

A
44 DA914
.028
1843

THE IRISH
IN THE
ENGLISH ARMY & NAVY,
AND
THE IRISH ARMS BILL,
IN FIVE LETTERS,
TO
MICHAEL STAUNTON, ESQ.,
PROPRIETOR OF THE "REGISTER ;"
T. M. RAY, ESQ.,
SECRETARY TO THE LOYAL NATIONAL REPEAL ASSOCIATION,
AND
LORD ELLIOT,
THE "ENGLISH" SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND.

"Nor need I tell, when dangerous deeds require
The boldest hearts, and claim the warrior's fire,
First in the field, the flames and sword we bear,
And 'midst a thousand deaths provoke the war:
The battle o'er, when bloody tumults cease,
And spoils and laurels crown the soldier's peace;
In vain our merits equal share may claim,
Theirs are the lands, the triumphs, wealth and fame".

TASSO.

BY
JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN,
AUTHOR OF "THE GREEN BOOK."

DUBLIN:
PUBLISHED AND PRINTED BY JAMES M'CORMICK,
16, CHRIST-CHURCH-PLACE.
1843.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE IRISH
IN THE
ENGLISH ARMY AND NAVY,
AND
THE IRISH ARMS BILL,
IN FIVE LETTERS,
TO MICHAEL STAUNTON, ESQ.,

PROPRIETOR OF THE "REGISTER;"

T. M. RAY, ESQ.,

SECRETARY TO THE LOYAL NATIONAL REPEAL ASSOCIATION,

AND

LORD ELLIOT,

THE "ENGLISH" SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND.

"Nor need I tell, when dangerous deeds require
The boldest hearts, and claim the warrior's fire,
First in the field, the flames and sword we bear,
And 'midst a thousand deaths provoke the war:
The battle o'er, when bloody tumults cease,
And spoils and laurels crown the soldier's peace;
In vain our merits equal share may claim,
Theirs are the lands, the triumphs, wealth and fame".

TASSO.

BY
JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN,

AUTHOR OF "THE GREEN BOOK."

DUBLIN:
PUBLISHED AND PRINTED BY JAMES M'CORMICK,
16, CHRIST-CHURCH-PLACE.
1843.

TO
THE
PEOPLE
OF IRELAND,

WHOSE PRIVATE MORALITY AND PUBLIC VIRTUE PRESENT SUCH A BRIGHT CONTRAST TO THE GENERAL WORTHLESSNESS AND RAPACITY OF THE MOST CONTEMPTIBLE ARISTOCRACY IN EUROPE, THESE LETTERS, PROVING, IN ANSWER TO ENGLISH TORY INSOLENCES, THE FORMIDABLE STRENGTH OF IRELAND IN (AS WELL AS OUT OF) THE ARMY AND NAVY, AND SHOWING WITH WHAT INFAMOUS DESPOTISM SHE IS LEGISLATED FOR BY ENGLAND, ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED, IN THEIR PRESENT CHEAP FORM,
BY THE AUTHOR OF
"THE GREEN
BOOK."

PREFACE.

At a period, when the corrupt and aristocratic rulers of these islands are proving to the world by their various unconstitutional measures, that they are unwilling to rely for support on public opinion, the only legitimate basis for honest government, the reprint, in a cheap and popular form, of the following letters, may not be deemed unseasonable, especially in Ireland, as tending to show so much of the constitution of that army, with which the oligarchy would gladly crush the strictly just, legal, and peaceable demands of an oppressed people, for the restoration of their inalienable privilege of being ruled by their own laws. But, independent of such considerations, the writer of those letters, as having a character to maintain, has been compelled to republish them, in vindication of that character, from the renewed attacks upon it by the *Standard*. That Tory journal, with the usual enmity of its party to those who advocate any other position for Ireland, than that of a degraded and plundered province to England, having thought fit, amongst its other abuse of the Irish people, to threaten them with the army, as a certain means of putting down the popular demand for a domestic legislature, the writer of these pages first met the threat in *The Green Book*, by demonstrating, from various authorities, all most carefully and minutely specified, that the number of Irish Catholics was, and had long been, so great, not only in the army, but likewise in the navy, as to make the invincibility of the *Standard's* supposed "British heart and British arm," rather a doubtful matter. On the publication of the *Green Book*, early in 1841, a copy of it was sent to, and an advertisement of it inserted in, the *Standard*, as well as the other leading London journals. The *Standard*, however, taking no notice of the work, though continuing to assail the character of the Irish Catholics in the British army, the *Register* took up the question for Ireland; referring the *Standard*, for a refutation of its calumnious assertions, to the *Green Book*. The *Standard*, still affecting to be ignorant of the book, the author came forward, and vindicated, in the three letters published in the *Register*, the statements of his work, by the production of more authorities on the subject in dispute. These letters the *Standard* was unable to answer, though branded at the time, for not doing so, "as a detected braggart." Meanwhile, the controversy having excited considerable public attention, on both sides of

the channel, a leading Irish Member of Parliament got Mr. Hume, to move for official returns of the Irish, English, and Scotch, in the army. These returns being granted in May, 1841, the number of Irish in the army, though considerably reduced from what it was during the French war, was, nevertheless, proved beyond a doubt, to be greater, in proportion for Ireland, than the amount of English and Scotch military, for England and Scotland. Accordingly, in May last, when Peel, and that base and unnatural Irishman, Wellington, had the audacity to utter their ruffianly threats of "physical force," against the Repealers, those official documents which the *Green Book* was one of the principal causes of procuring, were made use of by the writer, in a fourth letter, addressed to Mr. Ray, on the Irish in the English service, as a means of showing, to the insolence of unprincipled authority, what a large proportion of the so-called English army would be composed of Irishmen, in case the troops should be ordered to attack the Irish people, for merely advocating, by legal means, the repeal of an act of parliament. And, indeed, since the Spanish army have ventured to *pronounce*, that orders to fire upon one's fellow-subjects, are not, in every case, to be obeyed, inasmuch as those orders may not always be founded on justice, and when not so founded, can, if obeyed, be only complied with, in violation of the solemn commandment, "*Thou shalt do no murder!*"—since the patriotic Spanish army, like that of France at the Revolution, have so presumed to think, and to prove they think, that soldiers are not always to be counted upon, as mere unreasoning or conscienceless herds of wholesale and unconditional man-butchers, whenever the aristocratic oppressors of the community, under the designation of "government," may command the people to be massacred, for not submitting to injustice—since this fresh "moral lesson" has been pronounced for "all whom it may concern," it is difficult to perceive, even independent of the circumstance of so many of the military being known Repealers, how the great mass of our army can be reckoned on, to uphold, at the expense of their own, as well as the people's cause, the supremacy of an oligarchy, whose generosity, gratitude, and tenderness to the soldiery for so doing, consist of promotion to commissions only for the rich, the mangling lash to the bleeding back, and such merciless drillings as have caused poor private Macmanus to drop down dead, and private George Jubee, (a soldier of acknowledged good character;) to send, in desperation, a bullet through Adjutant Robertson Mackay's body! To the foregoing letters, on the Irish in the so-called British army and navy, a fifth letter to Lord Elliot, on his infamous and insulting Arms Bill, has been added, as serving more clearly to expose the combined weakness and despotism of the Peel and Wellington ministry, who imagine they can silence the just demands of the Irish nation by brute force; and who now *call out the old Chelsea pensioners, agreeing to pay them two shillings a day, and supply them with big coats, &c. along with their present pensions, while the poor, overdrilled, and unpromoted soldier, in the prime of his life, only gets one shilling a day!* Thus would this government make it appear, that the moral, intelligent, orderly, temperate, brave, and respectable body of men, the serjeants and privates of the army, cannot be depended upon! The extreme cheapness of the present form of publication has been chosen, in order that the public (in the widest acceptation of the term) may be best enabled to judge, how far the *Standard* was recently entitled to say—"The lies and exaggerations of the *Green Book* can hardly be forgotten."

