leinster Directory of the United Irishmen, as the earliest and foremost member of the Southern Executive, and a member also of the Ulster Executive. He is entitled to consideration, moreover, as a man of independent fortune, of considerable influence, no less from his connections than his brilliant talents, who had distinguished himself in parliament, in the press, at public meetings, and who moved in the first society both in England and in Ireland. Arthur O'Connor claimed, moreover, to be the descendent of an ancient race, and I feel it my duty to lay before my readers the best evidence that can be adduced in favour of that claim, though I am not able, or perhaps not sufficiently skilled in genealogical antiquarianism, to recognize its validity.

O'Connor Kerry—Arthur O'Connor.

The sept of O'Connor Kerry, we are told by Dr. O'Donovan, were of very ancient and noble origin, being descended from the illustrious line of Ir, son of Milidh, or Milesius, which sept is said to have reigned in Uladh, or Ulster, from the Milesian conquest to the subjection of that kingdom, and the destruction of the famous royal seat of Emania, A.D. 332, by the royal race of Heremon. Of this line of Ir, while it flourished at Emania, were the champions of the Red Branch, as celebrated in our old Celtic story and song, as the feats of the heroes of the Trojan war have been in Hellas or Greeces, and the exploits of the Paladins of Charlemagne in the romances of the middle ages and the strains of Ariosto. From King Fergus, that reigned at Emania about the commencement of the Christian era, and the heroine Meave, Queen of Connacht, the old genealogists deduce Ciar, the progenitor of the line of O'Connor Kerry, whose chiefs were kings of Kerry for centuries previous to the Anglo-Norman invasion in the twelfth century. Soon

after that invasion, says Dr. O'Donovan, the dominions of this family were narrowed to the territory of Iraght-I-Conor. At the close of the reign of Elizabeth, they were deprived of the greater part of this little principality, and the lands which they had peopled for at least 1600 years, were conferred upon the then recently erected University of Dublin. Finally, in the confiscations under the Cromwellian usurpation, they shared the common ruin of most of our Milesian houses. Of this O'Connor Kerry sept is "the celebrated Arthur Condorcet O'Connor, General of Division in France", writes Dr. O'Donovan, who, he adds, "is the son of Roger Connor, Esq., of Connerville, son of William Conner, Esq., Connerville, son of Mr. Daniel Conner, of Swithen's Alley, Temple Bar, London, merchant, and afterwards of Bandon, in the County of Cork, son of Mr. Cornelius Conner of Cork, whose will is dated 1719, son of Daniel Conner, who was the relative of O'Connor Kerry. This Cork branch descends from Philip Conner, merchant of London, to whom his relative, John O'Connor Kerry, conveyed Asdee by deed, dated August, 1598".*

It is deserving of notice that the ancestors of Arthur O'Connor designated themselves simply *Conner*. Arthur and Roger were the first of their race who assumed the O of the ancient family of Ballengare, of an undoubted regal line, with which family the Conners of Connerville, I believe, were not legitimately connected.

The father of Arthur, old Roger Conner, inherited considerable property from one of his ancestors, who had certainly lived long and made a large fortune in England (if he was not a native of that country), and had been engaged in the business of a Chandler in London. This old opulent tradesman came over or returned to Ireland, and fixed himself eventually in Bandon.† Whatever means came into the possession of old Roger, the father of Arthur (and they were ample), were derived from this person.

* "O'Donovan's Book of Rights", p. 48; "Battle of Moyrath", pp. 172, 202, 215, 328, 329, 248; "Four Masters", vol. II., pp. 774, 775, 891, 893, 1109, 1111. To the eminent and accurate Irish historical antiquarian, John Cornelius O'Callaghan, Esq., the author is indebted for the preceding notice.

† The first Conner of any note in the County Cork was a Mr. Daniel Conner, of Bandon, styled "merchant"—(See Sir Bernard Burke's "Landed Gentry", part i, page 232). This Daniel Conner is, no doubt, the person above mentioned, who had been, at one period of his life, engaged in business in London. He married, and had issue, besides daughters: 1. Daniel, who carried on mercantile business in Bandon, and died there in 1737. 2. William, who was a representative of the County Cork in 1765. He married a daughter of Roger Bernard, Esq., of Palace Anne, County Cork, in 1721, and had issue: Roger, who built the house called Connerville, and married Anne Longfield, sister of Lord Longueville, by whom he had issue, among others, the subject of this memoir. R.R.M.

Old Roger married an Irish lady of high rank, the sister of Lord Longueville, a person of stronger intellectual powers than her husband. The parents of Arthur O'Connor were not very remarkable for their exalted virtues or strong religious principles, or particularly commendable for the moral or religious example they set their children. Old Roger Conner, of Connerville, by this marriage with Anne Longfield, sister of Lord Longueville, had issue:

1. Daniel, born in 1753, who came into possession of Connerville during the father's lifetime, "to his father's great misfortune". A *crim con* affair with the wife of a Mr. Gibbons, a prosecution and heavy damages, obliged Daniel to quit Ireland and to sell Connerville to his brother Roger. This Daniel went to Bristol, where he fixed his abode. He removed subsequently to Orme Square, Bayswater, near London, and died there June 4th, 1846, aged ninety-three years. He married the lady he ran away with, and had one child, a daughter, by the marriage. He married, secondly, the sister of his deceased wife, a Miss Hyde, sister of the Rev. A. Hyde, and had issue Daniel Conner, of Manch, near Connerville, born in 1798, who had the misfortune to shoot, in a duel, the father of Mr. O'Neil Daunt.

2. William Conner had been a major of the Cork Militia, and held the lucrative office of Collector of Cork, the emoluments of which were about £5,000 a year. He sunk into abject poverty, and died about 1822 or 1823 in misery in Dublin, and, it is said, in confinement for debt. An acquaintance of this gentleman thus speaks of him:—"There was another of the O'Connors, who was a major in the army, and subsequently a collector in the Customs at Cork. Through mistake in his accounts he lost this situation; and when first I knew him he was in Dublin, prosecuting some claims he had upon the commissioners".*

3. Robert Longfield Conner, who inherited from his father about £1,500 a year, was captain of a corps of yeomanry, a violent partizan of the Orangemen of his locality. He endeavoured unsuccessfully to get his brother Roger hanged. He died at his place, Fort Robert, about nine miles from Bandon, leaving three daughters.†

4. Roger O'Connor, the fourth son of Roger Conner of Connerville, who claimed "by the law and usage of tanistry to be the chief of his race", and who styled himself *Kier-Reige*; born in 1762, died near Cork, in the

* "London and Dublin Mag.", Feb., 1828, p. 30.

† Under date, August 23, 1815, in Secret Correspondence, book 1, page 217, (Lord Whitworth, viceroy), a record is found of a "pension to Edward O'Connor, and Mrs. Margaret O'Connor, of £200 a year for life".

parish of Ovens, in 1834, and by his express desire his remains were interred in the old family vault of the McCarthy's at Kilcrea, though wholly unconnected with the latter.

5. Arthur O'Connor, a leader of the society of United Irishmen, a general of division in the French service; born in 1763, died at Bignon in France in his ninetieth year in 1852.

There was one daughter, Anne, who had been in love with a Mr. McCarthy, was opposed in her desire to marry that gentleman, and drowned herself in a well at Connerville, which is still known in the locality, to the country people, as Anne's well. There were two other daughters, who died in early life without issue.

The following outline of a biographical sketch is made from a document furnishing specific replies to a number of queries which had been addressed by the author in 1842, to General O'Connor; and the substance of the answers to these queries is given here in a consecutive form, without any comment or intermixture of other matter. It is hardly necessary to add, that the form in which the information appears in this communication is very different from that in which an unbroken narrative might be expected from a man whose abilities, in the way of composition as well as in conversation, are acknowledged to be of the very highest order.

"Arthur O'Connor was born at Mitchels, near Bandon, on the 4th of July, 1763. His father lived at Connerville, in the County of Cork. He was a man of very large landed property; he passed his life and expended his income in the country. A. O'Connor's mother was the only sister of Lord Longueville, and a woman of considerable talents and acquirements. She died at Connerville in 1780, aged forty-eight. His father died at the same place at the age of seventy, and both were buried at Kinsale. Arthur O'Connor, at an early age, was placed at a public school at Lismore, and subsequently at one in Castle Lyons. He had a great taste for poetry when very young, but his parents and preceptors discouraged it. He entered Dublin College, as fellow-commoner, in 1779, under Mr. Day. He had four brothers and three sisters; the three sisters died unmarried. Arthur O'Connor was the youngest son; he was called to the Irish bar in 1788, but did not practise. He was educated in the Protestant religion—in rigid Protestantism. In 1807 he married the only child of Condorcet; he had three sons, one of whom was living in 1842. He inherited £1,500 a year, paternal property.

"He was devoted, from the period of his college life, to serious studies, but political economy was the favourite

study of his life. His literary tastes were formed on the classical education he received. His habits were always temperate, and were so even while he lived in Ireland. He lived there, and in England also, in the first circles. It was his good fortune to make many friends, and never to lose any of them, even when differing from them in principle. He became a member of the society of United Irishmen in 1796, and he and Lord Edward Fitzgerald constituted the first Leinster Directory. He never took any oath. He had great confidence in the whole of the Northern Directory, though less in the steadiness of one still living than in that of some others. Dr. White was a light man. Of the Leinster Directory, he had implicit confidence in Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Bond, and Jackson. He never was in a directory with Emmet*.

["The fact is, the Catholic members convinced the Protestant members that they held separate meetings unknown to the Protestants, and always voted together on every question, while the Protestant members never met separately, and always voted as men that were of no party. For the above reason, General O'Connor had much greater reliance on Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Jackson, and Bond, and on the Northern Directory, than on the Catholic members, who all wanted resolution to act. General O'Connor will be forced to give in his memoirs several melancholy examples of this fact; but it was in the upper Catholics (this was the case), not in the rank of the people, who were all brave.*]

"The first directory of the United Irishmen was the Northern, there being no organization of the United Irish in the three provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, until two years later. When the Northern Directory was organized, it consisted of the two Simmses, Neilson, Tennant, and two others, whose names he does not remember. During the time the affairs of the United Irish were governed by the Northern Directory and Lord Edward Fitzgerald and himself, all hope of obtaining Catholic emancipation and reform was utterly abandoned, and they then looked to separation.

"It is true, Emmet insisted on inserting in the remonstrance which he, M'Nevin, and A. O'Connor addressed to government, that if Catholic emancipation

* The above passages in brackets, in reference to the Catholic leaders, from motives of consideration for General O'Connor, and a feeling of reluctance to injure his reputation, I used, as I then believed, a sound discretion in omitting in the statement of O'Connor, in reply to my queries, published in the first edition of this work. But the unfortunate publication of O'Connor, entitled "Monopoly", which appeared six years later, imposes on me the necessity of laying before the public the passages above mentioned, and some others equally objectionable and reprehensible.—R. R. M.

and reform had been conceded, we should have broken off the French alliance. But Emmet knew nothing of this; for he was not even a United Irishman when the French alliance was formed.*

"When O'Connor first applied to Emmet to be of the directory with Jackson and Bond, he declined it. It was not until O'Connor was confined in the Tower of Dublin that Emmet became one of the directory.

"The first Southern Directory consisted only of Lord Edward Fitzgerald and O'Connor; the second, of Jackson, Bond, M'Nevin, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and O'Connor.

"It is an error to put Emmet in the directory with Bond and Jackson; he was not in it until long after. He objected to the views of the other leaders, and menaced the directory to denounce them to government if they carried into execution the resolution that was taken to begin the revolution. He (O'Connor) was, from early life, of republican principles, imbibed at the time of the American revolution. At no time of his life, neither before he spoke in the Irish House of Commons nor subsequently, has he varied from those principles. His uncle, Lord Longueville, knew perfectly well, when he gave him a seat in parliament in 1791 for the borough of Philipstown, what were his principles, and he (O'Connor) only accepted the seat on the condition of being entirely free.

"It may be easily conceived that the debates of the Irish House of Commons could seldom interest an unflinching republican. Before the great Catholic question in 1795, he seldom spoke. However, in February, 1792, he made a speech on the Indian question, grounded on the principles of political economy. That speech caused Pitt to offer his uncle, Lord Longueville, an immediate place of commissioner in the revenue, with a promise of the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer [for A. O'Connor]. This offer was refused by O'Connor.

"He does not believe there was an efficient, or any directory, after the month of March, 1798.

"When General O'Connor negotiated, in 1796, the treaty for the United Irish with the agent of the French Directory, of which General Hoche's expedition was the result, there never had been any other treaty before that with France. In 1796, he and Lord Edward had an interview with Hoche on the French frontiers, and subsequently negotiations were entered into with Buonaparte. Buonaparte had a true intention to invade England, and had an army of 20,000 men in readiness for

* One of the many misstatements of O'Connor in relation to T. A. Emmet.

it, when the intelligence of the new designs of Austria and Russia caused that intention to be given up.

"He did not visit France in 1797 or 1798; he was then in prison. He was arrested in the beginning of 1797, and imprisoned in the Tower of Dublin six months,* and in the beginning of 1798 he was arrested at Margate, and was tried at Maidstone in May the same year. The only witness against him was one Lane, who had been his sub-sheriff for the County Cork.

"Though there was not legal evidence to prove that the paper found in Quigley's coat pocket was Quigley's, yet, the fact is, it was his, and was found in his riding coat; for when the five prisoners were brought to Bow Street, a report was spread that the papers taken on the prisoners were lost; for the first time, Quigley said it was fortunate the papers were lost, for that there was one in his pocket that would hang them all. He never made a secret to his fellow-prisoners that he got that paper from a London society. In my memoirs I will clear up this point.

"Cox appeared at Maidstone, and came there from the interest he took in an event which involved the life of O'Connor. He remained always faithful to him, and also to Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Whatever changes may have taken place in his conduct, it was not until after Lord Edward's death and O'Connor's exile. While there was a chance of success, he was one of the staunchest men in Ireland to their cause.

"It is a great error to confound the conduct of Cox during the time the Union lasted, with his conduct since it ceased. There was not a single man in the Union, south or north, be he who he may, that was more staunch or zealous than Cox, and he (O'Connor) had the strongest proof of it. It was when General O'Connor was in the Tower of Dublin that Cox set up the *Union Star*; and the first thing General O'Connor did, on coming out of the Tower of Dublin, was to convince Cox of the evil his paper was capable of producing, and instantly he discontinued it. It would be absurd to suppose the government could support a journal that made them all tremble for their lives.

"As far as he could learn, no one betrayed Lord Edward Fitzgerald. He believes the imprudent visits Neilson paid him were the cause of his being discovered. Certainly Neilson never betrayed him.

"The paper called the *Harp of Erin*, published in Cork, was established chiefly by Roger O'Connor, and was almost exclusively filled by him.†

* A. O'Connor was liberated on bail, the 5th of August, 1797.

† The "*Harp of Erin*" was suppressed the 24th of March, 1798.

"The *Press* was the paper of Arthur O'Connor. He believes the letters signed 'Marcus' were written by Swift. He does not now recollect who wrote under the signature 'Montanus'. At this day it is utterly impossible to discover the authors of what was written in the *Press*. The box for the articles was generally so full that the editor had but to select, and that without occupying himself with the names of the authors, a thing so studiously avoided; for instance, we had reason to think that Dr. Drennan wrote for the *Press*, but as he was cautious, we denied it.

"A great many of the apparent supporters of government made offers of their services to him (O'Connor) under the seal of secrecy, but their object was to have two strings to their bow.

"He was kept in solitary imprisonment in the Birmingham Tower, in Dublin, six months; in the Tower of London, two months; in the Maidstone prison, three months;; in the Marshalsea prison in Dublin, three months; in Kilmainham prison, three months; in Newgate, about two months; and four years and three months at Fort George, in Scotland.

["Thomas Addis Emmet and M'Nevin set themselves at the head of a faction from jealousy against him (General O'Connor), at Fort George; this faction was reorganized in Paris in 1803, so that the whole of the plans connected with Robert Emmet's plot, were directed by the faction, but were not communicated to him by them.]*

"Robert Emmet's plans were divulged to him by the French government, who continued to treat with him as the accredited Irish Ambassador, recognized as such by it, and known only as such by the Irish directory. The person in Paris, who in this party had the most influence, was Russell, and the project devised by him and Emmet gave the finishing blow to the United Irish confederacy. Dowdall was engaged in this plot, but he knows not what became of him. Buonaparte, in conversing with General O'Connor, expressed himself unfavourably of the attempt and of those engaged in it.

["He (O'Connor) was apprised of the insurrection in 1803, but had no part in it; he looked on it as an act of madness. He had no connection with the Emmets, disapproved of them both; one for his cowardice, the other for his folly and rashness, that ruined the union. As to Robert Emmet's attempt, how call that a plan which vanished in smoke the moment it saw the light, and that instantly ended in ruin of all those that were engaged in

* This passage was omitted in the first edition.

it? If those in France, who excited Robert Emmet, were in Ireland when the attempt was made, they would have been the first to condemn it as the height of madness—his brother Thomas the first; but they were so unhappy in their exile in France, that they hazarded everything in Ireland that offered them a chance of their return.]*

"Despard's attempt in England was wholly foreign to the affairs of Ireland. He (General O'Connor) knows not that Robert Emmet came to Paris previously to the insurrection in 1803. Allen, who was constantly with Robert Emmet, and who gave General O'Connor a most minute account of their mad project, never hinted that he (Robert Emmet) had quitted Dublin at all. As to Thomas Addis Emmet's knowledge of his brother Robert's intended attempt in 1803, there is no doubt he did know it. Thomas Addis Emmet communicated their plans to the French government, from whom he (General O'Connor) had them.

["When General O'Connor first applied to Thomas Emmet to be of the directory, with Jackson and Bond, he declined it, saying he did not feel firm enough to take part in an insurrection. It was not until General O'Connor was confined in the Tower that Emmet ventured to be of the directory. It was then his timidity paralyzed the directory, by threatening to go to the Castle if they persisted in commencing the insurrection. This was not the only occasion when Lord Edward Fitzgerald and General O'Connor were prevented from acting by the cowardice of some men they confided in.]*†

"It was in 1803 that Buonaparte gave his opinion to O'Connor, that Ireland contained but two millions. He read it in some old geography.

"The place of the intended debarkment of Hoche's expedition has never transpired; the knowledge of it was confined to Hoche and himself. Despard's attempt was wholly foreign to the affairs of Ireland.

"The Sheareses had very little to do in the Union; *they acted without the Union, and of themselves*, and for a short time only before they were cut off; the fact is, they did not make themselves known to the directory. As to M'Cabe, the French government acquired the proof that he was a double spy. General O'Connor saved his life

* This passage, likewise, was omitted in the first edition.

† The preceding passages in brackets, respecting the Emmets, from the same feelings of reluctance to hurt the reputation of General O'Connor, which I explained in a previous note, I omitted in the first edition of this work; and for the same reasons which I stated in regard to General O'Connor's injurious strictures on the Catholic leaders, I now publish the preceding most unjust observations of General O'Connor in relation to Thomas Addis Emmet; but to this subject I will have to refer elsewhere.—R. R. M.

with the Minister of War, the Duke of Feltre, after it had been discovered that in London he had intercourse with persons in some of the public offices in Downing Street.

"The *Biographie des Contemporains* gives a most erroneous and incorrect list of what O'Connor has published. The following is a correct list of his published writings:—a Pamphlet, in 1794, signed, 'A Stoic', entitled, *The Measures of the Ministry to prevent a Revolution, are the certain Means of bringing it on*; published by Sweeney, Cork, and Eaton, 74, Newgate Street; his Speech on the Catholic Question, May 4, 1795; his *State of Ireland*, in 1798, addressed to the Irish nation; two addresses to the free electors of the County of Antrim, one of October 22, 1796, the other January 20, 1797; his *Letter to Lord Castlereagh from his Frison*, January, 1797; in 1803, *The State of Great Britain: a Letter to General Lafayette*, published at Paris in French, and in London in English, in 1831. He has kept no note of the numerous articles he has written in the newspapers".*

Thus far, the summary account of O'Connor's career, his connection with the society and relations with the leaders of United Irishmen, embodies the precise statements of O'Connor's written answers to the author's inquiries, which it seemed for obvious reasons desirable to present in O'Connor's own words, and in a continuous unbroken form, notwithstanding the unconnected nature of the information given, and the necessity of adverting in those replies to many important matters without reference to chronological order or arrangement.

The following letter accompanied the replies of General O'Connor:—

"From General Arthur O'Connor to R. R. Madden.

"Bignon, Sept. 24, 1842.

"My dear Madden—I have just received your letter of the 20th of this month with your questions. Though I am but just recovered from a severe illness, I hasten to furnish you with answers to your questions. By the nature of these I find you have drawn your information from erroneous sources. You seem to imagine Cox was a false United Irishman while the Union lasted, whereas I have the most singularly honourable positive proof that he was firm against the greatest temptations offered by

* Replies of Arthur O'Connor to queries addressed to him by R. R. M. in 1842.

government; whatever failure was in him (of which I know nothing) was after the Union was dissolved. You seem to think the Sheares were leading men in the Union, whereas I may say they never entered it, so as to be known to us. The fact is, they were just entering it when they were cut off. It was the younger Sheares' proclamation, which was an act purely personal, without the knowledge or concurrence of the Union, that has misled some to think he and his brother were deeply engaged in the Union. They had the misfortune to communicate with Armstrong, who betrayed them. The elder Sheares was an aristocrat, the younger an ardent democrat, and led his brother with him.

"The *Dictionnaire Biographique des Contemporains* is a work so full of errors, that it has no species of credit; it now sells, the five volumes, on the quays of Paris for ten francs. All it says of me, Condorcet, and of Madame Condorcet, is nearly all false. It makes me the author of works I never wrote, and does not give those I wrote. I am occupied with my memoirs, but what you may write will not interfere with them. My memoirs will take in all I have to say of the Union, from the beginning to the end. There is a wide field, and room enough for all that wish to write on the subject.

"I had never heard of your work until I got your letter, not having seen it advertised in any paper, French or English. You will oblige me by depositing a copy of your work at your lodgings at Paris, and if you will have left it, my friend Isambert will call for it, and pay for it; he will send it to me; I will take great interest in reading it. There is not a greater example of national ingratitude than that which the after generation have shown to the United Irish, to whose noble sacrifices they owe their freedom. This has been greatly owing to the vile calumnies O'Connell has been constantly propagating against the United Irish, all from that jealousy that devours him of every one that serves Ireland disinterestedly. What would be this man but for the efforts of the United Irish, of whom 30,000 have given their lives for their enslaved country? He could not be a priest but at the risk of his life, nor a hedge-schoolmaster. He accuses us of drawing the sword. Ireland had lain for a century and more under the imputation of low cowardly slaves, who had not the spirit to vindicate her rights. It was imperatively essential we should show our oppressors we had the spirit to reclaim our rights; this we did, and by so doing we have convinced England it was impossible to longer withhold Catholic emancipation and reform. The United Irish will

live in history as the fathers of Irish liberty, when O'Connell will appear as their calumniator.

"There was a time when a little faction that grew up in the Union, that was devoured by envy of Lord Edward Fitzgerald and me, set up the calumny that I had received sums from the Catholics. *Never in my life did I ever accept one penny from the Catholics, but I expended in my negotiations and other ways of promoting the Union, a considerable part of my personal fortune; a marked difference between me and my great calumniator.* My memoirs will clear up these things and a great many others that seem to be wholly misunderstood by the present generation. It is a sacred duty for me to vindicate the generous generation of United Irishmen from the calumnies of their ungrateful detractors. I will do it without passion or partiality, but with such proofs as shall convince the most unwilling, of the noble and just efforts of my United countrymen, and of the infamy of their calumniators.

"I have been told that O'Connell, pushed by his jealousy of the United Irish, has permitted himself the most unwarrantable and sacrilegious epithets against some United Irish in exile in America. It is not only a great and black ingratitude, but a great want of common sense, for it must all fall back on himself.

"Yours most sincerely,

"A. O'CONNOR.

"Au Chateau du Bignon, par Fontenay,

"Dept. du Loiret,

"September 24th, 1842".

For some years previous to O'Connor's death he had been engaged in writing his own memoirs. But many important circumstances in connection with that undertaking, and, after his death, the difficulties of the task imposed on the editor of his memoirs, which have come to my knowledge, make it very desirable, in my opinion, to present the public in these countries with a more detailed account of O'Connor's career than has been given in the first edition of this work, or is now likely to be given elsewhere. Justice alone to the memory of one of O'Connor's most eminent, most honourable and virtuous associates, Thomas Addis Emmet, would render it necessary to do so. Justice likewise to the memory of O'Connell makes it necessary to adopt this course; for without reference to the lately-published opinions of O'Connor on religious subjects, no just estimate could be formed of that rabid hostility against the great Catholic leader, which he has indulged in the expression of so unscrupulously and so unsparingly.

O'Connor set out in life an aristocrat, connected with aristocracy, and associated with the proprietary and oligarchy of the country—with university men of high-church principles, and country gentlemen of a superior grade to the shoneens of the Irish magisterial bench—with grand jurymen, and "Life and Fortune pledgers" at county meetings of rampant ascendancy Tories—the Irish provisional bashaws of "three tails" and "two buttons".

His manners, external appearance, bearing in public, and demeanour in society, his notions of all things in general, with one exception, were aristocratic. In his political principles, Arthur O'Connor was a democrat. He was so from the beginning of his public career, and he continued to the close not only of it, but of his life, the same, without any change, or any apparent power of comprehending how any rational human being could possibly be anything but a democrat. His democratic sentiments, however, were kept in abeyance so long as it was possible for a man of O'Connor's impulsive nature to restrain them.

In 1795 he came out for the first time in his true political character in his place in parliament, on the Catholic question, in a speech which electrified the house, horrified his uncle, Lord Longueville, destroyed his interests and expectations in that quarter, and which seized fast hold of the hearts of the people of Ireland.

From that day, the progress of O'Connor's political life was one of steady advancement—an obvious onward movement from the starting-post of reform to an inevitable result—a rebellion engaged in for republican institutions and national independence.

Political economy was his favourite study; and it was his own opinion (expressed on many occasions to the author) that the natural bent of his genius and peculiar turn of mind was to that pursuit. He gave evidence of that opinion in his great work, *The revised edition of all the works of Condorcet*,* which he published in conjunction with Mons. M. F. Arago, in twenty vols. 8vo; and in his latest work in English, entitled *Monopoly the Cause of all Evil*, published in Paris in 1848, in three vols. 8vo.

* Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, was a native of St. Quentin. He was educated at the Jesuit School, Rheims, and at the College of Navarre, Paris. On the outbreak of the Revolution he wrote many important pamphlets on the popular side, and was elected to the Legislative Assembly, of which he became president in 1792. He voted that the King should receive the most severe punishment—except death, and later was accused and condemned by the extreme party. He eluded the vigilance of the revolutionary agents for some time, but was at length captured and confined in the prison of Bourg-la-Reine. He was found dead in his cell on the morning of April 8th, 1794. Ed.

O'Connor became a United Irishman in 1796; but previously to his formal connection with the society, he was on divers occasions consulted by their leaders.

Of each of the directories O'Connor was a member; but it was in the Leinster Directory where he exercised most influence and took a foremost part in the affairs of the society.

The council of that body were by no means remarkable for their unanimity. It is well known that one party in it was entirely opposed to any outbreak or rebellion without adequate assistance from France, in the way of men, arms, ammunition, and money. From the time T. A. Emmet became a member of the directory, he was the organ of that party and the exponent of that opinion; and outside of the directory he had that opinion advocated in the committees of the United Irishmen and the circles of a social kind, comprising the upper classes of the mercantile and professional communities, in which the objects of the society were carried out and promoted largely by the late W. M. of Dublin—a man of powerful intellect, singularly sagacious and far-seeing, of inflexible purpose and great solidity of judgment, wanting no great quality to constitute a man of first-rate power in revolutionary times, except promptitude in council, when a decision was to be come to, when the time for action came. The period of deliberation with him was never over; the process of mental examination was a peculiar one with him. When a subject for inquiry was presented to his mind, his first step was to isolate it, and fix its place in some sphere of thought where no surrounding influences could affect it. He never approached it in a straight line from the circumference, but always walked round it in circles, diminishing the distance so slowly as he went on, that the progress he made was hardly preceptible to those who anxiously awaited the result of his circuitous deliberation. This process, it must be confessed, would have done better in the antediluvian days of Noah, when men ordinarily lived half a thousand years, more or less, than in those degenerate times of ours, when, the Deluge having so seriously abbreviated the duration of human life, seventy years is a good round age for any temperate gentleman, who is not an author, to attain to. But Emmet's confidential friend, W. M., was a wise and a sober-minded man; and Emmet, though he was a drag in the directory on the movement party, who would risk an outbreak without French aid of any kind, it is manifest enough on the face of Tone's journals, had not been tardy in coming to the conclusion that French aid was essential to the success of the cause of the United

Irishmen, nor remiss in seeking to obtain it so early even as 1794.

O'Connor was at the head of the party who, though desirous to obtain French aid, were ultimately ready to risk a rising of the people without it. There certainly were times when any unaided attempt would have been more propitious than the latter part of 1797 or beginning of 1798, or any period after the arrests of the principal members of the Directory, and of the members of the Committee at Bond's, in the March of the latter year.

But on the question at issue between those leaders of the United Irishmen, who can now call in question the wisdom of those councils of Thomas Addis Emmet, which suggested that the country should not be committed in a formidable struggle, of tremendous importance to its people's lives and liberty, without such aid from another country as might afford a fair chance of success ?



CHAPTER II.

Organs and Pensmen of the Society of United Irishmen of Dublin. "The Press" and its writers: notices of Deane Swift and Dr. Drennan. The "Union Star" and Walter Cox.

The United Irishmen were certainly well served by their pensmen and the *Press* which represented their opinions and advocated their cause.

The newspaper and pamphlet literature of later times in Ireland will not suffer by a comparison in regard to ability with that of the *Press*, the *Northern Star*, the pamphlets of Tone, Drennan, Stokes, Sampson, and O'Connor.

The violence of Lord Clare in the House of Lords, was imitated, as far as invective went, in the years 1797 and 1798, in the columns of the *Press* newspaper, the organ of the United Irishmen. There are, however, few newspapers of the present day which display more literary talent, than that ably written, yet intemperately conducted paper exhibited.

The *Press* made its first appearance the 28th of September, 1797. The sixty-eighth number was seized the morning of its intended publication, and the paper was finally put down by the strong hand of military power,

the 6th of March, 1798. It was published from the beginning of November at Mr. Stockdale's printing establishment, No. 62 Abbey Street, now No. 72; the virtual proprietor of the paper was Mr. Arthur O'Connor: the sworn, but it must be added the nominal proprietor, was Mr. Peter Finnerty. In each number of the paper, up to the 30th of December, 1797, printed, we find the words, "P. Finnerty, printer, at No. 4, Church Lane"; but from that date A. O'Connor's name is substituted for that of Finnerty as printer.

A venerable man, now verging on his eightieth year, well known to the author, and respected by all who know him, Mr. O'Flanagan,* who was a printer and was engaged in the office of the *Press* newspaper in 1797 and the early part of 1798, has given an account of the origin and management of that paper, such as no other person now living (perhaps with one exception) could supply.

"In the latter end of 1797 the leaders of the United cause established a newspaper entitled the *Press*, to forward the movement for the liberation of Ireland. The first seventeen numbers were printed by Mr. Whitworth, an Englishman, in Upper Exchange Street, Dublin. The subsequently celebrated Peter Finnerty, who was to have been a compositor on it, was introduced to Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Arthur O'Connor, who found him to be a man of great talent, tact, and patriotism. They at once decided that he should be employed at the publishing office in Church Lane, College Green, where he had to conduct some very important correspondence for the United Irishmen. His name appeared at the bottom of the paper as the printer to the *Press*, and Lord Edward Fitzgerald on several occasions expressed his entire approval of Peter Finnerty's conduct.

"The first editor was Mr. Brennan, a very able writer, but a man of questionable integrity, as subsequent events proved. Brennan having been committed to jail for debt, he wrote to the proprietors to the effect that if they did not pay his debts immediately, he would place all the MSS. which he had in his possession in the hands of the Castle authorities. Brennan's threat was treated with contempt, and Arthur O'Connor wrote to him in these words: 'If you wish to act a base, dishonourable part towards us and the righteous cause you have engaged to sustain, we must regret it, we must likewise regret having been associated with a man capable of such baseness. Do your utmost. Posterity shall decide upon the rectitude of the cause you have expressed your intention of betraying'.

* There is an interesting account of Mr. O'Flanagan in Cavenagh's *Life of Thomas Francis Meagher*, pp. 142-149. Ed.

"In a few days after Brennan was liberated from prison by the government, who, no doubt, perceived that he was worth purchasing; but I am not aware of his having appeared before the public again in connection with politics.

"The aspect of Irish affairs looking very perilous, and prosecution following prosecution, Mr. Whitworth declined printing the *Press* any longer. Mr. Stockdale of Abbey Street brought out the eighteenth number, and continued to print it as long as it was permitted by the government.

"When Finnerty was found guilty of a libel, another name was obliged to be entered at the stamp office. Arthur O'Connor's name was then attached to it. Although there were upwards of 3,000 copies struck off each publication (Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday evenings), the day that Arthur O'Connor's name was announced as printer, it got a rise of 1,500, and increased to 6,000, which was the utmost that could be printed in time by the presses in use at that period. The name of Arthur O'Connor was everywhere received with enthusiasm by the people, particularly in the counties of Kildare and Meath. In truth, almost all Protestants who espoused the United cause, were generous, disinterested, noble-minded men, who truly loved fatherland. What a contrast with the 'Soupers', of these days !

"At the time Finnerty was sentenced to be pilloried at the front of Newgate, Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Arthur O'Connor went to Green Street to encourage him while in the pillory. There were several thousands present, and the people seemed much excited. When they reached the guard of soldiers, Lord Edward endeavoured to pass one of them. The soldier raised his gun, and was about to strike him, when the high sheriff (Mr. Pemberton) immediately advanced, and ordered him not to act without orders. He then gave directions to the officer in command of the guard to allow Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Mr. O'Connor to pass. They both continued near Finnerty during the time he was suffering the penalty. The high sheriff seemed puzzled how to act; but owing to his mild and conciliatory conduct to the people, all passed off quietly.

"Immediately after leaving Green Street, Lord Edward and O'Connor went to Stockdale's office. Having entered into conversation about what had taken place with the soldier, his lordship took two small pistols from his waistcoat pocket, and said that if the soldier had struck him, he would have shot him dead. If that had taken place, I am confident the entire guard would have been disarmed in a few minutes, for the crowd was so close to them at that moment, that they would not be able to use

their muskets. Lord Edward Fitzgerald was the most determined man I have ever seen.

"So hostile were the low Orangemen to the *Press* newspaper, that the messengers who carried the papers from the printer to the publishing office in Church Lane, were, on several occasions, waylaid, in consequence of which the printers formed themselves into a guard to protect the newspapers the men were conveying. One night a printer named Hardy* (a brave-hearted young man) and myself went for that purpose. Hardy was armed with a large pistol, and I had a piece of metal from the printing office, about two feet long and an inch thick. We left the messengers safe in Church Lane, and subsequently went through College Green, Trinity Street, and St. Andrew's Street. As we passed into William Street, Hardy, by the light of the old oil lamps, observed Major Sirr advancing at a distance, and immediately determined on shooting him as he came up, by discharging his pistol in the major's face, as he was supposed to have worn armour about his body. Having an extreme objection to assassination, I strongly urged my friend Hardy to abandon all idea of committing a crime so revolting to every Christian sentiment. He yielded to my entreaties; and in another moment Major Sirr passed us, little knowing what a narrow escape he had for his life. The major surveyed us from head to foot, and my anxiety was intense, for I still feared some act of desperation on the part of my friend Hardy, on meeting a man so universally detested.

"Counsellor Sampson was the last conductor of the *Press*. The paper continued to be printed until the sixty-eighth number, when a guard of the Cavan Militia, under the command of a rampant Orangeman, Maxwell, came and seized the office, carried away all the newspapers that had been printed, and destroyed the type, presses, &c., in a wanton manner.†

"While the *Press* continued to be printed at Stockdale's, one of the apprentices, William Powell, was passing through Back Lane, and hearing some noise proceeding from a public-house, he stopped to ask a man at the door what was the matter. The fellow immediately collared him, and he was dragged in. Powell then discovered that he was in custody of no less a personage than Jemmy O'Brien, who had been placed at the door by Major Sirr.

* Hardy was a Dublin man: he was about twenty-five years of age; his father lived in Greek Street. He was a United Irishman. He became a sailor, and died on the coast of Africa.

† Alderman Alexander accompanied the military party, and represented the civil authority in a magisterial capacity on this occasion.

The major had got information that Serjeant Downes, of the King's County Militia (who had been appointed to a post in the rebel army) was in the house, and had gone with his party to arrest him. Downes had his regimentals on, and as soon as he saw the Major enter the room, he attempted to draw his sword, but his arm was seized by the powerful grasp of an assistant, and he was immediately surrounded by the whole gang. Jemmy O'Brien all the time was stationed at the door. Powell and Downes were then handcuffed, and marched to the Castle guard-house. Serjeant Downes asked Powell his name, and as he thought his young companion was alarmed by his confinement, desired him to keep up his spirits, as they had no charge against him, and had only seized him to prevent his giving any alarm; but (said he) as to me, before the next day's sun will set I will be in eternity! After conversing for a while with Powell, he lay down on the guard-bed and slept for three hours. When he woke, he rallied Powell again, as he appeared to be much fretted, and said he would give him a song; he accordingly gave, in very good style, *Paddies Evermore*. At six o'clock in the morning a guard arrived at the door, and commanded Serjeant Downes to be led forth. Downes then bid Powell farewell, and was conveyed to the camp at the Naul: he was tried that day by a court-martial, and immediately shot! Poor Downes! I knew him well. His fate was deeply regretted by all who were connected with the movement. Serjeant Downes was a remarkably fine young man, brave and zealous.

"About the same time, Mr. Astley, who kept the Amphitheatre in Peter Street (now Molyneaux Asylum), made himself extremely obnoxious to the citizens of Dublin. He ordered his musicians to strike up *Croppies lie down*, and other insulting airs, twice every night, for the amusement of the low Orangemen who frequented the house; but my friend Hardy, who was so anxious to despatch the major, repaired, with about thirty Liberty boys, to Astley's and having taken their position near the musicians, all was quiet until the orchestra commenced playing *Croppies lie down*,* when Hardy started

* Every one in Ireland at least is familiar with "*Croppies lie down*". Here is the authorship, as given by Thomas Moore:—"Set off for Devizes at one o'clock, with Watson Taylor and Salmon, in W. S.'s carriage. Our conversation on the way interesting, as being about the events of '98 in Ireland, when W. Taylor was secretary to Lord Camden, and I was a young sucking rebel at college; his companions being the Cookes, Castlereaghs, &c., of that period; and mine, Emmet, Lawless, and hoc genus omne. Compared notes as to our respective recollections, and felt, both of us, how strange it was that he and I, who thirty years ago were placed in a position where either might have been called upon to hang or shoot the other, were now chatting

up and exclaimed, 'Come, boys, now is the time. Forward!' In a few minutes all was confusion. The upper gallery men descended into the pit, broke into the orchestra, and smashed all the instruments. Astley's theatre never recovered the shock of this *melee*. The Kilkenny Militia were on duty, but did not interfere; no doubt the Ballyragget boys felt no sympathy for the Orangemen.

"John Stockdale, the publisher of the *Press* newspaper, was committed to Kilmainham jail in 1797, for refusing to answer certain queries put to him by the House of Lords. He remained in prison six months, and during that period his property in types, presses, &c., was destroyed by the military and civil authorities.

"In 1803, he was implicated in the insurrection of Robert Emmet, and was again imprisoned on the charge of printing the proclamation of Emmet, and remained in confinement nearly two years. He came out of jail a ruined man; he met with no assistance from those whose battles he had fought in his paper; neither from the '*Patriots*' nor the '*Catholics*'. He died in Abbey Street, Dublin, the 11th January, 1813".

So much for the recollections of a surviving compositor on the *Press* newspaper.

There is a letter of O'Connor's, comparatively speaking, little known, on his becoming connected with the *Press*, chiefly, as he states, for the exposure of the frequent use of torture, nearly five months before the outbreak of the rebellion, which is deserving of the attention of every man who feels, or professes to feel, any concern in matters that effect the interests of humanity.

The 2nd of January, 1798, O'Connor published the following letter in the *Press*:—

"To the Irish Nation.

"Countrymen—Since the conviction and sentence passed on the printer of the *Press*, a clause has been pointed out by the Commissioners of Stamps, which lay lurking in one of the late parliament's acts, unknown to the lawyers, whereby a printer convicted of a libel shall be deprived of his property in the paper in which it had been inserted. By this law, in such perfect conformity with all the other acts of a parliament which, in the words of a great and good man, 'has taken more from the liberties, and added more to the burdens of the people', and, I may say, stained

over the whole matter amicably in his barouche, William Salmon not a little edified by our conversation. Found now, for the first time, that Watson Taylor was the author of the words of the celebrated 'Croppies lie down', a song to the tune of which more blood has been shed than often fall to the lot of lyrical productions".

the statute book with more penal laws, than any parliament that ever yet existed, it has become necessary that on the spur of the instant, from this unforeseen clause, another proprietor should come forward to save the Irish press from being put down. To perform that sacred office to this best benefactor of mankind has devolved upon me; and rest assured I will discharge it with fidelity to you and our country, until some one more versed in the business can be procured. Every engine of force and corruption has been employed by those ministers, in whose hands, unfortunately for the present peace and the future repose of the nation, unlimited power has been invested, to discover whether I was the proprietor of the *Press*. Had they sent to me, instead of lavishing your money amongst perjurers, spies, and informers, I would have told them what now I tell you. I did set up the *Press*, though, in a legal sense, I was not the proprietor, nor did I look to any remuneration; and I did so because, from the time that, in violation of property, in subversion of even the appearance of respect for the laws, and to destroy not only the freedom of the press, but the press itself, the present ministers demolished the *Northern Star*, no paper in Ireland, either from being bought up, or from the dread and horror of being destroyed, would publish an account of the enormities which these very ministers had been committing: where they not only suffered a lawless banditti of sworn extirpators to destroy the property, to raze the habitations, and to drive thousands of ruined families to the most distant parts of the country, for want of protection, but where the strongest suspicions rested that they had given encouragement to such diabolical acts, under the name of loyalty and the mask of religion: where they let loose an excited soldiery to commit acts of outrage which no invading army of any country in Europe would have practised without violating those laws established amongst civilized nations: where the torch had consumed their houses and property in entire districts, and summary murders had been wantonly perpetrated: where thousands have been hurried into those multiplied dungeons, and thousands sent to the gallows, on 'suspicion of being suspected' of *reform* and *union*: and, above all, where *torture* has been applied in numerous instances to extort confession of what, by the Insurrection Act, has been judged worthy of death, but, as I read it, by the strictest rules and injunctions of Christian morality, has been enforced as a paramount duty; '*that torture*', which our ancestors held in such inveterate abhorrence that its utter exclusion was esteemed so fundamental a part of our constitutional code, that neither that Stuart, nor his

ministers, whose heads paid the forfeit of the crimes they committed, nor the ministers of that Stuart who was expelled, durst introduce it. I could cite myriads of facts to substantiate the suppression of the publication of these enormous atrocities, but I will confine myself to the mention of one which has come within my own knowledge.

"Whilst I was confined in the Tower, the soldiers who were stationed all round it, fired up at the prison, and on being asked why they had fired without having challenged, or any pretext for so doing, they answered, '*that they had acted according to the orders they had got*'. As I was the only person confined in the prison, no doubt could remain that these orders were issued for the purpose of assassination. A gentleman who had been an eye-witness of the attempt, took a statement of facts to the *Evening Post*, which was at that time esteemed the least corrupted paper in Dublin; but the editor told him that, fearing that his house and his press might experience the fate of the *Northern Star*, he would not insert it, although, the next day, not only that print, but every other paper in town, contained an account of the transaction, in which there was not one word of truth, except the admission that the shots had been fired! From the moment I was enlarged from the Tower, I determined to free the press from this dastardly thralldom, that the conduct of those ministers might be fairly published; and whilst a beloved brother is confined in a cell nine fee square, against every form of law and the plighted faith of this administration, I take this opportunity to call on Lord Camden to tell you and the world, what inquiry has been made, or what punishment has been inflicted on the perpetrators of an act, which, if brought home to his administration, must affix a greater stain on his name than the ever-memorable days of September have indelibly left on Robespierre and the gang of his assassins, whose government was supported by burning of houses, destruction of property, massacring the people, and crowding the galleys and dungeons, but for which he, *even Robespierre*, disdained to employ torture to extort confessions of patriotism, which this sanguinary usurper punished as treason. Whenever it shall happen that one or a few base usurpers shall have seized on a nation's civil and political rights, and that they shall have sold them to a neighbouring country in the rankest and foulest corruption and treason—whenever it shall happen that, to heal religious dissention, to promote universal philanthropy, true Christian charity, and national union, and to establish the imprescriptible right of being represented, which no people can forfeit, shall be punished by lawless or legalized murder, trust me, the most drowsy conscience, stung by public exposure, will

make every effort by bribery, by violence, by persecution, and even by bludgeon and robbery, to put down the press. But, regarding it as the great luminary which has dispelled the darkness in which mankind lay brutalized in ignorance, superstition, and slavery—regarding it as that bright constellation which, by its diffusion of light, is at this moment restoring the nations amongst whom it has made its appearance, to knowledge and freedom—whilst I can find one single plank of the scattered rights of my country to stand on, I will fix my eyes on the *Press*, as the polar star which is to direct us to the haven of freedom. With these sentiments engraved on my heart; alive to the honest ambition of serving my country; regardless whether I am doomed to fall by the lingering torture of a solitary dungeon, or the blow of the assassin; if the freedom of the press is to be destroyed, I shall esteem it a proud destiny to be buried under its ruins. But if there be any men so base or so stupid as to imagine that they can usurp or withhold your civil and political rights—that they can convert truth into sedition, or patriotism into treason—if they imagine that this is a period favourable for abridging the freedom of mankind, or establishing despotic power on the ruins of liberty—let them look around them, and they will find that amongst the old and inveterate despotisms in Europe, some have been destroyed, and that the rest are on the brink of destruction. They may make martyrs, and Liberty's roots will be fertilized by the blood of the murdered; but if their deeds and their blunders have not made reflection a horror, let them look back on the five years that are past, and they will see that they have been the most destructively rapid revolutions that ever existed; they will see that Great Britain and Ireland, which, from the portion of rights they enjoyed, were the nations of Europe where revolution was least necessary, and where it might have been most easily saved, are now nearest the danger. But let them reflect ere it is too late—and it is never too late to abandon a ruinous course—that if they could establish, without opposition, *lettres de cachette* in place of habeas corpus and trial by jury; if the galleys and bastilles of despotism could be erected in place of the prisons of law; if they could abolish every idea of representation, and establish chambers for registering their requisitions and edicts; if, instead of the *Press of the Nation*, they could set up the *Gazette of the Court*; if they could abolish that great constitutional principle, that no man could be forced to his own crimination, and establish the torture to extort confession, they should recollect that, like France, instead of preventing a revolution, they would but create so many powerful causes to excite the people to make

one; and whilst tyrannic despots talk so much of supporting the constitution they have done so much to destroy, let them remember that, if it owes much to obedience, it owes more to resistance; and that the feelings of a people must determine where crimes and sufferings shall end the one, and begin the other.

"ARTHUR O'CONNOR".

The letters in the *Press* signed FORTESQUE were evidently written by a lawyer; the subject of them is generally the illegality of the proceedings which had superseded the trial by jury, the excesses committed by the military, or the tortures inflicted on the people. Sampson states, in his Memoirs, that many of the accounts of these enormities published in the *Press* were written by him, but he does not state under what signature: that of FORTESQUE however, may probably be regarded as having been suggested by the quality with which the name of Sampson is associated. He was certainly supposed to be "the manager of the *Press*", and was called so by Lord Moira in one of his letters to him.

In reply to Lord Moira's assertion he says: "The paper was set up when I was in the country, and was continued some time before I ever saw it". * * * "The use made of the *Press* was to publish those facts, of which you were desirous also to be the publisher—the suppression and subsequent impunity of which (facts) you seemed to foresee, as well as I did, would lead to rebellion".*

The facts he alludes to, were the statements, verified on oath, of numerous atrocities, such as half-hangings, scourgings and picketings, which he had drawn up and presented to Lord Moira, and which his lordship, on two occasions, laid many of the details of before parliament, and which he undertook to prove at the bar of the house, if a committee of inquiry would be granted for this investigation. But such an inquiry was not compatible with the reputation of Lords Clare and Castlereagh, or the interests of the faction which then constituted the "imperium in imperio" in Ireland.