LETTER I.

TO MICHAEL STAUNTON, ESQ.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF RECRUITING THE ARMY WITHOUT IRISH
CATHOLICS.

"The most useful of all lessons is the conviction of our strength and moral dignity. Let us cast our eyes around us, and this conviction is acquired."—*General Vandoncourt.*

SIR—The *Standard*, having affected to dispute the correctness of the proportion which you have assigned to the Irish in the British army and navy, on the authority of the "*Green Book*," and having likewise indirectly impugned the authority of that publication, on the pretence of its not having produced sufficient evidence in proof of that proportion—a few communications from the writer of the volume in question may not, under such circumstances, be deemed unreasonable. These communications, in which the facts of the "*Green Book*" shall be made use of, and strengthened by some of those additional testimonies called for by the *Standard*, cannot more appropriately commence than with an inquiry into the origin of the so-called Popish or O'Connellite "taint," in the forces of the empire, complained of by the London journalist; and to that inquiry the present letter is accordingly devoted.

The paper alluded to, speaking of the Repeal question, in terms which are a fair specimen of British Tory rhodomontade on the subject, has said:—"The Union must be maintained by force, and, thank Heaven, it can be maintained by force! and, again, thank Heaven for the British heart and the British arm, it shall be maintained by force!" A little investigation, will, however, show, that any Union with Ireland, resting only on "force," or the mere power of the "British heart and the British arm," would have rather a dubious foundation. In a strictly national and military sense, that is, as a united country—or as Leinster, Ulster, Connaught, and Munster, combining heart and hand in one cause—Ireland has never yet been conquered. The only period, in which such a patriotic union of all sects and parties occurred amongst us was in the time of our fathers, when, with considerably less than half her present population, and without availing herself of more than the comparatively aristocratic portion of her inhabitants, Ireland came to the following determination, as represented by "The effective men in the different volunteer corps, whose delegates met at Dungaunon, and of those who acceded to their resolutions, and the regulations of the House of Commons of Ireland, the 16th of April, 1782, viz. :—

"That there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind this nation, except the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, nor any other parliament which hath any authority, or power, of any sort whatsoever, in this country, save only the parliament of Ireland.

"That in this right the very essence of our liberties exist—a right which we, on the part of the people of Ireland, do claim as their birth-right, and which we cannot yield but with our lives."

The amount of the self-equipped and self-maintained force of Ireland, in

readiness, if necessary, to back those words by deeds, and independent, as has been hinted, of any aid from the working portion, or great mass of their countrymen, was as follows :—

	Men.	Guns.
Army of Ulster	34,152	32
Army of Leinster	22,283	38
Army of Munster	18,056	32
Army of Connaught	14,336	20
Ascertained total	88,827	122
Twenty-two additional corps, estimated at	12,000	8
	100,827	130

And then the demand of Ireland for self-legislation was granted, because then it could not be safely refused! (1) Since about that time, or the period of the American war, and indeed for several years before it, it would be ridiculous to boast of what the "British heart and the British arm" was able to effect, without the assistance of Irishmen. As early as 1769, experience showed, how impolitic was the wretched and contemptible bigotry that would rely for the defence of these kingdoms on their mere British or Protestant population, and the enormously expensive aid of foreign mercenaries, to the exclusion of the cheaper and more abundant supply of excellent Catholic soldiers, as well as officers, from Ireland, whom such blind sectarianism and persecution were not only depriving England of, but forcing into the hostile services of France and Spain. For the conduct of the Irish in the armies of those powers, I need only advert to the battle-fields or ramparts of Nerwinde, Marsaglia, Marseilles, Barcelona, Cremona, Luzzara, Blenheim, Ramilies, Pallue, Spire, Castiglione, Almanza, Villa Viciosa, Oran, Campo-Santo, Veletri, Fontenoy, Laffeldt, Menin, Ypres, Tournay, and Rosbach. The numbers, which were drawn from this country to strengthen the "natural enemies" of Great Britain, may be judged of by the fact, that, according to the records of the war-office of France, there died, in the service of that power alone, from 1691 to 1745, above 450,000 Irish; and, from 1745 to the Revolution, as many more as would amount to 600,000! (2) Meantime, the Protestant population of England and Scotland being rendered more and more comfortable by the progress of a flourishing commerce at home, became less fitted for, or less inclined to, military service abroad; while the Protestants of Ireland, being either raised above the hardships of a military life by the confiscated estates of the Catholics, and the monopoly of every government office—or occupied in whatever trade British oppression left in the country—or emigrating to America, in consequence of the deficiency of remunerative employment, caused by that oppression—and, in addition to all these circumstances, being too small in

(1.) Grattan's Miscellaneous Works, p. 129-30. Barrington's History of the Legislative Union, part ii. p. 10, II, and 12—edit. 1809.

(2.) M'Geoghegan, Hist. de l'Irlande, dedicat. tome. i. and iii., p. 754. Newenham, Inquiry into the Progress, &c. of the Population of Ireland, sec. iii., p. 60-63.—Commentaries on the Memoirs of Tone, advert., p. ii. &c.