Sampson, in the latter part of 1797, had formed "a Society for obtaining Authentic Information of Outrages committed on the People"; the object of which society, he says, was, "by the disclosure of these enormities, to restrain the perpetrators of them, and to render it impossible for the government, which had hitherto connived at these proceedings, to plead ignorance of them". "The members of it", he says, "were men undoubtedly

* Sampson's Memoirs; Introduction, p. 66.

the most distinguished in Ireland, such as Grattan, the Ponsonbys, Curran, Fletcher, the brave Montgomery", &c. "We had proceeded", he adds, "some time with effect, in despite of the reigning horror—and never were more tragical stories wrested from oblivion".*

So long as there was an organ in Ireland for the publication of these statements, there was a sort of control over the violence of Orangeism; but when the *Press* was put down by military force, there were no bounds to the excesses.

The members of parliament themselves, of the opposition party, were insulted by insinuations prejudicial to their loyalty—nay, some of them were openly taunted, as persons who were aiders and abettors of traitors.

The 15th of May, 1797, Mr. Grattan announced the determination of himself and his friends to the ministers, to secede from parliament:—"Having no hopes left to persuade or dissuade, and having discharged our duties, we shall trouble you no more; and after this day shall not attend the House of Commons".† Much blame has been thrown on Messrs. Grattan, Ponsonby, and Curran, for abandoning their posts at this fearful crisis. But the fact is, they knew their own lives and liberty, and (what was dearer than either) their reputation, was in peril; and there was no security for any man of their party from the malevolence of that Orange faction which then swayed the council, the viceroy, and even Castlereagh himself.

In a recent work, entitled *Lights and Shadows of Whigs and Tories*, ascribed to the pen of the son of an incorruptible judge, it is plainly stated "that the loyalty of a Hastings had been even called in question—that an informer had been got to couple the name of Grattan with treason—that the arrest of Curran had even been debated in the council—nay, that a certain knight, of the name of Ormsby, renowned, in those times of terror, for his chivalrous exploits in the riding-house, had proceeded to the country-house of Mr. Ponsonby, with the avowed purpose of inflicting corporal punishment on that gentleman, and duly prepared for that operation; which punishment, in the fortunate absence of Mr. Ponsonby, was relinquished for a temporary military occupation of his house".

The suppression of the *Press* had been determined on, to prevent the intended publication of an attack on Lord Clare, particularly and personally offensive to his lordship, information of it having been given to the Government by some one in the office. The article was already in

* Sampson's Memoirs, p. 57.

† Grattan's Speeches, vol. iii. p. 342.

print, when the house where the paper was printed in Mountrath Street, and the office where it was published in Abbey Street, were taken possession of by a military force under the direction of the high sheriff. This letter, addressed to "the Author of Coercion", and signed DION, probably written by John Sheares, is to be found in a volume called *The Beauties of the Press*, published in London in 1800.

Sampson, who lived within a few doors of the office, had been sent for by the wife of the printer, then in jail, when the seizure was made by the high-sheriff, assisted by a large military force.* He says:—"I learned afterwards, that the investment and occupation of Mr. Stockdale's house was to prevent an intended publication from circulating in the *Press* against Lord Clare".

Among the contributors to the *Press*, there were men of the first eminence in literature, and one (Thomas Moore) whose fame was yet unwon, and whose dawning talents were then hardly known beyond the precincts of the college. His first production in prose, he informs us, in his life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, appeared in the columns of the *Press* before he had attained his seventeenth year. He does not say under what signature he wrote for that paper; but some of the pieces, he states, which were inserted in the secret report of the committee of the House of Commons, and given to the public as specimens of the "alarming writings" of the *Press*, were his. There are some lines on Mr. Pitt, signed TOMMY TRUANT, in one of the January numbers of the year 1798, the author of which probably contributed other pieces of poetry to that paper.

There is one piece displaying a great deal of talent, called "The London Pride and Shamrock", in No. 11 of the *Press*, signed TREBOR, which I believe to be the production of that most highly gifted and ill-fated of our countrymen—the unfortunate Robert Emmet. The letters of the signature reversed, will be found to be those which compose the name "Robert". Before I noticed this circumstance, I was struck with the simplicity, the sombre cast of thought, the ardent enthusiasm which is displayed in these verses. John Sheares was one of the latest writers in this paper.

Another contributor to the *Press*, on the authority of Dr. M'Nevin, it may be stated, was Mr. William Preston,

* It has been stated in several publications that Lord Edward Fitzgerald was present on this occasion; but Sampson positively states that he was not there.

For additional information on the contributors to "The Press" see T. A. Emmet's *Thomas Addis Emmet and Robert Emmet*, vol. i. p. 231. Ed.

one of the most distinguished scholars of Trinity College in his time, by the acknowledgment even of one not very favourable to his politics, Dr. Patrick Duigenan. (See *Lacrimæ Academicæ*).

Preston was a member of the well-known society established by Yelverton and Curran, "The Monks of St. Patrick".

He was the author of the *Argonautics of Appollonius Rhodius*, translated into English verse, of several poems and dramatic pieces, and a contributor to the production called *Præcæriano*, a satirical piece, written against Dr. Hutchinson, Provost of Trinity College, in 1774. The numbers, 16, 24, 25, 29, 31, and 33, were written by Preston. Dr. Duigenan was one of the principal contributors. As one of the founders of the Royal Irish Academy and of the Dublin Library, the name of Preston is associated with those of Charlemont and others of the foremost men of his day. Preston was a man of great literary attainments, "his mind was stored with Roman and Grecian literature". For several years before his death, he filled the office of commissioner of appeals, and died in Dublin, in January 1807, in his fifty-sixth year.

The writings in the *Press* most distinguished for their ability, were those which bear the names of MARCUS, Wm. CAXTON, SARSFIELD, FORTESQUE, SCÆVOLA, A MILITIA OFFICER, and DION. Those under the signature of MONTANUS, eleven in number, are written with great power, and bear evident marks of a mind deeply imbued with political and legal knowledge, and an intimate acquaintance with the character and condition of the people. The spirit which breathes in these letters, is that of a calm determination, an imperturbable disposition, a nature softened by philosophy, insensible to fear, and influenced by no sordid or selfish motive. The author of these letters, on the authority of the late Dr. M'Nevin in a statement to the author (who ought to have known the person he believes to have been the writer of them better than anybody else), was Thomas Addis Emmet. It may be observed, that a statement in the latter part of 1797 (though not in itself entitled to much respect as an authority) appeared in the *Dublin Journal*, in which the writer declared that he had seen one of the manuscript letters signed MONTANUS, in the handwriting of Thomas Addis Emmet.

A prosecution was instituted against the *Press* in 1798, for seditious libel on Lord Camden's government, contained in certain letters which appeared in that paper in the latter part of 1797. The subject matter of the libel in the *Press*, signed MARCUS (for the publication of which the printer was prosecuted by the government), was the

refusal of Lord Camden to extend mercy to a person of the name of William Orr, of respectability, and remarkable for his popularity, who had been capitally convicted at Carrickfergus of administering the oath of the United Irishmen's Society, and was the first person who had been so convicted. Poems were written, sermons were preached; after-dinner speeches, and after-supper still stronger speeches, were made, of no ordinary vehemence, about the fate of Orr and the conduct of Lord Camden, which certainly, in the peculiar circumstances of this case, was bad, or rather stupidly base and iniquitously unjust.

The scribes of the United Irishmen wrote up the memory of the man whom Camden had allowed to be executed with a full knowledge of the foul means taken to obtain a conviction, officially conveyed to him by persons in every way worthy of credit and of undoubted loyalty.

The evident object of the efforts to make this cry, "*Remember Orr*", stir up the people to rebellion, cannot be mistaken—that object was to single out an individual case of suffering for the cause of the Union, for the sympathy of the nation, and to turn that sympathy to the account of the cause. Orr's case presented to the people of Ireland, at that period, a few *extraordinary* features of iniquity and of injustice. He was a noted, active, and popular country member of the society of United Irishmen. He was executed on account of the notoriety of that circumstance, but not on account of the sufficiency of the evidence or the justice of the conviction that was obtained against him; for the crown witness, Wheatly, immediately after the trial, acknowledged that he had perjured himself; and some of the jury came forward likewise, and admitted that they were drunk when they gave their verdict; and these facts, duly deposed to and attested, were laid before the viceroy, Lord Camden, by Sir John Macartney, the magistrate who had caused Orr to be arrested, and who, to his honour be it told, when he found the practices that had been resorted to, used every effort, though fruitlessly, to move Lord Camden to save the prisoner.* Orr was executed, I repeat it, on account of the notoriety of his connection with the United Irish system, but not on account of the crime legally laid to his charge.

* These facts were admitted to me to be correctly stated, as they are given in the publications of the day, by the son of Sir John Macartney, the Rev. A. Macartney, the vicar of Belfast, in a conversation which I had with him; on which occasion he informed me of the particulars of the arrest of Orr, which had been effected by him in September, 1797. This gentleman would have served the party to which he unfortunately belonged at the expense of his life, but, to the best of my opinion, not at the expense of truth.

William Orr, of Farranshane, in the County of Antrim, was charged with administering the United Irishman's oath, in his own house, to a soldier of the name of Wheatly. He was the first person indicted under the act which made that offence a capital felony (36 Geo. III.). His father was a small farmer in comfortable circumstances, and the proprietor of a bleach-green. James Hope, who was intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, informs me, "that William Orr was not actually the person who administered the oath to the soldier. The person who administered the oath was William M'Keever, a delegate from the city of Derry to the Provincial Committee, who afterwards made his escape to America".

In a letter of Miss M'Cracken, dated 27th of September, 1797, addressed to her brother, then in Kilmainham Jail, I find the following reference to the recent trial of Orr:—"Orr's trial has clearly proved, that there is neither justice nor mercy to be expected. Even the greatest aristocrats here join in lamenting his fate; but his greatness of mind renders him rather an object of envy and of admiration than of compassion. I am told that his wife is gone with a letter from Lady Londonderry to her brother on his behalf. . . . You will be surprised when I tell you that old Alexander Thompson, of Cushendall, was foreman of the jury, and is thought will lose his senses if Mr. Orr's sentence is carried into execution, as he appears already quite distracted at the idea of a person being condemned to die through his ignorance, as it seems he did not at all understand the business of a jurymen. *However, he held out from the forenoon till six o'clock in the morning of the day following, though, it is said, he was beaten, and threatened with being wrecked, and not left a sixpence in the world, on his refusing to bring in a verdict of guilty. Neither would they let him taste of the supper and the drink which was sent to the rest, and of which they partook to such a beastly degree. It was not, therefore, much to be wondered at, that an infirm old man should not have sufficient resolution to hold out against such treatment.*

(Signed), "MARY M'CRACKEN".

The report given in the *Press* of the 29th of October, 1797, is said to have been furnished by an eminent shorthand writer. Orr was defended by Curran and Sampson. The judges before whom he was tried were, Lord Yelverton and Judge Chamberlaine. The jury retired at six in the evening *to consider their verdict.* They sat up, *deliberating,* all night, and returned into court at six the following morning. The jury inquired if they might find

a qualified verdict as to the prisoner's guilt. The judge directed them to give a special verdict on the general issue. They retired again, and returned shortly with a verdict of guilty, and a strong recommendation of the prisoner to mercy. Next day Orr was brought up for judgment, when, after an unsuccessful motion in arrest of judgment, chiefly on the grounds of the drunkenness of the jury, which Judge Chamberlaine would not admit of being made "the foundation of any motion to the court", Lord Yelverton pronounced sentence of death "in a voice scarcely articulate, and at the conclusion of his address burst into tears". Orr said, pointing to the jury, "*That jury has convicted me of being a felon. My own heart tells me that their conviction is a falsehood, and that I am not a felon. If they have found me guilty improperly, it is worse for them than for me. I can forgive them. I wish to say only one word more, and that is, to declare on this awful occasion, and in the presence of God, that the evidence against me was grossly perjured—grossly and wickedly perjured!*"

The witness, Wheatly, made an affidavit before a magistrate, acknowledging his having sworn falsely against Orr. Two of the jury made depositions, setting forth that they had been induced to give a verdict contrary to their opinions, when under the influence of liquor. Two others made statements that they had been menaced by the other jurors with denunciations and the wrecking of their properties, if they did not comply with their wishes. The following persons composed Mr. Orr's jury:—Archibald Thompson, George Crooks, James M'Naghten, George Pentland, J. Bell, George Dickson, Samuel Semphill, William Laughlin, George Casement, Arthur Johnston, John Hall, and George Patterson.

James Orr, in the *Press* newspaper of the 28th of October, 1797, published a statement respecting his interference, with a view of saving his brother's life, to the following effect:—"He, James Orr, had been applied to by many gentlemen to get his brother William to make a confession of his guilt, as a condition on which they would use their interest to have his life spared. The high sheriff, Mr. Skeffington, and the sovereign of Belfast, the Rev. Mr. Bristowe, were among the number—the former undertaking to get the grand jury to sign a memorial in his favour. James Orr immediately went to his brother, and the latter indignantly refused to make any such confession, for 'he had not been guilty of the crime he was charged with'. James Orr not being able to induce him to sign it, returned to Belfast and wrote out a confession, similar in terms to that required by Skeffington and Bristowe, and forged his brother's name. The forged

document was then turned to the account it was required for. A respite had been granted; but the weakness of the brother was made instrumental to the death of the prisoner. The shaken verdict of the drunken jury, of the perjured witness, was not suffered to preserve the prisoner. The forged testimony of his guilt was brought against him. The promises under which that document was obtained were forgotten, and thus 'a surreptitious declaration', swindled from the fears of an afflicted family, was made the instrument to intercept the stream of mercy, and counteract the report of the judge (one of the judges, namely, Lord Yelverton) who tried him". Orr was executed outside Carrickfergus, on the 14th of October, 1797, in his thirty-first year, solemnly protesting his innocence of the crime laid to his charge.

The act of James Orr might have led the executive into error; but William Orr wrote a letter to Lord Camden, dated the 10th of October, plainly informing his lordship of the forgery committed by his brother, and that the confession imputed to him "was base and false"; but stating, if mercy was extended to him, "he should not fail to entertain the most dutiful sense of gratitude for such an act of justice as well as mercy".* On the day of the execution, the great body of the inhabitants of Carrickfergus quitted the town to avoid witnessing the fate of Orr.

A person who visited Orr previously to his trial, speaks of his personal appearance and address as highly prepossessing.† His apparel was new and fashionable—there was a remarkable neatness in his attire. The only thing approaching the foppery of patriotism, was a narrow piece of green ribbon round his neck. He was six feet two inches in height, particularly well made—in fact, his person was a model of symmetry, strength, and gracefulness. He wore his hair short and well powdered. The expression of his countenance was frank and manly. He possessed a sound understanding, strong affections, and a kindly disposition. In speaking to his visitor of the state of the country, who remarked that the government was disposed to act in a conciliatory spirit towards the country, he said—"No, no; you may depend upon it that there is some system laid down, which has for its object murder and devastation". He added, respecting the treatment of the Dissenters as well as the Catholics, "Irishmen of every denomination must now stand or fall together".

Thus a variety of depositions establishing the drunkenness of the jury and the perjury of Wheatly were laid before the Lord Lieutenant. One deposition was of the

* "Press", Nov. 21, 1797.

† Ibid, Dec. 21, 1797.

Rev. George Macartney, a magistrate of the County Antrim, respecting Wheatly's being brought forward by Mr. Kemmis, and on his (Wheatly's) coming into court, relating to Mr. Macartney his having seen a Dissenting clergyman, of the name of Eder, whom he had known elsewhere, and was sure he was brought there to invalidate his testimony. Another deposition was that of the clergyman referred to, stating that he had accompanied a brother clergyman, the Rev. A. Montgomery, to visit a sick soldier, apparently deranged, named Wheatly, a Scotchman, who had attempted to commit suicide; that he confessed to Mrs. Hueys, in whose house he then was, that he was in Col. Durham's regiment, and had committed a murder, which weighed heavily upon his mind, and that he had been instigated to give false evidence against William Orr, of which crime he sincerely repented. A similar deposition, before Lord O'Neil, was made by the Rev. Mr. Montgomery. Two of the jury made depositions respecting their drunkenness. Two others made statements of the menaces that had been used by the other jurors. But all were of no avail. Lord Camden was deaf to all the representations made to him. All the waters of the ocean will not wash away the stain his obduracy on this occasion has left on his character. Better fifty thousand times for his fame it were, if he had never seen Ireland. The fate of Orr lies heavy on the memory of Lord Camden.

The friends of Earl Camden in vain seek to cast the responsibility of this act on his subordinates in the Irish government. They say he was a passive instrument in the hands of others. The prerogative of mercy, however, was given to him, and not to them. On the 26th of October (1797), a letter addressed to Earl Camden appeared in the *Press*, signed MARCUS, ably and eloquently written, but unquestionably libellous, commenting on the conduct of his Lordship in this case. Marcus used those words in reference to it.—“The death of Mr. Orr, the nation has pronounced one of the most sanguinary and savage acts that has disgraced the laws. Let not the nation be told that you are a passive instrument in the hands of others. If passive you be, then is your office a shadow indeed. If an active instrument as you ought to be, you did not perform the duty which the laws required of you. You did not exercise the prerogative of mercy—that mercy which the law entrusted to you for the safety of the subject. Innocent it appears he was. His blood has been shed, and the precedent is awful. . . Feasting in your Castle in the midst of your myrmidons and bishops, you have little concerned yourself about the expelled and miserable cottager, whose dwelling at the

moment of your mirth was in flames, his wife or his daughter suffering violence at the hands of some commissioned ravager, his son agonizing on the bayonet, and his helpless infants crying in vain for mercy. These are lamentations that disturb not the hour of carousal or intoxicated counsels. The constitution has reeled to its centre—Justice herself is not only blind, but drunk, and deaf like Festus to the words of soberness and truth.

“Let the awful execution of Mr. Orr be a lesson to all unthinking jurors, and let them cease to flatter themselves, that any interest, recommendation of theirs and of the presiding judge, can stop the course of carnage which sanguinary, and I do not fear to say, unconstitutional laws have ordered to be loosed. Let them remember that, like Macbeth, the servants of the crown have waded, so far in blood, that they find it easier to go on than to go back”.* Finnerty was found guilty, and sentenced to be imprisoned for two years, to pay a fine of £20, and to give security for future good behaviour for seven years, himself for the sum of £500, and two sureties in £250 each.

Other letters bearing the signature of MARCUS, are remarkable for the impetuosity, energy, and boldness of their language. Traces are to be observed throughout those compositions, of a temperament whose ardour was under no control—of wild and luxuriant talents, subject to no restraint—of feelings, whose fervour in political matters was more indicative of a new-born zeal in a cause suddenly embraced, than of matured reflection on the political circumstances of the times, or the probable result and adequacy of the means proposed for effecting a removal of existing evils.

In 1842, the late General Arthur O'Connor informed me that the author of the stirring treasonable letters against Lord Camden's government, published in the *Press* newspaper, the Dublin organ of the United Irishmen, under the signature MARCUS, was a Mr. Deane Swift. He and Dr. Drennan were the chief pensmen of the Dublin leaders; some of the strongest and most stirring leading articles in that paper were written by Swift, whom O'Connor believed had been long dead. Deane Swift was the eldest son of a very eccentric gentleman, Theophilus Swift, a descendent of the Godwin Swift, uncle of the man to whom the name is indebted for its celebrity. “Godwin Swift”, we are told in a recent remarkable work, “who came to Ireland during Ormond's power, and acted as attorney-general for the Palatinate of Ormond, was descended from a Yorkshire family, originally from Belgium (Swyft or Suyft), settled at Rotherham.

* Ridgeways Report of Trial of P. Finnerty, Dublin, 1798.

The attorney-general of Ormond, Godwin Swift, married, first, Miss Deane, of the Muskerry family, by whom he had issue: Godwin, the ancestor of the Swifts of Lion's Den, and three other children. He married, secondly, a Miss Delgarno, daughter of a rector of Moylisker.*

The celebrated dean, according to Sheridan (*Life of Dr. J. Swift*), was a member of a younger branch of an ancient Yorkshire family. His grandfather, the Rev. Thomas Swift, was distinguished for his general exertions in favour of Charles the First, and his subsequent sufferings and ruin. Five of his sons went to seek their fortunes in Ireland, one of whom, Jonathan, was the father of the famous dean. He had married a Leicestershire lady, of little fortune, a Miss Abigail Errick, a relative of the wife of Sir William Temple, and had died in distressed circumstances, about two years after marriage, seven months before the birth of his only son, Jonathan. After his death, his widow came to Ireland, and was received into the family of her husband's eldest brother, Godwin Swift.

Theophilus Swift, who was a descendent of this Godwin, passed his days in waging pamphleteering wars with all sorts of opponents. He waged war, at one time, with the newspaper press of England, in defence of a person commonly known as the Monster Renwick Williams. He waged war at another period with the fellows of Trinity College, for marrying, against the statutes of the University. He declared "all married fellows were literary centaurs", and was quite of Pope's opinion, that

"Worth makes the man, and want of it *the fellow*".

He waged war of another kind, too, with an exalted personage—he fought a duel with the Duke of Richmond. He fell desperately in love, in his declining years, with the daughter of a venerable and most amiable clergyman, Dr. Dobbin, and pestered the family of the young lady with letters duly published in pamphlet form, describing his transports, and the pangs of unrequited, or, as he deemed them, ill-requited love.†

The number of pamphlets written by the great "Dust of Drumcondra", as Theophilus was styled, is considerable. One that I have referred to appeared in 1794. In *Animadversions on the Fellows of Trinity College*, 192 pages, the crime of the fellows, in marrying against an express

* Lyons' Grand Jury Lists of Westmeath, p. 303.

† "Correspondence of Theophilus Swift with the Rev. Dr. Dobbin, and others of his family, including Letters to the Rev. Thomas P. Lefanu, a gentleman who was then on the point of marrying Miss Dobbin". Dublin, 1811.

statute of the University, was generally attacked in this pamphlet, and the sin of Dr. Burrowes in particular. But the virtuous indignation of Theophilus was excited mainly against the Doctor, because his son, Deane, had been hardly used by him at an examination, and he had dared "to dub his son a blockhead" (which, certainly, he was not), "to stab both the fame and the fortune of an ingenious, but modest, youth". It seems, Dr. Burrowes had found fault with his logic, did not approve the responses he made in Locke, and Dr. Burrowes, moreover, was "the low instrument of the spleen of Dr. Wall", who had disparaged in conversation within the walls of College, his son's talents for composition in Latin verse, by saying publicly "that Latin verse was nothing but a knack". It was a very happy knack, however, which the young man possessed, as some of his caustic epigrams very clearly show. Burrowes, however, had an opportunity of punishing the eldest son of Theophilus, and he accordingly rebuked him at examination, "with a caution". This led to the lad's removal from Trinity College to Oxford; to the pamphleteering vengeance of his father on the doctor; to an action and a cross-action at law for defamation; to the durance vile in Newgate of Theophilus; and the conviction, likewise, of Burrowes, for a libel on Theophilus.

Theophilus Swift took a deep interest in the politics and the affairs of the *Press*. Mr. Flanagan, a printer sixty years ago on that paper, and a printer to the present time on another, has a lively recollection of "the nice-looking little old gentleman", Theophilus Swift, who constantly visited at Mr. Stockdale's, and had been there on the occasion of the destruction of the printing materials at the hands of the authorities and their military agents. Theophilus was seen, at the departure of the Vandals, perambulating the printing offices, treading on a great mass of type strewn over the floor, with his hands clasped, surveying the ruins of the *Press* establishment. One of his latest, and not the worst of his political pamphlets,—*Hear Him! Hear Him! A Letter to the Right Hon. John Foster*—appeared in 1811.

The eldest son of Theophilus Swift, his father states, was born, and received his early education at Eton. He entered Trinity College in July, 1792. The youngest was born and educated in Ireland. His classical acquirements were received at a school of much note in its day, that of Mr. Dowling, of Blackrock, near Dublin.

Mr. O'Connor was mistaken in supposing that the writer of the letters signed MARCUS, in the *Press*, had been long dead, as I subsequently learned from the keeper of the regalia in the Tower, that Mr. Deane Swift was still in

being, and then residing at Gravesend, in comfortable circumstances, and highly respected by all classes.

My informant, who was then charged with the custody of her Majesty's crown, Edmond Lenthal Swift, Esq., was the brother of the formidable penman of the *United Irishman*, Mr. Deane Swift, the MARCUS of the *Press*, whose writings had so seriously troubled the repose of Lords Camden, Clare, and Castlereagh.

Having stated to Mr. E. L. Swift the account given me by General O'Connor as to the authorship of the MARCUS Letters, the impression was left on my mind that Mr. E. L. Swift concurred with me in that account. But I may be mistaken in that supposition.

E. L. Swift, Esq., was keeper of the regalia in the Tower so far back as July 1817; and in 1847, when I last saw him, still held that office. He was an occasional contributor to the *Gentleman's Magazine*.* In the number of that periodical for 1817, he published some verses on the death of the Princess Charlotte, entitled "The Heart", strangely contrasting with the effusions of his brother in the *Press* newspaper of 1797 and 1798, under the signature of MARCUS.

Deane Swift was a young man of considerable ability, an excellent scholar, a good Latin versifier, and an able writer. From the time of the war with the Fellows, and the composition of divers sarcastic epigrams on them, no more was heard of young Deane Swift till the memorable year of 1798, when his name occurs in certain governmental documents, under the list of proscribed persons specified in the Fugitive Bill of 1798, representing him as a person not particularly loyal in his opinions; and then he disappears from the stage of Irish politics and the page of Irish history, and is only known to have quitted Ireland at the period above referred to, and not to have returned to it for many years.

He is still existing, however, in his native city, an old man, of a philosophical mind, retired in his habits, not of sanguine expectations nor of strong faith in the public virtue of modern patriots and political parties, Whig or Tory, prized and respected by those who know him, for his intellectual powers, extensive acquirements, simple tastes, the moderation and tolerance of his opinions, and that sort of consistency which Robert Holmes has made so conducive to the honour and renown of a long career, that has been maintained with honesty nearly sixty years, aloof from all factions and ambitions, small and large.

* Gent. Mag., July, 1817, part xi., p. 3.

Dr. William Drennan.

The classical pen of that excellent writer, Dr. William Drennan, the friend of Dugald Stewart, was likewise employed in the *Press*. He was, in fact, the chief penman of the United Irish Society. The first declaration of the Dublin society, and many of the addresses and resolutions of the society (of which, in the years 1792 and 1793, he was frequently the chairman), were written by him, as were also many of the songs and other poetical compositions which appeared in the *Press*, and subsequently in *The Harp of Erin*. In the former he published, 14th January, 1791, anonymously, amongst other pieces, the well-known ode, "To the Memory of William Orr", beginning with the words, "Oh! wake him not with women's cries", a piece written with great power, and which, probably, had more effect on the public mind than any production of the day in prose or verse. This piece alone, with his song, "When Erin first rose", and that admirable paraphrase of the classical story, called "The Jewels of Cornelia", published the 4th of January, 1798, in the *Press*, are to be found in a small volume of his, entitled, *Fugitive Pieces, in verse and prose*, published in Belfast in 1815. In this volume, we find a poem called "Glendalough", and a number of hymns, which in any other country, where English poetry was prized, would have gained a high reputation for the writer; but Ireland, as to literature, is still in the condition described by Spencer:

And in so fair a land as may be redd,
Not one Parnassus, nor one Helicon
Left for sweet Muses to be harbored.

Dr. Drennan was a member of a political and literary club, formed in 1790, by T. W. Tone; the other members were T. A. Emmet, Pollock, William Johnson, subsequently a judge, Whitley Stokes, Peter Burrowes, and Thomas Russell.

These spirit-stirring songs of Drennan, beautiful in their imagery, though certainly not calculated to allay the excitement of the public mind at that period, circulated with the utmost rapidity over the country, and became the standard songs of every convivial society where United Irishmen, or those who were friendly to their views, assembled. One of these songs of Drennan, to which I have alluded, was very remarkable for its highly poetical diction, it was called "Erin to her own tune", beginning with the words, "When Erin first rose". Mr. Moore has

paid the compliment to the merit of its composition, of adopting one of its beautiful images in those exquisite lines of his, at the close of the fiftieth number of his *Melodies*:

Dear harp of my country, in darkness I found thee,
The cold chain of silence had hung o'er thee long.

In a note to that piece, whose numbers, "most musical, most melancholy", would alone be sufficient to make the name of Moore remembered in after times, the author says—"In that rebellious, but beautiful song, 'When Erin first rose', &c., there is, if I recollect right, the following line:—

The dark chain of silence was thrown o'er the deep".

In this song, Drennan first designated his country as the "Emerald Isle"; and I was assured by his widow, now residing in Belfast, that he prided himself not a little on the paternity of this title. This amiable lady, deservedly respected by all classes in Belfast, informs me that Dr. Drennan, at one period, had some idea of writing a history of the United Irish Society, but his other literary avocations prevented him carrying his purpose into effect. It is greatly to be regretted that he did not undertake this task, for no person could have done so with equal advantage. His admirable letters, bearing the signature—ORELLANA, THE IRISH HELOT, which appeared in 1784, and those of Joseph Pollock, signed OWEN ROE O'NEILL, published about 1790, and those of Jebb, under the signature of GUATIMOZIN, are the ablest compositions of all the political literature of those times.

From the notes of two sons of Dr. Drennan, not unworthy of their name and origin, nor unmindful of their obligations to their father's memory, the following account of this remarkable man are given:—

William Drennan, born in Belfast, 23rd May, 1754, was the youngest of nine children, three only of whom survived the age of childhood. His father was the Rev. Thomas Drennan, minister of the First Presbyterian Congregation in Belfast. He married in 1741, Anne Lennox, daughter of Martha Hamilton and Robert Lennox. Martha Hamilton was daughter of John Hamilton, who, in 1672, purchased the townland of Ballymenentragh, in the County of Down, from the then Earl of Clanbrassil. This property Martha Hamilton, afterwards Lennox, inherited, and left two daughters, Martha Lennox, married to Alexander Young, and Anne Lennox, married to the Rev. Thomas Drennan.





NAPOLÉON BONAPARTE IN 1796.

Martha Lennox on her marriage obtained her half; but on her mother's death, claimed and obtained half of her sister's; thus acquiring three-fourths. She and her husband left two sons and five daughters; but the sons and four daughters having died without lawful issue, their last surviving sister, who also died unmarried, left the whole of her share to Dr. Drennan, who thus became (his mother having also died) entitled to the whole. This property, purchased in 1672 for £50, was sold in 1824 for £22,500, or 450 times the original value in about 150 years. Dr. Drennan's ancestry by his father's side was of an humble class, but on that account so little was known of it, that his eldest sister, born in 1742, declared that she had never known any of her father's family, and she was a woman of remarkable independence of character. Some of Dr. D.'s own tenants in after life, at least one female, bore his name and was perhaps a relative, though she modestly disclaimed any title to be considered one. His grandfather was probably a small farmer, whose ambition it was to bring up a son to the ministry, as is still common in the north of Ireland and Scotland, as is the case also among our Catholic brethren. William Drennan, the subject of this notice, went to school to Matthew Garnet, and entered Glasgow College, 1769; obtained the A.M. degree 1771, studied medicine in Edinburgh College, 1773-1778, where, Sept. 8th, he obtained his M.D. degree. He practised two or three years in Belfast; but not succeeding as he expected, removed to Newry at the end of 1782, where for seven years he exercised his profession with very considerable success, and laid by some hundreds. But, desirous of more extended reputation, he removed to Dublin at the end of 1789, where, as he expresses it, he exercised the duties of an upright man and a strenuous citizen, conceiving them identified. He beheld the people divided both in and out of parliament into factions, and under the domination of an oligarchy which monopolised all honour, place, and profit. He saw the rural population ejected from their farms, left without resource to indolence and want, with no sure homes, with indifferent morals, and without any bond of union.

Thinking that something should be dared by individual effort for the common good, and hoping to abolish factious contests by an interest for the common weal, he conceived in his mind an intimate union of his fellow citizens in the bonds of virtue and concord. He founded, therefore, in idea, the first Society of United Irishmen, and published a prospectus in June 1791. Arrested subsequently for sedition, he spent a night in prison, with the Bible for his pillow, and narrowly escaped on his trial from the infamy of the informer, who had mingled truth with falsehood,

on the 26th June, 1794, but was acquitted. Those who despaired of amendment in the state, a little later rushed headlong to their ruin, appealed to arms, and sought assistance from abroad. The union of the people was broken by the snares of haughtier slaves, the upper classes. Betrayed by those who had figured as flaming patriots, in the grade of generals and colonels of Volunteers, or in lawyers' corps and conventions wherein members of both Houses of Parliament represented the citizen soldiers of various national associations, the country was lost, and the surrender of her independence as a nation was accomplished in her parliament. Drennan's mind and spirits, though depressed, were not subdued by the calamities which had fallen on his country. His opinions and principles remained unchanged; he relinquished practice, and removed from Dublin to his native place, having previously married, the 3rd February, 1800.

After Dr. Drennan's return to Belfast, in 1801, he seems to have had no particular object in view, except to conduct the *Belfast Magazine*, and to make it instrumental to an object which had taken possession of his mind, namely, that of extending the benefits of education to his townsmen and the province of Ulster. He had felt in his youth the want of a college in his native land, having spent a great part of nine years in pursuing the necessary studies for his profession, and obtaining his degrees in Scotland, and this at an expense which must have pressed heavily on his family's resources. He therefore joined, head, pen, and purse, with the founders of the Belfast Academical Institution, with which his feelings were so much bound up, as to have left a request that his corpse might be staid on its way to the grave for a few moments before its gates. On *that spot* there now stands a statue, to the memory of an amiable young scion of a noble house. When Belfast is *worthy* of some memorial of William Drennan, it will have it also; no friend of his fame should wish for it sooner. For his latest years he amused himself with versifying, and translated several shorter poems from the Greek anthology as well as the *Electra* of Sophocles. But though passages of this translation are highly poetical, as a faithful version it can scarcely be compared with Potter's, or those of later date. Dr. Drennan's acquaintance with Greek being rather that of a gentleman, and somewhat rusted, than of a minute grammarian or profound scholar. With Cicero he was more at home, yet even there his style is somewhat unnecessarily diffusive, especially as Cicero says too little. His own style may perhaps occasionally seem somewhat florid, antithetical, and lapsing into alliteration, a fault in the English language not easily avoided.

Among the papers of Dr. Drennan a fragment was found of a paraphrase in Latin verse of Hannibal's vow, which his eldest son has endeavoured to convey the style and spirit of, in the following English lines:—

My boy, lay thine hand on the blood of the altar;
For the oath I propose, let thy tongue never falter.
Here stand on the helmet you shortly shall try on,
And show your descent from Hamilcar the Lion:
For our wrongs from proud Rome, and, far worse, our dishonour,
The warrior's curse in old age is upon her.
Now swear that you'll never forget nor forgive her.
His gloomy brow gleamed, as his son answered—never.
How truly he kept the dread vow, let the story
Of Cannæ and Thrasymene tell for his glory.

In an American reprint of the *Proceedings of the Society of United Irishmen, Dublin*, published in Philadelphia, 1795, which belonged to Dr. William Drennan, and for which I am indebted to his son, all the resolutions, addresses, and declarations, which were written by Dr. Drennan, he has pointed out as his compositions, by affixing to each his initials—W. D.

The fact of his having done so was not known to me when the preceding series was published, where many of these documents will be found described in the account given of his works from page 216 to page 257. The following are the documents which Dr. Drennan claims as his compositions:—

1. The Test of the Society of United Irishmen of Dublin, November, 1791.

2. Circular of Society of United Irishmen, specifying objects of the Institution, 30th December, 1791.

3. Address to the Society of United Irishmen, on legal proceedings being taken against their secretary, J. N. Tandy, 28th February, 1791.

4. Address of Society of United Irishmen to the Friends of the People in London, setting forth the state of the representation in Ireland, and operation of the penal code on Catholics, 26th October, 1791.

5. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to the Delegates for promoting a Reform in Scotland, 23rd November, 1792.

6. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to the Volunteers of Ireland, A. H. Rowan, chairman, December 2nd, 1792. [This was the address beginning with the words "Citizen soldiers", for the publication and distribution of which, at a public meeting, Rowan was prosecuted and convicted].

7. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to the Irish Nation, William Drennan, chairman, 25th January,

1793. [This was the address for the publication of which Dr. Drennan was prosecuted, though not convicted—one of the ablest of the political compositions of Dr. Drennan].

8. Resolutions adopted at a full meeting of the Society of United Irishmen in relation to the imprisonment of Oliver Bond and the Honourable Simon Butler; B. B. Harvey in the chair—Thomas Russell, secretary. March 1st, 1793. [It is worthy of observation, that five years later the chairman and secretary were hanged; Oliver Bond was condemned to be hanged; and Butler had to go into exile].

9. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to their Catholic countrymen. No date, but written in June, 1793.

10. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to Dr. James Reynolds, on refusing to be examined on oath before a Committee of the House of Lords; Henry Jackson, chairman. 14th August, 1793.

11. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to Oliver Bond and the Honourable Simon Butler; John Sheares, chairman. 16th August, 1793.

12. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to Thomas Muir; B. B. Harvey, chairman. 22nd November, 1793.

13. Address of the Society of United Irishmen to the people of Ireland; James Reynolds, chairman. [At the end of this remarkable address, Mr. Drennan has written—"In part by W. D." He has marked the portions of it which were his composition—about a page, beginning, "If, however, it be a principle that a man who does not contribute to the support of government should be mediate or immediately concerned in legislation, such principle should be no exclusion to the poor, for they contribute in proportion to their means"; and ending with the words, "Sad experience has manifested, that giving political power exclusively to the property collected, not to the mass of living labour, has been in all ages, and particularly in modern times, the true cause of feudality, of vassalage, and of aristocratic despotism". And again, about two pages, commencing with the words, "Contemplating this grateful prospect"; and onwards to the end of the address].

At the conclusion of the last page of the volume, the following citation from D'Aguesseau is in the handwriting of Dr. Drennan:—"Après la gloire de faire le bien, le plus grand honneur est de souffrir pour l'avoir fait".

Having removed from Dublin to Belfast, his native place, in conjunction with Mr. John Templeton, the well-known botanist, and Mr. John Handcock, of Lisburn, Dr. Drennan established, in 1801, the *Belfast Magazine*, which ceased to exist in 1814; the most ably-conducted periodical of its

day, or indeed of any other day, in Ireland. The papers called "Retrospective Politics" was written by Dr. Drennan and Mr. Handcock. Dr. Drennan died in Belfast in 1820, in his sixty-sixth year, leaving four children, the eldest son a barrister, the youngest a physician, practising in Belfast—the inheritors of much of their father's eminent abilities. The remains of Dr. Drennan are buried in the same church-yard, at the rear of the poorhouse, where those of his friend Dr. Haliday repose. A small slab over his grave bears the following inscription:—"Gulielmo Drennan, ob. 5 Feb. 1820, æt. 66 an."

There are persons still surviving of 1798, who remember the time when Drennan's songs, and Lysaght's lyrical productions, and Curran's sallies of brilliant wit and humour, and all the unpremeditated jests, and black letter drollery, and erudite recreative scholastic humour of Bernard Clinch and Connolly of Booterstown, were in vogue in Dublin, and made to promote, if not the feast of reason, the flow of soul, at all convivial meetings; and they speak of them still as reminiscences of enjoyment of by-gone days, in which (pregnant with political strife as they were) the pleasures of social life were blended with literary tastes, and shared by persons of higher talents, of all politics, without distinction of creed or party, than are found to mingle in any social intercourse of the present day in Ireland.

The period between 1791 and the close of 1797, was marked by the development of those qualities which seldom fail to be discovered among those of the liberal professions, whose youth has been thrown on the troubled waters of an eventful period. Stirring times beget bold thinkers, daring projectors, and ardent votaries; they are calculated to call forth the noblest spirits, and to tolerate also the existence of men among them of the most reckless characters and the least steadfast in their principles, and even to conceal the defects of the latter, and to confound them with the impulsive activity of a generous enthusiasm. Thus men of dissimilar natures are brought into political intercourse, and eventually into social communion. The reunion of such heterogeneous materials, cemented for a season by a common excitement, which disposes all parties to the enjoyment of society, favours convivial intercourse; and it is only when the final conflict comes, that tries men's souls, that the great distinctive traits of their characters are fully exhibited. It would be difficult, without thus considering the circumstances of the time, to comprehend those terms of private intimacy which existed between persons of such incongruous public sentiments, as those fraternizing members of the Volunteer Corps (on the verge of dissolution), Whig Clubs,

Bar Clubs, the first Reform and United Irishmen Societies, the Historical Society, and various other associations, convivial and political, of a later date.

In one of these societies, formed at an earlier period (1779)—“The Monks of St. Patrick”,—we find among the names of its members those of Curran and Lord Carhampton, George Ogle and Lord Avonmore, Temple Emmet and Robert Day (subsequently Judge Day), Grattan and Lord Kingsborough, Lord Charlemont and the Earl of Mornington, the Rev. Arthur O’Leary, a Roman Catholic priest, and the Rev. Dr. Palliser, a Protestant divine. A few years later we find the same state of things existing in Belfast. That town was then spoken of as “*the Athens of Ireland, the focus of liberality of sentiment*” (Eheu ! Eheu ! how has the Northern Athens, the centre of enlightenment and liberality, sunk into the slough of stupid bigotry !),—that Belfast which, from 1782 to 1792, in its social circles, embraced the talent, the high intellectual and social qualities of all parties and all creeds. Men of the most dissimilar politics seemed to have adopted the non-contagion theory with respect to all forms of opinion on public matters; there then was no pestilence in to his dissenting neighbour’s soul in society. That a man’s creed to make the “fomes” of his faith dangerous apprehension was reserved for later times. In Dublin, at this period, we find the loyalty of Lord Moira suffered no contamination from the fervour of Theobald Wolfe Tone’s political sentiments in their intercourse at Moira House. The patriotism of Mr. Grattan came into contact, at Tinnehinch, with not a few of the leading democratic people of his time, without detriment to his principles.

In our reminiscences of the convivial pleasures of those times, the reunions at the house of Egan must not be left unnoticed; where the aristocracy of talent, comprising no small portion of the wit and humour of the forum, forgetful of politics, mingled in the wit-combat, at the supper table of the hospitable “Bully” of the Bar.

Before taking leave of the subject of the political periodicals of this time, another remarkable paper remains to be noticed—the *Union Star*, published in Dublin, to which Arthur O’Connor has largely referred in his communications to me.

Walter Cox.

Union Star was set up in Dublin in the summer of 1797, professedly the advocate of the principles and objects of the United Irishmen. Its advocacy, however, was repudiated by the directory of that society, and its atrocious sentiments disclaimed by all its leaders, and

especially, as we are informed in Sampson's Memoirs, by Thomas Addis Emmet. It will be necessary to say a few words respecting Mr. Walter Cox, in reference to the character of this journal, which has brought a very serious imputation on the character of the society of United Irishmen in general, as being the abettors and accomplices of the atrocious crime of assassination.

The following information respecting Walter Cox, I received from his step-daughter, Miss Isabella Powell, who was living in Dublin in 1842.

"He was the son of a master-blacksmith in Westmeath, in decent circumstances. His mother belonged to a respectable family of the name of Dease, of Summer Hill in that county. His father held some land, of which he lost possession at the period of Lord Carhampton's wholesale transportation of suspected persons. The old man was one of those arrested by his lordship, and was sent to jail. He was fortunate enough to get liberated after some weeks' imprisonment. He settled in Dublin, and died there in the neighbourhood of the North Strand.

"His son, Walter Cox, was bound apprentice to a gunsmith, of the name of Muley, of Suffolk Street, and after remaining three years with him, he served the remainder of his time to another gunsmith, Mr. Benjamin Powell, of 159 Abbey Street, a gun-contractor with the Ordnance department.

"On leaving Powell, he set up in business in a small shop in Bedford Row; he had previously married a woman of the Methodist connection, and, being a man of violent and ungovernable passions, he is said to have rendered the life of this poor creature miserable. She died in childbed; and, about the year 1797, he married the widow of his former master, Powell, and for some time carried on the business as gun-contractor with Government. This marriage proved no less unhappy than the former. On one occasion, he was brought before the magistrates for ill-using his wife, at the instance of Mr. Laurence Tighe, of 156 Thomas Street, who was an intimate friend of Mrs. Cox.

"Cox got a good deal of property, both in money and in houses, by his second marriage. He had no acquaintance with Laurence Tighe, and no intercourse with Major Sirr; but Mrs. Cox was intimate with the former. He had been deeply engaged in the rebellion of 1798, but not in that of 1803: if he said that he had been in the latter, he must have stated what was not true.

"He was separated from his wife upwards of twenty-five years previously to her death. He squandered her means, kept possession of her houses, and allowed her occasionally a small weekly pittance for her support, in a

miserable lodging in Clarence Street, North Strand, while in the same street he continued to lead a disreputable life in the house which belonged to her, and in which he resided till the period of his death.* The cause of his quarrel with his wife, was by some attributed to an opinion he entertained that his wife, shortly after Emmet's business, had given certain information to Mr. Tighe (who was said to be a Castle spy), respecting some papers of his, which had got him into trouble and occasioned his house to be searched by Major Sirr. At the time the *Union Star* was printed, he had a small place of business of some kind in Little Ship Street".

The preceding information of Isabella Powell I believe may be relied on. I visited the house in Clarence Street in 1840, where Cox died. The woman who had lived with him and attended him in his last illness, told me that she frequently heard him speak on the subject of the information which had been given against him in violent and angry terms. This person likewise denies that Cox had any intimacy with Major Sirr, or had taken any part in Emmet's conspiracy. It is right to observe, his enemies state the former as a proof of treachery to his associates of the United Irishmen; and Dr. Brennan alleges that he was in the habit of talking in his customary loose manner of having had the command of 1,500 Wexford men at the Broadstone, the night of Emmet's unsuccessful effort.

With whatever views his infamous paper the *Union Star* was established, it is certain that it was repudiated by the leaders of the United Irishmen, and equally certain that Mr. Cox was the sole editor, proprietor, and publisher of it. Garbled extracts having been given from this paper in the parliamentary reports, an entire number will be found in the Appendix.

The *Union Star* was printed on one side only, to allow of its being pasted on the walls; the name of its printer and place of publication were not given; its uniform theme was the necessity and justifiability of the removal of public delinquents. Obnoxious persons were pointed out for assassination, and their names regularly published in its columns. The ultra-violence of its revolutionary tendencies was prominently displayed; but its tendency, if not its design, was certainly to bring odium upon the cause it professed to espouse.

Cox went on for some months with perfect impunity, advocating assassination, suggesting the existence of an assassination committee, which never had a being; and all this time he contrived either to elude the vigilance of

* Cox died in 1837. For further information see Fitzpatrick's "The Sham Squire". Ed.

Government, or to secure its favour. The fact, however, admits of no doubt, that his paper was connived at by the authorities, who were daily denounced in his journal.

The probability is, that when Cox established this paper, he was animated solely by infuriated feelings of resentment for the treatment his father had received at the hands of Lord Carhampton; that, finding the chief confidence of the leaders of the United Irishmen placed in other organs of their opinions, namely, those of the *Press* and the *Northern Star*, he became jealous of the patronage bestowed on them, and had suffered himself to be tampered with by some of those official persons with whom his former avocations when in the employment of Powell, the gun-contractor with the Government, had brought him in contact; and that he had become, at first, the confidant of designing men, and perhaps eventually was not unwilling to be accounted their instrument. The fact which I have alluded to of his being found closeted with one of the agents of the Government, at the very period his paper was denouncing and proscribing its members, coupled with the circumstance (which he himself admits), that while the *Press* and the *Northern Star* editors were prosecuted and imprisoned, and their establishments ravaged by the military, the editor of the *Union Star*—the advocate of assassination—was fortunate enough to make terms with the Government, and to save his property from the slightest injury, is inexplicable. It is certain however, that some years subsequently to the putting down of the rebellion, Cox, on his return from France, considered himself neglected by the Government; and for the purpose of annoying it, in the month of November, 1807, he set up the *Irish Magazine*. But, lest any injustice should be done to one no longer living, and one, with all his faults, the Cobbett, on a small scale, of his day in Ireland—his own explanation of his conduct in the management of the *Union Star* is given here, taken from an article of his in the *Irish Magazine* for October, 1810, addressed to one of his opponents.

"You accuse me of being an assassin, because I was the author of the *Union Star*. Admitting the charge of proscription to have been fairly brought home to the character of that publication, where will the odium rest, if a fair comparison is made of the *Union Star* and the horrid circumstances that provoked its existence? Perhaps some will insist that emptying our villages into prison ships, a practice very common in the year 1797, was not assassination; putting the people out of the protection of the law, or half hanging them, were not acts of assassination: to me they appear as such; and in the ardent and impatient character of a young mind,

roused by a sense of exquisite feeling, at seeing, not only strangers agonizing under the most beastly cruelties, but my aged father swept off with his neighbours, by the hand of Carhampton, into a dungeon, I arrayed myself with those generous sufferers who were taught by the principles of the constitution to resist oppression, and among other acts of my industry to stem the authorized desolation, I produced the *Union Star*.

One murder makes a villian, millions, a hero:

Lords are privileged to kill, and numbers consecrate the crime.