amount, could not furnish any thing like a due supply of recruits for the "wear and tear" of the British army. "The troops in the Mediterranean sea," says Sir William Draper, so early as 1769, "in the West Indies, in America, labour under great difficulties, from the scarcity of men, which is but too visible over all these kingdoms"—that is, all over England and Scotland, as is shown by the context—"Many of our forces," adds Sir William, "are in climates unfavourable to British constitutions; their loss is in proportion. Britain," he concludes, "must recruit all these regiments from her own emaciated bosom, or, more precariously, by Catholics from Ireland!" (3). Shortly after, but particularly in consequence of, the defeat and capture of Burgoyne's army by the Americans, an imperative reason, even in the eyes of the prejudiced George III., for commencing an alteration in the "No Popery Code," appears to have been the want of "Catholics from Ireland," in order to compensate for the weakness of the "British heart and the British arm;" and the alarm which the French government of that day displayed, at this dawn of common sense on the part of the English cabinet, is too instructive not to be mentioned; more particularly as it has not been noticed by any of our superficial scribblers, who have entitled themselves "historians!" A contemporary writer, after remarking that, to the harassing legal incapacities, under which the Catholics laboured at home—"France owed some of her bravest brigades, and Austria her most distinguished generals," so that the British "government was not insensible of all this, and therefore, prudently resolved to give them (the Catholics) some indulgence," thus proceeds. "Perhaps there never was a period when a step of this kind was more solidly political, or better calculated to promote the common-weal. After the surrender of Burgoyne's army, what an alarming prospect appeared to the eyes of the nation!... The distresses and dangers of the nation called aloud for the assistance of every source of power which is within us; whilst an application to foreign aids"—i. e. Hessians, &c. levied at an enormous cost—"too forcibly proved a decay in our own vital principle. Nothing, therefore, could be better judged, under such circumstances, than to re-unite to the state such a numerous body of faithful subjects."... "But," continues the same writer, "the more Britain rejoiced at this happy event, the more France was confounded!—Political France! whose eyes are always open to her own interest, well saw the fatal tendency of such a step to her. No sooner was it seen there, that the act was passed in favour of the Roman Catholics, than an universal damp was seen in every countenance; and the general cry was, *Voilà, deux cents mille hommes armez contre nous!* 'See 200,000 men armed against us!' They lamented to think that their Irish brigades must now fall to the ground, and that they could no longer expect to be supported by a disaffected party among ourselves, in case they should invade us; and, to show to what length they carried their regret, the students of the English College at Douay wanted to give public thanks to God for the happy event; but they durst not do it! "Of all this," he adds, "I am informed by gentlemen of the utmost veracity, who were in France at the time, and who were eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of what passed." And "these unquestion-

(3.) Fourth Letter to Junius. Sir William's testimony, as that of a supporter of the Tory government of the day, and the holder of a high command in the British army, is unexceptionable.

able facts," he concludes, oddly enough, "to show, beyond reply, the propriety of the Repeal, and advantages that may be expected from it to this country!" (4)

Having thus shown, on British, Protestant, military, and contemporary evidence, the acknowledged impossibility of keeping up the forces necessary for the defence of the empire, without drawing on the Irish portion of the population, I cannot conclude this communication better—especially in reference to that "best possible public instructor" of the London press, who affects never to have heard of the reputation of the Irish Brigade!—than with the following little anecdote, as illustrative of the honourable character borne by the Irish abroad. "At the siege of Tortona," says Mr. Boswell, to whom the circumstance was communicated, in 1765, by General Paoli, "the commander of the army, which lay before the town, ordered Carew, an Irish officer, in the service of Naples, to advance with a detachment to a particular post. Having given his orders, he whispered to Carew, 'Sir, I know you to be a gallant man, I have, therefore, put you upon this duty. I tell you, in confidence, it is certain death for you all; I place you there to make the enemy spring a mine below you.' Carew made a bow to the general, and led on his men in silence to the dreadful post. He there stood with an undaunted countenance; and, having called to one of his soldiers for a draught of wine, 'Here,' said he, 'I drink to all those who bravely fall in battle!' Fortunately, at that instant, Tortona capitulated, and Carew escaped; but he had thus an opportunity of displaying a rare instance of intrepidity. It is with pleasure," continues Mr. Boswell, in allusion to the prejudices against the Irish in England and Scotland—"it is with pleasure, that I record an anecdote so much to the honour of a gentleman of that nation, on which illiberal reflections are too often thrown, by those of whom it little deserves them. Whatever may be the rough jokes of wealthy insolence, or the envious sarcasms of needy jealousy, the Irish have ever been, and will continue to be highly regarded upon the Continent!"

I remain, Sir,

Your very obliged humble Servant,

JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN.

May 4th, 1841.

LETTER II.

TO MICHAEL STAUNTON, ESQ.

INQUIRY INTO THE PROPORTION OF IRISH IN THE ARMY, AND THEIR PHYSICAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR SOLDIERSHIP, COMPARED WITH THE ENGLISH AND SCOTCH.

"Shame upon the men, who, with exasperating exclusions, with vilifying disqualifications, with ancient wrongs, and with *new insults*, repay the victories that have been achieved by the feats of Irish valour, and the waste of Irish blood! Shame upon the abominable system that takes away the heart's-blood of Ireland and requites it thus! . . . France, and Spain, and Germany, and Russia, shall hear of it!"—*Sheil*.

(4.) An answer to W. D.'s letter, to C. H., in which the conduct of the government, in mitigating the Penal Laws against the Papists, is justified, &c. First printed in Edinburgh, and reprinted in Dublin, for Wogan, Bean, and Co. No. 23 Old Bridge, 1779.

SIR—Having shown, in my last communication, the origin of the so-called Popish or Irish “taint” in the British army, and the impossibility of avoiding that “taint,” even in the opinion of Toryism itself, as evinced by its first material relaxation of the “No-Popery Code,” in consequence of the disasters of the American war, I leave the following particulars to prove whether, from that time, the proportion of Irish in the British service has or has not been exaggerated in the GREEN BOOK ?

In April, 1783, or about the close of the great contest, in which, to use the words of the American historian, Ramsey, “Irishmen were famous, but the sons of Irishmen were conspicuous,” Mr. Gardiner, afterwards Lord Mountjoy, speaking in the Irish parliament, on the subject of the Irish Catholics, observed, that “England had America detached from her by force of Irish emigrants!” (1.) This statement, put forth on the information of British officers, and deduced from the circumstance, amongst others, of the numbers who spoke Irish in the American army, is confirmed by Dr. MacNevin, who says, that one of the many pretexts, in his time, for refusing Emancipation to the Irish Catholics, was the fact that “16,000 of them fought on the side of America!” (2.) Nor were these all—“The men,” says the able editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, “who, in the American war, fought most bitterly against the English army, were the Presbyterians of Down and Antrim, who formed the Pensylvanian line;” (3.)—and these, as every one knows, were the very flower of the American force. Such were the opponents of the “British heart and the British arm” ABROAD, while of the British army that would have had to meet the Volunteers AT HOME, in case of a refusal of the demands of Ireland, “nearly one third,” according to Barrington, “was composed of Irishmen.” This proportion of Irish representatives of the “British heart and the British arm” must have advanced rather than declined. Even before the first great diminution of the Penal Code, we find it stated by Mr. Grattan, in his speech to parliament on the Catholic bill, in February, 1792, that it was a matter “known by the gentleman of the army, that, since they had recruited for foot in Ireland, the regiments had been filled, in a great proportion, with Irish Catholics.” (4.) According to General Cockburn, it was a subject of public boast in Ireland, that “full half of the army that drove the French out of Egypt were Irish!” (5.) In the parliamentary debate upon Catholic Emancipation, on the 13th of May, 1805—on which occasion, it may be mentioned, *en passant*, that Mr. Fox of ALL other means of recruiting the British army, when compared with what was to be obtained by the conciliation of Ireland, as “little rivulets to that great ocean of military re-

(1.) Plowden, Hist. Rev. vol. iii. p. 45.

(2.) Pieces of Irish History, p. 8.

(3.) *Morning Chronicle*, 26th Oct. 1833.—The political persecutions and tenant-ejecting policy of the Irish Tory landlords, of late years, are driving to the United States a number of our countrymen, whose natural indignation at such oppression, as the *Chronicle* recently remarked, is kept up and adding to a mass of anti-English feeling, in that great republic, of a similar kind to that above mentioned.

(4.) Grattan's Speeches, vol. iii. p. 46.

(5.) Military Observations on Ireland, and its Attack and Defence, p. 12.—Dublin, 1804. See also the whole of note 15, p. 159, in the “Green Book.”

source”—in the course of that debate, Mr. Foster, an opponent of the Catholic claims, also bore witness to the important and creditable connexion of the Irish soldiery with the expedition to Egypt, when he admitted that “the Irish (Catholics) composed a *principal* and *honourable* part of the army under Lord Hutchinson, by which Egypt was vanquished.” (6.) In 1807, or the year before the Peninsular war, Doctor MacNevin states the proportion of Irish in the British army as “about one half,” (7.) and that the estimate was not exaggerated may be inferred from the following circumstances. On the motion of thanks to Sir Samuel Auchmuty, for the capture of Monte Video, the General who proposed it said, “that the 87th regiment, which had so gallantly fought there, under Sir Edmund Butler, was composed altogether of Catholics,” that is, Irish—“and that he himself knew, that, of the 4,000 men who attacked that fortress, 3,000 consisted of Catholics, or, in other words, Irishmen, (8.) In 1810, Sir John Cox Hipplesley—from whose speech on the Catholic question, in that year, the foregoing confirmatory particulars are cited—mentioned in parliament, that, of his own knowledge, out of two levies of 1,000 men each, made a few years before, only 160 men were *not* Catholics; that, in another regiment of 900 in the South of England, 860 were Catholics; and he added, that it was then a well-established fact, that the proportion of Catholics (or Irish) exceeded that of Protestants (or British) in the English army! And such was the increase of even this large proportion of Irish in the army, towards the conclusion of the war, that there is no need of citing an authority for the general belief, of at least two out of three parts of the “British heart and the British arm” at the battle of Waterloo, having been Irish. From the demonstrations of sympathy evinced towards Mr. O’Connell, on his journey to the Clare election, by bodies of the soldiery, and from the results of an inquiry as to the disposition and feelings of the army with respect to Emancipation, before the passing of the Relief Bill in 1829, it was likewise “shrewdly suspected” by “men in office,” that the “British heart and the British arm” in that army would not be sufficient to arrest the settlement of that Irish question. (9.) And the government might well entertain this suspicion. In June, 1829, shortly before Mr. O’Connell’s return for Clare, a serious affray in the streets of Limerick, in which much blood was spilled, took place between the soldiery of the 60th regiment and the 36th, in consequence of a dispute about O’Connell and the Clare election, when the 60th, whose appellation of their opponents was, “*bloody Papists*,”

(6.) Impartial Detail of the Proceedings and Debates in both Houses of Parliament of the United Kingdom, in the Session of 1805, upon the Catholic Petition, p. 39 and III.—London, R. Taylor and Co, 38 Shoe-lane 1805.

(7.) Pieces of Irish History, p. 6.

(8.) Speech of Sir J. C. Hipplesley on the Catholic Question, May 18th, 1810, p. 50. “In this glorious storm,” says Mr. Alison, “the loss of the *British* was about 600, but twice that number of the enemy fell, and 2,000 were made prisoners, besides 1,000 who escaped in boats; so that the numbers of the garrison at first had been *greater* than that of the *besteging* force.”—(Hist. vol. vi. p. 150.) Thus is all this “glorious storm” set down to the credit of *one thousand British*, and not a word said of their *THREE THOUSAND IRISH* companions!

(9.) See the volume of *Tail’s Magazine* for 1835, p. 307 and 309.

being deserted by several of their own corps, who felt insulted as Catholics, were worsted by the 36th, to the cry of "O'Connell for ever!" The correspondent of the *Times*, who mentions this very significant circumstance, says—"A moiety of the soldiers, indeed, I have heard, three-fourths, now in Ireland, are Catholics and Irishmen. Even the greater part of the Highland regiments, it is well known, belong to this country"—that is Ireland—"and have," he continues, "manifestly been inoculated with the feelings of those, among whom they live, and from whom they were taken!" (10.) Nor is other evidence wanting to show that much more than "a moiety" of the "British heart and the British arm," which the *Standard* would, but the Duke of Wellington would not, venture to array against Emancipation, consisted of Catholics, or Irishmen. In a speech, at the Catholic Association, a couple of years before the Clare election, for a vote of thanks to the Right Rev. Dr. Kelly, Roman Catholic Bishop of Waterford, in consequence of his invaluable exertions to make out his proportion of the comparative census of the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland, ordered by the Association, Mr. Sheil, after recapitulating several instances of the immense numerical superiority of Catholics, observed—"But a fact remains to be communicated to you of still greater moment. It has been ascertained, in the taking of the census of Clonmel, that there are 350 soldiers stationed in that town, and that 310 of them are professors of our damnable, idolatrous, unconstitutional, and disloyal religion. This is certified by the Reverend Doctor Flannery. Furthermore, it has been stated to me by the Reverend Mr. Sheehan (than whom there is not a more zealous, ardent, and invaluable man in the city of Waterford, and who has honourably devoted himself to the independence of the country,) that the garrison of Waterford, (the 29th,) consists of 500 men; and although it is accounted an *English* regiment, and is commanded by an *English* baronet, out of these 500 men, there are only 177 who are not Catholics." (11.) In fine, Sir Edward Litton Bulwer has said—"two-thirds of the army are Irish." (12.) The reason of this preponderance of Irish in the British service is contained in Tone's assertion, that "the army of England is supported by the *misery* of Ireland;" or, as the more loyal Duke of Richmond said, during the war, on being told, as Lord Lieutenant, of the distress of the Dublin tradesmen—"a high-priced loaf, and low or scarce wages, are the best recruiting serjeants for his Majesty." In fact, "privations, poverty, and hardship," as Napoleon observed, "form the school of the good soldier;" or, to cite the more pointed remark, adverted to by General Cockburn, not only *fighting*, but *marching* and *starving* "are, at times, the soldier's lot, and the army that excels in these *three* points will probably, if decently commanded, ultimately succeed." The admitted superiority of the Irish in these qualifications for a military life, as contrasted with the general mass of their insular neighbours, proceeds from the greater health, vigour, and hardiness of constitution, produced more by agri-

(10.) *Times* correspondence, for June 3rd, 1829, as cited in "Wyse's Historical Sketch of the Catholic Association of Ireland," p. 90-91. This assertion, in reference to the Highland regiments, can be corroborated, if necessary, by passages from the *United Service Journal*.

(11.) Speeches of Daniel O'Connell and Richard Sheil, Esqrs. on subjects connected with the Catholic Question, p. 33-4.