"It was intended only to guard the Union against the intrusion of such men as Reynolds or O'Brien.

"Laying aside the right of authorship, which I very early assumed in preference to the vice and the anvil, to soothe the agonies of my country, and to avenge the atrocious indignities heaped by a Luttrell on my parent, I defy any man existing, in any rank of life, to fix any act of cowardice, meanness, or dishonesty, on Walter Cox, either as a politician, an author, or a tradesman. I had the honour of enjoying the confidence and intimacy of the greatest and most virtuous men that ever adorned this ill-fated country; and, after a lapse of thirteen years, I possess the esteem of such of them as have escaped the whirlwind of civil desolation. I was tampered with by the terrors of the triangle and the fascinations of the treasury; and I owe nothing either to my friends or my enemies. I escaped being involved in the ruin which overtook the other leaders of the rebellion, by surrendering myself as the author of the *Union Star*, with the express advice and direction of my friends, as the proclamation exposed me to a discovery by the extraordinary reward offered for my detection; and I the more readily made terms, as there was not on record a single instance of the *Union Star* having brought the slightest injury on any individual.

"I not only enjoyed the confidence of A. O'Connor, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, T. A. Emmet, and Dr. M'Nevin, for the character I ever preserved amongst honest men, but was a member of that body whose ambassadors were accredited in the greatest empire upon Earth. Like your friend Mr. Beresford, I represented the City of Dublin in the greatest council of the nation, where I was placed by fifty times as many electors as all his influence could procure".

So much for Mr. Cox's explanation of his conduct: we now turn to the pages of the *Milesian Magazine* (the rival of Mr. Cox's publication), the editor of which, the well-known Dr. Brennan, charges Cox with having been at a

former period in the pay of the government, and a hireling pamphleteer in the service of Major Sirr. He charges Cox with writing a defence of Sirr's conduct on the occasion of his squabble with Emerson for the blood-money earned by the capture of Russell. Brennan, at this time, was denounced monthly in Cox's *Magazine*, and was not forgetful how he might turn his injuries to account, or scrupulous as to the means by which he was to be appeased, or the party by whose sacrifice he might be revenged.

In 1804 a pamphlet was published in Dublin, signed "Timothy Tell-truth", in vindication of Major Sirr, whom Mr. John Swift Emerson, *an honourable member of the attorneys' corps*, had accused of defrauding him of his due proportion of the blood-money, in the case of the apprehension of the unfortunate Thomas Russell, the friend of Tone and the sharer in the desperate enterprise of Robert Emmet. It appears by a pamphlet published in 1804, in defence of Major Sirr, that he derived his information respecting the place of concealment from Emerson, and Emerson from a third party, who, to use his own words, "did not choose to appear in the business".

Russell was apprehended in the house of a gun-smith, of the name of Muley, in Parliament Street. Mr. Cox was of the same trade, and was employed, subsequently to the rebellion, in the Ordnance department in the Castle, as an operative gun-smith. Brennan states, that the third party alluded to by Emerson was Walter Cox; and he also charges him with being the author of the pamphlet in question, and the person who acted as "setter" to Major Sirr on Lord Edward Fitzgerald's removal from Moira House, in Dirty Lane, when Sirr failed of success, in consequence of the resistance made by Lord Edward's party.

It is remarkable that Mr. John Swift Emerson was one of the major's party on this occasion, as well as Major Ryan and Mr. Justice Bell.

In Brennan's *Magazine*, for June 1812, in reference to an intimation in Cox's publication, that the betrayer of Lord Edward was Mr. Laurence Tighe, of Thomas Street (who lived within two doors of Murphy's house, where Major Ryan, on being wounded by Lord Edward, it is to be observed, had been immediately taken), the following statement is made:—

"Who betrayed Lord Edward, is, as yet, a matter of doubt: the party came upon him in full set; but who was the 'setter dog'? is the question. In the desk of Lord Edward, on the table where he was, was found a paper containing a plan for taking the City of Dublin—a plan upon which Lord Edward was supposed about to act that

very night.* This paper was in the hand-writing of Walter Cox, and he owned it at the Castle, and pleaded having made his peace *two years before*,† on the *Union Star*, affairs, as a justification of following up murder with treason; and the Castle folks admitted his plea—and Watty was still let loose. If Lord Edward received a plan of military operations so important from any man, is it not to be supposed he expected and respected his co-operation?—and in that case, is it not almost morally certain he concealed nothing from him, particularly his residence? The commentary is easy. Does not Watty's impunity carry with it the conviction of Castle service? If Watty was false, then, is it to be supposed he did not betray on so great an occasion? That he knew where he (Lord Edward) was, is proved. Russell knew Cox through Lord Edward; and that Watty and the major were close friends at the time, is proved by Watty's own words in the defence of the major, where he says the major told him (the author of the pamphlet signed 'Timothy Tell-truth') the whole story the morning after Russell's capture. But Watty then did not imagine that 'Timothy Tell-truth' would one day be proved to be no other than the notorious Watty Cox".

Now, in confirmation of that part of the statement, respecting the plan for the taking of Dublin, found in Lord Edward's possession, we find the following remarks on this paper, in the journal of Lady Sarah Napier, in Moore's *Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald*, published many years subsequently to the appearance of Brennan's Magazine:—

"The plan referred to was not found at Lord Edward's place of concealment, but in his desk, in the charge of Lady Fitzgerald, immediately after the arrest at Bond's, on the 12th of March.

"Lady Sarah Napier, speaking of a visit he received from Captain Armstrong (this gentleman is not to be confounded with the Captain John Warneford Armstrong), says: 'From him I heard that the prisoners would come off well, that there was no committee, only some of them assembled about the *Press*; that the report about a dreadful map in Lady Edward's care, was one of Dublin, with notes written by a *clever gun-maker*, who had marked the weak parts, and who had sent it to Lord Edward. That, no sooner had this man heard of the noise it made, than he went to government and said it was his, which he had shown to Lord Edward. They asked him for what purpose

* This is not correct: the resolution taken by the Directory in the beginning of May, was that the rising should take place on the 23rd.

† This cannot have been the case; the "*Union Star*" did not exist two years before. R.R.M.

he had drawn it, 'For my own amusement', said he".*

At a subsequent period, in a letter from the Duchess of Leinster to the Duke of York, her Grace, in reference to this plan of Dublin, says: "That paper was found on the 12th of March, and a few days after an armourer, who worked in the Ordnance-yard in the Castle of Dublin, on hearing it talked of, went to the under secretary of state, and desired to see the plan, which, when shown to him, he acknowledged it to be his, and that he had sent it anonymously to Lord Edward Fitzgerald; and being asked his reason for so doing, said, because he understood Lord Edward was a good engineer and curious in those matters. The plan is not mentioned in the Report of the House of Commons, drawn up by Lord Castlereagh, who knew the circumstances".†

There are no comments in the work from which I have quoted these passages, on the extraordinary conduct of this "*clever gun-smith*", this armourer said to be employed in the Castle, at the period he communicated his plan for attacking the capital, in which he had so industriously marked the weak points. The fact seems to have escaped the notice of all those who have written on the affairs of 1798, that the clever gun-smith, the editor of the assassination journal, the *Union Star* and Mr. Walter Cox, the subsequent editor of the *Irish Magazine*, were one and the same person. The impunity with which the *Union Star* was allowed to proceed in its atrocious career, and with which Mr. Cox was eventually permitted to acknowledge himself to government its editor and proprietor; the singular step of declaring himself to the under secretary of state to be the framer of that treasonable paper he had given to Lord Edward; the fact of his being enabled, immediately after the rebellion, without any resources of his own, to leave the country and remain abroad for nearly a year on that occasion; these circumstances, coupled with the evident tendency of his journal—namely, to bring discredit on the cause he professed to advocate—render it a very difficult matter to understand the views and conduct of this man: one, in fact, whose mental conformation was the exemplification of all kinds of contradictory qualities, which utterly confound inquiry, and make it well-nigh impossible to form any estimate of the character of so eccentric and singular a person.

It is very difficult to believe that Cox was not in the service of the Castle, and yet there are unquestionable proofs that at the very time he was a frequenter of the

* Vide Moore's "*Life of Lord E. Fitzgerald*". American edition, vol. ii., p. 23.

† Ibid., vol. ii., p. 197.

public offices at the Castle, and was considered in its service by the authorities, he was even then so far faithful to those of the United Irish leaders he was attached to, as to keep secrets from the government that would implicate them in high treason, and to give timely and very serviceable notice to those persons, when steps against them were meditated by government.

On the authority of Arthur O'Connor, it was during the period of his imprisonment, in the latter part of the year 1797, the *Union Star* got into circulation. The first thing he did on being set at liberty, was to send for Cox, and to remonstrate with him on the madness of his proceedings. Cox protested that his only object was to frighten the people at the Castle and the Orangemen, and showed, as a proof of his success, that a large reward had been offered for the discovery of the printer and publisher of the *Union Star*. Cox states that O'Connor told him he was sure to be discovered, and that his best plan was to go to the Castle, propose to give up the author and proprietor of this prohibited paper, and on making terms, to declare himself to have been the individual.

Cox says he saw the advantage of following this advice. He acted on it, and to the utter astonishment of Mr. Cooke, announced himself as the editor and publisher of the *Union Star*. He had the modesty even to claim the reward for his own discovery; however, he was content to have it stipulated that no proceedings should be taken against him, and he should be allowed to remain in Dublin unmolested.

The subordinate agents of government now looked upon Cox as a rebel, who had made a clean breast of one kind of treason, and was prepared for the entertainment of another. He was closely questioned about his intimacy with O'Connor, and given to understand, that evidence which would go to his conviction, would be very serviceable at that period.

He was examined by Mr. Cooke with respect to his knowledge of O'Connor, and what sentiments he heard expressed by him. Cox replied, that he had never seen Mr. O'Connor but on two occasions, about a pair of pistols which he had sold to that gentleman. He was asked if he knew anything of his political opinions; Cox answered, he only knew them on the subject of pistols, which, he said (much to his surprise), he preferred of English manufacture to that of his own country. Cox was considered unfit for the task intended for him. He discovered that similar inquiries were made of other persons, and he feared the result would be fatal to O'Connor. He visited O'Connor that night, and the information he gave him was such as to induce him to

lose no time in making an application to the law officers of the crown to be permitted to go over to London for a few days on some legal business. At this time O'Connor was under heavy recognizances to take his trial for a seditious publication, whenever he should be called upon.

Having obtained permission, he immediately started for England. That he was attended at a respectful distance by some familiar of the Castle, and dogged wherever he went, from the day he quitted Dublin till his arrest at Margate, there can be little doubt. It is due to the memory of Cox, which certainly stands in need of all the justice and charity that can be done to it, to say that Arthur O'Connor is convinced of the fidelity of this man to his associates.

We are informed, by Sampson, of Emmet having taken some steps to restrain the violence of Cox's writings; but neither he nor Sampson appear to have had any idea that Cox had acknowledged himself to government to be the publisher of the *Union Star*, and to have made terms for his security. Sampson says, speaking of this paper, "I believe the author never was discovered; some thought it was a stratagem of the government to throw odium on the opposite cause. To me the arguments seemed too strong, and too terribly applicable, to warrant that supposition. I had, upon the subject of these papers, several conversations with Mr. Emmet, who was very zealous in his efforts to restrain them, and, I believe, successful. And what is more, there was found amongst his papers, at his arrest, one drawn up by him and me, and intended to have been subscribed by all whose names could be supposed most influential amongst the people, which the government, with its usual candour, took care entirely to suppress".

And in a note appended to the above remarks, written long subsequently to the letters which form the greater portion of his Memoirs, he adds:—

"It has been lately discovered, by the disclosure of the civil list, that he was pensioned to the amount of £100 a year; and, moreover, it is said that he received a considerable sum on going to the United States".*

The pension alluded to by Sampson was conferred on him during the Duke of Richmond's administration, when all other means of silencing his magazine had been found ineffectual, including those of the pillory, and three and a half years' confinement in Newgate.

The *Union Star* was printed in a cellar in Little Ship Street. The whole business of composing and printing

* Of the latter fact the autograph statements of Cox, in my possession, leave no doubt. Sampson's Memoirs, p. 71. R.R.M.

was there performed by Cox himself, according to his own account, without any assistance, within a few steps of the Castle. Whether Cox, subsequently to his delivering himself up, was considered as entitled to pecuniary assistance, it is hard to say; he was certainly employed in some way in the ordnance department at the Castle. There is a person of his name whose services were occasionally recompensed between 1803 and 1804:—

"April 7, 1803, Major Sirr for Mr. Cox	£11	7	6
Dec. 25, 1803, Mr. Flint, per Mr. Wickham's note—Cox	68	5	6
Feb. 16, 1804, Mr. Griffith for Serjeant Cox's wife	11	7	6
Jan. 26, 1804, Chaise from Naas, with Fleming, Cox, Keogh, Finnerty, and Condon	3	1	9"

From one of the persons who had long been most intimately acquainted and connected with him, and who attended him in his last moments, I received a number of documents, which throw some light on his strange career. About 1804, he went to America, took with him nearly £500, and returned to England in about eleven months, without a sou.

In 1807, he established his *Irish Magazine*, a very singular medley of truth and falsehood, blended at random, and tinctured not slightly with the spirit of the *Union Star*. It is a performance, however, in which one who is sufficiently acquainted with the subject to discriminate between the reality of his representations of the horrors of 1798, and his exaggerations of them, will find valuable details of the doings, of the O'Briens, Sirrs, Sandys, Swans, Hepenstals, and others of their class, such as he will only observe glanced at elsewhere, or touched upon with an obvious and natural repugnance.*

The pertinacity with which this man stuck to his subject, and bore the burnt of the legal warfare which he had to encounter in the various prosecutions carried on against him, is without a parallel, I believe, in this country. No sooner was he convicted of one libel on the government, and sentenced to a lengthened term of imprisonment and the punishment of the pillory, than we find him brought up from Newgate, tried over again for a new libel, sentenced to twelve months' additional imprisonment, fined £300, and called on to give securities, himself in £1,000, and two new sureties in £500 each.

* The caricatures published in Cox's Magazine were drawn by Brocas, afterwards the head-master of the Royal Dublin Society's School of Art. Ed.

And all this time his magazine pursued the rough and most uneven tenor of its way, through good report and bad report—battling with "the majors", "the gun beggars", the cabin burners, the riding-house heroes, &c., as of nothing had happened to Mr. Cox. The article which drew down on him the heaviest weight of legal vengeance, was one called "The Painter Cut", written by Mr. Thomas Finn of Carlow, the eldest brother of Counsellor William Finn. The original correspondence of Thomas Finn with Cox has lately come into my hands. When proceedings were instituted against Cox, Finn offered either to give himself up as the writer of the prosecuted article, or to give Cox the sum of £300 in the event of the latter consenting to bear the brunt of a prosecution. The offer of the £300 was accepted.

The consequences of the prosecution that ensued, however, eventually brought ruin on Cox. He still went on conducting his magazine in prison, and seeing no probability of ever leaving it. Under the plea of recovering a sum of eighteen shillings, due to the stamp-office by Cox, a considerable quantity of the magazine ready for publication was levied on and carried away; the persons who sold his magazines in the streets were brought before the major, and menaced with punishment; his shopmen were threatened, on various occasions, with legal steps and personal chastisement. In short, the whole legal and executive power of the country was brought to bear on the devoted head of the scribbling gun-smith, and without effect. He found it necessary to procure a shopman of some celebrity in the fighting way, and accordingly he obtained the services of Mr. Bryan Maguire—a later and more improved edition of George Robert Fitzgerald; and this gentleman's organ of combativeness being universally known to be very largely developed, Mr. Walter Cox's representative was troubled with no applications for explanation or retractation. At length, an influential gentleman was sent on an amicable mission from the Castle to the cell of the intractable printer in Newgate. Cox was asked if it was his desire to die in jail, or to live at large with a comfortable independence; and if he preferred the latter, he was called on to name the sum on which he could contrive to live, and to relinquish the troublesome task of editing periodicals. This tempting proposal was too much for flesh and blood to withstand—macerated and calmed down a little by upwards of three years of life in Newgate. Poor Cox, to the utter astonishment of the mediator on this occasion, said he thought £100 or £150 a-year would not be too much for him to ask. An arrangement was immediately concluded (a sum of £400 in hand and an

annuity of £100); had Cox asked twice the amount, it would have been readily granted to him. In 1816, having placed in the hands of the authorities all the unsold copies of his work, which amounted to 600, he was enabled by government to quit the country, and proceeded to America. In 1817 he established a newspaper at New York, which he called the *Exile*, of the same nature as the *Irish Magazine*, but more violent in its tone. It commenced the beginning of January, 1817, and died in the spring of 1818. This man's career in America very much resembled that of Cobbett—he began by praising the country—he ended by reviling it, its climate, and its people, in the strongest terms. The pamphlet in which he attacked America, and everything that was American, was published by him in New York, in 1820, under the title of *The Snuff Box*; in point of ability it excelled anything he had written; but with respect to the ferocity of his abuse, it was an out-Coxing even of Cox himself.

By a passport of his in my possession, I find he arrived in Bourdeaux from America in 1821. There he received an intimation from his friends in Ireland, that the discontinuance of his annuity had been a subject of discussion at the Castle. He addressed a characteristic letter on this occasion to a person connected with the government, in which he declared his intention, and prefaced it with an oath, that "if they stopped his pension he would invade Ireland". The threatened invasion amounted to a menace of his coming back; and in the month of November, his passport, was put in order for his return to England by way of Hull. How long it was before he "invaded Ireland" I know not; but he had been quietly domiciled in Dublin for several years, when he received a notification from the Castle, in Dec. 1835, that his annuity would be discontinued from that time. Among his papers, I find the following draft of a memorial he addressed to his Excellency the Earl of Mulgrave, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

"To his Excellency Earl Mulgrave, Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland.

"The Petition of Walter Cox.

"May it please your Excellency, your petitioner, in his early days, was reared a gun-smith; and for many years a contractor with the Irish Board of Ordnance, for supplying His Majesty's army in Ireland with muskets and other small fire-arms; but, at the period of the legislative union, the Ordnance Board being abolished, the making of arms was removed to England, by which

alteration petitioner was deprived of subsistence from the trade he was bred to, and reduced to great necessity and destitution. He was compelled to adopt several expedients to obtain a livelihood, without any success. At length he commenced a periodical publication (the *Irish Monthly Magazine*), a work which was continued for more than eight years with an extensive circulation; but, by incautiously giving insertion to a very reprehensible article, was brought to trial by the Attorney-General, was convicted, pilloried, fined, and imprisoned during three years and four months.

"However, the Irish Government, at the head of which was the Right Honourable Mr. Peel, in its mercy to an individual overwhelmed in ruin and poverty, granted him an allowance of a hundred pounds a year during life, on the express condition that he would give up the publication for ever. The offer of mercy was gratefully accepted; he closed his shop for ever, and, as the agreement further required, surrendered at the Castle of Dublin near six hundred volumes of his Magazine, which at the present day would bring him four hundred pounds.

"Mr. Peel mentioned this fact of the extinction of the publication at the time in the House of Commons.

"Petitioner has been now more than nineteen years living in harmless obscurity on this allowance, which the good faith of Government, as he believed, intended should continue to his death, but now learns that it is your Excellency's gracious pleasure to order it to be discontinued, and to end with the year 1835.

"The situation of petitioner is in a most perilous state, as the quarterly payment has been anticipated by contracting many small debts, including rent to be paid, leaving nothing in hand; and only that your Excellency's mercy has ordered him one hundred pounds, he must go to prison.

"This short story of woe is substantially true, and is humbly submitted to your Excellency's consideration, hoping your Excellency will continue the allowance, or appoint petitioner to some trifling employment. He has learned to live on a little; and, whatever may be your Excellency's gracious will, he will accept of it with gratitude and resignation.

"And petitioner will ever pray.

"WALTER COX.

"December 26th, 1835."

When he received the notice of the discontinuance of his annual allowance, the sum of £100 was granted to him, to enable him to meet his existing exigencies. He survived this event little better than a year. He died at

No. 12 Clarence Street, in very poor circumstances, the 17th January, 1837; in his sixty-seventh year. He had a small house at Finglas, and three or four acres of land, which he bequeathed to a Mr. Crosbie.

The house in which he lived, and its effects, he willed to his housekeeper. This person informed me, that on the day of his death, "there was not so much money in the house as would buy candles to wake him". He was attended in his last moments by the Rev. Mathias Kelly, P.P., of St. Margaret's, Finglas.

One circumstance which shows the strange, mischievous, and daring disposition of this man, is worth mentioning. On his second return to Ireland, he informed a gentleman whom he had long known, that it had occurred to him some short time previously, that "he would annoy the major and his people" by cutting the head off King William's statue. He said that from his trade as a gunsmith he had greater facilities than any other man for effecting his object: he concluded the statue was made of bronze. He had gone there by night, accompanied by a young man in his employment: he kept watch, and his *élève* ascended the statue. After more than sufficient time to accomplish his purpose, he asked the young man, who was hard at work filing away at the neck, what progress he had been making. The reply was, little or none. In fact, the figure proved to be of lead. The tools employed were not the right ones, and the attempt had failed. Many years afterwards, when another attempt had been made on it in 1836, by some other person, and the statue was thrown down, on examining it, it was found that the back part of the neck bore the deep marks of the files which had been used on the occasion of Cox's attempt on King William's head.

The turbulence and restlessness of this man's mind never suffered him to be quiet, or to persist in any pursuit. While he was in America, he had tried all sorts of trades and callings; he had been a newspaper editor, a pawnbroker, a chandler, a dairy-keeper, and a dealer in Irish whiskey—and in all was unsuccessful.

Had he received a liberal education, and been early taught to feel the restraints of religion, in all probability he would have been a vigorous, fearless, and faithful advocate of justice, a useful and influential member of society, a person of strong intellectual powers, and one who might have loved his country with the tempered ardour of a Christian patriot. Trained as he was, and uncompensated by religious impressions for the want of mental culture, few men of his time, and of his rank and station, rendered themselves more feared and less loved than Walter Cox.

He seems to have been aware of the defects in his

character, which arose from the kind of education he had received. In a burlesque statement of his qualification for the office of librarian to the Dublin Library, for which he was a candidate in 1826, having been received with hisses, he issued an address to the members, in, which he reminded them that particular reptiles, and red-hot horse-shoes, could hiss as well as human beings; and then, by way of explaining the causes which deprived him of those advantages which other candidates might possess, he subjoined a testimonial (evidently of his own manufacture), as having been obtained from one of the hedge-school-masters, who were accustomed to teach the young Popish ideas how to shoot in his early days:—

“Gentlemen—When I was a boy, it was the custom of the artificial darkness of the period to study in thick bushes; but having a high conceit, a cabin kind of elevation of mind, I was taught in a large elm tree, near Longwood, County of Meath. It may be called the Tree of Knowledge; and I may now say with safety, as a compliment to our own happy times, it sometimes was not the Tree of Life; as we were not unfrequently disturbed in Reading-Made-Easy, by the growl of the bull-dog and the menace of the priest-hunter. This short prefatory apology will go to explain the purport of the annexed Certificate—an exact translation from the original Irish—written in a fair hand by our Provost, BRYAN MacGARRY, Philomath.

“‘This bit of parchment, written by me and nobody else, certifies that the bearer, Walter Cox, is a fine *sommaghau*, and a rattling hand at writing, a ready mouth in reading and spelling, and arguifying in all matters of contraband learning; that he sat with great respect to himself for two years and two hours within Ballyfadden big tree, and rose *betwixt* terror and talents to the very highest branches under heaven, of which all the world is bound to take notice.

“‘Given under my hand this 17th day of March, and God bless all that hear it, the 91st year since the invention of potatoes.

“‘BRYAN MacGARRY’”.

From the papers in my possession, of Mr. Thomas Finn, among which are several original letters of Walter Cox, addressed to that gentleman, the following are selected as illustrative of the writer's character, and, one of them in particular, as affording very remarkable evidence of the profligacy of the Irish government of that day, and its regime of Orangeism, in the dealings of the Duke of Richmond with Mr. Walter Cox:—

From Walter Cox to Thomas Finn, Esq.

" Dublin, January 9, 1816.

" My dear Friend—I received your letter to-day, and have to acquaint you that I was obliged to submit to the Government, to avoid another dreary imprisonment, and, as the Attorney-General threatened, in a remote jail. They insist, as one of the terms, that I must leave the country, but have agreed to pay my passage to America, and, when landed, to pay me £400.

" I am much gratified that my Magazine did not owe its dissolution to dulness, as you may see it required the overwhelming power of the British Government to suppress it.

" I shall not go before May; in the interim I hope to see you.

" My best wishes shall ever be, during my remote situation, for you and your good family.

" I have a book or two which are at your service, such of the Magazines as I have, and left as you dictated.

" Yours most truly,

" WALTER COX".

" Brig Adams, Dublin Bay.

" My dear Friend—On the moment of sailing for New York, I take the opportunity of letting you know of my departure from my country, and of assuring you how much I esteem yourself and your family, and of my wishes to hear from you in my adopted country.

" Farewell, and believe me,

" Yours sincerely,

" WALTER COX.

" September 17".

" New York, Dec. 14, 1816.

" My dear Friend—I arrived in Boston, after a passage of 39 days, on the 28th of October. This country would astonish you—its climate is delightful this moment. Its trade is more extensive than that of any other nation; it abounds with all the comforts of life, collected from every quarter of the globe. The poorest labourer can live here as well as the President. Cider, which is the finest in the world, is cheaper than buttermilk is in Dublin. Brandy is but 7s. 6d. a gallon; St. Croix rum. . . . per gallon; the best of green tea, gunpowder or hyson, from 8s. to 11s. a pound; Maderia wine, 7s. 8d. a gallon;

claret, from 2s. 6d. to 3s. a bottle. Perfect equality of rights—the sons of a tailor or farmer have as much chance of being President of the United States, as the sons of any other man; for no man is considered inferior, in point of rank, to any other individual.

"I must conclude with recommending the *Exile* to your patronage, and giving my most affectionate wishes to Mrs. Finn and children.

"Yours sincerely,

"WALTER COX".

From Walter Cox to Thomas Finn, Esq., with enclosed Prospectus of "The Exile".

"New York, September 28, 1816.

"My dear Friend—I take the opportunity of the ship *Onis*, which sails to-day, of acquainting you of my existence, and to assure you and your family of the affection I must have for you in this remote situation. My prospects are no way flattering, as the new ideas on Bibling and Governments I had the honour of first *introducing into this nation* of swaddlers and hypocrites, have set every one against me; and my crimes, though very great, are much aggravated by being an Irishman—a character severely reprobated by the English factions here, which includes all the fanatics.

"You may guess my situation is not very enviable: if you were to know how it is made worse by a bad climate, as variable and fatal to human existence as any country inhabited by white people! In fact, the Southern States are not suited to any constitution but Negroes: this moment the yellow fever is sweeping Carolina and New Orleans—a merciless and almost an unnecessary visitation, as the climate itself is an enemy to human life, so much so, that an unacclimated man, conscious of the few days allowed, lives as much in ten years, dies before he is thirty-two years of age.

"Everything contributes to make me abhor this people, and make me alarmed at the climate; and, between you and I, Ireland I am determined to see again, let what may be the consequence. The state of business is very low, as they have lost the carrying trade they had during the protracted contests in Europe—the aspect of affairs quite as dull as in Dublin, as there is no employment for labourers or mechanics, on the sea-board particularly. Employment may be had in the back countries, among the kind of farmers in the wilderness; but privation and hard labour must be expected, if a man has not some capital and some practical knowledge of hewing trees and tillage.

Land is cheap. I could have purchased, the day before yesterday, by auction, for seventeen pence of this currency an acre; equal to eight pence three-farthings Irish the fee-simple; so I might have an estate for ever of 337 acres for about eleven guineas. It is covered with timber, and lying in the State about three hundred miles to the westward.

"I have been recruiting for MacGregor, and have sent him many brave Irishmen who could not do better.

"Reports are had to-day that he has given up the command, but they are not credited.

"I sent some papers a few days ago for you to the care of Jas Maher, Waterford. I sent some directed to O'Reilly.

"I remain, my dear friend, yours, &c.,

"WALTER COX".

Prospectus of "The Exile".

Mr. Walter Cox, late proprietor of the *Irish Magazine*, a periodical work, which attracted more of the public attention in Ireland than ever before honoured any print since the introduction of printing into that country, apprises his countrymen of his arrival in the City of New York, where he expects, under the patronage of the public, to commence a weekly newspaper, to be called *The Exile*.

"The editor presumes that his labours and the character of his works are known to his countrymen in America, assures them that the humour, wit, and liveliness, which won the approbation of a numerous class of readers, even in defiance of the provoked and jealous vigilance of the British Government, shall not degenerate for want of industry or the aid of valuable correspondents throughout Ireland.

"The first and leading duty which shall direct *The Exile* is a due and devout reverence for the institutions of the American Republic.

"The Irishman in America, who wishes to learn how the administration of English justice disposes of his relations and friends in Ireland, shall be regularly supplied with official details of the massacres and deportations weekly perpetrated under the provisions of the Curfew, or *Hushoe* Law, in the condemned districts; the minutest occurrence which takes place in the unsparing tribunals—the agonies of the victims, and the jokes of the judges—will occupy a considerable portion of *The Exile*.

"He who admires rural economy will find in the new publication a faithful report of the transactions of that celebrated farming society, which improves the condition of brutes, and refuses food to man—an institution which protects dog-kennels, and prostrates altars.

"The literary man will find a new character in the lettered world peculiar to British government, by learning, through the medium of *The Exile*, that the witchcraft of writing or reading in Ireland has been treated as capital offences by the same candid policy which punishes and defames the people for attributed ignorance.

"The religious inquirer will hear with astonishment that the Bible is a state instrument, offered hourly to the people on the point of the bayonet; and that the four Evangelists are made the accomplices of the informer, to hang and govern by the aid of the perjurer.

"The politician will learn an anomaly in legislation, which declares a *superabundant* population inconvenient, and reduces the novel theory into practice by the fusée.

"In short, every important information relative to the current transactions in the Cabin War which now desolates Ireland, will be accurately given from the most respectable sources, of which the limited brevity of a prospectus can give but an imperfect idea.

The terms of *The Exile*—Three dollars a year; half in advance.

"It will be published on Saturdays, to begin on the _____ of January, 1817.

Dr. John Brenan and the "Milesian Magazine".

Having referred to Dr. Brenan's accusations against Cox, with regard to Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Thomas Russell, it would be an act of injustice to Cox's memory, whose fidelity to his associates Brenan impugns, to conceal the circumstances which render his own statements somewhat doubtful. Brenan had been an early contributor to Cox's Magazine: he quarrelled with him, and set up a rival periodical. Brenan, like his competitor, was nominally a Roman Catholic: he struck out a new line in satire and censoriousness—a warfare of ridicule on the Roman Catholic leaders of the day, and of ludicrous scurrility against the members of his own profession. It was the interest, and manifestly the object of Brenan, to bring Cox into disrepute, and to establish his own claims on the gratitude of the administration, without incurring the suspicions of his own party.

It would be a folly, indeed, to refer to such matters, if circumstances of far higher public interest were not connected with them. Literature of merit in other countries derives rewards and honours from government; in Ireland, a scurrilous lampoon has been found sufficient to procure a pension from government. Some doggrel

verses, smartly written, turning the most prominent of the Catholic leaders into ridicule, beginning with the words, "Barney, Barney, buck or doe", recommended the writer, Dr. Brennan, to the especial favour of the Duke of Richmond's government. This poor man, of whom it is not only charitable but true to say his wits were partially disordered, on his death-bed, in his wanderings, often repeated incoherent rhymes (for the ruling passion strong in death, prevailed with him), and one couplet not unfrequently was repeated, which there is good reason to believe denoted a foregone conclusion:

Barney, Barney, buck or doe,
Has kept me out of Channel Row.

Many pensions, no better earned, have kept men of little worth out of Channel Row poor-house.

Dr. Brennan's *Milesian Magazine*, or *Irish Monthly Gleaner*, is the most perfect specimen that exists in eccentric ephemeral literature of a periodical professing to be a monthly one, setting at defiance all obligations in respect to punctuality, as well as propriety and decorum. Intervals of six, twelve, and eighteen months—nay, even of years—occasionally occurred between the appearance of consecutive numbers of this meteoric magazine. The first number appeared in April, 1812; the last—No. 16—in July, 1825. There can be no doubt the mission of the *Milesian Magazine* was a governamental one. The objects to be effected were, to bring Cox and his *Irish Magazine* into disrepute, and the Catholic leaders and the Committee into ridicule.

The first article in the first number is an attack on Cox and his former assassination journal, the *Union Star*; the second is illustrated by an emblematic engraving, representing Cox in the act of killing his wife.

The poetry in the first number consists of the elaborate lampoon, above referred to, on the principal Catholic leaders, Lords Fingal, Gormanstown, Southwell, French, Killeen, Kenmare, Netterville, Major Bryan, John Keogh, William Murphy, Silvester Costigan, John Lawless, Owen O'Connor, William Finn, Dr. Drumgoole, and Barney Colle with the absurd refrain:—

Barncy, Barney, buck or doe,
Who shall with the petition go?

The labours of Dr. Brennan were duly requitted by the representative of the British Government in Ireland. More fortunate than a modern lampooner similarly employed, Brennan was rewarded with a pension of £200

a year—the evidence of which fact, in the handwriting of Dr. Brennan, is in my possession.

Brenan died in July 1830, in Britain Street, Dublin, aged about sixty-two years. He left two children, a son and a daughter, the latter a lady of a very amiable character, respectably married in Kilkenny. He was born at Ballahide, Carlow; his father was a gentleman of ancient family and once of considerable fortune. He died intestate, leaving six small children, the eldest of whom was John, the subject of this notice. After his father's death, he went to law with his family, and carried on a protracted suit in Chancery against his mother, which brought ruin on the property.* His son, however, contrived to get from the wreck of it, between five and six thousand pounds, which he carried with him to England, and having squandered away whatever he possessed, he died there a few years ago. Dr. Brennan was a man of classical attainments of a high order, and very considerable talents, which were most sadly misused by him; he devoted his fine talents to sarcasm and scurrility; the little use he made of his abilities in his profession, was still sufficient to make his name known to medical men, not only in England, but over the continent, as the person who first brought into practice the use of turpentine in puerperal disorders.

Besides the *Press*, the other newspapers published in Dublin were, the *Dublin Journal*, the *Freeman's Journal*, *Saunders's News-letter*, the *Dublin Evening Post*, and the *Hibernian Journal*.

The *Dublin Journal*, edited by Giffard, was the organ of the government and the faction that swayed its councils. *Saunders's News-letter* professed neutrality in politics, and was chiefly devoted to commercial communications. The *Post* and *Hibernian Journal* were moderate supporters of liberal principles. The amount of literary talent employed in all was extremely small; but in this respect, with the exception of the *Press*, the *Dublin Evening Post* excelled

* The property of Dr. Brennan's father, in Carlow alone and its immediate vicinity, called the Castle Hill, at the time of his decease, was worth £200 a year. This and other landed property, Dr. Brennan states, he and his family were swindled out of professionally by his attorneys. The injury he suffered at the hands of these legal gentlemen may account for the incessant warfare he waged on their profession. Brennan's free translations of remarkable passages in classical works of celebrity are deserving of notice:—

"Nemo repente fuit turpissimus".—"It takes seven years and some hard swearing to make an attorney".

"De mortuis nihil nisi bonum".—"When scoundrels die, all knaves bemoan them".

"Irvitum qui servat idem facit occidente".—

"Cure a man against his willing;

The cure will vex him worse than killing".

all its cotemporaries, and in the fidelity and accuracy of its reports of the debates in parliament, it had no equal.

Mr. John Giffard and the "Dublin Journal".

Of the *Dublin Journal*, which claimed to be the Government newspaper of that day, a few words may not be found unnecessary.

This paper was originally established by Mr. George Faulkner, one of the aldermen of the City of Dublin, and was ably conducted by him for upwards of fifty years. His house was the rendezvous of the leading parliamentary, literary, and political men of his day. He associated with persons of the highest rank, and was in the habit of entertaining them, it is said, in a style of splendour. Faulkner died in 1775. From the period of his death, this paper gradually declined in spirit and integrity, till its doom was fixed, when its fanatical career commenced, on its coming into the hands of one of the most illiterate and illiberal men who ever became ambitious of conducting a public journal. This person, Mr. John Giffard, better known by the complimentary *Soubriquet* of the "dog in office", was an *Alumnus*, it is said, of the Blue Coat Hospital. He was taken by the hand by a person of the name of Thwaites, a brewer, and was brought up to the business of an apothecary. He married a young woman in humble life, in the County of Wexford, and set up as an apothecary in the town of Wexford, but got maltreated in a brawl with a man of the name of Miller in that town, and removed to Dublin, where he set up in the business of an apothecary, in Fishamble Street, in 1771.*

In that year, a Mr. John Giffard, a cooper, of Price's Lane, Fleet Street, died in Dublin, but whether a relation or not of the former I cannot say. The following year the name of the Giffard of subsequent notoriety is found in the list of common council-men. As his prospects brightened, he changed his residence from Fishamble Street to College Street, then to Grafton Street, and finally to Suffolk Street, in 1790. He distinguished himself early for the violence of his democratic principles, became a member of the Volunteer Association, and declaimed in unmeasured terms against parliamentary corruption, tyranny, and English influence.

* John Giffard's first appearance in print we find in the "*Hibernian Journal*", from 23rd to 25th October, 1771:—

"Being election day for the Corporation of Apothecaries, Mr. John Pentland, Mary's Abbey, was elected master; and John Giffard, Fishamble Street, and Mr. Thomas Powell, were elected wardens for the year ensuing". R.R.M.

Patriotism, however, and the glory acquired in the Volunteer service, brought no money into the pocket of Mr. John Giffard; and in a little time, to the amazement of his friends, he suddenly changed his politics, reviled his former associates, and was duly encouraged and advanced by his new confederates. The first notoriety he acquired, was in the discharge of the humble duties of director of the city watch. In this office he had given some offence to the collegians, and this powerful and lawless body decreed the honours of a public pumping to Mr. John Giffard. As they were in the habit of beating the watch with impunity, and even breaking open houses for the purpose of seizing persons who had offended them, they proceeded to Giffard's house in a tumultuous manner, and commenced the demolition of his doors and windows. Giffard manfully defended his house, repulsed his assailants, and shot one of the young rioters in the wrist.

From this time, though Giffard did not throw physic to the dogs, the fortunate dog was himself thrown into office. He filled no particular post or definable situation in the Castle, but was a man of all work of a dirty kind for Government—a hanger-on of Clare and the Beresfords.

In the spring of 1790, Giffard's privileged insolence had already reached the acme of its audacity. He attacked Mr. Curran in the streets at noon-day, for alluding in his place in parliament to the large sums of money squandered on the subordinate agents and partizans of administration.

The circumstances of this insult are detailed in a letter of Mr. Curran to the Right Honourable Major Hobart, the secretary, demanding the dismissal of this menial of the Government from a post he then held in the revenue.

"A man of the name of Giffard", writes Curran, "a conductor of your press, a writer for your Government, your notorious agent in the city, your note-taker in the House of Commons, in consequence of some observation that fell from me in that house on your prodigality in rewarding such a man with the public money for such services, had the audacity to come within a few paces of me in the most frequented part of the city, and shake his cane at me in a manner that, notwithstanding his silence, was not to be misunderstood".

Curran, despising the menial, held the master responsible for the insolence of the servant, and a duel between him and Major Hobart was the consequence.

Just previously to the trial of Hamilton Rowan in 1794 for a seditious libel, it was found necessary to have a jury which could be relied on for a conviction, and a sheriff that could be trusted in such an emergency. Mr. Giffard was therefore made sheriff some months before the trial,

"a jury of the right sort" was empanelled, and Hamilton Rowan was sent to Newgate.

Mr. Giffard was at this time, by Lord Clare's patronage and protection, on the high road to preferment under government, and its countenance had already enabled him to become the chief proprietor of the *Dublin Journal*. From the time it came into his hands, its violence, virulence, vulgarity, and mendacity, were of so extreme a character, that in the present day its advocacy would be held detrimental and disgraceful to any party. Yet its editor was patronized and preferred to places of honour and emolument by the administration, and especially favoured with the countenance and confidence of Lord Clare. Indeed, none but the most worthless and unscrupulous men were selected for his lordship's favour.

One of the most signal instances of this man's effrontery was on the occasion of Mr. Grattan's appearance at the hustings in Dublin in 1803, to vote for the then liberal candidate, Sir Jonah Barrington. Mr. Giffard objected to Mr. Grattan's vote, on the alleged ground of his name having been expunged from the corporation, in consequence of the report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons, especially got up and revised by Lord Clare, containing the evidence of a man of the name of Hughes (a notorious informer), involving Mr. Grattan in the designs of the United Irishmen. Grattan on this occasion poured forth a volume of invective on the astonished Mr. Giffard: such, perhaps, as never fell on the devoted head of so humble a minion of administration. This memorable burst of disdain and indignation was addressed to his victim in these words:—"Mr. Sheriff, when I observe the quarter from whence the objection comes, I am not surprised at its being made. It proceeds from the hired traducer of his country, the excommunicated of his fellow-citizens, the regal rebel, the unpunished ruffian, the bigoted agitator. In the city a fire-brand; in the court a liar; in the streets a bully; in the field a coward. And so obnoxious is he to the very party he wishes to espouse, that he is only supportable by doing these dirty acts the less vile refuse to execute".

Giffard's reply, as recorded by Sir Jonah Barrington, "I would spit upon him in a desert", is indicative enough of the mind and manners of the discomfited zealot.

In 1798, the "dog in office" discharged the functions of an officer in the corporation of Apothecaries, a proprietor and editor of the *Dublin Journal*, a surveyor and gauger of the Custom House Quay, a Sheriff's Peer, an Orange-

man, an officer of the Grand Lodge, a captain of the City of Dublin Regiment of Militia.*

In July, 1799, the gallant Captain John Giffard was tried by court-martial, held in the barracks of Dublin, upon charges brought against the said Captain John Giffard by Major Sankey, of the same regiment. (*Vide* Milliken's Edition of Trial, 1800)—Four charges were brought against the prisoner:—The first, for disrespectful conduct to his commanding officer.

2nd—For neglect of duty and inattention to his company.

3rd—For disobedience of orders.

4th—For scandalous and infamous conduct, unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman, in having made a false return of the necessaries wanting to complete his company, and in having directed a sergeant of said regiment to make a false return of the necessaries wanting to complete his said company, particularly under the head of shot, by returning a smaller deficiency than there actually existed, in order thereby to impose on his commanding officer, and to prevent him from knowing that the regimental standing orders, or his own, had not been complied with.

The prisoner pleaded not guilty. He was defended by his son, Counsellor Harding Giffard.

In reply to the second charge, of absenting himself from duty when the regiment was actively engaged against the rebels in the month of May, 1798, Captain Giffard, in his defence, said:—"On the 22nd of May, by leave of General Duff, I came from Limerick to Dublin to see Captain Ryan, my nephew. He was mortally wounded by the dagger of the accursed rebel, Fitzgerald. The day immediately following, my son, Lieutenant Giffard, coming also from Limerick, was savagely murdered at Kildare, because he scorned his life when to be purchased with disgrace. Of this dreadful event I soon heard. I left poor Ryan dying in Dublin, and went to Kildare to cover the mangled remains of my hero. I went singly through that wicked country, and was, of course, fired at through the hedges. I arrived time enough to meet Sir James Duff, and was under him for some time at the Collieries, Monastereven,

* In 1817, the old terrorist of 1798 was still a "dog in office", but only in the Corporation of Apothecaries, as one of the examiners of that body. His military glory had departed. His connection with the excise had terminated in an unpleasant manner. The "Dublin Journal" was defunct: nothing of it remained; but the savage instincts of its Orangeism, its traditions and animosities to the people of Ireland and their faith, found a shrine in a London newspaper—the "Standard"—and a priest for their homage, and a revival of veneration for their intolerance, in the person of a son of Captain John Giffard.

&c., &c. The army then marched to Baltinglass, on its way to the County Wexford. From Baltinglass I was despatched, with 220 infantry under my command, to steal a march, in the night, through the mountains and through the armies of rebels that occupied them. This is the proudest event of my life. General Dundas and General Duff know that, through good providence, I succeeded, threw myself into Rathdrum, which I fortified in a manner much approved of by every officer who saw it, and thus covered Dublin, and prevented the enemy from turning the left of our wing".*—"Magnificabo apostolatum meum".

This glorification of the captainship of the Dublin apothecary, when he stole a march in the night through the mountains of Wicklow, occupied by armies of rebels, when he threw himself into Rathdrum, and fortified that important place and covered Dublin, and saved our left wing from being turned by the enemy, is worthy of one of the heroes of Homer. But how superior to Homer's description of similar heroic exploits is Captain John Giffard's "plain unvarnished tale" of his achievement, let the reader judge. Thus Homer sings:—

Εκλαγξαν δ' αὖ οἷστοι ἀπ' ὤμων χωμηνοιο,
 Αὐτὸ κινήθεντος ὃδ' ἦε Νυκτι εοικώς.
 Εἴετ' ἀπὸ τ' ἀπανευθε νέων, μετὰ δ' ἰὸν ἔηκε,
 Δεινὴ δὲ κλαγγὴ γενετ' ἀργυρεοιο βιοιο.
 Οὐρηας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπώθειτο, καὶ Κύνας ἀργῆς,
 Αὐτὰρ ἐπειτ' αὐτοῖσι βέλος ἐχευεσκες ἀφίεις
 Βαλλ' αἰεὶ δι πυρραὶ νεκρῶν καίοντο θαμναι.

"The arrows rattled in his quiver as he moved along in all the fierceness of his wrath. His march was like the night. He took his station at a distance from the foe, and sent forth a shaft; and the sounding of the silver bow was terrible. His first attack was on the animals, the mules and dogs; but after that, he smote the army itself with many a deadly arrow, and the funeral piles of the slain blazed frequent through the camp".

Hom. Il., i.

The court-martial found the gallant captain guilty of the first charge, not guilty of the other charges, "and adjudged him to be reprimanded for said offence at such time and place as his Excellency might be pleased to direct".

The majesty of Orangedom was not to be offended in the person of the warlike apothecary, Captain John Giffard. The idea of a court-martial, in 1799, bringing

* Report of proceedings of court-martial, p. 52.

in a verdict of guilty against the proprietor of an Orange Journal, on a charge of "scandalous and infamous conduct, unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman", was preposterous. "The lucky dog" was accordingly not only acquitted of that charge and two others, imputing neglect of duty and disobedience of orders to the valiant Giffard, but the daring prosecutor, not having the fear of the *Dublin Journal* and Giffard's Orange patrons before his eyes, was severely censured by the honourable court-martial, as having "originated the three last charges more from pique than from zeal for His Majesty's service".

Nevertheless the court was compelled to find the prisoner guilty of the first charge, and adjudged him to be reprimanded for that offence.

But the power and influence of an Orange partizan of Captain Giffard's pretensions to importance in the state, were not to be disregarded by the Government; and consequently, immediately after the publication of the sentence of the court-martial, Captain Giffard received a letter from the secretary of Lord Cornwallis, addressed to General Craig, with instructions to present it to the General, to the following effect:—

"Dublin Castle, 20th August, 1799.

"Sir—I have it in command from the Lord Lieutenant to desire that you will be pleased to reprimand Captain Giffard, of the Dublin Militia, in a *slight manner*, instead of the mode expressed in his Excellency's warrant to you of the 13th instant.

"Signed,
E. B. LITTLEHALES.

"Lieut.-General Craig, Dublin Barracks".

Thus Orangedom was propitiated by the representative of the sovereign in Ireland, and all superior officers were made to feel that henceforth all disrespectful conduct on the part of officers under them, who had the advantage of being Orangemen, was only subject to a slight reprimand, by the express command of the Governor-General of Ireland.

The impunity accorded to Orange delinquencies by the Government was exemplified in the preceding year in a still more remarkable manner, by a court-martial sitting in Dublin Barracks, in the case of two soldiers tried for murdering an inoffensive citizen, Mr. Ryan, a skinner, of Watling Street, who was dragged from his own door for daring to look at a party of yeomanry cavalry returning

from an execution at Rathcoole, as they passed by his door; and as this military rabble of organized Orangemen, armed by the Government and wearing the King's uniform, were conveying unfortunate Ryan to the Provost, one of the ruffians, of the name of Tibby, deliberately shot him, and another of this military gang, of the name of Hicks, assisted in despatching the unoffending citizen.

Lord Camden was then viceroy, and Lord Castlereagh the factotum of his administration !!!

[Giffard, it might be remembered was the ancestor of the late Lord Halsbury, Lord Chancellor of England from 1895 to 1905. Ed.]

* * * *

CHAPTER III.

O'Connor's flight from Ireland in February 1798. His arrest at Maidstone. Trial and acquittal. Condemnation of Mr. Coigly. O'Connor's re-arrest—Transmission to Ireland. Compact of the State prisoners with the Government.