(12.) England and the English, vol. i. p. 87.

cultural than by mechanical or manufacturing pursuits; and, in England and Scotland, we know that there are at least *two* mechanics for *one* agriculturist, while in Ireland the proportion of the two classes is directly the reverse; if not even still more in *her* favour, as regards a military population, from the wholesome manner in which *her* manufacturing operatives are employed, when compared with the wretched and demoralized victims of the factory, or white-slave system of Great Britain. (13.) The Irish have accordingly been recently found and acknowledged, on British authority, to be better calculated for soldiers than the English and the Scotch. "The company to which I belonged," says an English officer of the British Legion, in the Spanish service, "when it first landed in San Sebastian, was above 100 strong on parade; six weeks after its arrival at Vittoria, the utmost it could muster was 15 files or 30 men. The regiment, in like manner, which was originally between 7 and 800 strong, dwindled down, in the space of 2 months after the fever broke out, to not more than 400. All the other regiments, with the exception of the *Irish*, were cut up in like manner; and two of them, the *2d English* and *5th Scotch*, were so nearly annihilated, that they were broken up, and the miserable residue drafted into other regiments. The *Irish* Brigade, on the contrary, suffered little or nothing from disease, although it was not better off for provisions or quarters than the rest of the force, and the 7th, 9th, and 10th, to the very last retained their superiority in numbers, without receiving a single recruit from the disbanded regiments. Had the whole of the Legions been composed of Irish, instead of losing 1,000 men at Vittoria, we might not have lost 100. In spite of all their hardships, the severity of the winter, the total want of pay, the Irish lived, thrived, and grew fat, as if in clover. Such are the advantages of misery and starvation at home!" (14.) This account is supported by other testimony in the *United Service Journal*. "The Irish regiments, I must here remark," observes another personal narrative in that periodical, "were decidedly the most active and healthy of the Legion. Their loss at Vittoria was comparatively trifling; and I question if the *three* Irish together lost as many men, through sickness, as any *one* regiment that had been raised in England. In the midst of the greatest hardships, I have remarked Irishmen possess a light heart, with a readiness for 'fun and frolic,' which no danger or privations could ever entirely destroy!" And in connexion with this British testimony as to the hardihood of *Irish men*, it would not be right to omit what is added respec-

(13.) For more on this point see the *GREEN BOOK*, p. 163-4, note 21.

(14.) Twelve Months in the British Legion, by an Officer of the 9th Regiment, (i. e. the son of Colonel Peyronnet Thompson,) p. 163-4. In this expedition to assist the Queen of Spain, matters were better managed for the honour of our countrymen, where they formed a distinct force or brigade, than in Don Pedro's affair in Portugal, where they were principally mixed up with the English and Scotch, and thus, as usual, passed off for—English! Colonel Hodges, for instance, a native of Limerick, who gained such distinction in Don Pedro's service, we find lauded and claimed by the English papers of the day, as a "BRAVE ENGLISHMAN!" and several others of his countrymen, who are spoken of in the despatches for their gallantry, are likewise *honoured* by a similar appellation. If they were going to be hanged, however, it would be soon stated by those journals, that they were *Irishmen*!

ting the strength and endurance of the Irish *women*. Speaking of the latter, in describing the long mountain march between Miranda del Ebro and Ona, he thus observes—"The hardships endured by many of these poor creatures seemed incredible. I have known some of our Irish women, with one or two children at their back, keep up with the baggage over mountain and dale, when we were marching at least one or two and twenty miles a-day, on an average. Bare-headed and bare-footed, they trudged along, seldom repining, and comforting themselves with the thought, that they were moving nearer to 'ould Ireland!" (15.) But the best and most decisive evidence, on this occasion, in answer to the equally untrue and insulting assertion of the *Standard*, that the Irish are "inferior" as soldiers to the English and Scotch—for that, also, the *Standard* has asserted!—is afforded by the letters of Col. Shaw, the brave and honest Scotch officer, on whom the command of the 3 regiments, that composed the Irish Brigade, in the Spanish service, was conferred by General Evans. In mentioning his appointment to the command of those "3 Irish regiments," the Colonel styles them "decidedly the best and strongest brigade in the service." Writing from Antesana, March 11th, 1836, he says—"With the three regiments, consisting of 1,800 men, I have not yet had a punishment, and these men are suffering great privations. This ought to be known to the credit of the poor defamed devils I must tell you I get famous fun with the Irishmen! Writing from Forunda, March 25th, 1836, after observing that no pay could be gotten, he remarks,—“It is unaccountable how well the men behave under all circumstances. I have about 1,800 in my brigade, but little or no flogging; in short, no British soldiers ever conducted themselves better: in fact, the Irish are fine fellows!" Writing from Santander, April 1st, 1836, he says,—“The three Irish regiments, decidedly the best brigade in the legion, have been put under my command; and if you had been, like me, accustomed to deal with the Glasgow weavers, in the shape of soldiers, you would enter into the delight I have in commanding these light-hearted, willing, easily-managed fellows. . . . As we marched through Vittoria, on the way to Puebla, the appearance of those regiments," he adds,—and *this*, it should be remembered, after all the pestilence and privations at Vittoria, that had settled the great mass of the English and Scotch—"The appearance of those regiments would have done honor to any in the British service. During the whole march," "he goes on, "there was not a complaint against a single soldier. The officers excelled each other in the zealous performance of their duty. In short," he concludes, "I am proud of them!" (16.) What good reasons Col. Shaw had afterwards, for being equally "proud of them" in action, would be too

(15.) *United Service Journal* for March, 1839, p. 368 and 369.

(16.) *Memoirs*, vol. ii. pages 500, 508, 509, 519, 534, and 535. The contemptuous allusion of Col. Shaw to the "Glasgow weavers" as soldiers, when contrasted with the Irish, is a good comment upon a similar allusion in the *Register* to the "Manchester weavers" as recruits. As long ago as the session of 1818—since which the evil complained of has gone on increasing—Sir Robert Peel thus expressed himself in parliament, with respect to such Manchester materials for recruiting. "It would be found, that those so employed did not grow to a full size, nor live to a great age. Should troops again be wanted, Manchester, which used to furnish so many to the army, would be able to produce the customary supply *no more!*"

long to detail here. The expedition to China has supplied another strong proof of the great superiority of the constitutions of the Irish to those of the British, for resisting the effects of bad climate and disease; the mortality of the gallant 18th, or Royal Irish Regiment of Foot, at their pestilential winter quarters in the island of Chusan, being, according to the published returns, only at the rate of 8 per cent. while that of the 49th English regiment was 13, and that of the 26th Scotch, 18 per cent. Indeed, the physical superiority of the Irish to the English and Scotch, in the qualities requisite for good soldiership, is virtually acknowledged by a recent comparative scale for recruits in Great Britain and Ireland, laid down by the Horse Guards itself; a larger standard in point of size, &c. being assigned for young Irish recruits, than for English or Scotch recruits, not only of an equal, but even of a maturer, period of life. In fine, as far as the English are in question, even long before the great progress of those many unwholesome manufactures, which have unfitted, and are every day more and more unfitting, such a large proportion of the population of England for making good soldiers, Marshal Schonberg wrote as follows to his master, William III., from the English camp at Dundalk—"The English nation is so delicately bred, that, as soon as they are out of their own country, they die the first campaign in ALL the foreign countries where I have seen them serve!" Nevertheless, he adds—in allusion to some of the *Standard*'s notions of that day—the English "parliament and people have a prejudice, that an English new-raised soldier can beat above six of his enemies!" (17.) The gallant old Marshal, who, at the age of 82, had ample experience of the military qualifications of every people in Europe, found this vulgar dream of insular ignorance and fire-side presumption to be of very little value in the lazaretto camp at Dundalk; and what similar notions were worth at Vittoria, or will be worth elsewhere, I make a present of to the London scribe, who commenced *this controversy*.