From the time O'Connor became a member of the Leinster Directory of the society of United Irishmen, he was the foremost leader in their affairs. When the United Irishmen solicited the intervention of France in 1796, O'Connor negotiated the treaty with the agent of the French Directory. He and Lord Edward had an interview subsequently with Hoche at Frankfort, and arranged the place of landing and consequent military operations.

In the early part of 1797 O'Connor was arrested and committed to the Tower, "vehemently suspected of sundry treasons", rather than charged with any specific crime against the State. After an imprisonment of six months he was liberated. In February, 1798, Arthur O'Connor was in London, about to proceed to France on a mission to the French government from the Leinster Directory of the United Irishmen, the object of which was to press on the French authorities the urgent necessity of hastening the despatch of the promised expedition to Ireland. While O'Connor remained in London he was constantly in the company of Charles James Fox and the leaders of the Whig party, frequently a guest of Fox, and in close and confidential communication with him on the state of Ireland, the organization, there is good reason to believe,

and the views of the society of United Irishmen. That Fox was acquainted with the nature of O'Connor's intended mission to France in 1798, the statements of O'Connor and Lord Cloncurry can leave no doubt.

O'Connor's high position in society, his talents, his fortune, and expected large accession to it at the death of his uncle Lord Longueville, together with his uncle's coronet, made him of sufficient consequence to be not only well received, but courted, even in the best circles of London. He was at the height of his popularity there when he took his departure from London on his expedition to France.

On the 27th of February, 1798, the Reverend James Coigly, John Allen, Binns, and Leary, came to Margate. Coigly had adopted the *nom de guerre* of Captain Jones; Allen assumed the character of Coigly's servant; Leary went by his own name, and was the servant of O'Connor. The latter under the name of Colonel Morriss, had arrived at Margate with Binns, who was called Mr. Williams by another route, the same day. Binns had been previously living with his brother, in London, at the house of the Secretary of the Corresponding Society, No. 14, Plough Court. Coigly and Allen had been staying in the same house, and O'Connor had lodgings in Strattan Street; but on the night previously to his setting out for France, he slept at the house of Mr. Bell, a merchant, in Charterhouse Square.

John Binns had been traced to Canterbury and Whitstable, on the 22nd of February, where he was endeavouring to make arrangements for the hire of a vessel, to convey some friends of his, who were said to be in the smuggling line, to Flushing, or to the coast of France, for which three hundred guineas were asked, and refused by Binns. He then proceeded to Deal, and partly entered into terms for a vessel for sixty or seventy guineas, and then returned to London. This arrangement, however, not having been completed, the parties proceeded to Margate, and, the morning after their arrival there, they were arrested at the King's Head Inn, by Revett and Fugion, two Bow Street officers.

Coigly was at breakfast in a room in which a great-coat was found, with a pocket-book containing several papers, one of which purported to be "An Address of the Secret Committee of England to the Executive Directory of France", stating that "the citizen who now presents their sentiments, was the bearer of them on a former occasion", and concluding with a declaration, that "their only wish was to see the hero of Italy and his invincible legions landed on their coast". Several Latin papers, certificates of Coigly's studies at foreign universities, were found on

him. A passport of Coigly's was found at Binns' lodgings, bearing the signature of the French authorities, in April, 1797. In O'Connor's baggage, a quantity of money, to the amount of £900, was found, a military uniform, and some papers, among them a key to a correspondence with Lord Edward Fitzgerald, found at the residence of the latter, which plainly indicated the purpose of communicating with the French government. The letter found at Lord Edward's contained the following paragraph:—"It is said that Lord Fitzwilliam is going over to Ireland, and great hopes are entertained that he will be able to separate the Catholics from the Union. This you and every good man must endeavour to prevent". The prisoners were conveyed to London, examined before the magistrates at Bow Street, and the Privy Council, and finally transmitted to Maidstone jail, to abide their trial at the next assizes.

Monday, May 21st, 1798, James Coigly, Arthur O'Connor, John Binns, John Allen, and Jeremiah Leary, were put upon their trial at Maidstone, before Mr. Justice Buller, Mr. Justice Heath, and Mr. Justice Laurence.* An application was made to the court by Mr. Plumer, counsel for Messrs. Coigly and O'Connor, founded on an affidavit, setting forth that a magistrate of the county, the Rev. Arthur Young of Dover, had tampered with three of the persons who were called as jurymen; and his own letter to a Mr. Lloyd of Bury (acknowledged to have been written by him), was read to the court, wherein, in referring to three farmers summoned on the jury, he says: "They are much in my interest, to be sure. I exerted all my influence to convince them how absolutely necessary it is, at the present moment, for the security of the realm, that the felons should swing. I represented to them that the acquittal of Hardy and Co. laid the foundation of the present conspiracy. I urged them, by all possible means in my power, to hang them, through mercy, as a memento to others; that, had the others suffered, the deep-laid conspiracy which is coming to light, would have been necessarily crushed in its infancy. These, with many other arguments I pressed, with a view that they should go into court avowedly determined in their verdict, no matter what the evidence".*

The Judges and the Attorney-General, Mr. John Scott (subsequently Lord Eldon), reprobated the act of the

* Lord Eldon, then Attorney-General, assisted by Mitford, afterwards Lord Redesdale, and Garrow, prosecuted in this case; the prisoners were defended by Sir J. Plumer, Dallas, Gurney, Scott, and Cutlar Ferguson. R.R.M.

* Report of the Trial of O'Connor, Coigly, &c., p. 35.

reverend gentleman, and the latter said he concurred in the challenge to the three jurymen referred to.

Revett's evidence on the trial was to the following effect:—He arrested Coigly; there was a dagger found on his person. He was at breakfast; he refused to give his name, or to acknowledge his luggage. There was a great-coat in the room lying on a chair; he would not acknowledge it to be his. The great-coat was taken to another room, and, on searching the pocket of it, the officers found a pocket-book, which Fugion examined, and said it was of great consequence. All the papers were marked, and never out of his possession till they were marked, some in Bow Street, some at the Secretary of State's office. On his cross-examination, he said, after he seized the papers (at the hotel), he did not mark them there; he believed he was desired by the prisoners to take the papers before a magistrate, to have them marked and sealed up. Nobody was in the room when he found them; he had no recollection of the papers being missing after they were brought to Bow Street. Fugion gave similar evidence, but stated that the person who read the paper, when the pocket-book was found, was a Mr. Twopenny. He had heard at Bow Street, the handkerchief which contained the papers was missing. Twopenny swore that he saw the pocket-book taken out of the pocket of the coat while the prisoners were present, but it was then tied up in a handkerchief.

Mr. Frederick Dutton swore that two letters addressed to a person in Holland were in Coigly's hand-writing. He had seen him write his name and the names of others, for the purpose of getting a watch raffled, which belonged to a poor man under sentence of death at Dundalk, where he (Dutton) once resided. The letters in question were dated the 24th and 26th of February. One stated—“Notwithstanding the severe prohibition carried on against our merchandize in France, I am resolved to carry on the trade at all events”—addressed to Mynheer G. F. Vandeleur, Flushing. The other stated—“Being here, and hearing that there is a great seizure of all our merchandize, I write this to inquire about it. If anything may be sent by sea, tell me. As I am under the necessity of attending here as a military man, write to my partner. Direct to Parkinson and Co., Manchester. We are very uneasy about the safety of the last parcel addressed to Mynheer Vanderslang, Amsterdam”. Another letter, addressed to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Mr. Dutton swore was in the hand-writing of Coigly. Dutton said he had been a servant, and was a quarter-master in the army since March, 1798. He had been dismissed from the service of a Mr. Carlisle; had kept a public-house at Newry

for some time without a license; never applied to government for any reward, but had applied by letter to Lord Carhampton, soliciting to be made a quarter-master in the army. He had sworn in Ireland against one Lowry, and had previously sworn secrecy to the Society of United Irishmen, which Lowry belonged to, but he had only been sworn on a "Reading-Made-Easy".

Mr. Lane, formerly under-sheriff of the County of Cork, when Mr. O'Connor filled the office of sheriff, identified a letter addressed to Lord Edward Fitzgerald, as being in the hand-writing of Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. Ford, one of the Under Secretaries of State for the home department, deposed that he was present when the prisoners were examined before the council. O'Connor objected to his examination being taken down, on the grounds of its incorrectness. *Mr. O'Connor's examination before the Privy Council, however, was produced and read.* In that examination O'Connor had denied any knowledge of Coigly, or of an intention of going to France.

Revett, the Bow Street officer, produced a book, purporting to be the constitution and test of the Society of United Irishmen. The whole, at the instance of Mr. O'Connor, was read, for the purpose, as he stated, of showing the jury "that it was not possible he could have belonged to a society of such a description as that of the United Irishmen appeared to be, without its being publicly and notoriously known".*

The examination of Coigly, signed by him, before the council, was then read by the Attorney-General, said—"He was no particular profession; declined to answer whether he was in orders; had no particular acquaintance with O'Connor; the examinant was in bad health; was going to Margate; the great-coat, and the paper found in the pocket of it, he knew nothing about; the dagger found on his person he had bought in Chapel Street, Dublin. He knew Evans, of Plough Court, but was not aware of his belonging to the Corresponding Society".

Mr. Plumer, as leading counsel for Messrs. O'Connor and Coigly, made a speech, which occupied four hours and a half in the delivery, in the defence (the report says) of both prisoners; but truth obliges me to say, that the defence of the unfortunate priest forms no part of that speech; and the few words that are devoted to the mention of his name, in conjunction with O'Connor's nominally in his defence, were virtually in the defence of O'Connor, and to the downright prejudice of Coigly. The fault lay with the lawyer, and not with his client, O'Connor. The Lord Advocate of Scotland might truly say, many years

* Report of the trial of Messrs. O'Connor, Coigly, &c., p. 62.

after the event, "that man (Coigly) was not properly defended".

Binns was ably defended by Mr. Gurney; Allen, by Mr. Ferguson; and Leary, with considerable earnestness and efficiency, by Mr. Scott (the gentleman who published, about two years ago, a letter in one of the London Newspapers, signed—"A Disciple of John Horne Tooke", in which he asserted the innocence of Coigly, stating that the paper found in his pocket had been put there for a hoax by Dr. Crossfield, a member of the Corresponding Society).

Jeremiah Hasset, a witness for the defence, deposed, he was keeper of the Round Tower in the Castle of Dublin. Mr. O'Connor had been kept in close confinement there; suffered to see two friends, and no other persons. In the month of June, 1797, two shots had been fired by some of the Highland Fencibles at the window of the room where O'Connor was confined. From that time O'Connor went no more to the window.

Mr. Stuart, a magistrate in the County Tyrone, knew Coigly in Dundalk; was aware of his father's house having been wrecked by the Orangemen or Peep-of-Day Boys. Coigly's moral character was good; he (Mr. Stuart) had assisted Coigly lately with money in London.

The Earl of Moira deposed to his having a slight knowledge of Mr. O'Connor; did not feel competent to speak of O'Connor's general character; had only one political conversation with him. The evidence of knowledge, grounded on a single conversation, was objected to by Mr. Garrow.

The Hon. Thomas Erskine deposed to his having known O'Connor three years; his acquaintances in England were people of high rank, with whom he (Mr. E.) acted in parliament. Mr. O'Connor's character was the best any man could possess; he was a man of the strictest honour and integrity, and had made great sacrifices in maintaining the opinions he thought right; he was incapable of treachery to any man, and Mr. E. knew him to possess the highest admiration and regard for the persons he associated with. He (Mr. E.) was not aware of his having any other connections, or holding any other political principles.

The Hon. Charles James Fox had known O'Connor for three or four years, and frequently conversed with him on political subjects; he lived on intimate terms of esteem and confidence with him, and with the friends of Mr. Fox, who are called the opposition. He (Mr. Fox) always considered him a person well affected to his country, a man highly enlightened and firmly attached to the principles which seated the present family on the throne,

to which principles they owed their liberty. He (Mr. Fox) was acquainted with Lord Edward Fitzgerald; he was a near relative of his (Mr. Fox's), and he believed Lord Edward was anxious to go to France, relative to some private affairs concerning his wife, who had property there.

The Earl of Suffolk had known Mr. O'Connor eleven years, and so much admired his political character, that two years ago he introduced him to the Duke of Norfolk, the Bishop of Llandaff, and Serjeant Adair.

The Right Hon. R. B. Sheridan said, he had known Mr. O'Connor for three years; he took a deep interest in the affairs of his country, and concerned himself so much about the grievances of Ireland, he seemed to think the people of England had none to complain of. He (Mr. Sheridan) had advised O'Connor not to remain in this country. O'Connor had said to him, "he would have to form some connections he would not wish to form for the purpose of getting away". He never met any man in his life who more reprobated the idea of any party in this country desiring French assistance.

The Right Hon. Henry Grattan said he had known Mr. O'Connor since 1792; he was formerly a member of the Irish House of Commons. Mr. Grattan never imagined that Mr. O'Connor would favour an invasion of this country.

Lords John Russell, Thanet, and Oxford, and Mr. Whitbread, gave testimony pretty nearly similar to the former, as to O'Connor's honourable character and constitutional principles.

Mr. Coigly, at the conclusion of the speech of the Attorney-General, said: "Gentlemen of the jury, it is impossible for me to prove a negative; but it is a duty I owe to you and to myself, solemnly to declare, that I never was the bearer of any message or paper of this kind to France in the course of my life. That paper is not mine: it never belonged to me. It states that it was to be carried by the bearer of the last. This is something which might be proved; but it is impossible for me to prove the negative. There is also an allusion in this paper to secret committees and political societies. I declare that I never attended any political society whatever in England. With these considerations, I consign my life to your justice, not doubting but that you will conduct yourselves as English jurymen ever do, and that your verdict will be such as shall receive the approbation of your God".

Mr. O'Connor said, "he was not desirous of adding a word to what had been so ably said in his defence by his counsel".

Mr. Allen said, "he did not think himself called upon

to address the jury. He had not seen anything in the evidence tending to criminate him".

Mr. Binns spoke in similar terms; and Leary said: "My lord, they may do what they like with me".

Mr. Justice Buller, in his charge to the jury, leaned heavily against Coigly, throwing out many doubts of a favourable kind to the other prisoners. The jury having retired for about half an hour, returned a verdict of guilty against Coigly, and not guilty against all the other prisoners.

The sentence of death was no sooner pronounced on Coigly, than an unprecedented scene took place in the court. Two Bow Street officers, stationed close to the dock, attempted to seize O'Connor while he was yet standing at the bar. This was prevented by the court, and in a few minutes was again attempted. O'Connor then rushed from the bar into the body of the court; on which a considerable number of police officers appeared, and the court was thrown into complete confusion. Two swords, which were lying on the table (produced on the trial as part of the property of the prisoners), were drawn by some persons, and people were struck with these weapons. Several persons were knocked down, and the tumult seemed to forebode dangerous consequences.

By this time, O'Connor was seized and dragged back again to the bar; when, silence being restored, he applied to the court for protection, and desired to know by what authority he was seized, being then cleared from all charge by the verdict of the jury. Whereupon the officers produced a warrant, signed by the Duke of Portland, dated so far back as 22nd of March, for O'Connor's arrest on a charge of high treason. O'Connor, appealing to the court, said: "May I be permitted to say a few words?"

Mr. Justice Buller inquired what he had to say.

O'Connor proceeded—"Will the officers take their hands off? If I am again to be confined, may I not beg the indulgence of being sent to the same place as my brother? I have seen swords drawn upon me after my acquittal in this court. I am not afraid of death. If I am to die, let me die here! Life is not worth preserving on the terms on which I now hold it—to waste it out in loathsome dungeons. Another confinement will soon be fatal to me".*

* Lord Thanet, Robert Cutlar Ferguson, O'Connor's counsel on the trial at Maidstone, and several others, were tried subsequently, upon an ex-officio information, for a riot, in having attempted to rescue O'Connor. Lord Thanet and Ferguson were convicted, fined, and imprisoned. The well-known Walter Cox had gone over to England, with what precise object does not appear, when it was known in Ireland that O'Connor and Coigly were arrested and were to be tried on a charge of high treason. He was present at Maidstone during

He was then remanded back into the custody of the jailor. Binns and Allen were liberated the following morning; and Coigly, who, during this extraordinary scene, had stood perfectly calm, and apparently the only unconcerned spectator of it in the court, was removed from the dock to one of the condemned cells in Maidstone jail.

The late Lord Holland, in his *Memoirs of the Whig Party*, gives the following account of the trial, and the embarrassing connection with it of his great Whig friends:—

"What passed at Maidstone exposed the opposition to much calumny. Arthur O'Connor had summoned all his acquaintances in that party to speak to his character. From motives of humanity and friendship, they endeavoured to give the most favourable colour they could to his views and opinions about England, and they thereby exposed themselves to the imputation of being concerned in the plot, or at least accessory to the designs, which he soon afterwards confessed. As to the specific charge, there was certainly not sufficient proof against him. Coigly, with whom he had fallen in by accident, furnished the only evidence, in a paper which he imprudently carried about him, and which was to the full as remarkable for its uselessness and nonsense as for its

the trial, and there is reason to believe, from some mysterious allusions of his, in an account of the trial published in his "Irish Magazine", that he was not only privy to the attempt made in court to rescue O'Connor at the conclusion of the trial and acquittal of that gentleman, when the latter was arrested on another charge of treason, but that the attempt in question was made, and the arrangements for its execution were organized by him. Cox always spoke of O'Connor as a friend to whom he was devoted; and O'Connor declared to the author that he had entire reliance on his fidelity. Poor Coigly was less fortunately circumstanced than O'Connor. He had only one friend to aid or assist him, or to enable him to make any preparations for his defence. That friend in the time of need and extremity, was the late Lord Cloncurry. He furnished the means liberally for Coigly's defence, and put his friends' generosity in requisition for that humane object. These particulars the author had from Lord Cloncurry's own lips. But O'Connor had not only credit and influence at his command to enable him to make due preparations for his approaching trial, but it was in his power to summon Lord John Russell, the Earl of Moira, Lord Thanet, the Earl of Suffolk, Lord Oxford, Charles Fox, and Messrs. Grattan, Sheridan, and Whitbread, to bear testimony to their knowledge of his character and principles. Some of the other prisoners' witnesses from Ireland were deterred by threats of prosecution, as parties implicated in the affairs of the Society of United Irishmen, from appearing for them on the trial, or punished for appearing for them. The following document, copied from an original and authentic memorial, subsequently addressed to Major-General Drummond, in the author's possession, will sufficiently demonstrate the fact of government interference with witnesses for the accused priest—

treason. The poor man, feeling that he had thus endangered the companions of his journey, generously entreated them to sacrifice him without scruple, if in any way it could contribute to their defence. Coigly was condemned on false and contradictory evidence. I do not mean to aver, as Lord Chancellor Thurlow assured me he did to Judge Buller, who tried him, that '*if ever a poor man was murdered, it was Coigly*', but simply to allude to a circumstance which, in the case of a common felon, would probably have saved his life. The Bow Street officer who swore to finding the fatal paper in his pocket-book, and remarked in court the folding of the paper as fitting that pocket-book, had sworn before the Privy Council that the same paper was found loose in Coigly's

"TO MAJOR-GENERAL DRUMMOND, COMMANDING THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT.

"The humble Petition of James O'Neill

"Showeth—

"That, in the month of April last, your petitioner was subpcenaed to Maidstone, in England, in order to give evidence on behalf of James O'Quigley, who was tried for high treason. Your petitioner thought himself legally obliged, did attend, but gave no evidence, nor was called to give evidence. Your petitioner, at his return home, found his house and property burned, and also the house of his sisters adjoining thereto, by the yeomanry of Magherafelt; and, by the threats of said yeomanry, your petitioner was obliged to conceal himself in woods and ditches, lest he should suffer death or torture, and, by cold, hunger, and anxiety of mind, your petitioner contracted a scirrhus and symptoms of a dropsy, and still remains without health. Your petitioner was taken by said yeomanry, and kept prisoner for forty-eight hours, and was obliged to give in bail to leave His Majesty's dominions in a short time, or as soon after as opportunity would admit. Wherefore your petitioner has, since the month of October last, been travelling from one seaport to another, and had no opportunity since to leave the kingdom, nor dare your petitioner go home, for fear of said yeomanry. Petitioner was never tried by court-martial, and thinks it hard that he has to leave the kingdom for attending the subpcena, as he thought the law obliged him to attend. Petitioner acknowledges he was a deluded United Irishman, but had taken benefit of the proclamation issued by the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland, and never was since concerned with rebels, but abhors the thought of them. Petitioner has five small children, and has nothing to support him or to carry him or them out of the kingdom. Petitioner hopes that your honour will take it into consideration, and relieve him from leaving the kingdom. Your honour taking petitioner's distressed situation into consideration, he

"As in duty bound, shall ever pray.

"JAMES O'NEILL".

"I do hereby certify that James O'Neill, of the townland of Ballyriff, parish of Ardtrea, and County of Londonderry, came before me, and performed the requisites pointed out by the proclamation issued by the Lord Lieutenant and Council, bearing date 17th May, 1797, for suppression of insurrection in this kingdom.

"Given under my hand, this 20th day of July, 1797.

"GEORGE L. CONYNNGHAM".

great coat, and, I think, had added that he himself had put it into the pocket-book. An attorney of the name of Foulkes gave me this information, and I went with it to Mr. Wickham, then, I think, Under Secretary, who assured me that the circumstance should be carefully and anxiously investigated before the execution. But the order had gone down, and while we were conversing, the sentence was probably executed. Mr. Wickham's general good character, and the good opinion which subsequent acquaintance has given me of his humanity, made it just to add, that I acquit him of the hypocrisy of expressing interest about the fate of a man who was no more; and I suppose that he thought there was plenty of time for a respite and investigation. Coigly, who was a priest, showed great unconcern about his own life, but was not indifferent about the cause in which he suffered. When Judge Buller, in passing judgment, enlarged in commonplace eloquence on the mercy and virtues of George III., the poor man, with great composure, but with a smile of contempt, took a pinch of snuff, and cried 'hem'".

The following remarks on the trial and condemnation of Coigly are extracted from a letter addressed to Dr. Thomas Attwood by a person styling himself "A Disciple of John Horne Tooke". This letter appeared in the *Sun* newspaper, in December, 1839, and the writer of it states that he was the counsel for Coigly's fellow-prisoner, Leary; and, on referring to the trial, I find the council for Leary was Mr. Scott:—

" High Treason.

" To Thomas Attwood, Esq.

" Before many of you were born, I was counsel at the State trials at Maidstone, in 1798, for a young man charged with high treason. There are many things in those trials known to the public, and some not known to the public, though well worthy of your attention, and of the attention of every jury engaged in the awful question, whether in such a case there has been any treason in the mind or not. The overt act laid against O'Connor was his setting off to go to France, then the enemy of England; but this, though an illegal act, was not an overt act of treason, and therefore the Attorney-General of that day, one of the greatest lawyers that any country ever produced—I mean the late Lord Eldon—tried hard to connect O'Connor with an undoubtedly treasonable paper that was found in the pocket of one of his companions and fellow-prisoners, the Rev. Mr. Coigly, a Roman Catholic priest. In this the Attorney-General completely failed.

and the overt acts charged, not being in themselves treason, O'Connor was acquitted. Now, mark well what I am going to tell, and behold what time brings to light; for you will find that, upon this occasion, a guilty man was saved, and an innocent man was convicted.

"In less than two years, O'Connor, to get out of an Irish prison and save his life,* confessed his treasons in the face of many of the Whig nobility and gentlemen of England, who had come forward and declared upon their oaths their confident belief that O'Connor was incapable of entertaining a treasonable intent.

"The poor priest, Coigly, had no Whig party, or any other party, at his back to swear in his favour. He sat unmoved during the whole trial, and, after the disgraceful scene that took place in the court at midnight, the moment after Mr. Justice Buller had finished passing the then horrible sentence of high treason, Coigly sat like a stock through all the confusion, while O'Connor was trying to run out of court, till he was knocked down at the door by Judge Buller's coachman. Now, the whole conduct of this revered gentleman had so occupied my attention, that, though he was not my client, I was beginning, in my address to the jury, to defend him, when I was stopped by his own counsel and by the court. But, not many years ago, my old friend, the late Lord Commissioner of the Jury Court of Scotland, better known by the name of Willy Adam, who was one of the counsel for the crown in these trials, declared to me that he thought Coigly had not been properly defended, and that if I had been allowed to go on, and had defended him as well as I did my own client, O'Leary, I should have got him off. I could not agree in this high compliment of my good friend, for though the treasonable paper was not in Coigly hand-writing, and there was no evidence how he came by it, yet it was found in his pocket amongst his most sacred papers—such as his letters of ordination; and I despaired of inducing the jury to believe that it had been put there by anybody but himself.

"Now, time proved what was unknown to anybody but himself, and which this noble-minded man kept secret till after his conviction. This paper was all a hoax of a Dr. Crossfield, who had himself been tried for high treason. He was the author of the song, 'Plant, plant', &c. He and Coigly had met at a tavern the night before he set off for France, and there Crossfield wrote this invitation to the French to invade England, and desired Coigly to get it put into the *Moniteur*, and said, 'it would make William Pitt.

* The above statement as to the motive for O'Connor's revelations is not true. R. R. M.

"Thus time has shown that a treasonably guilty man was saved, and an innocent man hanged; for, except this hoax, there has been no evidence, that I ever heard of, of the treasonably guilty mind of Coigly up to this hour.

(Signed),

"A DISCIPLE OF JOHN HORNE TOOKE".

It is possible there may be some truth in this statement; but if the paper was written by Crossfield, it certainly was put into Coigly's pocket without his knowledge, if the dying declaration of the man is entitled to any credit:—

"I declare most solemnly in the face of my country and my God, it (the statement of the papers being found in the pocket of his great-coat) was false, unless one of them, or some other person unknown to me, put it there".*

And yet how is this declaration to be reconciled with a statement made to the author by O'Connor, of a very opposite nature, which will be found in the memoir of Coigly?

In the first series of this work, it was said to have been stated by A. O'Connor, that the address of an English society, found in the great-coat pocket of Coigly at Margate must have been placed there by the police agents. In a written statement, however, on that subject, in the hand-writing of A. O'Connor, now before me, the following account of that affair is given:—"Though there was no legal evidence to prove that the paper was Coigly's, yet the fact is, it was his, and was found in his riding-coat (pocket); for when the five prisoners were brought to Bow Street, a report was spread that the papers taken on the prisoners were lost. Coigly, for the first time, said it was fortunate the papers were lost, for that there was one in his pocket which would hang them all. He never made a secret to us, his fellow-prisoners, that he had got that paper from a London society. In my memoirs I will clear up this point".

This account corresponds with a statement made to the author by B. P. Binns, the brother of O'Connor's fellow-prisoner, J. Binns, in the material point of the paper having been in the possession of Coigly, and of its having been given to him to convey to France. O'Connor states it was given by a society; Binns says, by Dr. Crossfield, and leaves it to be inferred that Coigly took charge of it, as an ordinary communication, merely to oblige a friend. It is, however, impossible to put this construction upon it. Binns plainly states that Coigly had been the bearer of a previous communication from England to France, of

* Coigly's (or Quigley's) observations on his trial. Printed in London in 1798. Page 83.

great political importance, in 1796. The fact of his being the bearer of a former communication, is referred to in the paper found in the pocket of his coat. Binns states the former communications emanated from the Secret Committee of England, composed of delegates from England, Ireland, and Scotland, as a directory. It is, therefore, very difficult to believe that Coigly could be ignorant of the nature of a paper of this description, given him by Crossfield, a gentleman well known to be one of the leading members of a revolutionary society of this period. It is, however, still more difficult to disbelieve the solemn declaration, ascribed to Coigly, of his total ignorance of the existence of this paper, or of his firm persuasion of its having been introduced into his pocket by the police officers.

Coigly was convicted on the specific charge of proceeding to France on a treasonable mission from a secret *English* society, bearing a treasonable document of which he had a guilty knowledge. This charge was not sustained by any legal proof.

There can be no question but that the evidence did not warrant his conviction. One of the counsel for the crown, Mr. Adam, subsequently Lord Commissioner of the Jury Court of Scotland, declared to Mr. Scott, the counsel for one of the prisoners, that Coigly had not been properly defended. It would have been too much to have expected from the Lord Commissioner an acknowledgment that a prisoner had been wrongfully convicted.*

From the period of O'Connor's acquittal at Maidstone, the 22nd of May, 1798, when he was again arrested in the court on a warrant of the Secretary of State, issued the previous 22nd of March, in virtue of a bill which suspended the *Habeas Corpus*, he was kept in durance. After a few days' detention in London, he was transmitted to Ireland, and on his arrival in Ireland, was committed to Newgate, where several of his former associates were then immured. Nearly all the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen were then in the hands of government, several of them under prosecution or already convicted; and within a few weeks after his committal to Newgate, some were executed. At length a compact was entered into between the state prisoners confined in Newgate and Kilmainham, and the government, which originated with a member of the Irish House of Commons, Mr. Francis Dobbs, and, chiefly through the instrumentality of Samuel Neilson, eventually met with the concurrence of all his imprisoned associates, with the exception of Mr. Roger O'Connor and two or three others of minor note. All the particulars of

* Vide Letter of Mr. Scott.

this compact will be found in the memoir of Samuel Neilson. To stop the further effusion of blood, to save the life especially of one of the members of the Directory, Oliver Bond, who was then under sentence of death, were the chief objects of the parties to the compact, who were members of the Society of United Irishmen. Their own liberation was guaranteed to them; but when liberated they were to quit their country for ever, and to embark for any land they pleased to go to that was not at war with England, on the fulfilment of the conditions imposed on them by the government—namely, to reveal the plans and organization of their society, without disclosing, however, the names of parties implicated in the conspiracy. The compact was observed by the state prisoners, but some of its most important obligations were not fulfilled by the government.

CHAPTER IV.

Examinations and evidence of Arthur O'Connor before the Secret Committees of the House of Lords and House of Commons in 1798.

O'Connor's evidence before the Secret Committees abounds with important information, and throws the fullest light on his political views and those of the society he was connected with. In the parliamentary report, the examinations of O'Connor occupy a single page. In his own report of them, published in London, along with those of Emmet and M'Nevin, they occupy twenty-six pages. This authentic report of his is therefore inserted in this memoir:—

Examination of A. O'Connor before the Secret Committee of the House of Lords, August 9, 1798.

Committee.—Were you of the executive of the Irish Union ?

O'Connor.—I was a member of the executive from the time I became a member of the Union.

Com.—When did the communication between the Union and France begin ?

O'Connor.—You, I suppose, have the report I signed and delivered to the Irish Government, in conjunction with Mr. Emmet and Mr. M'Nevin.

[The Chancellor nodded assent; but none of the other members of the committee].

O'Connor.—In that report you will find the whole of that important transaction detailed. You will there find that the first alliance that was formed between the Union and France was in the middle of 1796. You will see that before the executive entered into any alliance with France, or that it resolved on resistance to the tyranny of the Irish government, a solemn meeting was held, when, after considering the uniform system of coercion and opposition which had been pursued from 1793 by the Irish government against the Irish people, and finding that 1796 had opened with the sanguinary laws, called the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts, whereby the most sacred rights of the constitution were destroyed, the most gross violations of the laws by the magistrates were indemnified—that the expulsion of 4,000 unoffending inhabitants of the County of Armagh from their homes and properties, left no doubt that all protection was at an end, the executive were decidedly of opinion that, by the principles

of the constitution, as established by the Revolution of 1688, they were justified in calling in foreign aid, and in resisting a government which had forfeited all claims to obedience.

Com.—You are under a mistake: the Insurrection and Indemnity Acts were not passed until the end of 1796.

O'Connor.—I am confident I cannot be mistaken, for I know that these acts were what filled up the measure of that oppression which decided the executive to seek foreign aid; and I am confident it did not come to that determination until May, 1796; and I also recollect that I left this country in February, 1796; and before I left it, the Attorney-General had moved these two bills; but if you can have any doubts, your journals will clear them up.

Com. When did the military organization begin?

O'Connor.—Shortly after the executive had resolved on resistance to the Irish government and on an alliance with France, in May, 1796.

Com.—Were there no communications with France before the middle of 1796?

O'Connor.—None: I can confidently affirm that, until the conduct of the Irish government forced the executive to resist, which was, as I have stated, in the middle of 1796, no alliance whatsoever was formed between the Union and France.

Com.—Did the executive imagine the North would rise if the French landed?

O'Connor.—We had no doubt but the North was sensible of the tyranny of the government, and that they would take the first opportunity to free their country.

Com. When was the first communication with France after the Bantry Bay expedition?

O'Connor.—I was a close prisoner in the Tower from February, 1797, to August following it. In August I heard of the first communication after the Bantry Bay expedition.

Com.—What did the despatch contain?

O'Connor.—It stated that a considerable force of 15,000 or 20,000 men were embarked at the Texel, and that they would sail in a week.

Com.—What prevented their sailing?

O'Connor.—The wind continued directly contrary for several weeks after, and the changes which took place on the 4th of September probably had some effect on the expedition.

Com.—Was it mentioned in the despatch where the landing should take place?

O'Connor.—It was not; the directory do not communicate such important intelligence, except to those to whom it may be absolutely necessary.

Com.—Had you any intelligence of the invasion at Bantry Bay ?

O'Connor.—There was a messenger who arrived in November, 1796; he said the French would arrive shortly, but did not say where.

Com.—Had you any other intelligence ?

O'Connor.—We received a letter about the time of this messenger's arrival (a French agent), which stated that the expedition was postponed: this has never been accounted for.

Com.—Was there a person sent in Spring, 1797, to France ?

O'Connor.—During the time these messengers were sent off, I was a close prisoner.

Com.—Did you see Dr. M'Nevin on his return from France ?

O'Connor.—I shall not answer anything about Dr. M'Nevin or any other person.

Com.—Oh ! he has been here.

O'Connor.—If so, there is the less occasion for you to ask me about him; I shall not answer any questions about anyone.

Com.—Did you see any person who returned from France towards the end of 1797 ?

O'Connor.—I did.

Com.—What intelligence did he bring ?

O'Connor.—When he left France, he was assured that assistance would be sent, though no time was mentioned; but so considerable a change had taken place in France on the 4th of September, 1797, and our messenger having left Paris before that period, and not arriving here till after, we did not know what measures the new arrangement might give rise to.

Com.—Have you heard that some conversation on Irish affairs had passed between General Vallence and some persons of this country ?*

O'Connor.—I cannot conceive that General Vallence could have anything to do with the business; he was an emigrant.

Com.—Was there any connection between the Union and the British and Scotch Societies ?

O'Connor.—The executive carefully avoided any.

Com.—Was there not some connection between individuals ?

O'Connor.—I cannot say what individuals may have done; the executive was careful to confine itself to the

* General Vallence was the son-in-law of Madame de Genlis, was privy to, or implicated in, Dumouriez's treasonable correspondence with the Austrians, and fled from France at the same time Dumouriez went over to the enemy. R. R. M.

affairs of Ireland. As one of the executive, I can say I never had the most distant connection with any British Society, nor did I ever interfere with the politics of England.

Com.—Do you know anything of a loan being negotiated with France or Spain ?

O'Connor.—Some of our agents were ordered to negotiate for £500,000 with either of these powers.

Com.—Was your place in the executive filled up when you left this in January, 1798 ?

O'Connor.—My place in the executive of Leinster was filled up.

Com.—Were you not proprietor of the *Press* ?

O'Connor.—I was until it was destroyed by the Irish government.

Com.—Was it not for the purpose of promoting the Union that you set it up ?

O'Connor.—The inculcating union amongst my countrymen was a principal object. I had also in view to expose the outrages and tyranny of the Irish government; but it was not set up by the Union; it was my own individual undertaking; it was under my sole control; and it was set up by me on the broadest basis for the support of the liberties of my country.

A. O'Connor's examination before the Secret Committee of the House of Commons, August 16, 1798.

Com.—Explain the first formation of the alliance between the Irish Union and the French.

O'Connor.—If you have seen the report I signed and delivered, in conjunction with Emmet and M'Nevin, it will not be necessary I should go very fully into that important transaction; but if you have not seen it, I will explain it more fully.

Com.—We have not seen the report you allude to.

O'Connor.—Some time in 1795, or the beginning of 1796, a letter was received by the executive of the Union from France, from some individuals of the Union who had fled from persecution, in which they mentioned that they had made such a representation of the state of Ireland, that they believed the French would be induced to treat with the Union to free us from the tyranny under which we groaned. This letter was not acted upon by the executive at the time it was received, from their unwillingness to have recourse to foreign aid except in the last resort, and in the hope that the effects on the popular mind from the tyrannical measures which government had pursued, would induce them to abandon their measures of coercion, and to adopt measures congenial to the wishes

of the people. But the executive saw that the year 1796 opened with the Insurrection Bill,—that four thousand unoffending inhabitants of the County Armagh had been driven from their homes on account of their religious opinions, by a lawless banditti, who were not only not restrained by government, but aided and instigated by its magistracy, and that an act was passed to indemnify the most gross violation of the most sacred laws by the agents and magistrates of government. Roused by these fresh instances of tyranny, the executive of the Union held a most important meeting, to consider the state of the country—to determine on what measures these sanguinary, tyrannical proceedings of government made it necessary for us to adopt. The views and conduct of those who exercised the powers of government, were coolly and dispassionately discussed. The executive were convinced, and the same conviction was in every mind, that a system of monopoly and usurpation had absorbed every part of the constitution which belonged to the people; that those who exercised the assumed right of representing the people of Ireland, were self-constituted; that they acted with the sole view of advancing their individual interests; and that what was called the emancipation of the Irish Legislature in 1782, was nothing more than freeing a set of self-constituted individuals from the absolute control of the British Legislature, that they might be at liberty to sell themselves to the corrupt control of the British ministry. The executive considered which (party) had the constitution on their side, they who contended that the House of Commons should be filled with the real representatives of the people of Ireland, or those individuals who contended that it should be filled with themselves. This was the great point at issue, by which the past, the present, and future conduct of the Irish government was to be judged, without even appealing to the imprescriptible right of the people to put down oppression. Standing on the ground of the constitution, the executive looked back upon the sanguinary, tyrannical measures which had been invariably pursued by the Irish government and legislature, under the control of the British ministry from 1793; they were convinced that if the most faint connection existed between those who filled the places of the people's representatives and the people, no government or legislature durst commit such unexampled outrages as those which had been perpetrated and indemnified in Ireland; that no lawful or just government could by any possibility be driven to burn houses, or to torture the persons of the people to extort obedience. The executive looked back to the melancholy history of Ireland: they saw how dreadfully it had been torn and

wasted by religious dissensions. The first object of the executive was to destroy religious discord, and promote brotherly love and affection among all the people of Ireland, be their religious belief what it may. The next object of the Union was to promote a reform of the government, and to regain those rights which were the people's birthright by the constitution; yet the oath which bound the people to these first duties of Christianity, morality, and the constitution, was punished with death by the Insurrection Act, which, by some other of its clauses,, broke down every barrier of liberty; that not only every effort was made to oppose us in these our exertions to destroy religious discord, but that no means were left untried to organize a sect, founded upon the diabolical oath of extermination, whose institution was avowedly for the purpose of perpetuating religious discord and rancour. This was not all; the expulsion of four thousand Irish citizens, with every aggravation of cruelty and horror, which was followed by the Indemnity Act, left no doubt on the mind of the executive, that all the excesses and outrages were either openly or secretly the acts of the government and legislature of Ireland. Struck with the enormity of these acts and outrages, the executive looked back to the history of James II., and after comparing his conduct with the conduct of the Irish government, which had been beyond comparison more tyrannical and cruel, they were of opinion that if the people were justified in calling in foreign aid to rescue their liberties and constitution from James's government, it was infinitely more justifiable in us to call in foreign aid. The executive were of opinion that the Irish government had not only forfeited all title to obedience from the people, but that we were called on to resist its most unparalleled usurpation and tyranny; that, as the people of Ireland had been disarmed, contrary to the right of every free people, and as the tyranny under which the government was upheld, was supported by the men and the money of one foreign nation, we stood peculiarly necessitated to seek the aid of some other foreign power. Actuated by this reasoning, the executive sent to seek an alliance with France in May, 1796, which was actually formed in the August following, the first which was formed between the Irish Union and France.

Com.—Did you not go to Hamburg, and afterwards to Switzerland, in the summer of 1796, in company with another person?

O'Connor.—This question points at Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and as it is notorious he did accompany me to Switzerland in 1796, and although my friend is no more, I will not answer anything which could in the most distant

manner lead to the disclosure of any act of his. Besides, I am not bound by the stipulation I have entered into for saving the lives of those you have in your power, to disclose any act of my life prior to my becoming a member of the Union; but so little am I inclined to withhold the account of any part of our conduct, and so fully am I convinced of the rectitude of what we have done, that if you will be satisfied with the substance of the transactions of the Union, without leading to names or persons, I will give it.

Com.—Well, we will be content with the substance, without any allusion to names or persons.

O'Connor.—In May, 1796, after the important meeting of the executive I have just mentioned was held, they sent to France to adjust the terms of the alliance, to plan the manner the succours should be seconded, so as to insure success. The most important part of the terms was, that France was to assist Ireland in freeing herself from the tyranny of those who exercised the government of Ireland, and that Ireland should be free to frame whatever constitution she might think fit to adopt. The same expedition which was afterwards equipped and sent to Ireland under Hoche, was agreed on, and everything was settled which could insure success on its landing. At the same time it was proposed to the person who formed this first alliance between France and the Union, that a body should be sent against England to cause a diversion, to retaliate for the Quiberon expedition. To dissuade the French from the invasion of England, this Irish negotiator used every argument in his power. He said, from his knowledge of England, the best men of that country would be most hostile to any interference of the French in the government of their country, on the same just principle that they condemned the interference of England in the government of France; that the situation of Ireland and of England were very different; that in Ireland the people were most solicitous for the aid of France, to rescue them from foreign and domestic tyranny; but that the majority of the people of England would be averse to their interference; that many of the people of England were beginning to see and feel the ruin the ministers had brought on the nation by engaging in the war; but that if they invaded their country, it would bury all consideration of the injustice of the war under the immediate consideration of self-defence; that it would prove the greatest support to an unpopular ministry, by giving them an unlimited power over the remaining wealth of England in any way they might wish to take it, while a guinea could be extorted. These, together with other arguments, were thought conclusive by those to whom

they were addressed, and the invasion of England in 1796 was abandoned.

Com.—Was not M. Barthelemy privy to these transactions ?

O'Connor.—I will not answer any question where the name of any person is mentioned.

Com.—But he is a foreigner.

O'Connor.—I care not; the name of a foreigner or a countryman shall be equally inviolable with me.

Com.—Was it not at Paris this first alliance was formed ?

O'Connor.—It was not; if it was, you would have no need to ask me the question.

Com.—Was it as Lisle ?

O'Connor.—It was not.

Com.—Were you of the executive ?

O'Connor.—I was of the executive from the time I became a member of the Union in 1796 until I was obliged to fly my country abruptly in January, 1798, to avoid being taken off by a foul plot which was laid by some of the under-agents of the Irish government, but which my respect for the safety of those who gave me the intimation of it, obliges me to keep secret.

Com.—Inform us of the progress and extent of the organization.

O'Connor.—When I was imprisoned in February, 1797, the organization had made considerable progress in Ulster, and things were in train to extend it to the other three provinces. On my liberation in the August following, I found the means we employed before my imprisonment had been successful in extending the organization, particularly in Leinster; but that it had been thrown into confusion by the burnings, hangings, and torturings, which had been extended from Ulster to the other parts of the country. But to such a degree had the minds of the people been exasperated by the cruelties of the government, the disposition towards the Union was so strong in the three provinces, that in four months after my liberation I was enabled, as one of the northern executive (there being no executive for Leinster during this period), to organize 70,000 men in Leinster only, while the number of those who took the test of the Union was nearly equal to the population of the three provinces. To such a degree did the Irish government raise the resentment of the people against it by the cruelties it practised to support its powers, and to keep down the national spirit for liberty.

Com.—Was not your object in forming the organization to effect a revolution ?

O'Connor.—If our mere object had been to effect a

revolution, the British ministry and the Irish government were effecting one more violently and rapidly than we wished for. We clearly perceived that the measures they adopted to prevent revolution were the most effectual that could be devised to insure it. When we viewed the state of the British Empire, we were convinced we need not take much pains merely to make a revolution. If that was our sole object, we knew that the Irish government of itself could not exist one month; we saw that it was the men and the money of England which upheld the Irish government; we therefore looked to the state of Great Britain, and considered the state of its actual government, and we were of opinion that the measures which the present ministry had pursued were the most rapidly ruinous which could be adopted. We examined her state before the war; we thought that as, before the enormous expenditure which the war occasioned, the minister could not extort more than sixteen millions annual revenue, it would be impossible, after hundreds of millions of the national capital had been squandered, that thirty millions annual revenue could by any physical possibility, be extorted, which was the least her peace establishment could amount to. But that, even supposing thirty millions annual revenue could be raised in Great Britain, experience convinced us that liberty must be destroyed by such additional means of corruption being thrown into the hands of the executive; and we were convinced that a nation which had lost her liberty could not long support such monstrous burdens, on the principle that capital, like fluid, would find its level. We were of opinion that as the profits of capital would be higher in France than in England, the vast exhaustion of capital which had taken place in France would be replenished on a peace, by the flowing in of a considerable portion of British capital, and that this disposition on the part of the British capitalist to transport his wealth, would be farther increased by a desire to avoid the enormous taxes to which his industry and his profits would be exposed. These considerations, among many others, left no doubt on our minds that the power of England, by which alone the tyranny and usurpation of the Irish government and legislature were supported, must be very shortly destroyed.

Com.—If you did not organize for the purpose of effecting a revolution, what other object had you in view?

O'Connor.—We saw with sorrow the cruelties practised by the Irish government had raised a dreadful spirit of revenge in the hearts of the people; we saw with horror that, to answer their immediate views, the Irish government had renewed the old religious feuds; we were most anxious to have such authority as the organization

afforded; constituted to prevent the dreadful transports of popular fury. We hoped that by having committees for each barony, country committees, and provincial committees, by holding out the benefits of the revolution to those who supported it, and by withholding its benefits from those who should disgrace it by popular excesses, we should have been able to restrain the people. But those who had monopolized the whole political power of the constitution, finding that they stood in need of some part of the population, and that, their monopoly being so directly opposite to the interests of all classes of the Irish Nation, they could not hope for the support of any (be their religion what it may) on the score of politics, except those in the pay of government; finding how necessary it was to have some part of the population on their side, they had recourse to the old religious feuds, and set on foot an organization of Protestants, whose fanaticism would not permit them to see they were enlisted under the banners of religion to fight for political usurpation they abhorred. No doubt, by these means you have gained a temporary aid, but by destroying the organization of the Union, and exasperating the great body of the people, you will one day pay dearly for the aid you have derived from this temporary shift.

Com.—Government had nothing to do with the Orange system, nor their oath of extermination.

O'Connor.—You, my lord (Castlereagh), from the station you fill, must be sensible that the executive of any country has it in its power to collect a vast mass of information, and you must know from the secret nature, and the zeal of the Union, that its executive must have the most minute information of every act of the Irish government. As one of the executive, it came to my knowledge that considerable sums of money were expended throughout the nation in endeavouring to extend the Orange system, and that the Orange oath of extermination was administered; when these facts are coupled not only with general impunity, which has been uniformly extended towards all the acts of this infernal association, but the marked encouragement its members have received from government, I find it impossible to exculpate the government from being the parent and protector of these sworn extirpators.

Com.—Were not some of the Union very monarchical?

O'Connor.—My first political acquaintance with the body of my Catholic countrymen, to whom I suppose you allude, was in 1791, whilst I was high sheriff of the County of Cork, when I defended the Catholics from an attack which was made upon them by the monopolists of our representation in that part of Ireland. At that time the

Catholics of Ireland were just beginning to feel the influence of the French Revolution, and to be sensible of the degraded state to which centuries of oppression had reduced them; they were, however, strongly addicted to monarchy, and made their first advances in pursuit of freedom in a very humble manner; but the contempt and insult with which their first petition was scouted from the House of Commons roused them to a sense of their rights as men. In 1792, they again petitioned, but in terms of boldness proportioned to the insult with which their former petition had been treated. They were joined by the Presbyterians; and the contemptuous manner with which both petitions were refused, created a union of sentiment, whereby the Catholics were led to examine what title to power those had who thus insultingly denied the joint desires of the great mass of the Irish Nation. They kept aloof from any explanation with the Irish parliament, and negotiated with the British ministry, who they found controlled every act of the government and legislature of Ireland. While the Catholics were succeeding with the British ministry in England, the borough-mongers of Ireland were most active amongst the grand juries in the summer of 1792, in pledging lives and fortunes, never to grant the claims of their Catholic countrymen. When the parliament met in 1793, the mandate came from the British ministry to accede to a partial emancipation of the Catholics. This was not all: in the session the House of Commons resolved that the national representation stood in need of reform; they raised the hopes of the Irish but to blast them afterwards. This most impolitic conduct brought the Irish government into the utmost disrepute, and was followed by a declaration on the part of the Catholics in 1793, to stand or fall with their countrymen on the great question of obtaining a national representation. From this time the Irish government seemed to abandon all idea of conciliating the Catholics, and to think only of punishing them for what they thought ingratitude. In pursuance of this plan, all idea of Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform was scouted; British troops were poured into Ireland, and prosecutions commenced against some of the Catholic and Presbyterian leaders in 1794, on such evidence as clearly demonstrated they were undertaken from vindictive motives of resentment. These measures were calculated to eradicate the inveterate predilection for monarchy from the hearts of the Irish Catholics. In 1795, the British ministry appeared sensible of the consequences which had resulted from the measures which had been pursued hitherto in Ireland; and an attempt was entered on to regain the Catholics,

by sending Lord Fitzwilliam, with powers to choose his own councils. The hopes of the national mind were raised, particularly of the Catholics; but the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, the abandonment, of the projected political changes, the renewal of the reign of terror and coercion, totally alienated the minds of the Catholics from their confirmed propensity to monarchy. No doubt, the French Revolution had a great and powerful effect in exciting the Catholics of Ireland to attain their long lost liberty; but it was the measures of the British ministry and the Irish government, which hurried them into their present violent detestation of monarchy and their present ardent love of representative democracy, which was confirmed in the minds of the very lowest orders, by being familiarized with the organization of the Union, and by observing its good effects.