And now, Sir, having placed a *green* instead of a *red* coat, on so much of what the *Standard* would claim for its "British heart and British arm" in the ARMY, and reserving for my next and concluding letter, as considerable a change from *blue* into *green* in the NAVY,

I remain,

Your very obliged humble servant,

JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN.

May 10, 1841.

LETTER III.

TO MICHAEL STAUNTON, ESQ.

INQUIRY INTO THE NUMBER OF IRISH IN THE NAVY, DURING THE
LAST CONTINENTAL WAR.

"You found the principle of exclusive empire would not answer. You have recruited for the navy in Ireland, and have committed your naval thunderbolts to Catholic hands. If, in one of our sea-fights, the admiral had ordered all the Catholics on shore, what had been the consequence? It is an argument against the proscriptive system, that, if adopted practically in navy or army, the navy, and the army, and the empire would evaporate."—GRATTAN.

SIR—I now proceed to fulfil the remainder of my promise, by showing that the unjustly-monopolised achievements of the *Standard's* "British

(17.) Dalrymple, vol. ii. pages 178, 180, and 181.

heart and British arm," were not less owing to Irish assistance in the *navy* than in the *army*. "In the last war," says Mr. Grattan, in parliament, in February, 1792, referring to the American contest, "of 80,000 seamen, 50,000 were Irish names; in Chelsea, near one-third of the pensioners were Irish names; in some of the men of war, nearly the whole compliment of men were Irish." (1.) To cite one instance, in corroboration of Mr. Grattan's assertion.—"In the year 1780," observes Sir John Cox Hipplesley, "when fewer Catholics entered the service than at present, (that is, in 1810,) the crew of the Thunderer, of 74 guns, Commodore Walsingham, was composed of two-thirds Catholics," or Irish. (2.) Sir Jonah Barrington, then, is amply justifiable in his assertion, as to what England had to dread, on a *naval* as well as a *military* score, had the "British heart and British arm" came to blows with the Volunteers, in 1782. "The British navy, too," says Sir Jonah, after referring to the amount of Irish in the English army, "was then also manned by what were generally denominated British tars; but a large proportion of whom were, in fact, sailors of Irish birth and Irish feelings, ready to shed their blood, in the service of Great Britain, whilst she remained the friend of Ireland, but as ready to seize, and steer the British navy into Irish ports, if she declared against their country!" "The mutiny at the Nore," he adds, in a note, "confirms this observation. Had the mutineers at that time chosen to carry the British ships into an Irish port, no power could have prevented them; and, had there been a strong insurrection in Ireland, it is more than probable they would have delivered more than one-half of the English fleet into the hands of their countrymen!" (3.) On the 17th of October, 1796, Mr. Grattan, in his speech to parliament on Catholic Emancipation, asserts, that, without the Irish Catholics, the British navy could not keep the sea, and that their proportion there was such, that their indisposition to England would be fatal. "What," he exclaims, "is the British navy? a number of planks? certainly not. A number of British men? certainly not: no; but a number of British and Irish." "Transfer," says he, "the Irish seamen to the French, and where is the British navy?" (4.) So convinced, indeed, was the French republican government of the great and indispensable number of Irish in the British fleets, that the first idea conceived by the French minister, Charles de la Croix, for accomplishing the invasion of, and rendering Ireland an independent nation, was a scheme to diffuse dissatisfaction, and eventual mutiny and revolt through the Irish portion of the crews of his Britanic Majesty's navy, by scattering money amongst them. (5.) And this plan the French minister had conceived, as we learn from Mr. Tone, *before* any communication had taken place between them; a circumstance which strongly evidences the *general* conviction of the correctness of Mr. Grattan's statement. Some time previous to that statement, or in February, 1796, Mr. Tone says—'Let it never be forgotten, that two-thirds of the British seamen, as they are called, are in fact Irishmen!' (6.) And, in the first curious memorial upon the con-

- (1) Speeches, vol. iii., p. 46.
- (2) Speech, p. 51.
- (3) History of the Legislative Union, as before cited.
- (4) Speeches, vol. iii. p. 235.
- (5) Tone's Works, vol. ii. p. 34 and 44.
- (6) Id. vol. ii. p. 199.

dition of Ireland, which he presented, the same month, to the Minister of the Directory, he writes as follows, in proof of the above assertion:—"For the navy, I have already said, that Ireland has furnished no less than 80,000 seamen, and that two-thirds of the English fleet are manned by Irishmen." "I will here," he continues, "state the grounds of my assertion. First, I have myself heard several British officers, and, among them, some of very distinguished reputation, say so. Secondly, I know that when the Catholic delegates, whom I had the honour to attend, were at St. James's in January, 1793, in the course of the discussion with Henry Dundas, principal Secretary of State, they asserted the fact to be as I have mentioned, and Mr. Dundas admitted it, which he would most certainly not have done, if he could have denied it! And, lastly, on my voyage to America, our vessel was boarded by a British frigate, whose crew consisted of 220 men, of whom no less than 210 were Irish, as I found by inquiry! I submit *this* fact," concludes the Irish exile, "to the particular notice of the French government!" (7.) And, at the battle of the Nile, in August, 1798, the Irish sailors did not fail to recommend themselves as much to the "particular notice" of the French navy, as the Irish soldiers recommended themselves, about two years after, under Lord Hutchinson, to the "particular notice" of the French army. "Is it not," said Mr. Foster, in parliament, in 1805, adverting to the conduct of the Irish troops in Egypt, in his speech, *against* Emancipation—"is it not also proclaimed to the glory of that people, that the gallant Nelson was greatly indebted to their valour in the hour of danger, for the conquest he obtained over the fleet of the enemy, on the coast of that country?" (8.) In the course of the following war, or in 1807, Doctor Mc'Nevin states, the proportion of seamen then furnished by Ireland to the British navy, as "almost two-thirds," (9.) and this estimate is not discountenanced by other authorities. Sir John Cox Hipplesley, in the valuable parliamentary speech already adverted to, said, in 1810, that, out of a list in his hand of 46 ships of the line, which, at two different periods, had belonged to the Plymouth division, the Catholics (or Irish) greatly exceeded the Protestants (or British) in the majority of the vessels. In some of the 1st and 2d rates, the Catholics amounted even to two-thirds; while, in one or two first rates, they formed nearly the whole; and, in the Naval Hospital, about four years before, (or the period of the publication of Doctor Mc'Nevin's book,) out of 476 sailors no less than 363 were Catholics. (10.) And, from the excellent character, as seamen, assigned to the Irish by Lord Collingwood, the companion in arms of Nelson, and second in-command at the battle of Trafalgar—from *that* character, and a remarkable proposal resulting from it, which his Lordship made to the Admiralty, it may be fairly assumed, that the number of Irish in the British navy rather augmented than diminished, during the remainder of the war against Napoleon. His Lordship, in writing to the Earl of Mulgrave, on the 23d of April, 1808, says—"One hundred Irish boys came out two years since, and are now *the topmen of the fleet!*"—and the editor of his Lordship's correspondence gives the following account of the proposal to the Admiralty thus alluded to, and the honourable grounds with res-