Com.—Why, what opinion have the lower classes of the people of political subjects?

O'Connor.—The lowest societies of the Union conversed freely of the corruption, and usurpation, and venality of parliament. While I was a member of the House of Commons, you know the frequent conversation among the members was—How much has such a one given for his seat?—From whom did he purchase?—Has not such a one sold his borough?—Has not such a lord bought?—Has not such a peer so many members in this house?—Was not such a member with the Lord Lieutenant's secretary to insist on some greater place or pension?—Did not the secretary refuse it?—Has he not gone into the opposition? These, and such like facts, are as well known to the lowest classes of the Union as to yourselves.

A member of the Com.—Mr. O'Connor is perfectly right; I have heard the lowest classes of the people talk in that style.

O'Connor.—The people are conscious you are self-constituted, and not their delegates; men who have no other object in view but to advance their own individual interests.

A member of the Com.—That we are a parcel of placemen and pensioners?

O'Connor.—Exactly so.

Com.—What is the object the people have in view at present?

O'Connor.—I believe they have laid by for the instant all idea of speculative politics.

Com.—Was there not a disunion in the executive?

O'Connor.—From the time I was elected one of the executive, I never experienced any disagreement.

Com.—Were there not men who could influence the people to disobey the orders of the executive?

O'Connor.—On the contrary, they were always obeyed with the most zealous alacrity. No doubt, the secret manner in which we were obliged to conduct the business of the Union, gave great scope to intrigue; yet I found that wherever religious prejudices were placed in the way of political liberty, the people invariably disregarded the former, and adhered to the latter.

Com.—Did not the executive form a plan of a constitution for Ireland's future government?

O'Connor.—The executive never thought itself invested with power to meddle with the future constitution of Ireland: that could have been the work only of those whom the people of Ireland might elect for that express purpose. We were elected solely to devise means of wresting power out of the hands of men who had violated every part of the constitution and liberties of Ireland, and outraged every feeling and right of man, by the means they employed to retain their usurpation.

Com.—What do you think would tranquillize the people of Ireland, and induce them to give up their arms?

O'Connor.—That is a question which would require the best heart to execute. I am not so ignorant of human nature as to suppose that those men who have so long engrossed the enormous emoluments of ill and unjustly acquired power, will ever restore them to the people, however manifest it must appear to an unprejudiced mind, that the most dreadful ruin awaits the present fruitless effort which is made to retain them.

Com.—But what, in your opinion, would tranquillize Ireland, and induce the people to give up their arms?

O'Connor.—Under the present system of usurpation and corruption, every source by which the Irish Nation could acquire wealth is betrayed to Great Britain, and even the wretched pittance her industry gathers is thrown a prey to monopolists of her political power, who have sold her dearest rights. By this double plunder the people of Ireland are destitute, not only of every convenience and comfort of life, but of the bare necessities to support their existence. If you would tranquillize a people, you must cease to oppress them—you must cease to betray them: make them tranquil. The great and main source from which the wants of a people are supplied, is agriculture; yet near two millions' worth of the rude produce of the agriculture of Ireland is annually exported to pay non-resident landlords; for this there is no return; it is all loss to the Irish Nation, and is, of itself, a sufficient drain to impoverish a greater nation for extent than Ireland. The commerce of Ireland has to cope with the most commercial nation on earth in its very vicinage, under the disadvantage of a general admission of every

species of manufactured and foreign produce on one side, and of an unlimited rejection on the other, with scarcely one exception. When the agricultural produce of a people—when their home and foreign markets are sold, the consequence must be, that they must experience a great dearth of national capital: hence, the best machinery and the most extensive division of labour, by both which labour is so wonderfully abridged, the low profits which result from abundant capital, and to being able to give long credits, are all lost to a nation bereft of every means to acquire wealth. By this cruel injustice, England can supply the people of Ireland with their manufactures (the other great source for acquiring national capital), the same fate is shared by our agriculture, and the abused laws by which the fisheries of Ireland have been destroyed, complete the catastrophe of the ruin of Irish industry, in the several ways of acquiring wealth with which God and nature have endowed her. But this is not all; the small portion of wealth which the Irish Nation acquires under these mutilated means, is subject to a thousand of the most gross extortions. A most monstrous establishment (and that for one-tenth of the nation only), under the name of supporting the ministers of religion, but really for the purpose of the most flagrant corruption; a vast military establishment, which those who exercise the powers of government are obliged to keep up, as the sole means by which they can maintain the actual usurpation of all popular and constitutional rights; sinecure places; pensions; and the various ways which are hourly devised for draining the people. These, if you would tranquillize the people, you must abolish; you must restore to them those means for acquiring wealth which God and nature gave them; you must not subject the wealth they do acquire to any exaction which is not absolutely necessary for the support of a government capable of affording them protection. The result of the pillage which the Irish Nation at present undergoes, is, that it diminishes national capital, that wages are low, and employment doubtful—the greatest causes of national misery. The next great evil which results from this great dearth of national capital is, that land has become the only material the people have to work on, which cannot be exported, every one is forced to hire it, as his only means of employment, and the competition has made the rents of lands much higher than they otherwise would be, whilst the tithes (the most impolitic of imposts) are an endless source of vexation and litigation between the people and the ministers of religion. If you would correct all these evils, restore to the Irish Nation its just rights; then wealth must flow in from every quarter; thousands of means of exercising

industry will present themselves; wages will be liberal; rents will be moderate; and it will be as impossible to disturb the public mind when the reign of justice shall be established, as it will be to tranquillize it, so long as the actual system of usurpation, plunder, and tyranny, shall be continued. It is oppression which has armed the people of Ireland; by justice only you can disarm them. A just government, which emanates from the people, and which exists but for the people's protection and happiness, need never dread their arms or desire to see them disarmed. As long as you are anxious to disarm the people, so long you have no reason to expect they should be tranquil.

Com.—You have made politics and political economy your study: what political changes do you think would tranquillize Ireland?

O'Connor.—Restore the vital principle of the constitution, which you have destroyed, by restoring to the people the choice of representatives, who shall control the executive by frugal grants of the public money, and by exacting a rigid account of its expenditure. Let the people have representatives they can call friends—men in whom they can place confidence—men they have really chosen—men chosen for such a time, that if they should attempt to betray them, they may speedily have an opportunity of discarding. Give us such a House of Commons, and I will answer for the tranquillity of the country. Place but the public purse in the hands of such representatives, and I will answer for it, the people of Ireland will not have to complain of the profligacy, the tyranny, or usurpation of government or legislators. How such a House of Commons could be chosen (if it was not the interest of those who monopolize the national representation to oppose it), would not be a difficult task to devise.

Com.—Was not the Union to destroy the constitution?

O'Connor.—We could not have an intention of destroying a constitution of which we did not believe there was one particle in existence. A House of Commons, so far chosen by the people, and so far independent of the Crown as to control it by its sole exercise of power over the public purse, was the vital principle of the constitution; it was by restraining from time to time this power over the public purse, that those rights, one after another, have been gained, which rights constitute the constitution. The instant such a House of Commons ceased to exist, and that it was supplanted by a House of Commons which represents itself, from that instant the vital principle which created the constitution, and which alone could preserve it from bankruptcy and ruin, was at an end. It was not

to destroy this vital principle of the constitution, it was to put down a parliament of self-constituted men, who first destroyed every vestige of the constitution, and then committed every outrage and cruelty to support their usurpation.

Com.—Why, did you not intend to set up a republic ?

O'Connor.—I have already told you we did not conceive that any power was vested in us to set up any constitution. We were chosen solely for the purpose of putting down your usurpation of the constitution and liberty of the Irish Nation. I know not whether those who would have been chosen by the people of Ireland for the purpose of forming a constitution, would have adopted the constitution you have destroyed. I know not whether it is possible to build up such a constitution, once it has been destroyed. I know not whether they would have formed a constitution purely representative, from a conviction that in an elective government the people, whether by their delegates or in their proper persons, exercise a control over the government, which I hold to be a republic. As such, the constitution (as long as a House of Commons made any part of it) was a republic; but whether the future government of Ireland may be less, equally, or more democratical than the constitution, those who shall be chosen to frame it can alone determine.

Com.—Was there anything more implied in the oath of the Union than what was set forth in the test ?

O'Connor.—Certainly not; for all we wanted was to create a House of Commons which should represent the whole people of Ireland; and for that purpose we strove to dispel all religious distinctions from our political union, and after we had destroyed your usurpation of our national representation, and that we had set up a real representation of the whole people of Ireland, we were convinced there was no evil which such a House of Commons could not reach; we were satisfied that, to set up such a House of Commons was our right, and that whether the other parts of the constitution could stand or not after the House of Commons was restored to the constitution, yet we were assured that our liberties would exist; but that without a constitutional House of Commons, the government must of its own nature speedily end in bankruptcy and ruin, from the vast expense of the corruption and force which it required to uphold it.

Com.—How was the late rising occasioned ?

O'Connor.—I have already told you how. From the beginning of the French Revolution, the measures pursued by the British ministry and the Irish government have worked up the minds of the people of Ireland to their present highly irritated state—at one time raising their

hopes, at another time blasting them; at one time promising emancipation and reform, and at another time resisting both with fire and sword, burning houses, hanging, lashing, and torturing; means unjustifiable to support any system, and which a just government could not for one instant stand in need of. These no human patience could endure; and yet (from a conviction that they were practised to goad the people to a premature attempt to put down their oppressors), as long as I could remain, I used every means in my power to endure a little longer; but when, to avoid being despatched, I was forced to fly, those in whose hands the executive power of the Union was vested, yielded to the pressing solicitations of the people of the most oppressed parts, who were desirous to risk their lives in order to rid themselves of the cruelties they hourly experienced.

Com.—Are there not committees forming at the present moment?

O'Connor.—I know not what committees are forming; but I am well assured the people of Ireland will never abandon the Union, and that its principles will never be eradicated from their hearts until we obtain our object.

Com.—How can deputations be sent to France?

O'Connor.—By as many ways as there are human devices.

Com.—Could you get one to go to France now?

O'Connor.—Thousands, if necessary.

Com.—How is that possible?

O'Connor.—Unless you destroy every vestige of commerce, we can find no difficulty in sending to France. Not a ship that sails, that contains a United Irishman, that does not contain a faithful messenger.

Com.—Do you know anything of the future plans of the French?

O'Connor.—I do not; but I firmly believe they will never abandon their engagements with us.

Com.—Were there many men of property in the Union?

O'Connor.—Men of property usually consult their own personal interests, which is a great check to any generous or disinterested exertion of patriotism; such men seldom run great hazards in the public cause. If we had been content with a hollow support, we might have had abundance of them; however, there were many of considerable property, who, upon principle were of the Union.

Com.—Would you not have destroyed the Protestant religion, and the Protestant establishment?

O'Connor.—The destruction of religion is one thing, the destruction of establishments another: the great and just principle upon which the Union is formed is the most

perfect freedom for all religions alike. We are of opinion that the monstrous Protestant establishment in Ireland is a greivous burden on Presbyterians, Catholics, Quakers, Protestants—in short, on all the people of Ireland; highly unjust to those who are not of the Protestant religion, and highly injurious to the Protestant religion itself; for we are convinced it would work a very desirable change in the Protestant clergy of Ireland, if they were made to owe their maintenance to a faithful discharge of their functions, instead of obtaining it by a base and disgraceful cringing to patrons; and that if there was no other objection to tithes than their being an endless source of discord between a Christian ministry and the people, they ought to be abolished.

Com.—How did you mean to pay the half million you wished to borrow from France or Spain?

O'Connor.—When the present government can borrow millions on millions, we could have had no difficulty in paying half a million. If millions can be had out of Irish industry by a government which has sacrificed every means of acquiring wealth, we have no doubt a government that restores those rights could easily find means to discharge any debts we should contract in the contest.

Com.—Do you imagine that Ireland could exist as an independent nation?

O'Connor.—I have not a doubt of it. We have five millions of a brave hardy people, and if we had the government in our hands but for a short time to organize and to arm them, we could defy the whole world. Once possessed of a country, they would fight for it; and it is one of the strongest countries in Europe by nature. It must have a tactic peculiar to itself, and the people of Ireland must execute that tactic.

Com.—Could not Great Britain destroy your trade with her navy?

O'Connor.—I doubt if the rest of the world would allow her to shut them out from so good a market. If we were once free, I doubt she could effect it. I doubt she could have power, after the separation of Ireland, to act so injurious a part; but as Ireland has no foreign dominion, and, I trust, never will, if her whole foreign trade was carried on by foreign ships, it is of little matter. The old notion, that a carrying trade is the most beneficial, is nonsense; the home trade should be the great national

"Memoir, or, Detailed Statement of Origin and Progress of the Irish Union, delivered to the Government by Messrs. Emmet, O'Connor, and M'Nevin; together with examinations of these gentlemen", &c., &c. [No printer's name, place, or date. The original authentic edition, printed privately for Emmet, M'Nevin, and O'Connor].

object, and that would be most flourishing. There is no convenience nor a comfort of life that we could not find in our island; and the temporary inconvenience and loss we should feel by being obliged for a long time to supply ourselves, would be compensated in a great measure by the hidden resources we should discover.

ARTHUR O'CONNOR.

* * * *

CHAPTER V.

O'Connor's protest against the breach of the compact entered into with the State prisoners by the Government. Removal to Fort George. Imprisonment there for three years and three months. Liberation on the coast of Holland. His relations in France with William Putnam M'Cabe.

On the 4th of January, 1799, O'Connor addressed a very remarkable letter to Lord Castlereagh from his prison in Newgate, boldly and eloquently, but passionately and imprudently, it must be added, considering his position, remonstrating with the "young lord" on the breach of faith which he alleged had been committed by the government, indignantly repelling certain statements of Lord Castlereagh in the House of Commons affecting the State prisoners who had been examined before the Secret Committee, and denying the correctness of the report of those examinations which the government had published.

The result of this explosion was the transmission of twenty of the State prisoners, who were parties to the compact, to Fort George in Scotland; and there O'Connor and his associates remained immured for three years and three months.

The Rev. Dr. Steele Dickson, in his narrative, mentions his disabusing the minds of the king's messengers, who conducted the State prisoners to Fort George, of the idea that the rebellion of 1798 was a Popish insurrection.

"Their introduction", says Dr. Dickson, "led to the knowledge that, on the representations in government papers, the Irish insurrection was firmly believed in Scotland to be a real Popish rebellion. One of the gentlemen, who knew that Messrs. Tennent and Simms were Presbyterians, and having learned that I was a minister

of that persuasion, in a low voice expressed his surprise that we would be concerned in a Popish rebellion. Overhearing that we would connect ourselves with Papists, and much more this, I interfered, and asked the gentleman, in a voice equally low, why he called the insurrection in Ireland 'a Popish rebellion'? He answered pertly, that 'he did so on the authority of government, and that it was known to be a fact'. I replied that 'such an assertion was one of the many falsehoods by which the people of Britain were deceived and misled in respect to Ireland'. As this seemed to offend him, I then asked him what opinion he supposed the Irish government to entertain of us twenty, then present. To this he answered rather peevishly, but without reserve, that 'they must consider us as the most guilty or the most dangerous, or they would not have distinguished us as they had done'. On this, with a view to remove an idea equally unfounded and pernicious, I withdrew to a side-table, and wrote our names, classed by our religious professions, as underneath:—

Catholics.

John Sweetman,
John Swiney,
Dr. M'Nevin,
Joseph Cormick,

Presbyterians.

William Tennent,
Robert Simms,
Samuel Neilson,
George Cuming,
Joseph Cuthbert,
Dr. Dickson.

Protestants of the Established
Church of Ireland.

T. A. Emmet,
R. O'Connor,
A. O'Connor,
John Chambers,
Mat. Dowling,
Thomas Russell,
Edward Hudson,
Hugh Wilson,
William Dowdall,
Robert Hunter.

"This done, I returned, and put my little scroll into his hand, whispering, 'Please, sir, to look at that; and then tell me what becomes of your Popish rebellion, on your own supposition that government consider us as the most guilty or most dangerous of its enemies?'

"While his eyes were intent on the paper, he seemed surprised and perplexed, and on returning it, hinted a suspicion that I was jesting with him. On this I passed it round my fellow-prisoners, asking them, as it circulated, whether I had truly stated their religious professions. This question all answered in the affirmative".

With respect to Arthur O'Connor, Dr. Dickson, in another part of his work, states that O'Connor was not only a Protestant layman, but had been educated for the

church, and had been ordained. This statement rests solely, I believe, on the authority of Dr. Dickson; but that it was not made without good grounds, I infer from the upright character of the man, who was known to me in early life, and left a strong impression on my mind of his honesty and sternness of principle.

O'Connor and the other State prisoners embarked on board a vessel of war, sailed from Fort George the 30th day of June, 1802, and were landed the 4th day of July at Cuxhaven, on the coast of Holland. O'Connor went to Paris in September, and was received by the best society of Auteuil, where he sojourned for some time, at the houses of Mme. Helvetius, Cabanis, Tracy, Boufflers, Ginguene, Dannou, Benjamin Constant, Mme. de Stael, and Mme. de Condorcet. He there also made the acquaintance of the first consul, Buonaparte.

On the 4th Ventose, an. XII. (February, 1804), Napoleon appointed him general of division in the French service. His letters of service, which were signed by General Berthier, Minister of War, directed that he was to join the army on the western coast of Brest, where he was to assume the rank of an Irish General Officer, and to command the division of Irishmen. He, in fact, proceeded thither; but dissensions, and conflicting views and interests, and altered designs on the part of the ruling powers in France, led to the abandonment of the projected expedition from Brest. O'Connor only wished for the independence of his country, and insuperable difficulties having arisen as to the means of realising it, he quitted the army and retired from the service.

[Dr. Emmet suggests that O'Connor cherished the hope that he might become King of Ireland, on the ground of an old family claim. Emmet: Thomas Addis Emmet and Robert Emmet, vol. i, p. 339].

He then married the only daughter of Condorcet, and turned farmer on the estate of Bignon, which had been that of Mirabeau, and was purchased in 1808. He rendered great services to the country by introducing new methods of cultivation.

When O'Connor was exiled in 1802, his brother Roger was entrusted with the management of his affairs in Ireland. His Irish property was then worth from £1,200 to £1,500 a year. Roger's ideas of property were theoretically those of a communist. He acted practically on those ideas in the discharge of the duties of the trust with which his brother had charged him. He sold portions of his brother's property, and applied the produce of the sales he effected to his own uses, to the extent of about £10,000.

Arthur went to law with his brother, and got a decree

against the property of Roger, which eventually brought it to the hammer.

When Arthur visited Ireland in 1834, with the permission of the British government, he made arrangements for the sale of all his Irish properties, and subsequently they were sold. Nineteen years previously, Madame Condorcet O'Connor was permitted to visit Ireland on the affairs of her husband.*

After Roger's abuse of trust, the general placed his affairs in the hands of his eldest brother, Daniel Conner (who retained the ancient surname of the family, and was ten years older than Arthur). Daniel was residing in Bristol in 1817, and was said to be then worth about £5,000 a year. His eldest son Daniel came over to Ireland, and built a house on that part of the paternal estate which was called Manch. This estate was afterwards sold in the Incumbered Estates Court, and purchased by Daniel Conner, Junior.

The general, in 1807, despatched a confidential agent of his, who had been established at Rouen in a cotton manufactory, to Ireland, to bring his brother to an account, and to rescue the residue of his property. This agent was William Putnam M'Cabe, the active member of the United Irishmen of Belfast, one of the body guard of Lord Edward Fitzgerald in the capital.

On several occasions M'Cabe was sent over from Paris to Ireland by O'Connor, under the name of William Lee. M'Cabe perilled his life each time he came over, for his name was included in the list of fugitives from justice who fled from Ireland in 1798, and by a special act of parliament his return to Ireland was declared a capital offence.†

Roger O'Connor's abuse of the confidence placed in him by his brother occasioned the general great embarrass-

* In the "Secret Correspondence" of the Duke of Richmond, during Sir Robert Peel's connection with the Irish government, a letter exists, bearing the signature of R. Peel, addressed to J. Beckett, Esq., dated February 1, 1815, in reply to an application of the wife of Arthur O'Connor, to visit London and to proceed to Ireland on affairs of her husband, stating that such leave would be granted. In another letter to the Lord Lieutenant, from the Home Office, London, Lord Sidmouth's views are stated in regard to this permission—namely, that Madame Condorcet O'Connor should be carefully watched while she remained in Ireland.

* An act to prevent persons returning to His Majesty's dominions who have been, or shall be, transported, banished, or exiled, on account of the present rebellion, and to prohibit them from passing into any country at war with His Majesty.—38 Geo. III. ch. 78.

† An act to compel certain persons who have been engaged in the late rebellion which hath broken out in this kingdom, to surrender and abide their trials respectively, within a limited time, on pain of being attainted of high treason.—38 Geo. III. ch. 80.

ment. In 1807 he was obliged to borrow a sum of £4,750 from William Putnam M'Cabe, which debt was not discharged during the lifetime of the lender; and it was only twenty years after that debt had been contracted that a final settlement was effected with the representative of W. P. M'Cabe, six years after the death of the latter, and after protracted legal proceedings of a great many years' duration, first instituted for the recovery of that debt in the beginning of 1809.

The original sum lent by M'Cabe, was £4,750 sterling, and a further sum of £42 for money expended for General O'Connor, with interest at five per cent., bearing date from the 7th of January, 1807. By a decree of the *Cour Royale d'Orleans*, the 9th of April, O'Connor was condemned to pay the sum of 143,623 francs, including interest to that date. By another decree of the *Orleans Cour Royale*, dated 6th May, 1819, the sum was definitely fixed at 135,000 francs, including interest and expenses. Eventually O'Connor undertook to make eight equal annual payments of 4,375 francs, in discharge of this debt, with interest, having paid down to Mr. Ely, for Mr. M'Cabe, 50,000 francs, and given already an undertaking to pay the balance in September, 1819.

By the original agreement the money was to be paid by certain instalments out of the rents of O'Connor's estate in the County Cork, the management of which was in the hands of his brother. These instalments were not paid. Proceedings were taken against General O'Connor in France, and resisted for some years on the ground, as O'Connor states, that the debt contracted was in the currency of France, and the claim set up was for the payment of it in Irish currency, which made a very considerable difference.

Eventually the matter was amicably settled. A portion of the debt was paid during M'Cabe's life; and finally, his daughter, Mrs. Nesbitt, received what remained due of it, after her father's death, in 1821. Among the documents referred to, there is an attested copy of a receipt in full, in liquidation of all claims on O'Connor, signed by Nesbitt, as executor, and acting for his wife, dated the 6th of April, 1827.

Singular circumstances enable me to explain the nature of the pecuniary relations which subsisted between Arthur O'Connor and M'Cabe, namely, the possession of M'Cabe's papers respecting this transaction, including numerous letters addressed to him by O'Connor, and the brother of the latter, Mr. Daniel Conner, of Connerville, in the County Cork, for which I am indebted to a gentleman whose father was intimately connected with M'Cabe's family—M'Cabe, the eminent watchmaker, of Cornhill, London; and

also the papers of the other party mainly interested in the affair, contained in the attested copies of all the legal documents appertaining to the cause, furnished to me by Arthur O'Connor. In justice to the latter, I feel bound to declare that those papers lead to the conviction that there was no disposition evinced by O'Connor to wrong M'Cabe. The whole of the difficulties arose from the embarrassments in which his Irish properties were involved, the consequence of his exile and of unnatural family dissensions, promoted at the expense of the absent proprietor. In proof of this assertion, I will give a few extracts from these letters, practising not a little restraint in the mode of dealing with them, but desiring to abstain from all unnecessary reference to matters of a private nature.

Letter of Arthur O'Connor to William Putnam M'Cabe.

“ Paris, February, 1807.

“ My dear Friend—I have written to Daniel to secure you the £4,000, and to pay you in cash the £750, though, from the numberless things you have left unpaid, and were unsettled, this latter sum will fall far short of being due to you. Indeed, was this an opportunity to scold you roundly for the confused state you left your affairs in, I would not spare you; but I'll reserve that until I see you; and if you wish to appease me, you will see Daniel and arrange with him, so as that he shall pay £200 interest into the hands of Bell for you regularly, or any one you think fit in London, so as that you may not have to call on me here for one sous of it. As it is my intention to sell all my property in Ireland as soon as possible, it would be advantageous to me that you should content yourself for the moment until the sale is made, with an acknowledgment that I owe you the £4,000; as, if he passes you a bond for me, the judgment will clog the sale, and be attended with costs to me.

“ Since I saw you, I have found the most advantageous and eligible estate that I could have wished, and if it slips through my hands for the want of £4,000, it will be a most greivous disappointment. If I had to wish, it is precisely the thing I could have asked, and in six years it will be more than double in value. For God's sake, press Daniel to procure me this sum. As yet, he has done nothing for me, and if it had not been for the money you lent me, I should have been in a sad taking. Assuredly, with Daniel's fortune, and all mine in his hands, he cannot find the smallest difficulty to procure me this sum, and he is now more than six months advertised of

how much I stand in need of it. If you do not find him inclined to sell all my property, assure him that if I had it, I could place it to the greatest advantage at this moment. This I leave to your zeal to enforce *with all your might*.

"Since I saw you, I have also received a letter from Evans, by which I learn that Roger's account with me is likely to be settled by arbitration, and, though most inconvenient, I have agreed to take the payment in five years. If you go to Dublin, I beg of you to see Evans, and bring me a letter from him about all my affairs; tell him how entirely I rely on his friendship to draw me out of the cruel situation I am in. If this estate that offers slips through my hands for want of £4,000, it will be a constant source of regret to me all my life, for it is the place, of all others, where I could be happy. There is a rapid stream that tumbles down through the whole property, *with every other advantage we could wish*; do not let me lose it if you can. The person who sells wants ready money. Let me hear, as soon as you can, what you have been able to do on this head for us, for I cannot tell you how much I have it at heart.

"Your dear, sweet baby is charmingly; she calls me her papa of Paris, and you her papa of *America*.* She never fails to ask me when I heard from you, when you'll be back from *Ameilca*, and how you are. She comes often to Rue Matignon, but, as she has a most excellent appetite, I would not consent that she should go to Whitlock's, lest they, from Irish kindness, should let her eat too much, and make her sick. She will make a fine and charming woman. She is beloved by every one—*l'enfant gate de la maison*. I have taken Alick and his wife into my service. I have given money to B. to pay the rent of the shop and of the lodging, and I have made the upholsterer take the third part of what he wanted for the hire of the furniture.

* The child of Mr. McCabe, mentioned above as the "dear, sweet baby," I subsequently knew as Mrs. Nesbitt, in indigence, in the French capital, where her "Papa of Paris" was then residing in affluence, as I shall have occasion to observe in the memoir of that poor lady's father, W. P. McCabe. It is only necessary here to remark, that in the Third Series of this work, published in 1846, being determined the former friends of Mr. McCabe should not be left in ignorance of the unfortunate condition of his daughter, I appended the following notice to the memoir of her father, I fear with little advantage to the poor lady:—

"The daughter of William Putnam McCabe (Mrs. Nesbitt) is now residing in Paris, in a state of poverty, with several children. The author is privileged to make this statement, and put it in the power of the friends of her father, and of his countrymen, to assist his daughter in her distress. This unfortunate lady is to be heard of at Mr. M'Henry's, Rue de la Paix, Paris".—"Life and Times of the United Irishmen", Third Series, p. 359.

"From the letters I received, if my uncle was not infatuated, his affairs might be settled to his satisfaction, and that of all the family; but I fear he is too much his own enemy to act as he ought. It is his children who will have to weep over his folly.

"O'C."

"April 7.

"I take up my pen to finish this letter. Let me first reiterate my request; that you will so arrange with Daniel as that your interests shall be paid in London; for, if you do not, it will distress us both beyond measure; indeed it will be wholly out of my power to pay it here; therefore, your regard for yourself, and your love for me, will make you steady in pursuing this point: that is, *don't venture to see me unless it is done.*

"As to the commissions I gave you, I am not sure you will execute them to my liking, for, if they were for yourself, you *could not have patience to have them well done*: yet, I know, if you can do them for any one, you will for your friend. The shawl I lay most stress on; and I do assure you, Eliza takes the same care of your little baby as if she were her sister; indeed, she doats on her.

"As the person who is to take this does not set off for some days, I'll not conclude as yet.

"O'C."

"April 10.

"Your child is in the best possible health: take good care of yours. Neglect nothing of our private affairs now; you are on the spot, and confine yourself to them. See Daniel, above all things, and bring me a satisfactory account of all my affairs. I didn't neglect any of yours.

"Ever your sincere and faithful friend,

"O'C."

It is very painful to contrast the terms of tender and affectionate solicitude for the health of the party written to, and the health of his infant child, in the preceding letters, with the altered tone of the same writer in 1842, in a communication to me, wherein reference is made to that man, formerly so prized and trusted, and greatly commended for his fidelity, but now only not forgotten in his grave, to be recalled in such terms as the following:—

"As to M'Cabe, the French Government acquired the proof that he was a double spy. General O'Connor saved his life with the Minister of War, the Duc de Feltre".

Extract of a letter to Daniel Conner, Esq., from
A. O'Connor.

"Paris, February 7, 1807.

"This will be delivered to you by a real, true friend, who, seeing the cruel situation I was reduced to, has lent me £4,750. As I am ignorant of what sums you may have been able to collect for me, I leave it to you to do all you can to satisfy my friend in the manner most agreeable to his wishes. Nor need I tell you how anxious I am that you may be able to satisfy him, as well for the four thousand pounds he does not want immediately, as for the *seven hundred and fifty* he has immediate occasion for. The £4,000 is to pay an interest of five per cent. until you can pay it; the rest you will pay him with my rents. As he will not meet with any one that can give him better advice for the plan that he should adopt, I request you will be of all the use you can, not only on the subject of his money matters, but on any other, all which his kindness to me merits. He will explain my sentiments fully on all subjects. . . .

(Signed), "A. O'CONNOR".

From A. O'Connor to D. Conner, Esq.

"Paris, March, 17, 1807.

"My dearest Daniel—Since your letter of the 1st of September last, I have never heard from you. I have just received a letter from my good friend Evans, by which I find he has written to you, acquainting you with the state of affairs with that wretched being, Roger. I hope the arbitration may be agreed on; but, in case he is mad enough to expose the matchless depravity of his conduct, I request you will inform Evans of the attorney you wish to have employed, should he force me into a law suit. In order to leave all to arbitration, I have pointed out an easy way for him, to discharge the debt he owes me. . . .

(Signed), "O'C".

Extract of a letter from Daniel Conner to W. P. McCabe.

"Bristol, July 5, 1808.

"I find, by the letters of my brother to me, that you lent him £4,750 in January or February, 1807: he is not exact as to date. I have ordered an estate of his, of the yearly value of £1,000, to be sold. My second brother,

William, has a mortgage on it for £5,000, with interest due. The moment it is sold, and the mortgage paid, I shall order your debt to be paid, with interest, to whomsoever you shall appoint to receive it.

"I am, Sir, your faithful, obedient servant,

" DANIEL CONNER.

"To William P. M'Cabe, Esq., 145 Portland Street, London. (*Under cover addressed*)

"To William Putnam, care of Thomas A. Emmet, New York".

Extract of a letter from D. Conner, Esq., to W. Putnam (M'Cabe).

"October 31, 1808.

"In answer to your last, I request you to consider if it was possible for me to do more than I have done. In June last, his estates were advertised for sale. I cannot compel persons to offer for them: they may be on the eve of sale, for anything I know. Reeves and Ormsby have been entrusted to sell them. My brother William has a mortgage of £5,000. As soon as that incumbrance shall be paid off, I shall direct your debt to be discharged; and, though I have had repeated letters from William, requesting the rents to be paid to him in discharge of arrears of interest, I have refused.

(Signed), "WILLIAM CONNER.

"To William Putnam, Esq., Dr. Murray's, Nicholson Street, Edinburgh.

"Mr. William Putnam, care of Dr. White, Baltimore".

Extract of a letter from William Connor, Jun., Esq., to D. Conner, Esq.

"Mardyke, Cork, November 22, 1808.

"Dear Uncle—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, and cannot help saying that its tenor and contents amazed me much.

"I had hopes, and I thought well founded, that when you had taken charge of my uncle Arthur's affairs, I should have met with punctuality; and you even said, in your letter antecedent to the last, that, at the time of your writing, you had not any money of his at your disposal, but that your wish was, to pay as fast as effects came in. This must surely have been satisfactory to me at that time, as I really understood it as a promise of my being paid whenever any sum might be received. I

have my family looking up to me for help and protection. Their claims on me are of a nature not to be trifled with or resisted, and the property too small to allow of such a deduction from its annual amount. Besides, I cannot conceive by what colouring of justice my property (for certainly it cannot be called Arthur's) should be carried from this country to pay any person in London or Edinburgh. I represent these matters to you, in order to again request your orders to the agent of the property, to pay me some part of the very large arrear due. If it is not done, I must, though reluctantly, apply to the Lord Chancellor for the proper means of redress, at whose hands I have no doubt of receiving it, and that speedily, by getting a custodiam on the whole issue of the estate until the whole arrears be discharged.

"I beg your pardon for thus trespassing on your time, and beg you to accept the assurance of respect and esteem of

" WILLIAM CONNOR, JUN.

"To Daniel Connor, Esq., Bristol".

* * * *

CHAPTER VI.

Notice of the latest work of General O'Connor, "*Monopoly the Cause of all Evil*", published in 1848; extraordinary opinions and extravagant ideas therein propounded.

O'Connor's last and most extensive work is entitled, "*Monopoly the Cause of all Evil*", by Arthur Condorcet O'Connor, General of Division (in three vols., 8vo, Paris, 1848).

The first and second volumes are devoted to questions of political economy, and legislative power, and principles of government, in theory and practice.

The third volume extends to 605 pages; of these 525 are devoted to polemics, the main object of the author being to prove that all ecclesiastical bodies—"corporate priests", as he designates them throughout his pages—"are arch-enemies of the Christian religion, hypocritical and heathenish".

I would be exceedingly sorry to misrepresent the opinion of General O'Connor on a subject of such great moment as that of religion, in the slightest degree, or to allow it

to be supposed that I may have been mistaken in interpreting his opinions on it. It is not necessary, however, to avoid this danger of misrepresentation, to cite many passages of the text of the volume I refer to. The reader will assuredly lose nothing valuable or original by being spared the perusal of any extensive portions of those lucubrations of the general. The headings alone of a few of the chapters might render the general's dominant idea of corporate priests, ministers of religion of all churches, being the cause of evil, sufficiently manifest.

Chap. 1. Heading—"That the religion professed and practised during the three first centuries was a secret, mental, spiritual religion, such as Christ Himself taught; that nothing was more abhorrent to the first Christians than the frequenting churches or the performing ceremonies, in the firm conviction such practices were hypocritical and heathenish"—page 7.

Chap. 2. Heading—"That Christ has excluded corporate priests from having hand or part in His religion"—page 24.

Chap. 3. Heading—"That so far has Christ been, from maintaining every *jot* and *tittle* of the Jewish law, there is not a jot or tittle of it He has not positively and unequivocally abolished as not coming from God".

Chap. 4. The same subject continued.

Chap. 5. Heading—"That the utter subversion of Christ's religion must inevitably follow if we admit the authenticity of the words attributed to Him by the 17th, 18th, and 19th verses in Matthew's fifth chapter, and all those parts where He is made to say He came *but* for the Jews, and in nowise for the rest of the world".

Chap. 6. Heading—"That if Christ had not founded His religion on a fixed principle, which carries its proofs within itself and is totally independent of all exterior proofs whatsoever, and if it was to depend on the truth or falsehood of the historical, biographical events which have been mixed up with the principles and precepts of Christ, they are too devoid of proof, too contradictory, and too opposite to God's attributes, to His immutable laws, and to man's progressive state, to stand the test of scientific examination, or to satisfy the minds of men, who found their religious belief on the convictions of their reason"—page 98.

Chapters 7 and 8. The same subject continued.

Chapters 9, 10, and 11, are devoted to corruptions and falsifications of "corporate priests".

Chap. 12. Heading—"The detection of the frauds and interpolations in the gospels, which have put Jesus in flat contradistinction with Himself, by representing Him as claiming the office of judging all mankind, while He

positively disclaims it by declaring He is not their Judge, but that he is their Saviour, and the fraud by which He is said to give to Peter God's infallible attribute of judging all mankind"—page 214.

Chap. 13. Heading—"Explanation of the pretended miraculous gift of the infallible Spirit of God to the apostles, and from them to corporate priests"—page 235.

The headings of the remaining ten chapters of the general's Boltairian theological disquisitions, my readers, who are Christians of any church, will dispense with, willingly no doubt.

The poor old gentleman, when he published this farrago of polemical twaddle, was in his eighty-sixth year. I cannot say he was in his dotage, for I saw him within a year of that period, and he was then preparing his work for the press, and he was in the possession of his faculties, in the ordinary sense of these words; but his ideas on religious subjects, which had always been known to his friends, and to those who were his intimate associates even so early as 1797 and 1798, to be identical with those of the philosopher of Ferney and the disciples of that school, had become less general as far as principles were concerned; they had become individualized; that is to say, the repugnance which he felt formerly to the doctrines of the Christian religion, or the derision of them which he habitually indulged in, had merged into a fierce spirit of animosity to men who were ministers of religion. The "corporate priests" of Europe, and those of France especially, he maintained vehemently, and on all occasions and in all circles, were engaged in a grand Jesuit conspiracy against the liberties of every European people.

This was the poor old general's *cheval de bataille*, which he mounted ever and anon, or rather from which it was impossible to find him dismounted at any hour of the day, at the period I refer to. He rode his hobby, corporate priests, conspiracy of churchmen, and European Jesuit plot, daily almost to death. It was a pitiable spectacle to see a man of such intellectual powers as Arthur O'Connor had been running a muck in the same ring as that in which Sir Harcourt Lees had allowed his garron of bigotry to ride away with him, galloping over fields of polemics where he showed to no advantage, and floundering in quagmires and morasses of sectarian strife and bitterness, whence he emerged without credit to his character as a man of deep research, of sober mind, and sound judgment.

O'Connor has devoted the last chapter of his third volume to his connection with the Society of United Irishmen, and a defence, on *religious* grounds, of that connection, and of his own principles especially, against certain attacks of O'Connell.

O'Connor, in explaining the motives which induced him to become a United Irishman in 1795, and replying to the invectives of O'Connell against him and the leaders in general of the society he belonged to, observes, that when he entered parliament in 1790, the savage penal law was in existence—"a code so tyrannically oppressive that O'Connell could not then have legally exercised the profession of hedge schoolmaster". The extracts given from the third volume of this last work of O'Connor, *Monopoly the Cause of all Evil*, convey his reminiscences of the stormy period of his political career. His defence of his conduct and of the United Irishmen, requires to be read, however, by the light of those preceding notices of his peculiar opinions and of his resentments.

As it is incumbent on me to state the main arguments he has adduced, and to give them in his own words (for otherwise it would be utterly impossible to give credence to the fact of their authorship), I must so far depart from the course I prescribed to myself of abstaining to quote any portion of the text of the polemical chapters of the work, as to cite a few passages illustrative of the religious opinions of the author.

The necessity of doing so arises from the obvious drift of O'Connor's reiterated denunciations of ministers of religion under the apparently limited designation of "corporate priests". The wary old soldier and skilful tactician generally introduces into those denunciations, whenever he aims a deadly blow at a fundamental truth of Christianity, such as the Trinity or the Atonement, a furious tirade against Popish frauds and Romish miracles. The innocent reader, of very strong anti-Catholic opinions, might therefore imagine the general was only manifesting his zeal against "the errors of Popery", and not seriously impugning the vital tenets of Christianity. I quote a passage in which the candour of his impiety makes itself discernible through the red-hot passion of his polemics: "It is true (he says), England has no inquisitorial court; but since the battle of Waterloo the corporate priesthood and feudal faction have established such an inquisition under their espionage and that of their bigots, that no man, even in female society, can dare to profess he does not believe in the Trinity of three Gods in one God; that Christ is not, at the same time, an immaterial immortal God, and a corporal mortal man; that the impassable God of infinite goodness, justice, and mercy, has not been guilty of the most monstrous injustice in condemning the innocent—even the unborn—and acting under the influence of the most execrable passions. Add to this the protection given to the immortal Jesuit conspirators against every virtue, supporters of the system of excusing and recommending the crimes

most destructive of every moral duty. If this odious system of cant and hypocrisy has not the same destructive result it has had in all the other countries where it was practised, England must be privileged and invulnerable to evils which have proved mortal to other nations.*

"Once man can be persuaded of this blasphemous notion, that he can serve God, it is not in nature to invent a stronger argument to convert men to a religion, than the making them believe they serve God by suffering persecution for His sake and in serving Him. It is owing to this belief that at this day there is not a people on earth (and I will not except Rome itself) where Popery is more firmly rooted, with all that Jesuitism can do to confirm it, than in the actual Papists in Ireland.†

"Give a priest, and above all a Jesuit, the use of a blasphemous dogma, and with the terrors of Hell flames he annihilates every spark of human reason. You render him irresistible.‡

"More than twenty years ago I warned the British Ambassador, Lord Granville, at Paris, that the Jesuits of Stoneyhurst and Castlebrown were inundating Ireland with their poison, and that if they were not driven out of England, they would render Ireland ungovernable".§

Volney and Voltaire are the great authorities on which O'Connor mainly rests his theological system. Of Volney's philosophy he speaks in divers passages in terms of profound reverence. Of Voltaire's piety, philanthropy, and benevolence, he is so enamoured, that his praises become more monotonous throughout the volume than the patience of any philosophy, Christian or Pagan, can endure. At page 115, the general tells us:—"Nothing can be better merited than the praises which the King (of Prussia) gives Voltaire". "It is from his actions (says O'Connor) we should convince ourselves that Voltaire's heart was filled with the milk of human kindness, which is the grand characteristic of a Christian".||

Protestants must not suppose that O'Connor's denunciations of "corporate priests" extended only to Roman Catholic ecclesiastics. At page 335, vol. iii., he gives an example of the sort of zeal for religion that corporate priests are inspired with, and he cites a list of enormous sums, "which some of those usurious blood-suckers of the poorest people in the world have bequeathed their descendents". The list of O'Connor includes the names of eleven Protestant prelates, who had left their children the sum of £1,375,000. It will be said O'Connor

* O'Connor's "Monopoly the Cause of all Evil", p. 536.

† Ibid., vol. iii., p. 587. ‡ Ibid., vol. iii., p. 588.

§ Ibid., vol. iii., p. 588. || Ibid., vol. iii., p. 115.

was in his dotage when he assailed Christianity in general, and Catholicism in particular; but if we refer to the earlier writings of the general—*Present State of Great Britain*, Paris, 1803; *On the Causes which have deprived France of the benefits of the Revolution of 1830*, Paris, 1831,—we will find ample evidence of the same spirit of fanatical infidelity and hatred of religion.

On the subject of his connection with the Society of United Irishmen, and the state of Ireland previous to the Union and at the period of it, we find the following observations in his latest work, indicative enough of talent of the highest order, and of prejudices that disgraced them. We perceive, moreover, ever and anon, the cloven foot of polemics worthy of Tom Paine, creeping on the heels of the politics of O'Connor:—

“Bred up in the traditions of my family, I was descended from our ancient chiefs, from my infancy I have been a mere Irishman, without any mixture or alloy. My earliest passion was the history of my country: the more I studied it, the more strongly every energy of my soul was excited to rescue her from the oppression and misery under which she had been suffering during six hundred years. What struck my youthful mind most forcibly, and has afforded me a certain object to fix my aim on, was a passage in Leland's history, where he gives the extract of a letter from Elizabeth's minister to the viceroy in Ireland. Its words are:—‘Should we exert ourselves in reducing this country to *order and civility*, it must soon acquire *power, consequence, and riches*. The inhabitants will be thus alienated from England; they will cast themselves into the arms of some foreign power, or perhaps erect themselves into an independent and separate state. Let us rather *connive at their disorders*; for a *weak and disordered* people never can detach themselves from the Crown of England’*

“From 1790 to 1796, that I was a member of the Irish Parliament, all my efforts were directed, by my speechings and writings in and out of Parliament, towards the destruction of the religious disunion which made the force of English power and Irish weakness in Ireland.

“In 1793, discontent was so general that the English Government was forced to introduce a law to grant the elective franchise and fair trial by jury to the Catholics.

“It was in 1795 Pitt detached the Duke of Portland from the Whigs, by giving him the whole of the patronage of the government of Ireland. In consequence, he named Lord Fitzwilliam to the viceroyship. It is not my intention

* Leland's “History of Ireland”, 1773, vol. ii., p. 291. Ap. O'Connor's “Monopoly”, vol. iii., p. 543.

to enter into the history of this disastrous transaction, by which the perfidy of Pitt has destroyed English domination in Ireland, by rendering government on the English system an impossibility. Acting on this treaty, Lord Fitzwilliam made his conditions before he left England, which were, *the power to dismiss some of the most obnoxious men in place, and to grant complete emancipation to the Catholics.*

"On his arrival in Ireland, he found the carrying those stipulated measures was so pressing that it admitted of no delay. He dismissed Beresford, however, with the load upon the nation of a pension of £3,000 for him, and leaving every soul of his family with places largely paid. Lord Fitzwilliam announced his resolution to support with all the influence of government the total emancipation of the Catholics.

"If Pitt had sought, in all the immense powers he exercised at this time, the most efficacious means for impressing on the hearts of the Irish Nation the most indelible repugnance to English rule in their country, the means he employed on this occasion were the most effectual.

"After having assented to Lord Fitzwilliam's dismissing Beresford, Wolf, and Toler, and his granting Catholic emancipation—after having let hope arrive at the moment of realization, and the cup was raised to the parched and burning lips of long-suffering Ireland, Pitt dashed it to the ground with the insolence that formed the essence of his character. The moment was critical; I made a last effort to live with England.

"Setting aside all consideration of self, of family, of friends, I then threw myself soul and body on the side of my oppressed, insulted, enslaved countrymen, and on the 4th of May, 1795, in the House of Commons of Ireland, after hearing twenty-one speakers, I rose to answer them, when the benches were strewn with snoring members, who soon started up to hear the truths I told them. I warned them that the unexampled insult of the British minister rendered the night's vote decisive for good or for evil. My words were: 'If you shall have convinced the people of this country that you are traitors to them and hirelings to the minister of an avaricious, domineering nation, under the outward appearance of a sister country; that the free national constitution for which they were committed, and for which they risked everything dear to them in 1782, has been destroyed by the bribery of the British minister and the unexampled venality of an Irish parliament; if you shall have convinced them that, instead of rising or falling with England, they are never to rise but when she has been humbled by adversity, and that they must fall when she becomes elated by prosperity;

if you shall have convinced the people of this country that, instead of reciprocal advantages, nothing is to be reaped from the connection with England but supremacy and aggrandizement on one side, and a costly venality, injury, insult, degradation, and poverty, on the other, it is human nature that you shall have driven the people of this country to court the alliance of any nation able and willing to break the chains of a bondage not less galling to their feelings than restrictive of their prosperity'.

"At the same time, I told the men I was addressing, 'that if they rejected the emancipation of the Catholics, they would appear to the Irish Nation not only as men voting in obedience to the British minister against the voice of the people, but as men voting for an union with England, by which Ireland would be everlastingly reduced to the state of an abject province'.

"The rotten borough interest carried the question in favour of the British minister against the nation by a majority of seventy-one voices. This blow, dealt with such wanton insult, is the grand epoch in the connection of the two islands; it is the pivot on which the door turns which has shut out English domination from Ireland.

"By this act Pitt proved to the Irish Nation she should never expect from England other rule than the *horrid* policy of Queen Elizabeth.