- (7) Id. ib., p. 192.
- (8) Impartial Detail, &c., (as before cited at length), p. 111.
- (9) Pieces of Irish History, p. 6.
- (10) Speech, p. 51-52.

pect to the Irish, in which that proposal originated. "He (Lord Collingwood) had found that IRISH boys, from 12 to 16 years of age, when mingled with English sailors, acquired rapidly the order, activity, and seaman-like spirit of their comrades; and that, in the climate of the Mediterranean, they often, in less than *two* years, become expert seamen.... He accordingly proposed to the Admiralty, to *raise* YEARLY, 5,000 IRISH boys, and to send a large proportion of them to HIS command," for the purpose, continues the editor, of having them "taught and prepared in *ships of the line*, before they were sent into *smaller vessels*!" (11.) Here is an equally trustworthy and creditable opinion of Irish seamanship from one of the most honest men, both in his private and public capacity, as well as by far the ablest admiral, from the time of Lord Nelson's to his own death, in the British service—so much so, indeed, that, when he wrote home to the government, on account of ill health, to be relieved from the Mediterranean station, then more important than any other, he was, nevertheless, requested to continue at his post—which he patriotically did till he died!—because the government, as they acknowledged, could find no adequate successor for him! If we may suppose his Lordship's suggestion respecting the "5000 IRISH boys" to have been complied with—and the supposition is not an improbable one, when we consider the source whence such advice emanated, and the superior facility of procuring sailors as well as soldiers, in Ireland, owing both to the greater want of employment there than in Britain, and the evident expediency of avoiding, as much as possible, the unpopularity of a frequent infliction of impressment in England, when it could be imposed with so much less cause for political apprehension, upon the less commercial, more warlike, and comparatively powerless or un-influential, because *religiously-divided* population of Ireland—if, for such apparently strong reasons, we may suppose his Lordship's idea to have been acted upon every year, from 1808 till the peace in 1814, Ireland, in addition to her previous numbers, would have contributed 35,000 seamen to the British fleets!

So much for what England could have effected during the last half century, without the blood of Irishmen; whose glory, obscured or concealed as it has been, from the world, under the swindling appellation of the "British heart, and the British arm," too forcibly reminds one of the noble prayer of Ajax to Jupiter, in the Iliad, amidst the darkness that prevented him from discerning the object of *his* wishes in the field of battle—

"Lord of earth and air!
Oh, king! oh, father! hear my humble prayer:
Dispel this cloud, the light of heaven restore:
Give me to see, and Ajax asks no more.
If Greece must perish, we thy will obey,
But let us perish in the face of day!"

Ireland, however, knows her own strength too well to be intimidated by the impotent threats and impracticable policy of such doctrines as those of the *Standard*, to whose insolence the facts in this letter—a pre-eminently fertile and strong insular territory of 32,201 square miles—a resident population of about 8,150,000, from whom the dregs of anglo-mania are daily disappearing

(11) See *Edinburgh Review* for May, 1828, and note 32, p. 170-71 on the "GREEN BOOK."

—a further population of at least 2,500,000 non-resident, or Irish-descended "sympathizers" in England, Scotland, and America—and an annual revenue, even at present, of at least £5,000,000, (12) at once furnish the best answer and fling back the best defiance. The Connaught regiment, that captured one of the two eagles of Napoleon, which were taken at the battle of Salamanca, sold it for a bottle of rum. (13) But, under the peaceful and constitutional leadership of O'Connell, Irishmen are disciplined for the acquisition of new political, if not military, eagles; and, thanks to Father Mathew, and the general progress of intelligence, there is now no chance of any trophy of national rights being lost, through such systems of past delusion, as are best typified by the effects of the bottle of rum.

And, now, a word at parting, on the *fairness* of London journalism, but more especially of the *Standard*, in reference to the "GREEN BOOK." That miscellany was advertised in the *Times*, *Standard*, *Globe*, *Sun*, *Chronicle*, *Examiner*, and *Athenæum*, by Mr. Charles Dolman, of 61, New Bond-street, London, who had likewise orders to leave a copy of the work at the office of each of those papers for the editor. Except a mere whisper from the *Globe*, (it best knows why), the "conticuere omnes" of the poet, describes the conduct of those editors, liberal and illiberal, with respect to any critical notice of the book, though the usual forms, in such cases, had been observed towards them; and, the *Standard*, above all, on being referred to the book by you, Sir, for an answer to its "heart"-and-"arm" swaggerings, first pretended never to have seen the volume, and then proceeded to insult the writer (if not the quoter from it also), by asking, was it the name of some Ribbon lodge? or words to that effect. Leaving the *honesty* of such editorship towards the work, and, in the case of the *Standard*, such *politeness* towards the author, to the judgment of an Irish public, and, with many thanks to the *Register*, *Freeman*, *Pilot*, *Evening Post*, *Drogheda Argus*, *Newry Examiner*, *Belfast Vindicator*, *Tipperary Free Press*, *Cork Southern Reporter*, and the Irish liberal press in general.

I remain, Sir,

Your very obedient humble servant,

JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN.

May 20th, 1841.

LETTER IV.
TO T. M. RAY, ESQ.

AUTHENTICATED PROPORTION OF IRISH TO ENGLISH AND SCOTCH NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND SOLDIERS, FROM THE ENGLISH OFFICIAL RETURNS.

NATION Office, May 22d, 1843.

MY DEAR SIR—Since it would appear, from the declarations attributed by the London journals, to the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, in

(12) The proprietor of the *Register* can demonstrate this, in opposition to English accounts, which, whether in matters of fighting or finance, of blood or money, are sure to give Ireland as little credit as possible for what is derived from her.