"*Legislative union* was to be the panacea for all the evils; but in this England has helped herself to the lion's part; and the infamous means by which it was effected damned it in the minds of the Irish.*

"It was in 1795, after this blow of Pitt's the union of all Irishmen, which had been a theory, became an existing fact. In Ulster, from this time, the generous spirit of union was propagated with the most active energy by the Protestants, who formed a population which, with the Lowlands of Scotland, was the best informed in all Europe. Each parish had its library, and the excellent journal, the *Northern Star*, instructed them and regaled them in their evening's recreation. The Directory, composed of Tennent, the two brothers Simms, Neilson, &c., conducted the Union. I joined them in 1796.

"The organization and propagation of union in the other three provinces devolved on my beloved Edward Fitzgerald and me.† In those parts of Ireland the grossest ignorance and superstition pervaded the people, except in the towns, marking how unflinchingly the

* "*Monopoly*", vol. iii., p. 546.

† If I do not speak of Lord E. Fitzgerald, it is that he had entire confidence in me, and left me to the executive part. It will appear in my memoirs how noble a part this generous associate took in the

system of Elizabeth for weakening and barbarizing Ireland, had been followed.

"I lost not an instant to push the work I had undertaken to its perfection. The mountain barrier I had to remove was the infernal dogma of the Popish religion, which exacts from *all* its members the belief that every human being who is not a Papist is irrevocably and eternally damned.*

"The next greatest evil was the profound ignorance which pervaded the three Popish provinces. I published a state of Ireland in 1796, in which I set forth the causes of her wretchedness and debasement. At the moment I quitted the Irish parliament I had the plan of a law for education prepared. It is thus described in my *State of Ireland*: 'The establishment would have been ample to pay for schools in every parish in the nation, where the poor might be instructed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, paying the master for the number of scholars he *really* taught; also for baronial schools for teaching mathematics, geometry, and such practical sciences as are essential to national industry; county schools for those who had shown genius in the graduate schools; and provincial universities for the highest instruction'—page 19.

"I was resolved that the national expense for education should have the preference over every other, and that the glorious monument of the seventh century, when Armagh contained 7,000 students, at a time when all Europe was buried in barbarism, should be re-erected in Ireland. It was by teaching my countrymen the laws of nature, I would have brought them to the sublime ideas of the true God, with all His attributes, and of the true religion of Christ, which is the *republication* of these laws of God.

"The next cause I assigned for Ireland's misery was the impossibility she was placed in of making the sacred fund that should pay the wages of her productive labourers keep pace with her growing population. What creates in a great measure this impossibility, and entails such a misery on Ireland, is the immense portion of the produce of her labour, which is transported into England to pay

* Startled, as I have been over and over, when perusing the work of O'Connor from which these extracts are taken, at the recurrence in every page, of the foulest slanders, most violent abuse, and reckless outrages on the religion of the great mass of the people of Ireland, I have constantly felt myself impelled to refute or reprobate some odious imputation or monstrous calumny of the writer. But to have done so, I found, would be to append a note to almost every paragraph. The wickedness, however, of the attempt to falsify the faith of Roman Catholics, and to fasten his "infernal dogma" on their religion as one of its tenets, has induced me in this instance to notice and to reprobate the rabid malevolence of a fanatical infidel and a reckless calumniator.

the rents of her English absentee proprietors. Much pains have been taken to persuade the Irish that this drain is no loss; nay, I have heard it argued as an advantage; yet, when we come to the fact, it cannot be denied it has the same effect for Ireland as if all the produce she sends to England to pay the rents of English proprietors, who expend every shilling of it in their own country, and not one farthing of it in Ireland, was thrown into the sea; for she would have just as much return in the one case as in the other. Not a shilling of those rents can be converted to the augmenting the capital of Ireland; every shilling of it goes to the augmenting the capital of England.

"The last cause of misery to Ireland I would have destroyed, is the enormous load religious establishments lay on the shoulders of the people. I found that this was so generally felt at that time by men of all religions, that all were agreed to put aside all alliance between the priests and the state, and restore the people to the liberty Christ has brought them, by making God alone the object of their adoration; and instead of employing a seventh day in worshipping priests and saints, parishioners would flock round the professors who had taught them the laws of nature, to hear them explain that all Christ's religion consists in loving our neighbour as we love ourselves, and that showing this love to God and man, was doing to others as we would they should do by us; that by the practice of this divine law no one could be guilty of an offence to God or man.*

"The last point on which I have to render an account is the part I took in attempting a separation from England.

"From 1795, when Pitt had struck the mortal blow to English domination, and the Parliament of Ireland seconded him, I became convinced nothing remained for the real benefit of the two countries but separation. In this determination I prepared Ireland for carrying it into execution, by uniting all my countrymen into one mind and one resolution; and that it might be effected without bloodshed, I formed an alliance with the executive Directory of France, who deputed the noble-minded General Hoche to make the treaty with me".†

"It is not in my character to palliate any action of my life by shifting off the responsibility with subterfuges, sophistries, or evasions. I will begin by avowing my acts. If I had erred, I would confess them frankly; but if my conscience tells me I was right, I will support them with their reasons.

* "Monopoly", iii. p. 552.

† Ibid., p. 554.

"This conscience told me the policy of England from 1171 to the hour I resolved on separation, was as ruinous and debasing for my country as it was hurtful and destructive to the real interest of England. I should have spared Ireland half a century of unexampled wretchedness and demoralization, and England the heavy expense of restraining an anarchical, murderous spirit she has connived at, and of feeling the famished misery her system has produced. With a system of common sense, of common honesty, of enlightened policy, that lives and lets live, England might have drawn immense benefits from an island situated and fertile as Ireland; but since she has set foot on Ireland, she has governed it so ill and made her such a thorn in her own side, that, not knowing how to do with her or without her, she has never ceased to wish her sunk in the ocean, instead of treating her in every particular as if she was a Yorkshire or a Middlesex".*

"When this calumniator of his best benefactors, the United Irishmen (O'Connell), accuses me of being a man of blood, the confounding him and justifying myself lies in all Europe being the witness of my alibi.

"I was a prisoner in strict secrecy in the Tower before the rising began, nor did I regain my liberty until *years* after all was over; and it was known to all the Union that when it was notified to me in the prison at Maidstone, that if I was condemned all Ireland would rise to revenge my death, I sent the most positive commands to forbid it, knowing that such a step could have no other consequence than the shedding of civil blood uselessly. The fact is, Lord Moira came to the British House of Lords on the 26th of March, 1798, demanding to be suffered to produce authentic proofs that ministers had inflicted torture generally on the Irish people, by picketing them until they fainted several times, by cruel floggings and wide-spread burning houses: this was refused by the Lords. As this was two months before the breaking out of the insurrection, and as these tortures had been exercised during a year and a half before, it is evident the real authors of the insurrection were the ministers who ordered those atrocities. What I did, and what I am responsible for, is the attempt at separation by the joint force of the French expedition and the United Irishmen; and this, if even the troops who entered Bantry Bay had landed, by the declaration of the Chancellor, Lord Clare, in the House of Lords, would have effected separation without a possibility of resistance or a drop of blood being shed. I would never have to begin an attack at a time

*"Monopoly", iii. p. 556.

when all the chiefs were in prison, and that there was not a man capable to command a platoon to direct them.*

"I know there is scarcely a man in England who will not condemn me for seeking separation; but how many were there in all England sixty years ago who would not condemn the American who should have said, American separation would be a great advantage to the two nations? Yet now who does not know that free trade with twenty millions of an independent nation is more profitable than a trade of stunted monopoly with three millions that existed before the American Revolution?†

"I have not waited until now to vindicate my united countrymen. I did it forty-five years ago, but in a work which was published in France at a time when all intercourse with England was cut off. I now republish a few pages, that they may serve to show how basely and ungratefully O'Connell has calumniated his benefactors, but for whose generous sacrifices he could not have exercised the office of a hedge schoolmaster.

"I have not had recourse to the testimony of friends for our vindication: it is to our bitterest oppressors, the men who have immolated 30,000 Irishmen to support a government they themselves admit was *the extreme of oppression on one side and misery on the other*. I entreat the reader to observe what has been the justice of men which has condemned us to secret prisons, to prosecution for our lives, to the loss of country, parents, friends, to horrible tortures, to exile and to death, for having attempted to give their country a better government than that I am going to give the description of, after the words and confessions of the ministers who have insulted, oppressed, and made destructive war upon us. I will begin with the description Pitt himself gives of this English system he supported by such horrible means:‡— 'When', says he, 'the connection with Ireland was something more than a name, when that connection was ascertained, and the Imperial Parliament of this country exercised a supremacy over Ireland, it did happen that during that period the narrow policy of Great Britain, influenced with the views of trade and commercial advantages tainted and perverted with selfish motives, treated Ireland with partiality and neglect, and never looked upon her growth and prosperity as the growth and prosperity of the empire at large. I reprobated as much as the honourable gentleman [Sheridan] that narrow-minded policy, as mischievous and pregnant with the most fatal consequences to both kingdoms. But the

* "Monopoly", vol. iii., p. 584.

† Ibid., p. 585.

‡ Debret's Parliamentary Register, 3rd Ses. Parl., vol. vii., p. 614.

imperfection of the Irish constitution is admitted, and to that must be added the complicated grievances and defects of the state of the country at large, with respect to the want of a diffusion of property, to the extraordinary disparity of rank, and to the scanty means of social improvements, all producing, in a proportionate degree, *misery in one extreme and oppression in the other.*

"If any institution be inadequate to provide an effectual remedy for these evils, it is, *I do not hesitate to say*, the Irish legislature—not from any defect of intention, not from any want of talent, but from its own nature; and it is, and must be, incapable of restoring the internal happiness of the country, and fixing the prosperity of the people on a firm and permanent basis, as long as the present state of that kingdom, with respect to its relations with Great Britain, continues.

"That legislature, formed as it is, must continue radically defective. I have spoken an honest and a fair opinion'.

"Mr. Dundas said:* 'It is a melancholy truth that there does not exist in the great body of the people of Ireland, that confidence in the Parliament of Ireland which is essential to its utility. I need not go far to search for the reasons of this essential defect. It grew out of the frame and constitution of the Parliament of Ireland. . . . It is generally acknowledged that the poor of Ireland experience all the miseries concomitant to a state of want and wretchedness'.

"Lord Hawkesbury:†—'The course of events, which had, for some years past, taken place in Ireland, have firmly rivetted me in the opinion that there must be something radically wrong in the internal situation of Ireland'.

"Mr. Windham:‡—'I maintain that the disorders of Ireland grew chiefly out of the constitution of Ireland, established for near a century and a half; and it was impossible that a government agitated as that of the sister kingdom—a government distorted in every limb—could enjoy health, or long survive those diseases—some slow, some acute—which had made her sickly of aspect and feeble of heart. But the seeds of the evil were in the constitution itself'.

"Lord Granville:§—'Does there, or does there not, exist a necessity for a change in the system of the Irish government? I declare I never conversed with any well-informed man from Ireland, who did not say, that the present state of things, as they now exist in that country,

* Debret, vol. vii., p. 708, 724.

† Ib., p. 736.

‡ Ib., p. 673.

§ Ib., vol. viii., p. 262.

could not continue, consistent with the general safety of the empire'.

"Mr. Addington,* the Speaker:—'It is a melancholy, but, I fear, an incontrovertible truth, that the state of Ireland had, at no period of its history with which we are acquainted, been such as to afford satisfaction to any mind that could justly appreciate the happy conditions of civil society. The bounty of Providence had indeed been displayed in that country by a fertile soil and by abundant means of internal improvement and prosperity; its inhabitants had not been less distinguished than those of Great Britain in corresponding stations of life, for eloquence, for literary and scientific acquirements, and for those talents and exertions which have established the naval and military renown of the British Empire. Their form of government was the same as ours, but it wanted its true characteristic; it did not, like ours, bestow and receive general confidence and protection, for it was not, *like ours, connected by indissoluble ties with the obvious interests, the feelings, and the sentiments of the great body of the people*'.

"Lord Auckland:†—'Is it not true that, whilst Great Britain has gradually advanced in civilization of manners, and in every art, science, and improvement which can give happiness, honour, and security to nations and to individuals, Ireland, possessing the same climate, a fruitful soil, excellent ports, and a numerous people, to whom the Common Parent of all gave great acuteness and ingenuity, has, nevertheless, been at all times involved in comparative disorder, poverty, turbulence, and wretchedness? I might add, without exaggeration, that in the six hundred years since the reign of Henry II., there had been more unhappiness in Ireland than in any other civilized nation not actually under the visitation of pestilence or of internal war. Neither prosperity, nor tranquillity, nor safety, were to be expected, founded on the pretensions of a small part of the community to monopolize the representation, the patronage, and resources of the whole. The insufficiency of such a system has been felt and lamented for a century. . . . and it becomes more than ever unsatisfactory to the bulk of the Irish Nation, and utterly incompetent and unsafe with respect to the general interest of the British Empire'.

"To these statements", says A. O'Connor, "I replied in my publication on *The State of Ireland*: 'If these great authorities, no less than His Majesty's late and present ministers, can stand in need of confirmation when they paint the oppressive and vicious state of the Irish

* Debret, vol. viii., p. 48.

† Ib., pp. 331, 332.

constitution, it is to be found in the fact that in 1799, when the Irish legislature was annihilated, 200 seats of the 300 of which the representation was composed, were claimed by a few individuals as their private property, who received a million and a half for the price, which million and a half, to fill up the measure of insult, injury, and oppression, was levied on the people of Ireland, to pay for the usurpation of their representation, which merited such exemplary punishment.

“ ‘Is it in language to furnish words more expressive than those of these ministers of the radically vicious and oppressive state of the Irish constitution, which the people of Ireland has made so many peaceable attempts to reform since 1784? I ask these ministers, why did you resist those just claims of the Irish Nation, or why have you supported that constitution which you now describe in such odious colours, by means at which humanity shudders, when you now tell all Europe that this Irish constitution was incapable of affording happiness or prosperity to the people; that it was deformed and distorted in every limb, sickly of aspect, full of diseases, some slow, some acute, incapable of giving protection, and unworthy of receiving confidence; formed in opposition to the interests, the feelings, and the sentiments of the great body of the people; that with all possible advantages of climate, soil, ports, and genius of its people, it was involved in disorder, poverty, turbulence, and wretchedness, suffering more in the 600 years that British government existed in Ireland, than any other nation on earth; that neither prosperity, nor tranquillity, nor safety, could be expected from a government founded on the pretensions of a small part to monopolize the representation, patronage, and resources of the whole; that all the mischiefs grew out of the constitution itself, producing misery in one extreme and oppression in the other.

“ ‘I ask these ministers, why have you supported this *worst of governments*, against the wishes of the great body of the Irish people, at the expense of 30,000 lives by banishment, by fire, by torture, and by all the rigours of martial law? Convicted on these, your own confessions, made in 1799, after all these horrors had been committed, I call on you, in the name of all those thousands executed and massacred, for your defence.

“ ‘You are arraigned at the bar of the public opinion of every nation. Why, from 1784 to 1798, have you reared, strengthened, and supported this worst of constitutions, producing *oppression* on one side and *misery* on the other? All this blood, all these cruelties, all these agonizing sufferings, have you brought home to yourselves by your *confessions*—confessions so full that the mind of

man cannot conceive a defence which shall wash away the blood with which you are covered.

“ ‘ If every other trace of these dark and bloody scenes was lost, and that these ministerial *confessions* of the nature, the vices, and the evil of the constitution and government they wished to reform, is it a language to furnish a more unanswerable refutation of all those virulent invectives these ministers and their adherents have poured out against the people of Ireland, than these ministerial *confessions* ?

“ ‘ If the thousands who now traverse the different regions of the earth, exiled for having attempted to give their country a better government than one which produced the extremes of misery and oppression, were questioned by the different governments where they sought an asylum—if they were required to prove that they were not those turbulent, ungovernable men these ministers have represented them all over Europe and America—what document more satisfactory could they produce than those *confessions* of these ministers ? What document more exculpatory of them and their country, and more condemnatory of their oppressors ? Nay, if the names of the 30,000 heroic souls who have fallen in the field or on the scaffold, without one single example of fear or weakness, had bequeathed to me the guardianship of their honour, and the office of rescuing their fair fame from the detraction and calumnies of these ministers (and I may now say of O’Connell and his Jesuits), what inscription could I place on the column that in the effusion of my heart I would raise on their tombs, which could discharge the holy and sacred duty consigned to my care more gloriously for them or more ingloriously for their oppressors, than these *confessions* of his Britannic Majesty’s late and present ministers ?

“ ‘ Had this Irish Parliament, which annihilated the Irish legislature, been composed of 300 real representatives of the people of Ireland, it would have been an act of outrageous treason in deputies chosen for eight years, to pretend to transfer that sacred right to the legislature of another country ; but when a parliament, of which the vast majority is composed of self-convicted traitors, finishes its career by publicly selling for ever itself and its country for a million and a half, what part of the nation that has not been betrayed and outraged by this impudent treason ? What part of the nation so vile as to think itself bound by the act of such despicable, unauthorized instruments ?

“ ‘ What act more perfidious towards those deluded men, who supported this government, so justly described by His Majesty’s late and present ministers, or more abhorrent

to those who opposed it? What proof more convincing of the contemptible policy of the ministers who planned this transaction, than the hope that any part of the people of Ireland could be conciliated by a corrupt and scandalous juggle? If we know the tree by its fruit; if Europe should seek to be informed of the effects of this perfidious act of British ministerial fraternity, she will find it in insurrection, in martial law, and in executions, without one single instance of acquittal' ".—*O'Connor's State of Ireland*.†

* Has there passed an hour in Ireland since the forty-five years this has been written, that has not confirmed it?—O'C.

† In the work of A. O'Connor on Monopoly, there are some remarkable observations on British rule in India, which, the author says, were written so far back as nearly forty years ago.

"Let not England flatter herself", says O'Connor, "that, with Europe free and America to back her, she will be permitted to monopolize under her absolute domination such immense portions of the globe, exculding them from half the inheritance God and nature have given to all; such a pretension would be in England most preposterous. In advising her to disincumber her commerce of the monstrous expenses her foreign dominions cost her, I know I shall have scarcely an Englishman who will not think my proposition the height of extravagance. It is only in some years hence, when I shall be no more, the wisdom or the folly of it can be fully judged. I maintain that by retaining only some emporiums at Calcutta, at Madras, at Bombay, at Ceylon, England would make a more lucrative commerce, than by burdening herself with all the danger and expense of keeping one hundred and twenty millions in India in slavery and wretchedness; that by abandoning the Canadas and all her American dominions, retaining emporiums and reducing her commerce all over the world to a general competition, she would have to the full as profitable a trade as she has at present, without the enormous costs, and without the certainty of being forced to relinquish those dominions, and that after a war which may bring her own liberty to ruin".*

And perhaps it may be allowable for me to subjoin a few passages from a work of my own on the same subject, written twelve years ago.

Extract from the Introduction to the Third Series of the "Lives and Times of the United Irishmen", published in 1846, page 13.

"All experience tends to show that the day of reckoning for a people's wrongs, come it slow or come it fast, is sure eventually to arrive; and we have only to turn our eyes to the events that are passing in countries that once vied in prosperity and colonial greatness with our own, to see that, the measure of the iniquity of their governments having been filled up, the hand of Divine retribution has been laid heavily upon them.

* "Monopoly the Cause of all Evil", vol. iii., p. 537.

With all the consummate ability displayed in this masterly production of O'Connor, who can read the preceding violent, revolting, virulent, and unscrupulous invectives of General Arthur O'Connor against Christianity, against the religion of his countrymen, whose cause he vindicated in parliament in 1795, and in the *Press* in 1797 and 1798, against his former political associates of that Church, against his Protestant associates too, with few exceptions, and signally against the best, the most virtuous and single-minded of them all—Thomas Addis Emmet, without lamenting the fatuity of this ill-advised publication of O'Connor's in 1848? I reserve to a more fitting opportunity the vindication of the character of T. A. Emmet from A. O'Connor's malignant and unfounded statements, impugning his courage and his conduct in the directory. In the memoir of T. A. Emmet in the following third volume, I will publish a statement of T. A. Emmet, which never yet has been in print, and has remained in my hands eighteen years; in reference to a private quarrel of a very serious nature between him and Mr. O'Connor, which, I have no hesitation in saying, effects the object I have in view—namely, the vindication of Emmet's character from the wicked calumnies of a man of very strong resentments and unscrupulous conduct in acting on them.

In withholding from publication portions of written communications made to me by O'Connor in 1842, I have already stated the motives of consideration for the writer of them, by which I was actuated. My object, when the former edition of this work was published, was to defend Arthur O'Connor in his decrepitude from himself. My duty now is to defend his old associates against his

"Who can reflect on the calamities that have fallen on Spain and Portugal—on the loss of the immense possessions of those kingdoms, the succession of revolutions that has followed the ordinary course of government, as it were in the natural order of cause and effect, for the last five-and-twenty years—on religion trampled under foot, its temples pillaged, its ministers despised and spoiled—party after party succeeding each other—one military despotism treading on the heels of another, proscription and decimation the rule of each, the people plundered by all—without feeling that the heavy hand of Divine retribution has been laid on these lands?"

"England would do well to profit by the examples of Divine retribution which those countries afford, to pause in her career of rapacity in the East Indies, and of injustice elsewhere. The laws of humanity and justice are not outraged with impunity; the wrongs of nations are never suffered to pass unpunished, and the cry of the wronged people will be heard, whether of the poor, borne down by exaction or grasping tyranny in the ill-ruled land, or of the multitude, driven to madness by oppression. The due time of retribution, and the fitting instruments of it, are known only to Him to whom the vindication of those laws belongs."

egregious self-conceit, jealousy, and dominating headlong passion of animosity to all persons whom he considered competitors for distinction or notoriety in the same cause he was embarked in.

I have known in various countries men who had been eminent theoretical demagogues in early life, or while engaged in maturer age in opposition to unpopular or oppressive governments, who had become in advanced age, or in the enjoyment of power or opulence or pre-eminence in public or professional position, exceedingly arbitrary, tyrannical men, intolerant of all opinions not in accordance with their own; ungenerous and unjust in their dealings with the claims of former associates, and where they could not crush them, apt and eager to depreciate and to discredit their competitors or antagonists: but Arthur O'Connor's equal in these respects I never met.

In 1815 General O'Connor offered his services to Napoleon to defend the independence of France, his new country, against foreign invasion. On the return of the Bourbons, this patriotic offer was the occasion of a letter full of reproaches, addressed to him by the Duke de Feltre, Minister of War, and an Irishman like himself. He was placed on the retired list in 1816, and on the 11th April, 1818, he became a naturalized Frenchman. By his marriage with the daughter of Condorcet, he had three children, two of whom, young men of great promise, died without issue; the third died on the 26th May, 1851, leaving issue two sons very young.

O'Connor had no desire to return to Ireland to remain there permanently, but he frequently applied for permission to Tory Secretaries of State to obtain a brief sojourn to arrange his affairs in the County of Cork; and it was only under the government of Earl Grey that the required leave was granted, and Arthur O'Connor revisited the altered scene of his early toils and perils. But he had not been long there, when the old faction of Orangeism manifested its ancient malignant instincts. Representations were made respecting O'Connor's presence in Ireland, to the new minister, who had succeeded Earl Grey, of an alarming nature, of the peril occasioned by O'Connor's prolonged sojourn in Ireland; and the Duke of Wellington was weak enough to act on those representations, and to order General O'Connor to quit the country immediately.

The late Mons. Isambert, one of the judges of the Court of Cassation, informed me in a letter on the subject of O'Connor's short sojourn in Ireland in 1834, that when

permission was accorded him to visit that country, and to sojourn there for a term of two months, reference was made to the act 38 George III. chap. 78, which declares, persons who return from transportation, banishment, or exile, on account of the present rebellion, without permission, are subject to the punishment of death, and prohibits them from passing into any country at war with Great Britain.

Mons. Isambert remarked, he did not see how that law could be considered applicable to the case of O'Connor and the other state prisoners, and he wondered how an Irish Act, that had relation wholly to temporary circumstances, could be held to be in force ten years after the general peace.

He observed further (and unfortunately for the character of the magnanimity of our government, with too much truth), "Your government keeps up its political resentments longer than ours does".

General O'Connor died at the Chateau de Bignon, on the 25th of April, 1852, in his ninetieth year.

The body of the General, after being embalmed, was buried in the family vault in the Park of Bignon. Among the mourners was the late M. Isambert, the eminent legal functionary and judge of the Court of Cassation, one of the oldest and dearest friends of the deceased. Before the tomb was closed, M. Isambert pronounced a brief funeral oration, in which he warmly eulogized the virtues of the departed general, and enumerated some of his numerous acts of beneficence.

The discourse of Monsieur Isambert deserves a place in this biography.

Of the defects in the character of Arthur O'Connor, I have spoken freely. If I have not sought to extenuate them, I am quite sure I have not set down aught in malice. Those who knew him well and were most closely associated with him, entertained the same opinions I have expressed in regard to those defects. If they have erred, I have been led into error by them. But there can be no mistake on their part or on mine as to the opinion that must be formed by all who are conversant with the history of the leaders of the Society of United Irishmen—namely, that among them no man was more sincere in his patriotism, more capable of making great sacrifices for his country, or who brought greater abilities to its cause, than Arthur O'Connor.

Memoir of WILLIAM JAMES MACNEVEN.

CHAPTER I.

Early History of Dr. Macneven—Biographical notice by his Daughter—His connexion with Roman Catholic Committee.

With few exceptions, the materials collected for the memoirs of the leaders of the United Irishmen would in all probability have perished, had they not fallen into the hands of women, who clung to the memories of their departed friends with feelings of attachment commensurate with the calamities which had overtaken the objects of their affection or regard. It would seem that in man's adversity, when his fellow-men fall away from his sinking fortunes, or detach their thoughts from his maltreated memory, there is a steadfastness in the nature of woman's love, a fidelity in her friendship, which gives to the misfortunes of her kindred a new claim to her solicitude for everything that concerns their interests or their fame. In the present instance of that faithfulness of affection, the memory of William James Macneven is indebted to his daughter for the ample justice that has been done to it.

The memoir which is now presented to the public was drawn up by Miss Macneven—not with a view to its appearance in this form, but in compliance with the wishes of the author to be furnished with such materials as might enable him to give an account of her father's life. The request was complied with; but the sketch however that was forwarded was so admirably drawn in style and feeling—so indicative of an understanding highly cultivated, of rectitude of mind and literary ability, that it appeared to him better calculated to give a just idea of her father's character than its details could be in any other form. In giving this narrative as it was presented to him, he would beg to make a few observations in reference to the use made of similar documents in the previous series of this work, as well as in the present one.

His great object has been to give information, the authenticity of which could not be called in question. With this view it was necessary, at no small expense of labour, to obtain from the surviving friends and relatives of the persons whose biography he had undertaken, all the information of a documentary kind that could be procured. Such information was sought in several quarters, and obtained in various forms. In matters which former contradictory accounts had left in doubt or dispute, it

seemed to be desirable—instead of entering into lengthened discussions, extracting passages from the several documents obtained in order to refute or corroborate particular passages in other works, and thereby to be exposed to the charge of garbling important documents—to give insertion to them in their original form, and without breaking up the matter, except where an obvious necessity existed for so doing. The consequence has been an apparent negligence in arrangement, which it would have been very easy to have avoided. But if there be any value in the information given in these documents, the advantage that might be found in carefully keeping one subject from trenching in the least degree on the limits of another, might be gained at the expense of that character for authenticity which these documents possess, and which constitute the chief, if not the sole value of the work. If the author exaggerate the importance of them, the failing is not uncommon to overrate the value of things which it has cost a great deal of trouble to acquire.

We now proceed with Miss Macneven's narrative :

" During the long illness of my dear father I frequently conversed with him on the subject of his early life and family, and committed to writing a short sketch of what he related to me.

" His ancestors were respectable country gentlemen, residing on their own estate, which was transmitted in a direct line from father to son. They owned originally large possessions in the North of Ireland, but were robbed of them in the time of Cromwell, and with many of their countrymen were allotted land in the wilds of Connaught. This property remained in my father's family until his emigration to America, when it was sold. His father's elder brother, William O'Kelly Macneven, left Ireland early in life, and established himself as a physician in Germany by the advice of his maternal uncle, William O'Kelly, who held an honourable station at the court of Vienna*. Here

* The genealogy of the Macnevens is set forth by one of the most eminent of Irish antiquarians, Dr. O'Donovan, in the following note to a passage in "The Tribes of Hy-Many:" "**Mac Cnaimhin**, now Anglicised Mac Nevin, and among the peasantry shortened to Neavin and Nevin. This family were originally settled at Crannog Meg Cnaimhin, now Crannagh-Mac Nevin, in the South-East extremity of the Parish of Tynagh, Barony of Leitrim, and County of Galway, and the name is still numerous in that and the adjoining Barony of Loughrea. The first notice of this family to be found in Irish history occurs in the Annals of the Four Masters at the year 1159, where it is recorded that Athius, the son of Mac Cnaimhin (Mac Nevin), was slain at Ardee, in the now County of Louth, in a battle fought between Muirchertach Mac Loughlin, senior of the Northern Hy-Niall, the legitimate heir to the throne of Ireland, and Roderic O'Connor, King of Connaught. The head of the name in the reign of Queen Elizabeth

he soon rose to eminence, and was appointed one of the physicians of the Empress Maria Theresa, with the title of Baron. He married a lady of rank and fortune, and settled permanently in Prague. His father, James Macneven, resided on the paternal property with an only sister, Mary Brennan, a widow lady, his younger brother Simon, and his four sons. It had been his misfortune to lose his wife a few years after his marriage. On his excellent sister devolved the charge of his children—a duty which she performed with a mother's care and tenderness. The name of his mother was Rosa Dolphin; she was of a good old Catholic family, and died when my father was but a few years of age.

"My father, William James Macneven, was born at Ballynahowne, County of Galway, on the 21st of March, 1763. He was the eldest of four sons; of his brothers, the youngest, Hugh, was the only one who lived to reach manhood; the other two, Joseph and Antony, died in infancy. At the age of ten or twelve years, my father was sent by his uncle, Baron Macneven, to receive his education in Germany, a custom very general in Catholic families, and rendered necessary at that time by the operation of the penal laws. Baron Macneven had also early become a widower, and his family consisted of himself, three daughters, and an only son. He lived in good style, occupying a handsome residence in Prague during the winter months, and passing his summers at an old castle on the river Sazva or Seva, about sixty miles distance from the city. This castle had in olden times belonged to the Knights Templars, and was one of their strongholds. It came into our uncle's possession through his wife, who being an only child had inherited it from her father. In his uncle's family my father spent eight or ten years very happily and profitably. He received an excellent classical education in the college at Prague—subsequently he passed through the medical college there, and finished his professional studies at Vienna, where he graduated at the age of twenty, 1783. He uncle was a man of learning and science, and my father had the advantage of associating from childhood with the polished and learned men who formed this circle. The last years of my father's residence

was Hugh Mac Knavin: he was hanged on the 4th of June, 1602, as appears from an inquisition taken at Galway, on the 10th of October, 1605: 'Quod Hugo Mac Knavin, alias dictus Mac Kellie, intravit in actionem Rebellionis et captus et suspensus fuit, 4 Junii, 1602; et fuit seisitus in Ballilie, Cranach MacNnavin,' &c. In a grant to the Earl of Clanricarde, dated 19th July, 1610, mention is made, among various other lands granted to him, of part of the lands of Cranach Mac Knavin, parcel of the estate of Hugh Mac Knavin, otherwise O'Kelly [an error for Mac Kelly], of Cranagh Mac Knavin, executed in rebellion."—R. R. M.

in Germany were rendered still pleasanter by the arrival of his brother Hugh, who was also sent for by their kind uncle, and enjoyed similar advantages with himself. When their studies were fully completed they returned to their native country, and my father commenced the practice of his profession in Dublin, about 1784. His family were of the Roman Catholic persuasion. His father was a man of the most admirable disposition and benevolent feelings, just and honourable in all his actions, warmly attached to his children and friends, and humane to his dependents. At this period he was leading a tranquil life in the midst of his friends and neighbours. His son Hugh and his brother Simon resided with him, and his sister Mary superintended his family. My father always spoke with warm affection and gratitude of this excellent woman. She was a pious member of the Roman Catholic Church, received in all simplicity and faith its doctrines, and taught them with fervour to her nephews. A few years since, a family relic was transmitted to my father from Ireland by some person into whose hands it had fallen after her death. It was a piece of the true cross enclosed in a small silver case, which he well remembered seeing his aunt wear round her neck. It had been more than a hundred years in the family when my father was a child, having been brought from Rome to Ireland by a great uncle, who was an ecclesiastic. His aunt kept it reverently as a sacred and holy relic, and only opened it on solemn occasions. The last time my father saw it in his own country was on the occasion of his leaving home for Germany, when she opened and showed it to him to add to the strength of her parting benediction. Fifty years from that time it came into his possession in the way I have mentioned; and so strong was the force of the early associations connected with it upon my father, that as we passed it from one to the other, gazing on it merely as an object of curiosity, he expressed himself pained at seeing what had been held in such high veneration by his good aunt, and by himself in his childhood, handled thus irreverently.

“ My father was now established in the practice of his profession in Dublin. With youth, health, superior abilities, and education in his favour, and good family connexions, he had a fair and prosperous career opened before him, and he was soon enabled by his practice to live genteelly and independently, and to keep with ease his station in society. Had Ireland been in a happier condition, or could selfish motives have deadened his love of his unfortunate country, I cannot doubt but that my father would have become greatly eminent in the paths of science and literature—but a more stormy career was before him.

"The Catholic Committee, originally organized by Messrs. Wyse, O'Connor, and Dr. Curry, still held its meetings in Dublin, and numbered among its members almost all the influential Catholics, both of the nobles and commons. My father was a constant attendant at these meetings, and became greatly interested in their debates. At one of them a division arose between the members on the subject of a remonstrance to be offered to the government, which the merchants and citizens, who might be called the democratic party, opposed, as too submissive and slavish in its tone; and the other party, including mostly the men of rank and fortune, upheld as discreet and loyal.* My father addressed the meeting on this occasion, strongly opposing the aristocratic party, and the measure was carried against them. The committee being thus divided, the loyal or aristocratic Catholics presented their address to the government, signed by only sixty-eight names, and an account was given in the public prints of the successful opposition it had met with. This difference of opinion in the committee, respecting the extent of their rights, caused much debate among the great body of the Catholics throughout the kingdom. The citizens of the town of Navan published an address to my father, warmly approving of the course he had taken; and in his answer to them he animadverted with some severity on the timid and temporizing policy of the opposition. This was the commencement of my father's public career. The following year, 1792, a general convention of the Catholics was called to ascertain definitively their true sentiments on this subject. Representatives were chosen from the different

* The meeting referred to took place in the latter part of December, 1791. The secession of Lord Kenmare's party, and the presentation of an address to Lord Westmoreland, couched in terms of hyperbolical attachment to the laws which ground the people to the dust, were the results of it. The penal laws had so far degraded the Catholic people that for nearly a quarter of a century, previous to 1791, they submitted to the leadership of men destitute of talents, courage, dignity, or spirit, such as Lords Kenmare and Trimbleston. The former was born for slavery. He had not the spirit either of the Gael or the Saxon in his composition. Nature intended him for a Cappadocian. He was not only enamoured of servitude, but he would have it believed that all his race were content to remain in bondage. Messrs. Wyse, Curry, and O'Connor neutralized, as far as they were able, the influence of those oligarchs. It was reserved for the United Irishmen to give power and popularity to the Catholic cause, which enabled such men as Keogh and Byrne to shake off the incubus of the Catholic aristocracy. The secession of Kenmare and "the Sixty-eight Addressers" from the Catholic Committee took place when Tone's energies began to give an impulse to that body, when Keogh's abilities began to come in collision with the pretensions of Kenmare, and the language of the plain, truth-telling Macneven became offensive to the lord whose ideas of his own consequence and sagacity were diametrically opposed to those which were entertained by others of his worth or influence.—R. R. M.

towns and cities, and my father was elected by the Catholics of Galway and those of Navan. Personal considerations induced him to accede to the call of Navan.† Dr. Sheridan, one of his most intimate friends, was residing there, and its citizens had previously distinguished him by their approbation. During the meetings of this convention my father made several able speeches, published in the newspapers of the day, and originated and effected the measure which obtained for the forty-shilling freeholders the privilege of elective franchise. I am uncertain at what period my father became acquainted with Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Arthur O'Connor; but they sought an interview with him, and at their first interview explained their designs, and requested his co-operation. He cordially entered into their views, and became a member of the secret society of United Irishmen.* Mr. Emmet also joined the secret society about the same period, and my father then commenced the intimacy with that excellent man which death alone interrupted. My father now devoted all his energies to the accomplishment of the one great object of his most ardent wishes, the liberation of Ireland, and he became one of the prominent leaders of its cause. In the meantime, he continued the practice of his profession, and mingled in society as usual. He has often spoken of Mrs. Lefanu, the sister of the great Sheridan, as one of the loveliest and most accomplished women of the day. At her house he was on the intimate footing of a valued friend, and enjoyed exceedingly the re-union of the polished and the learned, who delighted to gather round her. Mrs. Moore and Colonel Moore were also my father's intimate friends. The Colonel commanded one of the six Catholic regiments raised by the British government at the suggestion of Lord Clare, partly to give employment to the officers of the French army, who had emigrated on account of the revolution in France, and perhaps also with a view to increase the patronage of the government. My father was a frequent guest at his house, where he constantly met General Lerrin and the Duke FitzJames, also in

† The author feels some pride in stating that his father was one of the delegates who sat in that convention for the town of Enniskillen.—R. R. M.

* The oath was administered to him by the daughter of James Moore, of Thomas Street, the friend of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, a young lady then celebrated no less for her beauty than her devotion to the interests of the union. That lady, the late Mrs. Macready, informed the author that several of her sex, to her own knowledge, were sworn members of the society. The oath had been administered to her by John Cormick, of Thomas Street. There can be now no impropriety in stating, that the attachment which subsisted between Macneven and Miss Moore was not solely a political one, and that there was a very ardent desire on the part of the former to make the fair Roland of her day an Irishwoman legally united to him.—R. R. M.

command of regiments; and through this acquaintance with them, he obtained for his brother Hugh the post of surgeon in the regiment under the command of the Duke FitzJames, which he held until his death, in 1797. I do not know that my uncle Hugh was ever an United Irishman; he was several years younger than my father, who was tenderly attached to him, and I think shrunk from involving him in the dangers he braved himself. My father often spoke of him with warm affection, and described him as a young man of most amiable character and superior talents. He was always delicate in health, and died of a rapid decline in the summer of 1797, while my father was absent on his mission in France. It is not necessary that I should recapitulate the public career of my father from this period, until his connexion with his beloved and unfortunate country was dissolved by his imprisonment and exile. There are some incidents, however, in it which throw a good deal of light on his character.

"When the emissary arrived in Dublin from Generals Hoche and Tone, with verbal instructions to Oliver Bond and McCormick, these gentlemen were much perplexed as to the propriety of receiving the communication, and called at my father's lodgings to advise with him on the subject. He asked if they were satisfied with the messenger's credentials. They replied that they could not doubt but that he had seen and spoken with Tone; still the communications to be received and made were of too grave a nature not to induce them to hesitate in committing themselves. My father strongly urged the necessity of his reception, and volunteered to meet the agent himself. An appointment was made for meeting him that night with all possible secrecy and care. Accordingly, as had previously been agreed on, my father repaired to the Post Office, walking in front of it near the hour of eleven, and at the striking of the hour the agent emerged from under the shadow of the building and joined him. The appointed signals were given, and they walked away together. My father received from him the important intelligence he had to communicate, and gave in return all the requisite information. I think, if I remember rightly, that my father said he accompanied him to the quay, and saw him safely off before the hour of midnight. This gentleman was Colonel McSheehy, then aide-de-camp to General Tone, afterwards killed at the battle of Eylau.

"I have often heard my father speak with great interest of the many evenings passed during this period at Lord Edward Fitzgerald's residence, near Dublin, in the society of that true nobleman and his accomplished wife and sister, I think the Lady Emily Fitzgerald. He particularly mentioned one evening, when they had

obtained certain intelligence that assistance would arrive from France. Mr. Emmet and himself hastened immediately with the news to Lord Edward—I believe also that Arthur O'Connor was one of the party—and full of the most cheering hopes they conversed on the brightening prospects of their country, the two ladies entering with ardent enthusiasm into all their feelings, and sharing in their brilliant anticipations. Of my father's arrest on the 12th of March, 1798, his imprisonment in Kilmainham, and subsequent removal to Fort George, it is unnecessary to give any further details.

“His long imprisonment was rendered less irksome to him by the vigour and activity of his mind. Books were his greatest resource; it was his custom to commit to writing notes on the various works he read, and I have found among his manuscripts many such indicative of his studies at this period. Among other things he devoted much of his attention to the writings of Ossian, &c., many of which he translated from the original Gaelic, a language he was perfectly familiar with. He made notes also of conversations he held with the Scotch soldiers and attendants about the Fort, relative to the traditions of the origin of that ancient people, and confirmatory of the idea that Scotland was originally colonized by the Irish. I have found also among my father's papers, and in his handwriting, one or two commencements of an autobiography which we often entreated him to write, and I furnish you with copies of them, and with a copy of a paper, also in his handwriting, relating to Mr. Emmet. After the arrival of Mrs. Emmet and her children at Fort George, it became one of the recreations of the state prisoners to instruct the latter in the various branches of education; my father taught them French, and compiled for their use a French grammar—Mr. Hudson gave lessons in music—a third in dancing, and so on through the usual course of instruction. During the whole time of his confinement, I believe my father's health was good, and even robust. He has often spoken of one period when he bathed in the ocean almost every day in the year, even in the depth of winter.

“After the liberation of the state prisoners from Fort George, my father passed the summer and autumn of 1802 in travelling through Switzerland on foot, and wrote an account of his journey, called ‘A Ramble through Switzerland.’ He also visited his relations in Germany in the course of that year, and he always maintained an affectionate correspondence with them.

“In 1803 he went to Paris, and either in that year or the following entered the French army as a captain in the Irish Brigade. From my recollection of my father's conversation on this subject, and from the tenor of his

correspondence at this period, I have reason to think that he still contemplated an attack upon Ireland by the French, and in entering the service of France was only devoting himself, in another way, to that cause he had espoused elsewhere. Deceived and disappointed in these hopes, he at length resigned his commission, and in June, 1805, set sail from Bordeaux for New York, where he arrived on the 4th of July.* My father has often described his mingled sensations on first landing in this, his adopted country. He landed on the Battery at the hour of three in the afternoon, and found himself in the midst of an immense assemblage of military and citizens, commemorating their independence and liberation from the very power that desolated his native land, and exiled himself and so many of his countrymen from their homes. His heart warmed to his new brethren; but he was yet unknown, and as he walked through the crowd up Broadway to the city hotel, he felt keenly that bitter sense of loneliness which none but the stranger in a strange land can realize. It was, I think, beautifully appropriate that one who had suffered so much in the cause of liberty should have reached the shores of America on the anniversary of her day of freedom; and, by an equally pleasing coincidence, Mr. Sampson landed on the 4th of July, the year following.

"My father lost no time in presenting his letters, and declaring his intention of becoming a citizen. He fixed upon New York as his permanent residence, and immediately entered on the practice of his profession, in which he was so successful as speedily to assure himself an easy competence. He met with a kind welcome from his new associates, and very soon numbered among his friends all who were most eminent for talents or virtues. The society of Mr. Emmet and his family, and of Mr. Sampson, were among his greatest pleasures; the bond between them was of no ordinary friendship—it was more like the tender attachment of brothers, and they reposed in each other the most implicit confidence, which through

* One of the causes which induced Macneven to leave France was the concern he felt at the fatal issue of a duel, in which he acted as second. The principals were Mr. John Sweeney, a native of Cork, one of the Fort George prisoners, and Mr. Corbet, a brother of the late General Corbet, of the same city. A more desperate rencontre has seldom taken place. The statement of the particulars drawn up by one of the seconds, and signed by both, gives a frightful account of this affair. Macneven acted as second to Sweeney; Ware—now Colonel Ware—the second of Corbet. Either nine or ten shots were exchanged. Corbet, after he had been wounded, still persisted in keeping his ground, while Macneven in vain endeavoured repeatedly to put an end to the contest, which unfortunately terminated at length in the death of Corbet.—R. R. M.

the course of their long lives was not interrupted for a single day.

"On the 15th June, 1810, my father was married to Mrs. Jane Margaret Tom, widow of Mr. John Tom, merchant, of New York, and daughter of Mr. Samuel Riker of New Town, Long Island. From an early period of his arrival in this country, both he and Mr. Sampson were intimately acquainted with Mr. Richard Riker, my mother's brother, an eminent lawyer, and for many years known favourably as district attorney and recorder of New York. This intimacy ripened into the truest friendship—so enduring, that it was the request of Mr. Sampson, before his death, that his remains should be interred in the family burying-ground of the Rikers, among the friends he most valued.

"My grandfather, Mr. Riker, a descendant of the early Dutch settlers, resided on his farm, on the shore of a beautiful bay about eight miles from the city. He had served his country through her revolutionary struggle, and afterwards as a representative in Congress, and had a mind and heart to appreciate and understand men like my father and Mr. Sampson, whose society he greatly enjoyed. Mr. Sampson, to the great qualities of his mind added a refinement—I may say, a poetry of feeling, which enabled him keenly to relish the real beauties of nature, and to tinge even the common-place realities of life with a bright and pleasing colouring. He had always great delight in boating, and during his years of health and vigour was never without a boat, large enough to hold himself, his friends, and their families; and it was one of his greatest pleasures to collect them together, and make excursions up the river to visit the Rikers, his friends at Bowery Bay. The sail from New York up the East River is one of much variety and beauty, with just sufficient peril in passing through the narrow passage called Hell-gate, to give it a romantic interest; but Mr. Sampson was a master of boat-craft, and used safely to conduct his little vessel through all dangers, until it entered the smooth waters of the bay, when he would give notice of his approach by playing an air on his flute, always his companion, and he was greeted by a hearty welcome before his boat could reach the shore. Sometimes the sound of his flute might be heard at the quiet farmhouse, of a fine moonlight night, as late as eleven or twelve o'clock. The doors were immediately thrown open to receive the party, and after passing an hour or two in cheerful conversation, he and his friends would take the turn of the tide and sail gaily back to the city. I have often, in thinking of these scenes, contrasted the peaceful serenity and pure pleasures of the exiled lives of my father and his friends with the stormy and painful

ordeal they had encountered in their native land. At the period of Mr. Emmet's death I was too young to have personal recollections of him; but of Mr. Sampson I have the most vivid and affectionate remembrance. His family and ours have ever been united in the warmest friendship, and when I look back the pleasantest of our past recollections are connected with him. He possessed, more than any one I ever knew, the power of creating enjoyment; it was impossible that any company could be dull of which he was a part. His brilliant wit and pleasant fancy enlivened and adorned the conversation, whether grave or gay. I wish it was in my power to describe, as I remember it, the delightful social intercourse between our families. While speaking of those whose friendship my father most highly prized, I cannot omit naming the widow of Theobald Wolfe Tone, and his son, the late Captain Tone. They were amongst his dearest friends; and I feel it is the privilege of my birthright to know, and love, and reverence that noble woman.

"In 1823 my sister was married to Thomas Addis Emmet, the son of my father's dear friend, and they and their children have been among the chief sources of happiness to his declining years.

"For the medical appointments conferred on my father I refer you to the biographical notice in *The New York Medical Gazette*, of which I transmit a copy. In 1823 he was elected a member of the American Philosophical Society; he was also a member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of New York, and there are many now living who must remember with pleasure the meetings of that society at his house in Park-place. All those most eminent in science, arts, and literature, with any distinguished strangers who might be visiting the city, were convened on these occasions and formed indeed a brilliant circle. My father took an active and prominent part in the politics of his adopted country, until within the few last years of his life, and always supported her laws and constitution with consistency and firmness. The importance attached to his opinion was evinced in 1834, on the occasion of a popular election. He differed from the party he had hitherto supported on a subject of great national interest, and his sentiments being publicly called for, he gave them in a letter to the querists with the independence and decision that formed such prominent traits in his character. His letter was immediately reprinted throughout the Union, and produced such an effect that a storm of party rage was raised against him, his opponents quite forgetting in their violence that they were denying him the simple right of holding and expressing his own opinion. My father bore all their

attacks with dignity and equanimity—and some were hard to bear, for among lesser things it was endeavoured to alienate from him the affections of his countrymen, by disseminating the basest falsehoods, such as not even party heat could justify; they of course fell harmless, for their mark was far above them. I enclose two papers of that period, one containing my father's letter, and the other a report of adopted citizens, in which is a letter of Mr. Sampson, descriptive of many points of my father's character. Towards his native land my father's devoted attachment remained ever the same; neither time nor distance, the cares of life nor the approach of death, could diminish or weaken it. He was ever active in her service, and seized every occasion which offered to promote the great object of her happiness. In proof of this are the many addresses from his pen, advocating with untiring patriotism her rights, and arousing in her cause the sympathies of his fellow-citizens. I may refer in particular to his address to the people of Ireland, published in February, 1825, which awakened considerable attention, both in this country and in his own. In August, 1828, my father, in connexion with Mr. Thomas O'Connor, one of his oldest and most valued friends, Mr. Sampson, and many other patriotic gentlemen, formed an association called 'The Friends of Ireland.' The exciting cause of this association was the sympathy awakened in behalf of Harry Mills, the independent and honest forty-shilling freeholder. My father was elected president, and continued to preside at its meetings until May, 1829, when Catholic Emancipation was granted. During the period of the existence of this society a large amount of Catholic rent was transmitted to Ireland, and similar associations were formed throughout the United States, and even in Mexico.

"My father wrote an account of its proceedings, read before the Literary Association of the Friends of Ireland, published in *The New York Truth Teller* of July, 1830. He also took a warm interest in promoting, by every means, the welfare of emigrants to this country, and he was president of the Emigrant Society up to the period of his death.

"In December, 1832, he met with a severe blow to his happiness in the death of his eldest son, James Joseph Macneven. My brother had finished his collegiate studies, and had commenced the study of the law, and his fine talents and amiable disposition had awakened bright hopes for the future. But a sudden and severe illness tore him from us at the early age of nineteen. It was a deep and abiding sorrow to my father, and to the last of his life he could not name him without tears.

"My father was first attacked with severe illness in the month of March, 1838, previously to which he had enjoyed almost uninterrupted health. For some days he was dangerously ill, but the attack at length terminated in a severe fit of the gout. His health was so much impaired by this illness as to render the practice of his profession both irksome and injurious to him, and he determined on retiring to the country. Accordingly, in April, 1839, he broke up his establishment in Broadway, and removed with his family to the residence of his son-in-law, Thomas Addis Emmet, about four miles from the city.

"In the preceding February he had again experienced the bitterest sorrow in the death of a beloved daughter, and retirement was congenial to his feelings.* In the spring of 1840 he was appointed resident physician, an office which he resigned a few weeks previous to his death.

"From the period of my father's first illness, in 1838, he was subject to frequent severe and painful attacks, which he bore with the patience of a Christian and the fortitude of a philosopher. In the treasures of his own mind he found a great resource. Books were to him never-failing friends, and the wide range of his reading comprehended the greatest variety. While in the bustle and business of his profession he was unable to give any great portion of his time to general literature; but after his retirement, he read everything. He enjoyed, with a wonderful youthfulness of feeling and fancy, the writings of Sir Walter Scott and Miss Edgeworth; he read Sparks' Life of Washington, voluminous as it is, with great interest—the writings of Jefferson, various works on geology, and all the scientific and literary reviews of the day. The study of theology engaged much of his attention, and he compared the tenets of the different sects more with a view to find points of resemblance than to discover dissimilar opinions. With all this he continued to take a deep interest in the affairs of his beloved country, and read with avidity all that related to her destinies. On the 25th of November, 1840, as my father was returning from the city, a heavy loaded waggon came in contact with his gig; he was thrown from it, and received a severe wound in his leg, which, together with the shock of the fall, occasioned him a long and painful illness: from this he partially recovered, but was again taken very ill, and was never afterwards able to leave his room. Throughout his illness, he was remarkable for the serenity and cheerfulness of his temper. The vigour of his mind and the warm

* This young lady was seen by the author a very few months before her death, apparently in the bloom of health, and certainly in the possession of beauty and accomplishments of no ordinary kind.
R. R. M.

affection of his heart seemed to triumph over his bodily sufferings, and enabled him to receive pleasure from many sources. The society of his family and a few intimate friends was his greatest happiness, and his enjoyment of reading continued almost to the last. He was never deceived with respect to the event of his illness, but conversed often on the subject with perfect calmness, and even cheerfulness. In the month of June his strength failed so rapidly that we were obliged to give up the hopes we had clung to—that he might yet be spared to us; and on the 12th of July, 1841, my dear father breathed his last.

“He was throughout his life a consistent and enlightened Roman Catholic, and his examination of other creeds tended only to confirm him in that persuasion. Twice during the winter of 1841 he received the communion from his friend, the Very Rev. John Power; and on the morning of his death the last rites of his Church were administered to him by the Right Rev. Bishop Hughes.

“I am unable to portray to you, as they are written on our hearts, the great and admirable qualities possessed by my beloved father. His public career is before you; but I fear you can form but an imperfect idea, from this feeble sketch, of his private worth. As a husband and father he was most affectionate, and tender and indulgent to the greatest degree. He was a firm and faithful friend, and always willing to aid the unfortunate to the utmost of his power. I cannot forbear mentioning the generosity of his nature, which made him ever ready to acknowledge the talents of others and to rejoice in their success. His patriotism was pure and unselfish, and I well remember that on one occasion, when O’Connell’s popularity here met with some abatement—*when his obnoxious address reached us, in which he denounced the men of ’98 as miscreants**—my father was the only one of our circle who seemed unmoved. He smiled at the warmth of our expressions, and continued to watch with the greatest interest the movements of O’Connell in furtherance of the good of Ireland. The man was nothing to him; the end proposed was what my father had at heart, and he always awarded to Mr. O’Connell the meed of praise he merited.

“My father, besides being a good classical scholar, was a proficient in several modern languages. He spoke German and French with the same facility as English, and

* In this place the passage printed in italics was omitted by me in the first edition of this work, which I considered as not essential to the main object of the memoir, and was rather severe, as I thought, on the lapses of the tongue of a great man who talked a great deal in public unpremeditatedly, and therefore very often at random, and injuriously of persons not in actual contact with him.—R. R. M.

was well versed in the literature of those countries. He was also a good Italian scholar. He understood Irish, his native tongue, perfectly well, and conversed in it fluently. I have heard him say it was the first he ever spoke.

"On a careful examination of his manuscripts, I find they principally consist of notes and memorandums connected with the history of Ireland, a work on which subject, at one period, he contemplated writing. Some are in his own handwriting; others seem materials transmitted from other sources. His writings were chiefly on medical, scientific, or political subjects, and were generally in the form of lectures, addresses, and essays. His laborious profession, the duties of the professorships he held at different times, and the constant necessity of devoting himself to the daily business of life, left him little time to bestow on literary labour. Of his political writings, a pamphlet, called 'An Argument for Independence in Opposition to a Union,' is well deserving of attention. His early speeches are given in the accounts of the meetings of the Catholic delegates, held in Dublin in December, 1792, and various other meetings of that body from that period till 1794. His principal publications are the 'Ramble through Switzerland,' published in Dublin in 1803; 'Pieces of Irish History;' an edition of 'Brande's Chemistry;' and an 'Exposition of the Atomic Theory.' My father had also made military matters a subject of thought and study, and I have on my desk a pamphlet by him on 'The Nature and Functions of an Army Staff,' printed in New York in 1812.

"The burial-ground of the Riker family is on the shore of Bowery Bay, Long Island, within a short distance of the old family mansion; and there the mortal remains of my dear father rest, beside his children; and near to it a plain monument of white marble marks the grave of his friend, Mr. Sampson. This monument was raised to his memory by the wife and daughters of Mr. Sampson; and we contemplate erecting a similar one to my father. There are but three of my father's children surviving: my two brothers—the eldest now practising medicine in New York --and myself. My sister Mrs. Emmet, is my mother's daughter by her former marriage. My father was never rich; but he has left us an honourable competence, and a dowry, far beyond the greatest wealth, in his name and character.

"JANE MARYANNE MACNEVEN."

From William Hugh Macneven, son of Dr. W. James Macneven, to R. R. M.

" 28th November, 1843.

" My Dear Sir—The work on the United Irishmen has been read and re-read both at home and among our circle of friends with very great eagerness; but, apart from the general interest of a work in which every one could so well participate, I feel it my duty to thank you, in an especial manner, for the pains you have bestowed upon the portion devoted to the biography of my father. In assuring you of the entire satisfaction it has afforded to the family, allow me to express to you also the many and sincere obligations we feel for the kindness and friendship you have always displayed.

" As to the manuscript furnished you by my sister, although intended by her mainly to afford material for your more able pen, you were nevertheless at perfect liberty to dispose of it as you deemed best; for herself, she begs most sincerely to thank you for the very flattering approval you have given it. In the printing of her sketch there is, however, one error I would call your attention to, which it would be well to rectify in case you issue a future edition, and that is in the spelling of my mother's maiden name—it is *Riker*, not *Ricker*, as it has been published. No other error, I believe, has been made; but if there is one thing which I might be permitted to take exception to, it is to a slight alteration you have made in the text, qualifying some expressions of my sister which incidentally alluded to O'Connell. I feel indeed the difficulties and responsibilities of your position, and that you might very justly wish to shun any censuring remarks not required by the business of your work, but I think that any allusion to him on the part of one of us had better have been omitted than be equivocal as to its purport. . . .

" Immediately after the appearance of your second series in Europe, the first number of an American edition was issued from the press here, which the publisher thought fit—as it was at a time when the Repeal agitation was at its climax—to bring out under the title of 'Lives of Eminent Irish Repealers,' but ere the second number could be published the malapropos address of O'Connell to his fellow-countrymen in America, animadverting harshly upon this country, had given a most sudden and fatal blow to the demonstrations which the previous news had just aroused to so much enthusiasm. Such a revulsion as regarded the interests of Repeal was not for the time calculated to benefit anything associated with it; and so, it seems, thought the publisher, for a stop was immediately

put to any further issue of the work under the false and injurious title he had given it. An artifice of this kind was, in any event, an ill-judged one for the publisher. For the attempt to class the men of '98 with the leaders, or rather *leader* of an association by whom they have been spoken of as 'weak and wicked men,' and even stigmatised as 'miscreants and villains,' was most certainly insulting to their memories.

"Though, as an humble advocate for liberty, I must feel well affected to a Repeal of the Union, or any change, having for its object the amelioration of the condition of Ireland, I cannot feel indifferent to the unworthy attempts O'Connell constantly makes, and has made, to misrepresent and sully the character and measures of the men of '98. The unfairness of his comparisons, and the conclusions he draws from them—the want of generosity and common honesty he displays in reflecting falsely upon men who can only speak from their graves—and the thorough littleness and want of dignity betrayed by unfavourably contrasting their course and the one which a change of circumstances has permitted him to pursue—stamps the character of O'Connell with such attributes as, despite his genius, must only belong to the most depraved natures. It may be very excusable and just policy for him and his followers to remain silent upon the subject of force, and even discourage any present allusion to such a measure; but I feel that in their condemnation of force, under any possible contingency, the Repealers are upholding a doctrine as false as it is subversive of the very fundamental principle of liberty; and I feel confident that the expression of such sentiments will only be looked upon as a species of time-serving hypocrisy, quite unnecessary, and totally beneath the dignity of freemen. I have expressed my opinion the more freely, since I think there is no better comment upon the truth of what I have just said than the impartial history you have had the disinterested courage to produce. For, though you have been forced to record the unsuccessful issue of the means used, you have boldly exposed the necessity which should always justify them; and must be regarded by all, in so doing, as forwarding in a very effectual manner the great cause of liberty.

"My mother and sister present their sincere regards to Mrs. Madden and yourself, in which permit me most cordially to join.

"I have the honour to remain, most faithfully,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed)

"WM. H. MACNEVEN.

"To R. R. Madden, Esq.

CHAPTER II.

Thomas O'Connor's Reminiscences of Macneven—His arrest—Compact of State Prisoners with Government—His examination—Imprisonment at Fort George, and liberation.

The preceding narrative of Miss Macneven has rendered it unnecessary to enter into any other details, with the exception of those connected with the political movements in which Macneven was engaged.

Thomas O'Connor (one of the descendants of Denis O'Connor of Ballenagare) at a public meeting in 1837, in New York, gave the following account of Macneven's early services in the Catholic cause. Many passages cannot fail to make a profound impression on the mind of every English reader:*

"The British Government, when it acquired an equivocal ascendancy of Ireland, should have tried to secure it by an incorporation of the Irish with the British people; an evil genius stood in the way, and under its counsels it was resolved to enslave the Irish. The great instrument employed to effect this purpose was the penal code against the Catholics, who constituted the mass of the inhabitants.

"The system of terror which grew out of the enactment of the penal code was sufficient to daunt the heart. There are, fortunately, in all countries, some master-spirits—persons who belong not to the common class of men, and who seem destined for great purposes. Ireland was not destitute of some such. In the year 1760, three Irishmen, bold as they were patriotic, associated themselves into a Catholic Committee. Its object was to obtain the repeal or modification of the penal statutes. This committee formed a nucleus, about which were gradually collected the best spirits in the land. Under various changes or modifications of constitution or name, it continues to the present time. The National Association, now in Ireland, is but one of its legitimate descendants. May I be permitted to add, that an ancestor of mine, Charles O'Connor, was one: the other two were Dr. Curry, the historian, and Thomas Wyse, the forefather of the present highly gifted member for Waterford.

"Dr. Macneven, scarcely yet qualified by his years to assume the *toga virilis*, entered the committee as the representative of the town of Navan. He found extreme caution paralyzing many, and in some shape all of them, with the exception of John Keogh of Mount Jerome, in the

* In The New York Times this statement, made by O'Connor, of Macneven's services in the Catholic cause, is said to have been drawn up by Counsellor Sampson.

County of Dublin. Mr. Keogh found himself no longer alone. On the arrival about this time in Ireland of a new Viceroy, Lord Kenmare, a Catholic nobleman, backed by the Catholic aristocracy, prepared an address, which he sent to the committee for their sanction. In the absence of Mr. Keogh, Dr. Macneven opposed the cringing sycophancy of the address in a speech in which patriotism and eloquence were happily blended, characterizing it as unworthy of their honour and a departure from the general interests of the Catholics. The required sanction was withheld; the address, however, was subsequently presented at the Castle, signed by sixty-eight names—all that could be obtained. Dr. Macneven, on this occasion, received the thanks of his constituents of Navan. In his reply, he took occasion to develop the state of the Catholics, their growing spirit and increasing knowledge, and concluded by more than a hint to the sixty-eight addressers, to be careful how they further tampered with the wishes and interests of the people. The proceedings, with the names of the sixty-eight, were published, and served as the basis of the argument successfully used by Mr. Archibald Hamilton Rowan, a Protestant gentleman and patriot, when he proceeded to Ulster to disabuse the Protestants in that province in regard to their erroneous impression of the character of the Catholic clergy and gentry. This promoted that Christian union of Catholic and Protestant, afterwards known by the name of 'United Irishmen.'

"The authority of the Catholic Committee to speak the sense of the Catholic body having been frequently questioned, the committee issued a proclamation calling a convention of the Catholics of the kingdom. It was signed by their chairman, Mr. Edward Byrne, a wealthy and respectable merchant of the City of Dublin. Accordingly a convention, consisting of representatives from all the counties, cities, and principal towns of the kingdom, convened in Dublin in 1792, in the same room in Back-lane in which the Parliament of King James sat at the time of the revolution. Dr. Macneven was returned from three different places—a proof of his popularity: he selected to take his seat, as formerly, for Navan.

"In this Catholic Parliament, as it was often not inaptly called, Dr. Macneven sided with or rather led those who sought the invaluable right of the elective franchise; but an unhappy over-caution ruled the majority: the petition to the king, although it passed through the hands of Mr. Keogh, sought but a qualified franchise, confining it to the freeholders of the yearly estate of twenty pounds. The doctor took an active part in the long discussion of the question—he was in favour of a more extensive

franchise; in his zealous advocacy a spark from his lip fell on the latent democratic spirit of the members, and lit it into life. Availing himself of an excitement of his own creation, he moved an amendment to the effect that the Catholics should demand the elective franchise to the full extent it was exercised by Protestants. It was a crisis in the affairs of the Catholics; the motion happily prevailed, and the petition thus amended was presented to the king. It was not a time to tamper with the people—the petition was graciously received.

“On the opening of the next succeeding session of parliament, the subject was favourably introduced in the royal speech. In that session, a bill passed in conformity with the petition. To this act of Dr. Macneven, Ireland was indebted for the creation of that most courageous and patriotic class of citizens, the forty-shilling freeholders. The first great turn-out of the forty-shilling freeholders resulted in the election of Daniel O’Connell for the County of Clare, and the consequent emancipation of the Catholics.

“Dr. Macneven continued to take a distinguished part in whatever was connected with the Catholic question, until after the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam from the viceroyalty of Ireland; when the hope of emancipation became so doubtful, or was placed at such a distance, that the doctor quitted the narrow sphere of his operation, and was thenceforward an United Irishman and advocate, not of partial, but of general emancipation. The doctor was soon advanced to the chief executive office as one of the five directors. The post of danger was often assigned to him, and always promptly accepted. He repaired to Paris as the accredited agent of Ireland, and was in constant communication with Theobald Wolfe Tone, then in Holland. To seek arms, ammunition, and allies, was their object: in this they partially succeeded. The doctor was at Paris while the English and French commissioners were at Lille, negotiating a peace. It was all-important to Ireland to delay or prevent it. He and Tone, in perfect concert of views and exertions, strove to produce a rupture of the negotiation; or, if this could not be effected, to place on the protocol a demand for the internal independence of the Irish Parliament, including the religious freedom of the Catholics. Such acts of protection in favour of oppressed nations, from sympathising and powerful friends, are not uncommon in the history of diplomacy. The last of the kind is the stipulation in the Treaty of Vienna, in behalf of the nationality of Poland.

“It is well known that the English plenipotentiaries returned home, *re infecta*, without making peace, and that an invasion of Ireland was attempted the next winter.

"It failed, and unfortunately Mr. Tone lost his life in consequence of his capture on board one of the ships of the expedition. Dr. Macneven returned to Ireland and was imprisoned for several years, and finally was exiled." *

The 11th of September, 1792, the corporation of Dublin passed a series of resolutions, unanimously declaratory of their grand principle—"Protestant ascendancy"—and their determination to support it with their lives and fortunes. Having set forth the Roman Catholics to be in possession of

"The most perfect toleration of their religion,

"The fullest security of their property,

"The most complete personal liberty,"

It was resolved, "That we consider the Protestant ascendancy to consist in

"A Protestant King of Ireland,

"A Protestant Parliament,

"Protestant electors and government,

"The benches of justice,

"The army and the revenue,

"Through all their branches and details Protestant,

"And this system supported by a connexion with

"The Protestant realm of Britain."†

A Catholic Convention, the first ever called, responded to the sentiments put forth by the Dublin Corporation. At a meeting of the delegates, on the 3rd of December, 1792, Dr. Macneven, in a speech occupying nine pages of very closely printed matter, replete with powerful argument, in plain, energetic language, asserted the rights of his Catholic countrymen to the enjoyment of every privilege which the constitution accorded to their Protestant fellow-subjects, and made the unfortunate declaration of "their honours" of the corporation the subject of an attack, which inflicted on Protestant ascendancy a greater blow and a heavier discouragement than it had ever before sustained.

He investigated its origin, its design, and its results. "It was this ascendancy," he said, "that in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, like a ferocious tiger, devastated the land of our fathers, and after establishing its den on a depopulated waste, surrounded it in a succeeding age with the horrors of mental darkness; it was this ascendancy that, breaking through the sympathies of nature and the obligations of eternal justice, established the slow tortures, the recreant prohibitions, the unnatural, unmanly enormities of the penal code. It was this ascendancy that annihilated the flourishing manufacture of woollens, that

* O'Connor's "Reminiscences of Macneven."

† Address of the Corporation of Dublin, 11th September, 1792.

abandoned Irish shipping, shocked Irish commerce, and despoiled the nation of independence, as it now deprived the Catholic of franchise. It was that same spirit of rapacity and division which prowled for addresses, and instigated grand juries.

"Its opposition to justice had at length taught the people their resources; it stimulated virtue, awakened pride, and armed every passion of the heart in defence of the best interests of the country. They must now come forward manfully with the long list of their grievances in one hand, the charter of liberty in the other, and arraign at the bar of national justice this monster which strides over a prostrate land and taunts the people from every ministerial print and grand jury with the clanking of their chains."

Macneven ended his address by moving a slight amendment in the prayer of the petition for "*a participation in the elective franchise*;" he proposed that the word "*equal*" be inserted before that of "*participation*."

On the following day, the 4th of December, he addressed the delegates in a speech no less powerful than the former, in support of "*a demand for total emancipation*, as the most honourable, the most consistent, and the wisest measure for them to adopt; one that could not be withheld by the power in the country, and would not be opposed by the power out of it."

The Protestant ascendancy men and Lord Kenmare found a troublesome opponent in Macneven. The claim to "*equal participation in the elective franchise*" must have astonished the weak nerves of the one, as much as the demand for total emancipation did the other.

Macneven sailed from Yarmouth for Holland on the 7th of July, 1797, on his mission from the directory of the United Irishmen. At p. 55 of the "*Pieces of Irish History*," he gives the following account of the knowledge of the British Government of the communications which had been carried on with France: "*Their knowledge of the negotiations of the United Irishmen with foreign states was equally notorious, and at this time one of the deputies had personal evidence of its extent and accuracy. That knowledge was obtained from some person in the pay of England, and in the confidence of France.*"*

* "*Mr. Reinhardt, the resident minister of the French Republic at Hamburg, when applied to by Dr. Macneven for a passport to proceed to Paris, insisted on his orders not to deliver any without the permission of his government first obtained for every individual case. Though much pressed, he was inflexible; but always offered to transmit a memoir which should detail the object of the mission. This was at last prepared, in despair of proceeding, and as Reinhardt knew the English language, and must at any rate translate the memoir into cipher, it was deemed unnecessary to compose it in French. Two*

The arrests of the members of the provincial Committee, and of the members of the directory, on the 12th of March, 1798, have been elsewhere described. The particulars, however, of the arrest of Macneven have been recently placed in my hands, drawn up for me by an eye-witness of that occurrence, Mr. William Lenehan:

"When a young lad, serving my time to Mr. Stubbs, an eminent clothier on Inns'-quay, in the year '98, Dr. Macneven lodged in our house. He was deeply implicated in the business of the rebellion, as was likewise my master, and the house was consequently one of the resorts of all the active spirits of the day, and amongst the rest of the infamous Thomas Reynolds.

"On the day in question, about 11 o'clock in the forenoon, Reynolds walked into the shop, and my master happening to be behind the counter, Reynolds sat himself on it, and commenced talking to him.

"After a little time, an unusual bustle being apparent on the opposite side of the quay, Stubbs looked out of the window, and saw the king's troops surrounding the house of Oliver Bond. (The deputies of the different bodies of the United men who met that day at Bond's, and who were to have decided on the breaking out of the rebellion, were being arrested). Stubbs immediately took the alarm, and sent me up to Dr. Macneven to say that Mr. Bond's house was surrounded by troops. When I entered the room, the doctor was standing with his back to the fire and his hat on (I believe he was about going over to Bond's), and Lord Edward Fitzgerald was sitting on a sofa near him. I immediately mentioned my errand. One long and earnest look passed between the two conspirators, and the doctor turned to me and said, 'Very well, boy—that will do.' I of course retired.

"In about half an hour after this we heard the drums of the Castle guard beating as they passed on to the relief (Reynolds still sitting on the counter), when from their rear a body of soldiers crossed over Church Street Bridge, and advanced towards our house.

"Stubbs again became alarmed, and desired me to say to Dr. Macneven that 'all was not right; that troops were days after it was delivered, Mr. Reinhardt's scruples vanished, and he granted the passport. Macneven afterwards saw the deciphered copy of this paper, in French, in Talleyrand's office, where it was kept under the particular key of the chief secretary. The original, in English, was withdrawn from Reinhardt, and never afterwards entrusted by Macneven into any hands but those of a friend upon whom suspicion could not attach; and independent of the security offered by his character, there is this strong circumstance, that the copy of the memoir which Dr. Macneven saw in the hands of Lord Clare was from the French and not the English."

This note, for reasons which it is unnecessary to state here, is commended to the particular attention of Lord Brougham.

coming towards the house, and that he had better keep out of the way for a little.'

"I had only passed the cross-door of the shop when the word 'Halt' was given; then 'Left face;' and the house was almost instantaneously surrounded. Sentinels were placed at every door, two of the soldiers were on the garden wall, and wherever there was a chance for escaping, a soldier occupied or watched that place.

"I had hurried up on the first alarm, and was telling the doctor what was now but too evident—that the house was surrounded, and the king's troops were coming upstairs. 'Let them come, boy,' was all the reply he made, when a king's messenger, accompanied by a captain in the Fermanagh militia and a sergeant of the same corps, entered the apartment.

"Dr. Macneven was still standing with his back to the fire-place, and Lord Edward was reclining on the sofa, as I already mentioned. 'Dr. Macneven?' said the messenger in a tone of inquiry. 'That's my name,' said the doctor, advancing. 'You are my prisoner,' said the messenger; 'and I will be obliged by your surrendering all your private papers into my hands.' The doctor immediately gave him his keys, and told him that the room they were in and the next one were the only ones he occupied in the house, and that he could search them.

"The messenger and the sergeant then left the room; the captain remained with the prisoner; and in a short time the two former returned, bringing with them the doctor's private desk and some papers. A carriage having been sent for in the meantime, the messenger requested the doctor to descend with him to the street. Macneven prepared to do so, as did also Lord Edward; when the militia captain, turning to the messenger, said, 'This is Lord Edward Fitzgerald; had we not better take him with us?' 'No, sir—certainly not,' said the messenger. 'My instructions are explicit, and I will not go beyond them.'

"The entire party then descended the stairs, and Lord Edward walked through the shop with the doctor to the carriage; when passing Reynolds, both looked at him, and he was evidently disconcerted by Macneven's fixed regard.

Arrived at the carriage, Macneven entered, accompanied by the captain and messenger. Lord Edward shook him cordially by the hand, and left. The carriage then drove off, and I never saw Dr. Macneven again.

"An hour had not elapsed from the time of the arrest till the messenger and party returned in great haste, and inquired for 'the gentleman who was with Dr. Macneven.' I told them Lord Edward had left the house with themselves, and had not since returned. The messenger retired; and that very evening there was a proclamation out,

offering a reward of £1,000 for the apprehension of his lordship." *

"On the 12th of March, 1798, after the arrests in Dublin, Mr. Cooke told Dr. Macneven that government was in possession of a copy of the memoir given by him to the French minister, and he removed, in this instance, all suspicion of his own veracity, by detailing a great part of its contents. The day following Dr. Macneven was again questioned by the Anglo-Irish Privy Council concerning the same paper. Of this discovery he found means to inform several of his friends; and at the period of the negotiation he had the satisfaction of knowing that one of those persons was actually in France, and had, in all probability, already communicated the intelligence to the directory."

The examinations of Dr. Macneven before the Secret Committees of the House of Lords and House of Commons, the 7th and 8th of August, 1798, having been garbled like those of Emmet and O'Connor, he published, conjointly with them in the memoir already cited, an authentic account of his examinations, and the following is a copy of them:

The examination of William James Macneven, before the Secret Committee of the House of Lords, 7th August, 1798.

I took the following minute of my examinations before the Secret Committee of the Lords and Commons; being then convinced that they would not publish the entire of my answers, and that I should possibly find it necessary, in vindication of truth, to publish them myself. The garbled, disingenuous report of these Committees has appeared, and I had then an opportunity of complaining to the Lord Chancellor of the unfairness with which my examinations are set forth in the appendix to it. He did not deny the fact, but declared very roundly I must not expect they would publish more of them than would answer their purpose. This, to be sure, was candid, and I will not conceal one of the very few merits I can allow his lordship.

"The Lord Chancellor had before him extracts from the memoir which we sent to Lord Castlereagh, on the 4th of August, in fulfilment of our agreement with government. They related to the facts detailed in our paper concerning the history and progress of the union, detached from an account of the motives and abuses which were stated by us to have given rise to the resolutions we adopted. The examination was altogether conducted in a manner to

* This proclamation was in the Public Record Office, Dublin.

obtain for such parts of the memoir a certain authenticity for publication, without publishing the memoir itself. He went into a minute examination of the civil and military organization, and the various communications with France. When he came to that part which mentions another memoir given to the French minister at Hamburg, he turned to an extract of a copy of it, which he had before him on some subsequent occasion. He said that no copy of the entire was ever sent from England; and in this I can readily believe him. He asked how that memoir happened to be given to the French minister. I answered that the Irish agent applied to the French minister for a passport to go into France, which the minister made some difficulty in granting, but called for a memoir, and offered to transmit it to his government. The memoir was accordingly written, and soon after the person got a passport. This tedious examination took up several hours.

Lord Chancellor.—Pray, Dr. Macneven, what number of troops did the Irish directory require from the French Government for the invasion of Ireland?

Macneven.—The minimum force was 5,000 men; the maximum, 10,000. With that number, and a large quantity of arms and ammunition, we knew that an Irish army could be formed and disciplined. This, aided by the universal wish of the people to shake off the yoke, we had no doubt would succeed; and we were always solicitous that no foreign force should be able to dictate in our country. Liberty and national independence being our object, we never meant to engage in a struggle for a change of masters.

Lord Chancellor.—Was not your object a separation from England?

Macneven.—It certainly became our object when we were convinced that liberty was not otherwise attainable. Our reasons for this determination are given in the memoir; it is a measure we were forced into, inasmuch as I am now, and always have been of opinion, that if we were an independent republic, and Britain ceased to be formidable to us, our interest would require an intimate connexion with her.

Lord Chancellor.—Such as subsists between England and America?

Macneven.—Something like it, my lord.

Archbishop of Cashel.—In plain English, that Ireland should stand on her own bottom, and trade with every other country just according as she found it would be her interest?

Macneven.—Precisely, my lord. I have not, I own, any idea of sacrificing the interests of Ireland to those of any other country; nor why we should not in that, as in every

WILLIAM JAMES MACNEVEN.

other respect, be as free as the English themselves.

Archbishop of Cashel.—Ireland could not support herself alone.

Macneven.—In my opinion she could; and, if once her own mistress, would be invincible against England and France together; but this, my lord, is a combination never to be expected. If necessary I could bring as many proofs in support of this opinion as a thing admits of which may be only supported or opposed by probabilities.

Lord Kilwarden.—Had the North any intention of rising in rebellion in the summer of 1797?

Macneven.—It had an intention of rising in arms after General Lake's proclamation.

Lord Kilwarden.—What prevented it?

Macneven.—The people of the North were made acquainted with assurances received about this time from France, that the expected succours would be shortly sent to us; and it was represented to them that we would be giving the English a great advantage by beginning before they arrived. For this, as well as other reasons, I was always averse to our beginning by ourselves.

Lord Kilwarden.—Then if you thought you would have succeeded you would have begun?

Macneven.—Most probably we should; at the same time I am bound to declare that it was our wish to act with French aid, because that would tend to make the revolution less bloody, by determining many to join in it early, who, while the balance of success was doubtful, would either retain an injurious neutrality, or even perhaps oppose it.

Lord Kilwarden.—The union held out to the poor an assurance that their condition would be ameliorated; how was this to be accomplished?

Macneven.—In the first place, by an abolition of tithes; and in the next, by establishing such an order of things as would give more free scope to their industry, and secure to them a better recompense for it.

Archbishop of Cashel.—You know very well if tithes were abolished the landlords would raise the rents, and the tenants would not be benefited.

Macneven.—I know, my lord, that during the period of the lease, at least, there would be no such rise, but that now, year after year, there is not a single improvement made by the tenant without the parson's getting a proportion of the profits; it is a tax which increases in proportion with the tenant's industry, and encroaches on his capital in order to form an income for a man to whom he is not indebted for any service; and in general there is the loss of the full tenth between the incumbent and his proctor.

Archbishop of Cashel.—Can you account for the massacres committed upon the Protestants by the Papists in the County of Wexford ?

Macneven.—My lord, I am far from being the apologist of massacres, however provoked; but if I am rightly informed as to the conduct of the magistrates of that county, the massacres you allude to were acts of retaliation upon enemies much more than fanaticism; moreover, my lord, it has been the misfortune of this country scarcely ever to have known the English natives or settlers otherwise than enemies, and in his language the Irish peasant has but one name for Protestant and Englishman, and confounds them; he calls both by the name of *Sasanagh*; his conversation, therefore, is less against a religionist than against a foe; his prejudice is the effect of the ignorance he is kept in, and the treatment he receives. How can we be surprised at it when so much pains are taken to brutalize him ?

Lord Chancellor.—I agree with Dr. Macneven; the Irish peasant considers the two words as synonymous; he calls Protestants and Englishmen, indifferently, *Sasanagh*.

Lord Kilwarden.—I suppose the religious establishment would be abolished with the tithes ?

Macneven.—I suppose it would.

Lord Kilwarden.—Would you not set up another ?

Macneven.—No, indeed.

Lord Kilwarden.—Not the Roman Catholic ?

Macneven.—I would no more consent to that than I would to the establishment of *Mahometanism*.

Lord Kilwarden.—What would you do, then ?

Macneven.—That which they do in America; let each man profess the religion of his conscience, and pay his own pastor.

Lord Chancellor.—Do you think the mass of the people in the provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught care the value of this pen, or the drop of ink it contains, for Parliamentary Reform or Catholic Emancipation ?

Macneven.—I am sure they do not, if by the mass of the people your lordship means the common, illiterate people; they do not understand it. What they very well understand is, that it would be a very great advantage to them to be relieved from the payment of tithes, and not to be fleeced by their landlords; but there is not a man who can read a newspaper who has not considered the question of reform, and was not once at least attached to that measure; the people of the least education understand it; and why the common people, whose opinion on every other occasion is so little valued, should be made the criterion of public opinion, I do not know.

Lord Chancellor.—I dare say they all understand it better than I do.

Macneven.—As to Catholic Emancipation, the importance of that question has passed away long since. It really is not worth a moment's thought at the present period.

Lord Dillon.—Has the union extended much into Connaught?

Macneven.—It has, very considerably.

Lord Dillon.—I did not think so. What is the extent of the organization?

Macneven.—Less, perhaps, than in other places; it got later into Connaught, but very great numbers have taken the test. From the misery of the poor people, and the oppressiveness of landlords in many parts of that province, we have no doubt but if the French ever land in force there they will be joined by thousands—probably by the whole of its population.

Archbishop of Cashel.—If the French had made peace at Lille, as you say they were willing to do, they would have left you in the lurch; and may they not do so again?

Macneven.—The French Government declared that it would not deceive the Irish, and that it must make peace if England offered such terms as France had a right to expect; but that if the insincerity of the cabinet of St. James's should frustrate the negotiation, the Irish should never be abandoned; and I now consider the Directory as bound by every tie of honour never to make peace until we are an independent nation.

Archbishop of Cashel.—What security have you that the French would not keep this country as a conquest?

Macneven.—Their interest and our power. If they attempted any such thing they must know that England would not fail to take advantage of it; that she would then begin to get a sense of justice towards Ireland, and make us any offer short of separation, as she did America, when by a like assistance America was enabled to shake off her yoke. Moreover, it is not possible for the French to send any force into this country which would not be at the mercy of its inhabitants; but the example which was held out to them, and to which they promised to conform, was that of Rochambeau in America.

A Member of the Committee.—To what number do you think the United Irishmen amounted all over the kingdom?

Macneven.—Those who have taken the test do not, I am convinced, fall short of 500,000, without reckoning women and old men. The number regularly organized is not less than 300,000; and I have no doubt all these will be ready to fight for the liberties of Ireland when they get a fair opportunity.

Lord Chancellor.—We shall not trouble you with any more questions.

Secret Committee of the House of Commons, 8th August, 1798.

Lord Castlereagh.—Dr. Macneven, the Lords have sent us the minutes of your examination before them, and we only wish to trouble you with some questions relative to the interior state of the country.

Speaker.—Pray, sir, what do you think occasioned the insurrection ?

Macneven.—The insurrection was occasioned by the house-burnings, the whipping to extort confessions, the torture of various kinds, the free quarters, and the murders committed upon the people by the magistrates and the army.

Speaker.—This only took place since the insurrection ?

Macneven.—It is more than twelve months (looking at Mr. Corry) since these horrors were perpetrated by the *Ancient Britons* about Newry; and long before the insurrection they were quite common through the counties of Kildare and Carlow and began to be practised with very great activity in the counties of Wicklow and Wexford.

Corry and Latouche.—Yes, a few houses were burned.

Macneven.—Gentlemen, there was a great deal more than a few houses burned.

Speaker.—Would not the organization have gone on, and the union become stronger, but that the insurrection was brought forward too soon ?

Macneven.—The organization would have proceeded, and the union have acquired that strength which arises from order. Organization would at the same time have given a control over the people, capable of restraining their excesses; and you see scarcely any have been committed in those counties where it was well established.

Lord Castlereagh.—You acknowledge the union would have become stronger but for the means taken to make it explode ?

Macneven.—It would every day have become more perfect; but I do not see anything in what has happened to deter the people from persevering in the union and its objects—on the contrary, if I am rightly informed, the trial of force must tend to give the people confidence in their own power; as I understand it is now admitted that if the insurrection was general and well conducted it would have been successful.

Sir J. Parnell.—Do you know the population of Wexford county ?

Macneven.—Not exactly; but people agree that if the insurrection of a few counties in Leinster, unskilfully as it was directed, was so near overthrowing the government, a general rising would have freed Ireland.

Lord Castlereagh.—Were not the different measures of the government which are complained of, subsequent to various proceedings of the United Irishmen?

Macneven.—Prior, my lord, to most of them. If your lordship desires it I will prove by comparison of dates that government throughout has been the aggressor. [His lordship was not curious].

Speaker (looking at the minutes from the Lords).—You say that you wished to keep back the insurrection; how do you reconcile that with the general plan of arming?

Macneven.—From the time we had given up Reform as hopeless, and determined to receive the French, we adopted a military organization, and prepared to be in a condition to co-operate with them; but it was always our wish to wait, if possible, for their arrival. We wished to see liberty established in our country with the least possible expense of private happiness, and in such a way that no honest man of either party should have cause to regret it. We had before our eyes the revolution of 1688, in which a popular general, with only a small army, gave the friends of liberty an opportunity of declaring themselves. Accordingly, upon that celebrated occasion, the junction of the people of England with King William was so extensive, that war and its concomitant evils were entirely precluded. I know the case would be the same here if there was a French landing.

Mr. Alexander.—Although talents and education are to be found in the union, yet there is no comparison, in point of property, between those who invited the French and those who brought in King William.

Macneven.—Pardon me, sir, I know very many who possess probably much larger properties than did Lord Danby, who signed the invitation to the Prince of Orange, or than did Lord Somers, who was the great champion of the Revolution. The property in the union is immense; but persons in a situation to be more easily watched were not required to render themselves particularly conspicuous.

Speaker.—But in case of a revolution, would not many persons be banished or destroyed, and their property forfeited; for instance, the gentlemen here?

Macneven.—We never had a doubt but in such an event many of those who profess to be the warmest friends of the British connexion would very quickly join us; and the readiness with which we have seen them support different other administrations, led us to suppose they might possibly do us the honour of supporting our own. I am

confident, sir, that in case of revolution the United Irishmen would behave better to their enemies than their enemies do to them.

Speaker.—Was not the *Olive Branch*, and the arms she had on board, destined for this country ?

Macneven.—I never heard they were. Arms have been frequently offered, but we always refused to accept them without troops; for we knew that insurrection would be the immediate consequence of a landing of arms, and we constantly declared to the French government that we never meant to make our country a La Vendée, or the seat of Chouan.

Speaker.—Do you think Catholic Emancipation or Parliamentary Reform are objects of any importance with the common people ?

Macneven.—Catholic Emancipation, as it is called, the people do not care about; I am sure they ought not now. They know, I believe, very generally, that it would be attended with no other effect than to admit into the House of Peers a few individuals who profess the Catholic religion, and enable some others to speculate on seats in the House of Commons. No man is so ignorant as to think this would be a national benefit. When Lord Fitzwilliam was here I considered the measure a good one, as it would have removed the pretexts of those feuds and animosities which have desolated Ireland for two centuries, and have been lately so unhappily exacerbated; but now that those evils have occurred, which the stay of that nobleman would have prevented, they are not little measures which can remedy the grievances of this country.

[*Speaker* (looking over at somebody).—See that].

Speaker.—But are you not satisfied that Reform would go as little way to content the people as Catholic Emancipation ?

Macneven.—Sir, I can best answer that question by declaring what the sentiments of the United Irishmen were at different periods. When Mr. Ponsonby brought in his first Bill of Reform, I remember having conversed with some of the most confidential men in the North on that subject, and they declared to me they would think the country happy, and likely to think itself so, by getting that bill. When he brought in his last bill, I am sure the country at large would have been satisfied with the same.

Lord Castlereagh.—They would have been satisfied to effect a revolution through a reform.

Macneven.—If a change of system be one way or other inevitable, of which I have no doubt, and which you yourselves cannot but think highly probable, who can be so much interested in its occurring peaceably as you are ? In any tranquil change you will retain your properties, and

the immense influence which attaches to property. In such a situation you would necessarily have a considerable share in the management of affairs; and I cannot conceive how a revolution effected in such a manner would much confound the order of society, or give any considerable shock to private happiness.

Speaker.—Don't you think the people would be dissatisfied with any reformed parliament which would not abolish the Church Establishment and tithes?

Macneven.—I have no idea of a reformed parliament that would not act according to the interest and known wishes of the people. I am clear that tithes ought to be suppressed, and have no doubt the Church Establishment would follow.

A Member.—Would you not set up another?

Macneven.—Most certainly not; I consider all church establishments as injurious to liberty and religion.

Mr. J. C. Beresford.—Will you tell me what you understand by a free House of Commons?

Macneven.—One which should be annually and freely returned by the people, and in which their interests, for the most part, should direct their decisions.

Mr. J. C. Beresford.—What do you think of potwalloping boroughs? They afford a specimen of universal suffrage.

Macneven.—I know some adversaries of reform who have less reason to be displeased with them than I have; but they are a proof how useless would be any partial reform, and that a thing may be noxious in a detached state, which would form a valuable part of a good system.

A Member.—It seems we are reduced to the unfortunate situation of not being able to content the people without a reform which would overthrow the Church Establishment, and break the connexion with England.

Macneven.—If you be in that situation, give me leave to tell you it was brought on by the perseverance with which every species of reform has always been refused, and the contumely manifested towards those who petitioned for it. Discussion was provoked by this treatment, and resentment excited; the consequences of which are now that the people would probably exercise to its full extent whatever privilege they acquired, though, if timely granted, they would stop far short of the length to which it might be carried; this is the nature of man. But, sir, I see no necessary connexion between the fall of the Establishment and a separation from England.

Speaker.—Sure, if the head of the Church was removed, the connexion would be broken.

Macneven.—It might be preserved through the king, if the Irish thought proper to retain it. As the parliament

now exists, with two-thirds of it (if I may be allowed to speak frankly) the property of individuals in the pay of the British cabinet, the connexion is indeed injurious to Ireland, and it is rendered so by the parliament; but if we had a free parliament, there might be a federal connexion advantageous to both countries.

Sir J. Parnell.—Under the federal connexion Ireland would not go to war when England pleased.

Macneven.—I hope not. Were the connexion of this nature, it would probably have preserved England from the present war, and rendered her the same kind of service which might be expected from a free House of Commons, if she had one.

A Member.—What has hitherto prevented the French from invading this country?

Macneven.—Nothing, I am sure, but inability; this, however, will not always last; and I have not the least doubt but when it passes off they will invade it, unless by a change of system you content the nation, and arm it against them; it will then defend itself, as it did before by its volunteers.

Speaker.—What system?

Macneven.—A system of coercion, and a system of injustice, to be replaced by a system of freedom.

Sir J. Parnell.—Would you not be disposed, as well as other gentlemen who may have influence with the people, to exert it, in order to induce them to give up their arms, without the intervention of force?

Macneven.—I cannot answer that question, unless I am told what equivalent is meant to be given them for such a surrender.

Sir J. Parnell.—Pardon.

Macneven.—They never considered it a crime to have arms, nor do I; on the contrary, they have been taught and know it is a right of theirs to possess them. If any attempt is made to take from them their arms, they will mistrust the motives, and think, not without reason, that it is intended by such conduct to leave them naked, at the mercy of their enemies.

Sir J. Parnell.—Pikes are horrible weapons, and I don't know but a law might be passed against them.

Macneven.—I am sure I have seen as strange laws passed without any difficulty; but one might equally as well be made against muskets and bayonets.

Sir J. Parnell.—But pikes are not in the contemplation of the law which gives the subject the right of possessing arms.

Macneven.—I believe, Sir John, the law which declares that right to belong to every freeman was partly obtained by the pike.

Speaker.—It was Magna Charta.

Lord Castlereagh.—What is likely to be the effect of the insurrection that has been just put down ?

Macneven.—It will teach the people that caution which some of their friends less successfully endeavoured to inculcate; and I am afraid it will make them retaliate with a dreadful revenge the cruelties they suffered, whenever they have an opportunity.

Lord Castlereagh.—Will they, do you think, rise again ?

Macneven.—Not, I believe, till the French come; and then, most assuredly, whenever they can join them.

Speaker.—Will the people consider themselves bound hereafter by the oaths of the union ?

Macneven.—I suppose they will.

Speaker.—Would you ?

Macneven.—I, who am going to become an emigrant from my country, am dispensed from answering that question; yet I acknowledge, were I to stay I would think myself bound by them; nor can I discover anything in what has passed to make it less my duty.

Speaker.—Ay, you consider a republican government more economical ?

Macneven.—Corruption is not necessary to it.

Speaker.—How did you mean to pay the loan from Spain—I suppose from our forfeited estates ?

Macneven.—Rather, sir, from your places and pensions. If I only take the pension list at £100,000 (it has been considerably higher, and I believe it is so still), that alone would be sufficient to pay four times the interest of the half-million we meant to borrow. I need not tell you that money can be got when the interest can be regularly paid. We conceive also there are several places with large salaries, for which the present possessors do no other service than giving votes in parliament; another considerable fund would, we imagine, be found by giving these sums a different application.

Speaker.—Do you remember Mr. Grattan's motion about tithes ? Was not that a short cut towards putting down the Established Church ?

Macneven.—If the stability of the Established Church depends on the payment of tithes, the Church stands on a weaker foundation than in civility I would have said of it; but sure I am, sir, that if tithes had been commuted according to Mr. Grattan's plan, a very powerful engine would have been taken out of our hands.

A Member.—Is not the union much indebted to the Roman Catholic Clergy ?

Macneven.—The principle of burying all religious differences in oblivion was warmly embraced by the Catholic Clergy; some of them became more active

members of the union, and I make no doubt but they are in general well affected to the liberties of their country.

Speaker.—Have not the priests a great influence over the people ?

Macneven.—When they espouse the interests of the people they are readily obeyed by them, from the reliance that is placed on their better sense and education. When they oppose these interests they are certainly found to have neither authority nor influence. Of this I can give you two important examples. At the time the Catholic Committee was opposed by the *sixty-eight*, together with Lord Kenmare and his *marksmen*, a priest between Kilbeggan and Moate, who endeavoured to seduce his flock to support the slavish principles of that party, was well nigh *hanged* by his own parishioners for what they deemed treachery to their interests. The other, a priest in the North, who thought fit to preach against the union; the flock immediately left the chapel, and sent him word they would for that Sunday go to the meeting-house, and that if he did not desist from such politics in future they would come near him no more. Of such a nature, gentlemen, is the influence of the Catholic Clergy.

Speaker.—Are the bishops much looked up to ?

Macneven.—They are not, as far as I can learn, so well beloved, or so much confided in by the people as the inferior clergy.

Speaker.—Can you assign any reason for that ?

Macneven.—I am inclined to believe it is because they are seen so much about the Castle, and because some acts coming from that body have manifested an over-extraordinary compliance for the supposed wishes of government.

Speaker.—Did you see Dr. Hussey's letter—what do you think of that ?

Macneven.—I have seen it, and disapprove of it. As one name and paper is mentioned, I cannot help saying that I have seen another letter with the name of Dr. Moylan, which contained a remarkable falsehood in favour of administration; but as this was only a pious fraud perhaps, I could never hear that they complained of it.

Lord Castlereagh.—We will detain you no longer.

WILLIAM JAMES MACNEVEN.

CHAPTER III.

Career of Macneven in the United States.

From the period of Macneven's examination to that of his arrival in America, there are no matters of importance which have not been given in the preceding narrative. The following documents will serve to throw some additional light on the brief notice of his career in the United States :

Extract from a letter of Mr. Thomas O'Connor of New York in reference to the above-mentioned subject.

" New York, 26th September, 1842.

" Although the history of my friend Macneven's career in America has no direct connexion with his earlier life in Europe, or his connexion with the endeavours to establish freedom in his native land, yet it serves to show how consistently he pursued and studied the interests of his country here. In the year 1816, a free office was opened in Nassau Street (I believe the first of the kind established in the United States), for the purpose of procuring employment for Irish emigrants, who were then arriving here in great numbers. It was attended with considerable success. Besides employment obtained in the city and neighbourhood of New York, a vast number of them were directed to places in the interior where employment had been previously engaged for them. It was about this time a meeting was held in this city, at which all the distinguished Irishmen attended, the object of which was the settlement of Irish agriculturists on American lands, where, as owners of the soil, they would be respectable and independent. Dr. Macneven was either the chairman, or an active and influential member of the meeting. As a result of that meeting an application was made to the Congress of the United States for a portion of the public lands on terms accommodating to the Irish, and not injurious to the interests of the government. The petition for this purpose was favourably viewed by a large number of the members of the House of Representatives, but the question went against the Irish by a small majority—I think twelve.

" About the year 1827 he established a free office in Mott Street, with an object similar to that of the one in Nassau Street, and with somewhat similar success. He relied on the corporation of the city for some support, to be derived from the money levied on emigrants on their arrival there. This application met no favour from the corporation.

"He was likewise the originator, I believe, of an establishment, or free registry office, for the benefit of servants; the office continues open in Broadway, near Canal Street. Several years ago he wrote and published for the direction of emigrants, in pamphlet form, 'Directions or advice to Irishmen arriving in America.' To it were attached directions for naturalization, by the late Thomas Addis Emmet. He was a member of nearly every society formed in this city, having for its objects the honour or the interests of his countrymen. One only he eschewed, because he considered it not sufficiently *national* in its views. In the years 1828-9 he was appointed president of the society, 'The Friends of Ireland,' in New York, which contributed not a little to the means which insured the success of the emancipation of the Irish Catholics. He was the first to move and to promote the erection of a splendid monument to the memory of the late Thomas Addis Emmet.

"Dr. Macneven was as warm an advocate of the Repeal of the Legislative Union between England and Ireland, as he had heretofore been a never-pausing advocate of the independence of his native land.

"THOMAS O'CONNOR."

In the spring of 1834 Macneven passed through one of those ordeals which men who take a part in public affairs in America have not unfrequently to go through. Jackson's removal of the deposits from the United States Bank had been publicly spoken of by Macneven as "unwise and unstatesmanlike." Up to that period he had been a strenuous supporter of Jackson. A furious clamour was raised against him; he was accused of inconsistency, and, like every other person then opposed to the removal of the deposits, he was charged with being bribed by the bank to support its interests. The Jacksonite press, and even the Irish press of America, assailed him in the fiercest manner, and the usual consequence of a warfare of this kind followed. Macneven was denounced, mobbed, and, in all probability, would have been maltreated had he fallen into the hands of the enraged multitude; his house was besieged, some persons forced their way into it, terrified his family, and, having done so, returned to their homes, and after a little time to their senses. No small number of the lower orders of his own countrymen joined in this outrage, on a man whose life had been devoted for twenty-nine years in that city to their interests.

On this trying occasion, when popular injustice and ingratitude might have been expected to have irritated and disgusted him, he gave expression to no complaint, manifested no annoyance, nor would suffer others to speak

harshly of the treatment he had met with. "He said his poor countrymen had been deceived—they would soon find out their error, and make amends for their folly." In his communications to the press on this subject, he maintained the same tone of moderation; in the calm and philosophic spirit which was peculiar to his character, he pursued the even tenor of his way, and in a little time the usual mutability of public opinion was exhibited, and he found himself, as he expected, reinstated in his old position in public favour.

The New York Enquirer of March, 1834, enters largely into Dr. Macneven's opinions on the question of the removal of the deposits from the United States Bank, by the president, General Jackson. The following extracts are taken from a communication of Dr. Macneven to certain citizens of New York, who had called on him for his views of a subject that had become a national controversy in the United States. Dr. Macneven says in this communication :

"I supported General Jackson's election, and I continue to feel the highest sense of gratitude for his eminent services in the field. Though, perhaps, disappointed in some of the expectations I have formed of the benefits to be derived from his administration, still, preferring him far before those who were brought as candidates against him, I have sustained him as long as I could do so conscientiously. In relation to the great question which agitates and engrosses Congress and the people, after having examined his course with every disposition to find it justifiable, I cannot possibly approve it.

"The fiscal reasons which have been assigned for the removal of the public deposits are so futile, that they hardly deserve an answer. To say in the same breath, that the necessary demands of government will reduce them in one year to little or nothing, and yet that they must be removed at once, lest they should be so greatly accumulated by the time the charter will expire, as to compel Congress to renew the charter, is really too absurd to be deemed serious. When I am told that the public monies were not safe in the United States Bank, and looking at the public documents I find that just before the removal they amounted in the whole to less than ten millions, while the bank had eleven millions in specie; but now that they amount in this city alone to five millions, while the banks in which they are placed have only eight hundred thousand dollars in specie, I cannot see what has been gained in point of safety.

"The true and indeed avowed motive was a political one. The object was to cripple—nay, to crush an institution deemed dangerous, and which is said to have

set itself in opposition to the will of the people, and to have improperly interfered in the election of our chief magistrate. But the folly of the attempt of the bank, if it really was made, has been fully demonstrated by the result of the elections. We are not, thank God, governed by wealth, but by numbers.

"Yet it is not simply because an unwise and unfortunate measure has been adopted and is obstinately maintained, that I feel myself called upon to express my dissent. Though an humble individual, I may be permitted to say that I am actuated by much higher motives. I have looked at the law which is said to warrant the deed, and I see that by it the public monies were ordered to be kept in a certain place, unless the secretary of the treasury thought it necessary to remove them, in which case he was bound to lay before Congress his reasons for so doing.

"I cannot sustain such a measure. It is a palpable infringement of the laws. It is equally contrary to the spirit of our constitution, to the principles of genuine liberty, and of republican institutions.

"The three respectable banks selected for the purpose have a capital of six millions of dollars. Their discounts before they had the public deposits amounted to 9,200,000 dollars, and they made, one with another, an annual dividend of $6\frac{1}{2}\%$. But with the aid of the public monies they are now able to discount near 13,800,000 dollars, or 4,600,000 dollars more than formerly, giving an additional profit of $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ a year on their capital. Thus we have forty bank directors endowed with the power of distributing four millions and a-half in loans, beyond the natural resources of their banks, and two thousand stockholders whose income is at once raised from $6\frac{1}{2}\%$ to 11% . This might not give much influence to the grantor if the boon was irreparable. But on what tenure is it held? It depends on the sole will of the secretary, who has reserved the power to annul the contract whenever he pleases, and who for any such change is no longer bound to assign reasons.

"The democratic party was founded on the purest principles, and whilst adhering to and bound by these, it had a right to require personal sacrifices from its friends—namely, that they should yield their opinions to those of the majority, on unimportant points not affecting these principles, or in the selection of candidates of equal qualifications. But where the principle itself is called in question, I must preserve my independence of opinion, and with regret, yet without hesitation, dissent from those who, under colour of adherence to the usages of party, may require a sacrifice of all that is dear to us, and thereby

subvert the fundamental principle of our institutions. This, as I understand it, is that the majority, not of any party, but of the people, must govern.

"To you, my friends and fellow-citizens, who know me, I need not say that I am not one of the rich—that I derive my means of existence from the moderate profits of my professional industry—that I am and cannot cease to be a democrat—that I have lived a friend of liberty, and have suffered for that cause. For my zeal in its defence I became a proscribed exile from my native land. Here, in this asylum of the oppressed, I have now lived almost twenty-nine years. I have, you well know, no other country. I am identified with its interests, its prosperity, its glorious institutions. These I cannot desert. On their preservation depends our happiness and that of our posterity. They are the boast, the model, and the hope of the friends of liberty throughout the civilized world. I adjure my fellow-citizens not to blast those hopes and the high destinies to which this nation is called; to preserve those institutions inviolate; to defend and protect them against every attack, and every attempted infringement, from whatever source, or from whomsoever they may come; to bring back the administration of our government to its native purity; and to leave to their children, entire, unshackled, and unblemished, the sacred inheritance such as they received it from their fathers.

"To sum up in a few words, gentlemen, my answers to your questions: I disapprove of the removal of the deposits, and am in favour of their restoration forthwith.

"I am opposed to the continuation of the present Bank of the U. S., but am in favour of a national bank that shall possess the advantages of this, and distribute them as equally as may be for the public accomodation, without prejudice to liberty.

(Signed) "W. J. MACNEVEN."

Extracts from a letter of Counsellor Sampson in defence of Dr. Macneven's views.

(*"New York Journal of Commerce," 9th April, 1834*).

"As to the letter of Dr. Macneven, in answer to a requisition of his fellow-citizens, it is manifestly the production of a sound and vigorous understanding, and I am well convinced the heart of him who penned it is no less sound. It is clear, unsophisticated, and unequivocal. He has however been accused of tergiversation and inconsistency, and for this reason, that on the 29th of

January he offered a resolution at his ward approving the measures of the executive, which in his letter, after a lapse of about two months, he as positively condemned; and for this, without any regard to circumstances, or any account made of the character of the man, gross and unfounded calumnies have been heaped upon his head. It has been maliciously said that he was bribed and corrupted by the bank; and when this was found too revolting, another charge was added, that he had, through pique and disappointment on the refusal of an office, betrayed his friends, his party, and his own unsullied reputation.

“Is this, my fellow-citizens, to be endured? Is this a fair use to be made of the liberty of the press? Are such calumnies to be justified by party spirit, or indulged as electioneering squibs? Are they not blisters on the foul tongue of him who utters them? Is it a maxim to be countenanced by honest citizens, that all is fair in politics, and that the exercise of the most important franchise, upon whose purity all security of our rights and liberties depends, is to be polluted by means so base and unworthy? Is that being true to a party which is false to justice and reckless of common decency? It is from the too great encouragement given to such unworthy means that I have always stood aloof from party, and rather chosen to renounce its emoluments than bind myself to connive at what ought not to be tolerated. . . .

“I could as well believe that such men could countenance that emanation from their meeting which invaded the sanctity of the private abode of my friend—whose hisses and groans, and brutal exclamations, ominous of evil, and characteristic of depravity, penetrated the recesses of his dwelling, carrying terror and alarm to the hearts of those females to whom the ties of nature and the knowledge of his virtues had rendered him so justly honoured and so dear. . . .

“In one point the adopted citizens have not had fair play. *The Truth Teller*, to which they look for information, condemned the conduct of the doctor, but omitted the letter to which that censure referred; and some who came to the meeting full of indignation would have been, I apprehend, somewhat puzzled to say what it was about. But my countrymen have honest and feeling hearts, and will not long be deceived; they will read and judge for themselves, and remember that the man against whom they have been so suddenly inflamed is the same United Irishman—the same conspicuous and efficient member of the great Catholic Committee, whose energies and courage first forced the chain and broke the spell which held the Irish Nation in abject slavery; the colleague of the amiable and virtuous Teeling; the bosom friend of

that ever memorable hero—the gallant, the accomplished, the lion-hearted Theobald Wolfe Tone.

“They will remember that from these and their interests he has never swerved; that his heart and hand has ever been open to the needy and distressed; that if for their sakes he has sometimes turned from the rich, at no time has he turned his face from the poor man; and if any feelings of gratitude remain they will come back to him with redoubled affection, and if any honest pride, they will be proud of such a compatriot.

“I am, gentlemen, with much respect,

“Yours very truly,

“WILLIAM SAMPSON.”

The most striking feature in Macneven's character was an imperturbable coolness and self-possession, combined with the most remarkable simplicity of mind and singleness of purpose; he was totally devoid of fear in the maintenance of his principles, and of every species of affectation in the exhibition of a very high degree of moral courage, and a chivalrous sense of duty to the interests of humanity and justice. These qualities were strikingly exhibited by him in 1834, in the controversy in which he engaged, and the conflict with the opinions of the great majority of his countrymen in the United States which ensued.

There was a sort of stoic attachment in the fidelity of Macneven to his principles; but his politics were those of a philosopher, his patriotism was the widely extended benevolence of a Catholic philanthropy. He talked of his devotion to his cause in language the least impassioned—of the enemies of his country in moderate and charitable terms; if a single virtue belonged to one of them, he presented it prominently before his hearers: it was a pleasure for him to descant upon some acts of Clare's, which he believed were evidence of a nature originally generous. It was impossible to be in his society, and still less so on terms of intimacy with him, without observing the consistency of his opinions, and the rectitude of mind displayed in the expression of them. The same principles he set out in life with advocating, he upheld in his old age, without change or modification; but his mind was open to every improvement that was suggested in the mode of carrying them into effect. His principles were inflexible, and yet he was free from obstinacy and arrogance in the assertion of them; and as to jealousy of his associates, or envy of the prominence of their station, or the pre-eminence that might be claimed for their opinions or their acts, it was not in Macneven's nature to feel anything of

the sort. I speak of the man from my own intimate knowledge of his worth and virtues.

There was nothing brilliant in his talents, or showy in his conversation; his abilities, however, as a public speaker were considerable, and one or two extracts from his early speeches in "The Back-lane Parliament," as it was called, will give some idea of the plain sound sense, and strong conviction of the truth and justice of his cause, which distinguished the speeches of Macneven.

But when the vices of those, whose profligacy in the gratification of their passions had made treason to their principles the means of replenishing their resources, were the subject of his remarks, it would be difficult to convey an idea of the solemn earnestness of his language, and of the vigour and expressive energy of the terms in which he described and reprobated the acts of such men as Reynolds. It was only on some such occasion that one could discover in the placid benignity of the old man's countenance, the tranquillity of its expression, the gentleness and suavity of his manner, the mildness of his tone of voice, traces of that energy of character which he displayed on many occasions, which called for extraordinary intrepidity, presence of mind, quickness of observation, and promptness in taking advantage of the knowledge thus obtained.

The stuff that was requisite for a man in the occupation of a post beset with dangers, or a martyr to a cause which needed the demonstration of an attachment to it superior to the fear of death, was that which entered into the composition of Macneven. If the interests of that cause called for any extraordinary effort, though its issue were to prove fatal to him, Macneven would have walked to the scaffold with the same air and aspect of composure with which he would have gone to his bed.

When I visited him for the last time in 1839, and saw with deep concern the change which had taken place in his appearance, being then evidently broken down in health, and fast approaching the termination of his career, I made a memorandum of the subjects of conversation on which he expressed any opinion respecting the events or men of '98, or communicated any interesting information.

In speaking of Reynolds, Dr. Macneven said: "That villain did all he could to get evidence from me to convict me, but I distrusted him, knowing him to be given to falsehood and inclined to gluttony. I never knew one who was a sensualist who was good for anything in public business. I knew the mother of this man Reynolds well—she was a Geraldine—a shrewd, intelligent old lady. I was her physician, attended her in her last illness, and believed she did not die a natural death."

"Immediately before the arrests at Bond's, Reynolds was desirous to entrap me into an admission of a guilty knowledge of the designs of the United Irishmen. Reynolds came to my place of abode two or three days before the arrests in March, and asked for me. He came several times in the course of one day and also of the next. I at first shunned him, but finally determined to see him, and endeavour to find out if my suspicions were well founded. When he called at my lodgings on Ormond Quay, Reynolds told me he had called to know where the provincial committee was next to meet, and the object of it. I had folded up a blank sheet of paper as a letter directed to Reynolds, and taking it up off the mantle-piece I said to Reynolds, 'Here is all the information I can give you on the subject;' fixing my eyes steadily at his face, 'but,' said I 'as we have met there is no occasion for the letter,' and I threw the seeming letter into the fire. Such disappointment I never saw represented on the stage by an actor as was depicted in the physiognomy of Reynolds. Here the written testimony, as he thought, that would have hanged his victim, he was on the point of getting hold of, and in a moment it was in the flames; and still greater disappointment was exhibited when I said, 'How do you suppose, sir, that I should know anything of the matter?' Reynolds went away, his purpose was defeated, and he felt that he was suspected."

"The policy of government was to make us exaggerate our sentiments—to inebriate our opinions, in order to drive us to desperate courses, and then take advantage of our folly. There was one infamous paper, *The Union Star*, which was made to advocate assassination, and to express sentiments hateful to the United Irishmen. These efforts were denounced by *The Press*, but *The Press* was prosecuted, and *The Union Star* allowed to escape unpunished. The editor was a bad man."

"A certain lord said, just previous to the breaking out of the rebellion: 'The country must be made sick of republicanism; they (the people) must be maddened with liberty principles before they have had enough of anarchy, and are forced to come back to us for good government.'"

"Lord Clare was a sort of an Irishman in feeling—with his vices, he was not of the same class as Lord Castlereagh—his blood was warm, and he was susceptible of generous emotions."

"Sir L. Parsons (the late Lord Ross) was the most staunch democrat, as I thought, of all the men of that party—his change of politics surprised me amazingly."

"Grattan would not have been so much thought of, if it had not been for Clare's hostility to him. They hated

one another—Grattan checked Clare's vices; Clare stimulated Grattan's patriotism."

"There were a great many persons of high rank, and even some holding official situations, who were in the confidence of the United Irishmen, watching the turn that things would take, and ready to shape their course accordingly. A general officer in the British service was in the interest of the United Irishmen; a privy councillor was likewise friendly to their society, and frequently serviceable to it."

"Neither Grattan nor Curran were United Irishmen; with the former they entered very little into communication—it was known, in the event of success, Grattan would have accepted an important appointment in the new government; but Curran was continually consulted by them, knew everything that was going on, and his whole heart was in the cause—but he was never committed to it by attending any meeting or taking any oath. The officer, Captain Nugent, who arrested me at my lodgings on Ormond Quay, passed Lord Edward on the stairs, and allowed him to leave the house, not knowing who he was. I was taken to the Castle and brought before Lords Clare and Castlereagh; they put several questions to me; I declined to answer any; I said I had nothing to answer."

"Secretary Marsden visited the prisoners at Kilmainham, spoke kindly to them, told them that Rufus King objected to their going to America—they must think of some other country; they said their principles were those of America; he replied, 'Perhaps they imagine they have too many republicans there already.'"

"George Nugent Reynolds was a man of extraordinary wit and humour; he wrote his beautiful songs *currente calamo*. The best of them or of any in our language was his 'Green were the fields where my forefathers dwelt, oh.' He died at an inn in England on his way to Stow, to visit the Duke of Buckingham."

"Neilson's boy and Emmet's were educated by the prisoners at Fort George—each of them instructing the boys in some particular branch of education. Neilson's son was a remarkably fine boy."

"The Sheares took no ostensible part in the business in Dublin, until after the arrests at Bond's; there was a gap then, and they filled it up. They knew Lord Edward, but I was not intimately acquainted with them."

"John was rather a free-thinker in religious matters—expressed himself too openly—he was wrong in so doing even though he might have given no preference to any particular form of religion, or made no profession of conformity to any; he (Macneven) considered it a proof of

bad sense and bad feeling to make any parade of opinions on such subjects opposed to those generally entertained."

"Lord Edward Fitzgerald had a great deal more of mind than is generally imagined by those who are supposed to be conversant with the history of those times. He had no pretensions—no purpose but to serve Ireland; and to promote her interests he would have served in the ranks as a common soldier."

"Anthony M'Cann, 'the Exile of Erin,' exiled previous to 1798, was a handsome man with a dejected cast of countenance—he lived at Altona. His first acquaintance with the lady he married was somewhat singular. From some unknown benefactress, when his circumstances were embarrassed, immediately after his exile, he received a new year's gift of a considerable sum of money. The following year the same act of beneficence was repeated. He then discovered the person, who proved to be a rich widow lady; and in a short time 'the Exile of Erin' was no longer an unhappy man. I heard from him about two years ago."

"T. A. Emmet was simple in his tastes and manners, went little into society, loved his family, read much; his first speech at the bar in the United States was in the defence of a slave; his last effort in a court of law was in behalf of a charitable institution. This was as it should be with his career."

"Emmet always spoke of his brother Temple as one of the first men of his age. The attorneys of Dublin told him (Macneven) that Thomas Addis Emmet had few if any superiors at the bar. One of the best pictures of Emmet was painted by Benjamin West, and is now in possession of the Fulton family."

"My views for Ireland are now limited to a domestic legislature for the business of the country, not extending to foreign policy, continuing to be a part of the English monarchy, subject to the King of England; no Church Establishment; no tithes. All schemes for the advantage of Ireland, short of this, are futile."

To a question put to me by the daughter of Macneven—"Whether it was likely the government would let her father go back to Ireland, and afford him the gratification of feeling it was in his power to return to his country, though he might never avail himself of the permission?"—Macneven did not give me time to answer; he said, "It is too late to think of that; my lot is cast here, and I have few, if any, relations in Ireland now living. The few who are living are in the County Donegal."

The last time Dr. Macneven ever addressed a public meeting was at a dinner on the festival of St. Patrick, 1837, at which he presided, in New York. The following

extracts are copied from the report of that address, published in *The Green Banner* ;

"It is a consolation to us to know that Ireland has to aid her in this inveterate conflict, many eminent sons of exalted genius and burning patriotism, to all of whom we owe the expression of our admiration and gratitude; but we will begin with him, the Hercules of her host—the slayer of the monster, religious persecution—whose long and invaluable services place him first in the remembrance of his countrymen—The Liberator. The toast is naturally answered by the heartfelt cheer of every true Irishman. Nor this alone. The illustrious subject of your homage merits the admiration of mankind, for his ability and success in establishing religious freedom in his country without the contamination of crime or bloodshed; as he is now prosecuting her liberation from civil bondage without violence or war. The course of Mr. O'Connell forms in some sort a new era, well worth the consideration of whoever would win liberty and preserve order in other places subjected, like Ireland, to foreign and domestic servitude. He is now engaged in a great experiment, which the philosopher is looking to with hope, and the oligarch with dismay—an experiment on the reforming power of reason, the cogency of argument, the pressure of public opinion, and the novel efficiency of sullen but resolute inaction that, without abandoning its purpose, waits for its opportunity. With the unwearied application of his powerful talents he rouses his countrymen to an indignant sense of their degrading condition, while in the same breath he engages their intelligence in the schooling of universal discussion. His constitutional agitation is a moral lever that has its fulcrum in the hearts and arms of millions of a valiant people, whose universal mind he has disciplined to co-operation and method. . . .

"While reviewing the operation and effects of Mr. O'Connell's system of agitation—for it is now a system, and may be denominated the Irish process of reform—we are struck with the frequent and sometimes simultaneous assemblages of large masses of the people; congregating in regular bodies, with the power and advantages of organization: taught to collect, obey, and act by superior orders. These are things that exhibit to us a great and satisfactory gain in public liberty and personal safety, such as might happen in New York, where a citizen is free to do anything and everything that does not infringe the law. But Irishmen had not this privilege in the calamitous days of the Convention and Gunpowder Bills, when the sanguinary daring of a Clare, a Foster, and a Castlereagh, stifled all remonstrance at the outset, sent the Riot Act and the soldiery to the public meeting, and trampled the

press under the mercenary's heel. At that time the moral power was not suffered to act, to discuss, to agitate. It could not then regenerate Dublin, any more than it can now regenerate Vienna, Berlin, or St. Petersburg. It is doubtless the best agent of reformation, provided there exists enough freedom of speech and action to give scope to its efficacy. In this lies the great difference between Ireland now and in 1798. There remained then but one mode of redress. It was that embraced by America under circumstances similar but not equal. There is now another way, directly contrary, but in altered circumstances far better. Who would now in this country, under any excitement of the tariff controversy, seize by force of arms a ship in Boston harbour and throw her cargo overboard, when a town meeting and a memorial to Congress would effect all that was proper or needful? No doubt Adams, and Washington, and Jefferson, were guilty of high treason when they embraced the only alternative left; yet these noble patriots, all determined as they were, need not, in our days and altered circumstances, burn a priming to bring about the happiest revolution that was ever achieved. We must all prefer, to the most successful use of physical violence, the moral, peaceful revolution which Mr. O'Connell is now effecting by the masterly employment of the powers acquired to his country since 1798. But his machinery of honest, staid agitation no man could work at that time. His present organization of agitation was then impossible. Perhaps it is not in accordance with facts to ascribe to any leader of the United Irishmen the committal of the country in 1798. The beginning of hostilities may come from either party; and to those who are versed in modern Irish history it is not unknown that the English government, through its Irish agents, intended, fomented, enacted the insurrection of 1798, in like manner as it had stirred up war in other times for ulterior purposes. Had the torture then widely inflicted—the pitch cap ignited on the peasant's head—the brand blazing in his thatch—been again encouraged by the government, even the controlling, constitutional eloquence of the Liberator himself might fail to restrain the outbursting of manhood. We have seen the case occur, when the government was the instigator to insurrection, and then the cruel and unrelenting avenger. Surely here is sufficient to justify revolution in its rise, and, thank heaven! not always without cause to bless it in its issue. We live in the midst of a specimen of what revolution has done to raise obscure provinces into the most prosperous empire on the face of earth. But whether to bear the ills we have, or to encounter others, does not admit of a general solution. Each case must be judged by the circumstances of the time

and the chances of success. Those circumstances at the period of 1798, were the war then raging between England and France, against whose Jacobin excesses she raised all Europe in arms; while her own acts in Ireland, religious and civil, were equal to whatever she stigmatized as heinous in her rival—to whom, in fact, she reproached no crime that could not be retorted from her own practice.”

Fragment of a narrative respecting his family, commenced by Dr. W. J. Macneven.

“New York, 23rd August, 1837.

“To gratify my wife and children, and at their earnest desire, I have undertaken to compose some notes on myself and family. In younger days I had dreams of celebrity, which could be gained, I thought, by giving a proper view of the heart-stirring subjects with which I was conversant; but more important cares have absorbed my prime, and a family memoir is all that remains for the completion of my declining years. However imperfect, it will be valued by my relations, and even fame, were it attained, is less precious than their love.”

“New York, Thursday, 12th March, 1840.

“Began these memoranda. I was born, I believe, in 1763, on the 21st of March. My family possessed in fee-simple a small landed estate in the County of Galway, about a mile south from Aughrim and Kilcommodan Hill. An eventful battle was fought there on the 12th July, 1691, between the forces of King James II. and King William, and my early intimacy with every inch of the field gave my thoughts ever after an invariable direction to the unfortunate relations of Ireland with England. My mother was the daughter of a gentleman in the neighbourhood of the name of Dolphin, and my kindred of that side continued to hold a respectable standing in the country. Until about the age of ten I passed through the nearest schools. Ballinasloe and Archreagh had each a good English and Latin teacher, and I acquired under them a moderate knowledge of the rudiments of English and Latin grammar. Though fonder of play than of my book, yet I never lost sight of the head of the class, and often arrived at that gratifying distinction.

“My paternal uncle, Baron Macneven, was at this time living at Prague; he was chief physician to the Empress Queen Maria Theresa, and president of the Faculty of

Medicine in the university of that city. He was also a man of good fortune, of eminent talents and learning, and persons of the best society took pleasure in frequenting his house. He sent for me to become an inmate in his family, and receive the advantages of an extensive and excellent education. A favourable opportunity presented itself, in the return of an officer in the Austrian service, who was going back, after a visit to his relatives in the County of Meath. In passing along Rogerson's Quay early in the morning, on our way to the Holyhead packet, I saw two fine-looking men brought from a back yard under a guard of soldiers, and handcuffed before my face; I learned they were American prisoners, and heard them say to the soldiery—though their own lot was a hard one, they would be happy to meet the enemy another time on Bunker's Hill. This incident awoke my attention to the events of the American war, and made me a willing reader of the English papers in my uncle's circle, when they brought us the glories of Washington and the defeats of the British army.

"My father was descended from one of that national party that stood out for Ireland in the war of Cromwell, and who were ultimately driven by the conqueror into the wilds behind the Shannon, not knowing where else to banish them. There my family lived, like others of the old race, in obscurity and independence—true to their religion—full of love of Irish nationality, traditionary pride, and aversion to England. . . .

Letters from Dr. Macneven to R. R. Madden.

"New York, 10th July, 1837.

"Dear Sir—It is full time I should return you thanks for your kind letter of the 1st instant; but though slow in acknowledging your valuable communication, I lost no time in making a proper use of its important contents. I at once communicated a clear abstract of them to one of our liberal, widely-circulating papers; and for their correction, or their shame, our rulers and our public were soon informed of the unworthy use that is made of our flag to favour and facilitate the slave trade. Just now I have seen extracts from the report of the British Commissioners of the 1st of January, 1836, concerning the transport of slaves from Cuba to Texas. You are probably aware that the inhabitants of the slave states are generally desirous of the separation of Texas from Mexico, and its annexation to the Union—their object being to extend and consolidate slavery, with a view of increasing and strengthening their power in Congress. Should this scheme succeed, the

people here, and all to the eastward, already tell us that they will be driven in self-defence to foster the discontents in Canada, favour the separation of those provinces, and promote their annexation to their extremity of the Union, as a counterpoise to the South.

"In this state of things I often wish that facilities were afforded to my poor Irish countrymen to settle at Texas, where they would at once possess a quantum of ground, power, and wealth, that would give them a real home, consideration, and happiness. There is great jealousy of them in the United States, and it is increasing daily, for their numbers are multiplying very fast, and the natives think that these foreigners, as they call them, interfere too much. There actually exists a dislike to them, notwithstanding the immense good they do. It would be a great matter for those who might remain here if there was another good place to which they would be welcome. You may offer Canada, but it is not worth occupying alongside the United States; whereas Texas would form an invaluable settlement for rich and poor. Mrs. Macneven joins me in best respects to Mrs. Madden, and in every good wish for you and your family.

"Yours sincerely,

"WILLIAM JAMES MACNEVEN."

The following portion of a letter was found unfinished among his papers after his death :

From Dr. Macneven to R. R. Madden.

"Dear Sir—I am long indebted to you for an acknowledgment and return of letters, and hope you will never have such cause of apology for similar omissions as but too painfully inculcate me. The inability caused by long and severe sickness was the first, though not the worst of those impediments. The illness and death of a beloved daughter, which happened in that interval, leave a wound that cannot be healed or forgotten. But to hear from you was still a gratification. I was disappointed at not obtaining any circumstantial or satisfactory information from your friend, Sir Edward Baker, respecting Lord Edward's family. He told me he was born and brought up in England, and knew little of the Irish history of his family. But I am glad to see that you are employing yourself upon Irish history, and I trust that you will cause it to be better known. Mr. Warden acquaints me from Paris that a General O'Neil in that city is preparing a work on Ireland, and desirous of receiving materials from this country. Yet there are so few here who take an interest in the subject, and all are so intent

upon their own affairs, that very little can be obtained. I have learned that Arthur O'Connor likewise is preparing for the press a work of a similar nature. I am now retired to the country, where I purpose to pass the remainder of my days. I am pretty old, and with this my domestic loss age leaves me no taste for a more public life. I am not rich, but have a comfortable independence for self and family, and in this country it is enough."

The preceding letter was written a short time before his death. That event took place at the house of his son-in-law, Mr. Thomas Emmet, at Harlaem, in the 78th year of his age. The following account of the funeral arrangement and interment of his remains is taken from *The New York Freeman's Journal* of 17th July, 1841 :

"On Wednesday morning, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather—the rain pouring in torrents—one of the largest funeral processions that has ever been witnessed in this city moved from Mr. Emmet's house to St. Patrick's Cathedral, where it arrived a few minutes after 12 o'clock. The scene in the cathedral was truly solemn and affecting. The pulpit was shrouded in black, and on the altar were laid all the habiliments of mourning customary on such occasions. The coffin was laid on a bier in the central aisle in front of the altar, and covered with a funeral pall of fine black cloth reaching to the floor, and with a deep white edging; and on it were laid a number of burning lights in silver candlesticks. The Right Rev. Bishop Hughes officiated in pontificals, such as are worn in the solemn services for the dead—black vestments, with a white cope and a mitre of the same colour, entirely plain and devoid of ornament. All was peculiarly impressive. The swelling tones of the organ, and the chaunting by the choir of the mournful requiem for the departed soul—the prayers of the bishop, and the holy incense arising in clouds from the burning censers held by the acolytes around the 'narrow tenement' in which were laid the sole earthly remains of one so great and good—all conspired to fill the hearts and souls of those present with the most saddening emotions. We could not forbear at the time recalling to mind, and contrasting with the scene before us, that most eventful period in the life of him who now lay silent in death—when he and the Fitzgeralds, and Emmets, and Tones, and Sampsons, and hundreds and thousands of noble hearts, rose up to avenge their country's wrongs—to save her—to redeem her from the misery of the insulted, down-trodden captive, which she had so long and so bitterly endured. But beset with foes, and spies, and traitors, their cause was lost. And where, we inwardly inquired, was all that gallant band? An Emmet on the

scaffold; Fitzgerald, the lion-hearted, set upon after the manner of assassins, and borne down beneath the weapons of a hired soldiery; death in its most terrible forms—chains, and dungeon, and exile. Such was the fate of those who loved their altars and the homes of their fathers. The time and the circumstances around us were indeed well calculated to call up sorrowful memories.

“It was consoling, however, amid all the grief which it occasioned, to see this time-honoured patriot go down to rest so tranquilly, and so surrounded with all that could give peace to the departing spirit. Friends without number—love and respect on every side—all the aids of religion in the hour of extremity, and his obsequies honoured by the offices of a holy bishop of that faith for which he had in his lifetime suffered and so zealously contended.

“After the funeral service in the cathedral, the procession in carriages moved to the East River at the foot of Grand Street, from which place the body was accompanied by the relatives and pall-bearers to the family burying-ground at Newtown, in Long Island.”

The medical career of Dr. Macneven is recorded in *The New York Medical Gazette* of 11th August, 1841 :

“Dr. Macneven was sent to Germany for his education at an early age, and continued there for ten years, taking his degree of doctor of physic at Vienna, in 1784. He returned that year to Dublin, and entered upon the practice of his profession in Dublin. . . . He landed in New York, 4th July, 1805. He immediately entered on the practice of his profession, and in 1808 was appointed professor of midwifery in the College of Physicians and Surgeons. In 1811, he exchanged his chair for that of chemistry. In 1812, he was appointed resident physician by Governor Clinton. In 1816, materia medica was added to chemistry, and he gave instruction on both branches till 1820, when they were again separated.

“In 1826, he resigned his professorship in the College of Physicians, and united with Drs. Hosack, Francis, Mott, and Godman, in the Duane Street School. Here the chair of materia medica was again assigned him. This school was discontinued in 1830, and at that point Dr. Macneven closed his career as a teacher. In 1832, during the cholera, he was chosen one of the Medical Council, to whom was assigned the supervision of the hospitals and other establishments for the sick. In 1840, he was again appointed resident physician, an office which he resigned a few weeks before his death. He published, in 1820, an exposition of the atomic theory, which attracted favourable notice both at home and abroad, and about the same time

an edition of Brande's Chemistry, which is extensively used as a text-book. As a lecturer he was simple, clear, and animated—as a practitioner, judicious and efficient—as a man, amiable, honest, and kind-hearted—as a patriot, ardent, active, bold, disinterested. With him the love of country was a passion as well as a principle; and when that country shall cease to cherish his memory she will be utterly unworthy of him."

Letter relative to the Death of Dr. W. J. Macneven from
his widow to Mrs. Madden.

"New York, 27th September, 1842.

"Dear Madam—I received your letter, dated 12th of August, and thank you for the kind sympathy you therein express for the irreparable loss we have sustained in the death of my much lamented husband. I feel that Dr. Madden and yourself are among the number of those friends who could justly estimate the private virtues as well as the public worth of one who never swerved from his duty in any one act of his life. I thank you for the amiable remembrance you are pleased to entertain of the happy intercourse between us, which your short visits to New York but too seldom gave us the opportunity of enjoying; and I remember with much pleasure, dear madam, the last evening you passed with us—you, Dr. Madden, and your lovely boy. Dr. Madden will receive, together with this letter, a packet from my daughter, containing a hasty sketch of her father and his family.

"Agreeable to your request, I communicated to Mrs. Sampson your wishes respecting her husband—his private life, &c. Mrs. Tone has sent me the enclosed packet for Dr. Madden, which I forward to him. We have read with great interest the doctor's late work. It is indeed ably written; and I need not say that it is highly appreciated by Americans as well as by the Irish population of our country. Mr. Emmet requests me to tell the doctor that his brother Robert, who has his father's papers, has been out of town for most of the summer—that he will return shortly, when he will obtain and transmit, by the earliest opportunity, anything that may be deemed useful for his work. Mr. Hugh Wilson, one of the United Irishmen, a dear friend and fellow-sufferer with my beloved husband, died in 1829, leaving two sons. The eldest, Edward Joseph, is practising law with my son, Thomas A. Emmet. He is the very counterpart of his excellent father. Hugh, the youngest, is engaged in farming in Pennsylvania. He is

well educated, and possesses good talents and great energy of character. They were united to my children and those of the Emmets by the strongest bonds of friendship.

"Please to accept for yourself and Dr. Madden my kindest regards.

"I am, dear Madam, yours very sincerely,

(Signed) "JANE M. MACNEVEN.

Letter from William Hugh Macneven, the only son of
Dr. W. J. Macneven, to R. R. M.

"New York, 18th April, 1843.

"Dear Sir—I enclose you with this letter a copy of a proclamation written by my father, after he had been exiled from Ireland and had joined the French Army in France. The United Irishmen having entered into negotiations with the government, many, like my father, entered the army with the hope of invading Ireland and achieving her emancipation. This proclamation was drawn up by my father with a view to publishing it as soon as they should land in Ireland; but disappointed and deceived in their expectations, it of course remained in manuscript.

"That portion of your work already published, I need scarcely say, has been widely circulated in this great reading community, and has given satisfaction to all for the candid spirit in which the events it embraces are narrated. The whole tenor of the work, disquieting as must always be the picture of that period of Ireland's unhappy history, maintains that dispassionate tone which is undoubtedly best calculated to obtain the confidence of the reader and must do much toward destroying the prejudices which calumny has so long engendered. The historian who records truths so unpalatable to the powers that be, follows no beaten track; he writes, however, not wholly for the present, but for a future which must come fraught with great political changes.

"I believe I but speak the sentiments of all similarly interested, in expressing my deep indebtedness to the pen which has so successfully undertaken the task of rescuing from oblivion a just record of the men of '98; and though I differ from you in upholding—as I most religiously do—the wisdom and justice of their attempt, I am satisfied that it can only need a faithful history of Ireland's wrongs to vindicate the character and motives of the men who sought to redress them. Few of the men of that day are now living to give their testimony, and the time was fast

passing when history could secure a just record of a period which successful tyranny is so much interested in cloaking with falsehood.

"With sentiments of great respect, dear sir, I remain your obedient servant.

(Signed)

"WILLIAM HUGH MACNEVEN.

"Dr. R. R. Madden.

"My mother and sister beg to be remembered most kindly to Mrs. M. and yourself."

Notices of Dr. W. J. Macneven's Death, and of his career,
in the American Papers.

(*"New York Freeman's Journal," 17th July, 1841*).

"Death of Dr. William James Macneven.—It is our mournful duty, this week, to announce the death of one of the best and purest of Ireland's patriots—one of the last surviving relics of that sacred band who, in the disastrous days of '98, struck boldly—though alas ! unsuccessfully—for Ireland's freedom, and whose memory is now, and will for ever remain, warmly and affectionately enshrined in the hearts of Irishmen.

"William James Macneven is no more ! A great and a good man is gone from amongst us ; one around whose declining path of life there shone a glory reflected from years long past—all the proud though sad memories of his country's last great struggle to assume her rightful place as an independent nation ; one who was so identified with that period of intense but melancholy interest in Ireland's history, that with his name or his presence there always came the thought of freedom and independence—of the high and daring aspirations of the patriot, and the fearful calamities and dark treachery in which all were lost and extinguished—of bright hopes, almost bursting into glorious reality, for a nation's rescue from bonds and slavery, but all swept cruelly away in the sudden tempest and overwhelming power of the oppressor's wrath. These were some of the heart-stirring thoughts which were ever associated with the name and presence of Macneven, and the recollection of which crowds upon the soul so sadly, now that his mortal life—faithfully devoted as it had been to his country, and to the cause of justice and humanity everywhere—is closed for ever. And these thoughts will not be allowed to slumber now in the breasts of the Friends of Ireland. One so venerated and beloved—an honoured and noble relic of that time which showed that if Irishmen were enslaved they at least did not wear their bonds tamely and submissively : one thus endeared—the

personification of so much of the glory of his country—will not, we feel assured, be suffered to pass away without some marked and permanent evidence being given, that the Irishmen of New York are true to the generous character of their country: that freedom is a name dear to them, and that the love of the land of their fathers remains unabated in their bosoms: that patriotism is with them a substantial and a household virtue, and that he in whose whole life it was exemplified will not be suffered to go down to the grave unforgotten and undistinguished. And who could claim the possession of that virtue in a more remarkable degree than he whose sun has now set amid so many blessings on his memory? To use the words addressed to us, since this melancholy event, by a venerable friend, an extract of whose speech at a public dinner forms a portion of this article:

“ ‘The natural life and the patriotism of William James Macneven would seem to be of the same duration. No man who knew him can say when he was not a patriot. Patriotism must have embraced him in his cradle. Contrary to the lesson which selfishness would dictate, he returned to his country from the Continent, where he had been sent for his education, and where honours and fortune awaited him. He loved that country too well to desert it in the day of its distress, and in all its throes and struggles for the recovery of lost freedom he took an active part; and, driven into exile, he continued in America to labour for the good of his countrymen in Ireland, and for the benefit of such of them as emigrated to this country. He was, in the year 1828-9, president of the Friends of Ireland in the United States; and was, at the time of his death, president of the Irish Emigrant Association in this city. But the heart that was warm, and was nobly so, is now cold and lifeless; the hand once employed in drafting a constitution for independent Ireland is now rigid in death; the tongue once eloquent is speechless; the eye fitted alike for the camp and the cabinet is dim and sightless; the man who would have made Ireland what Washington made America has not lived to witness even freedom's shadow—the Repeal of the Union.’ . . .

“Dr. Macneven was in the 79th year of his age when called as we believe and trust, to receive the reward of a life well spent. His health had been very feeble for many months past, owing principally to an injury received by a fall from his gig. Notwithstanding all the kind assiduities of affectionate friends and the best medical aid from his attending physician, Dr. William Power, his strength of late failed rapidly, and on the 12th inst., at one o'clock in the afternoon, he expired, at the house of his son-in-law, Thomas Emmet, Esq.” . . .

At the dinner (previously noticed) given in 1837, in New York, in honour of the Patron Saint of Ireland, the services of Dr. Macneven to the Catholic cause were set forth by an Irishman of an historic name and lineage, a man of great worth and talents, a Mr. Thomas O'Connor, a member of the American Bar.

The report of the proceeding of that festive meeting, given in *The Green Banner*, was republished in July, 1841, prefaced by the following observations of a New York journal:

"Dr. Macneven presided at the dinner referred to. The health of O'Connell was one of the standard toasts, and Dr. Macneven spoke to it with his usual force and eloquence. It was, we believe, the last time he ever addressed a public meeting. We give the following passages, which glow with patriotism and admiration for the unrivalled chief who has so successfully aroused and led on Ireland in her moral contest with English despotism, and at the same time vindicate the character and means employed by the heroes of '98. These latter, it will be remembered, O'Connell recently denounced; and although he has retracted since then, at a public meeting in London, much of what he uttered against them, still we put it to his own heart whether justice, and honour, and patriotism do not require a fuller exculpation from the charge which he preferred, than any which he has yet given, and whether there is not truth in every word of the annexed passage."

Mr. O'Connor, the vice-president of the meeting on the occasion referred to, said :

"Dr. Macneven is among the oldest of my living personal acquaintances—he was one of the earliest; fifty years have rolled away since we first met. As far back as my earliest knowledge of the doctor he was a patriot. . . . Endowed with talents of a high order, God and nature bestowed on him a heart and spirit which, for good or evil, must have drawn him into active notoriety, whether as the asserter of his country's rights or the oppressor of his country's liberties. He acted on his own judgment, and was by choice a patriot. Dr. Macneven was the uncompromising advocate of the independence of his country, at a period when no man of sense or honour would have taken up patriotism as a mere trade, when its immediate aspect presented but danger of the most appalling kind, and when, in its remote prospect, it promised but that happiness in the enjoyment of which the earliest labourer in the field has the least chance to participate."

To the preceding statement of Mr. O'Connor's views of the character of Dr. Macneven the author of this work has little to add. An intimate acquaintance with him enables the author not only to pronounce a very confident opinion of its accuracy, but to express his conviction that it falls short of conveying an adequate idea of Dr. Macneven's singleness of purpose, simplicity of character, stern integrity of principle, philosophical calmness and composure of mind, arising from controlled passions, moderated desires, and well regulated conduct adapted to all circumstances and vicissitudes of fortune.

These are not the qualities with which Shakspeare would have invested the character of a man "fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils." William James Macneven and Thomas Addis Emmet were assuredly not the persons whom a statesman (deserving of that title) could proscribe as rebels, without feeling there must be "something rotten in the state," and vicious in the extreme in the government of which he was minister, when sober-minded men of such exalted worth and virtue as they were could be induced to commit themselves and their country to a desperate struggle with their rulers. The preceding memoirs are especial illustrations of the truth of this opinion.

This work is, in fact, the embodiment of an idea that the Machiavellian doctrine, *Divide et impera*, and the policy of ruling a country through a faction, against the great body of a people, and for the interests solely of a section of them, if long continued, must terminate either in debasement, stifled hatred and servitude, or in rebellion. In the latter event the chances of success will be rarely found in a ratio with the wrongs an insurgent people have risen to redress, and a bad government will be rendered worse by an abortive insurrection, the failure of which will have only tended to consolidate the power of misrule. Eventually, either the bad government will become incurably depraved, or the force of circumstances or an instinct of self-preservation will turn it from the evil of its ways, and suggest the adoption of wiser, more moderate, and more wholesome councils; but its new action on them will be impeded and thwarted by the remnants of old oppressions and the resentment connected with them for lost privileges—for the withdrawal of state support from the ascendancy of a faction, and discredited pretensions to loyalty of an exclusive character—and embarrassed by the conflict of new opinions and recently recovered rights, with those damaged interests of an effete monopoly not yet reconciled to the humiliation of enfeebled insolence and restrained rapacity.

A government that has been uniformly just, *ab initio*, faithful to its trust, or that, from abandonment of its duties, has reverted to the first principles and intentions of all state authority deserving of that name, will endeavour by all legitimate means to render the people contented, and will leave no part of the community just cause of complaint. Equal laws, and an impartial administration of them, must insure that reverence for authority without which there is no real safety for state or people. If a well-ruled people unfortunately allowed themselves to be led by turbulent and disaffected persons into violent and illegal courses, the obvious duty of a good government would be, to adopt the promptest measures for the prevention of the designs of those disaffected persons, the most effective means to nip conspiracy in its bud, to hinder its growth, and render an outbreak of rebellion if possible impracticable. If all such efforts unfortunately failed, it then would be the duty of a good government to suppress rebellion by all the means at its disposal that were lawful, and in accordance with the principles of Christianity, which are recognised as the foundation of all authority in a Christian state. The policy of the bad government of those times which this work treats of was, to exasperate popular discontent, to cause men who were known to be disaffected to a faction whose power was predominant in the state to exaggerate the sense of their wrongs, to mesh them in a system of espionage, to speculate on the result of insurrection, to foment it, and promote its premature explosion, in order that when the deluded people went to war with them, they might with advantage go to law with the exasperated people, and administer it at the point of the sword, when the result could not be doubtful. In putting down the rebellion of 1798, which was prematurely exploded, savage and inhuman means of repression were had recourse to, and all laws human and divine were outraged. Is it good for the interests of humanity, of religion, of good government, that the history of that rebellion should be ignored or falsified? The writer of this work believes that it is not, and therefore he submits it to the cool judgment of sober-minded men of all creeds and classes in these kingdoms, confidently expecting that his motives and his labours will be duly and fairly appreciated.

The history of the rebellion of 1798 affords small encouragement for resistance even to the worst of governments. Abundant evidence is there for leaders in popular movements of enormous difficulties to confront, of vile intrigues and jealousies to contend with, of exaggerated expectations of sympathy, assistance, resources, and support. Ample proof will be furnished in those lessons

of history of the utter worthlessness of oaths and tests for the object they are intended to effect, the final certainty of deceived hopes—of treachery, stealthily treading in the footsteps of conspiracy, dogging its confederates from place to place—of grounds for suspecting the fidelity of associates, but no means of detecting and defeating perfidy—of falling into errors that may be fatal, and having no opportunity afforded of retrieving them. The teachings of that history would make their way to the consciences of men who loved their country, and yet were driven into rebellion by intolerable injustice. They would point out the disastrous effects of abortive insurrections to the honour and the interests of the land that gave them birth—disastrous effects which may surpass all other calamities in lasting mischief, save those of a famine or a pestilence. The calamity I refer to is the contempt brought on the country it was intended to revolutionise, by abortive insurrection; contempt for the country and the people that have met with defeat, and must endure subjection, felt not only by the government that has triumphed over them, but felt by foreign nations, which may have sympathised with the past wrongs and sufferings of that people that has been subdued. There would be found ample evidence of the evil of giving increased power to a bad government over a country that has been not only beaten down, but scourged without mercy, and brought into contempt. Ten, twenty—nay, even fifty years of that kind of peace that supervenes on a crushed rebellion—on the exhaustion of a nation's energies—on the disgrace and dishonour of defeat—on the insolent contempt that is felt for any assumption of power to resist oppression—may be enjoyed by the oppressor and endured by the oppressed. And that reflection is not rendered less poignant by the consideration that the prolongation of that injustice might not have been possible had no abortive insurrection taken place.

16/9 88



11, 391.