(13) "The Court and Camp of Buonaparte," p. 217,

in the assemblies called Houses of Lords and Commons, and likewise from the Philistine Arms'-Bill of the English Secretary of State for Ireland, that the intended means of the English government to oppose the peaceable and constitutional demand of Ireland for the repeal of an undeniably-unjust act of parliament, entitled the Act of Union, are to consist of "physical force"—or, in plain terms, the argument of the robber, the violator, and the murderer!—I think the following official information, relative to the composition of that army, through which alone an attempt could be made to gag and butcher above eight millions of Irish, may not be without its use, on both sides of the channel, at such a crisis. I have now before me three parliamentary documents, on that most interesting point, for the consideration of ourselves and our enemies. The first document, from the "Adjutant-General's Office, April 29, 1841," signed "J. Macdonald, A.G.," is headed, "Return of the Number of English, Scotch, and Irish Non-commissioned Officers and Privates, in the British Army, in each of the years 1830 and 1840, distinguishing the Household Troops and the Cavalry from Regiments of the Line, exclusive of Artillery and Sappers and Miners." The second document is entitled, "A Return of the Number of English, Scotch, and Irish Non-commissioned Officers and Privates of the Royal Artillery, on the 1st day of January, 1830 and 1840." The third document is denominated "A Return of the Number of English, Scotch, and Irish Non-commissioned Officers and Privates in the Royal Sappers and Miners, on the 1st January, 1830 and 1840." With the comparatively trifling exception of 518 men in January 1830, and 2,902 in January, 1840, marked as "Men on passage, &c., whose countries are not specified," we thus possess, in the three returns above mentioned, at once an authentic picture of the *democratic* or non-commissioned-officer-and-private portion of the so-called English army, and of the number of men of the three nations (or rather of the one nation and two provinces) in that army. From these documents it appears, that there were in January, 1830, in the so-called English army, of Englishmen, 44,329; of Scotchmen, 13,800; of Irishmen, 42,897—and in January, 1840, there were in the same force, of Englishmen, 51,559; of Scotchmen, 15,239; of Irishmen, 41,218. It will be remarked, how much more soldiers, as compared with the size and the population of England and Ireland, the latter country furnishes than the former; while the Scotch, of whose feats in the British army we are scarcely allowed by their writers to hear any end, bear no comparison in point of numbers to the Irish. I may likewise observe, that while Ireland—which certain folks would tell us must be nothing but a province—is superior in population to eighteen, and in territorial extent to fifteen, independent European states, the Irish, from a number of experiments, but particularly from a comparative examination made amongst the various European armies assembled in France after Napoleon's fall, have been allowed by the celebrated Scotch and Belgian professors, Forbes and Quetelet, to be the strongest race of men in Europe! And, by the way, if England should think proper to crush public opinion on the Union in Ireland, by mere force, and the Irish Catholic Church, knowing Repeal to be the right of Ireland, were, through the medium of its patriotic prelates and their subordinate clergy, to set its face against any more recruiting for the so-called English army in Ireland, pray where would that army be then?—The answer is to be found in the recorded sentiments of such prelates as the Archbishop of Tuam and the Bishop of Ardagh; whose conduct dis-

plays the emerald glittering in front of the mitre, and the crozier entwined with the shamrock. Wellington and Peel know and believe this, and if they attempt to put down Ireland by unconstitutional measures, they may be taught, like their brethren in a certain place, not only to "believe" but to "tremble" When, about fourteen years ago, it was found, that the soldiery in Ireland threw up their caps for Daniel O'Connell—or, in other words—that they were not, to their honour! to be depended upon for slaughtering the Irish people into slavery—the Emancipation Act of 1829 was passed. The Act, be it remembered, would never have been needed in Ireland but for the infamous infraction, by England, of the celebrated Treaty of Limerick, concluded with a force of 20,000 Irish, in October, 1691. The Irish people now come forward, to obtain redress, by a Repeal of the Union, for the violation by England, at the Union, of another treaty, or that of a "final adjustment between the two countries," concluded in 1782 by England with the Irish parliament, backed by 100,000 armed Volunteers. The demand for a Repeal of the Union is consequently as just in a *legislative*, as that for Catholic Emancipation was in a *religious* sense—one, in fact, as well as the other, having its origin in English perfidy and encroachment upon the publicly acknowledged rights of Ireland. And yet with an army so composed as I have shown—with a tottering revenue and commerce—with Corn-law Leaguers and smouldering Chartism at home—and France and America looking on from abroad—the strictly peaceable and constitutional agitation of Ireland is to be despotically put down! "We shall see—we shall see," as Napoleon used to say.

I remain, my dear sir,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN.

T. M. Ray, Esq.

LETTER V.

THE ANGLO-PHILISTINE ARMS BILL.

TO THE ENGLISH SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND.

"Arma virumque." *Virgil.*

"Elliot and his Arm's Bill"—*Free Translation.*

MY LORD—I find from the newspapers, that, even after your attempt to render the sufficiently-unpopular Poor Law worse than it is, you have been endeavouring to lessen or destroy any little portion of reputation left you for political liberality or fairness, by making yourself the dishonored instrument of introducing into an assembly, purporting to contain the representatives of the people, one of the most revolting specimens of anti-Irish legislation, that ever proceeded from the pre-eminently anti-Irish party, of which you now have proved yourself to be a most worthy member.

The measure I advert to is entitled, in the public journals, "A BILL TO AMEND AND CONTINUE THE LAWS IN IRELAND RELATIVE TO THE REGISTERING OF ARMS, AND THE IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE, AND SALE OF ARMS, GUNPOWDER, AND AMMUNITION."

On going through the various provisions of that atrocious law, which, in order to strip, as far as possible, a nation, of the sole real guarantee for political liberty—the use of arms—gives a set of privileges to the magisterial tools of power, only to be compared with those immunities conferred on its instruments by the Inquisition, for the extinction of religious liberty—I do not hesitate to say, that, if the measure in question can be carried as it is, no such enactment will have elsewhere polluted the statute-book of any country, at all entitled to call itself free.

Would you, or the party with which you are associated—or rather of which your proceedings, by this time, prove you to be “bone of the bone, and flesh of the flesh”—as anti-Irish, in spirit and conduct, as the rest of the justly-detested clique—would you, or they, DARE to propose for England such an enactment of Philistine tyranny, as this proposed Arms'-Bill for Ireland? You would not; you DARE not. Would the party opposed to you, styled Whigs, do so? They would not; they DARE not. Why? Because above five-sixths of the thing, call a “United Legislature of Great Britain and Ireland,” is made up of English or Anglo-Scotch representatives; the remainder only, or less than a miserable sixth of the whole—and that against every just proportion of members which could be deduced from a comparative view of the combined population and revenue of the two islands—being Irish. Such is the justice to, and equality with, England, meted out to Ireland, by virtue of the so-called Union; which Union, forsooth, is to be “maintained inviolate between the two countries,” according to the official *dicta* of one of your under-strappers, in defiance of “common sense”—and “common sense,” you are aware, was once rather an unpleasant adversary for England, in the persons of less than 3,000,000 of Americans, along with a seasonable intermixture of Frenchmen.

I have entitled your Irish Arms' (or rather *Irish-without-arms*) Bill, an enactment of Philistine tyranny; and, from the excessive penal restrictions placed by you on blacksmiths, and persons in any way connected with the making or repairing of arms, I leave it to the world to judge, if much of the *spirit* of your abominable and degrading measure may not fairly be compared with the substance of the following portion of Scripture, giving an account of the state under which the Israelites were kept, as regards the use of arms, while they were subject to the Philistines. I refer you, my Lord, to i. Samuel, chap. xiii. :—

“19. Now there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel : for the *Philistines* said, ‘*Lest the Hebrews make them swords and spears!*’

“20. But all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock.

“21. Yet they had a file for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks, and for the axes, and to sharpen the goads.

“22. So it came to pass, in the day of battle, that there was neither spear nor sword found in the hand of any of the people, that were with Saul and Jonathan !”

The perusal of this passage, my Lord, suggests an idea, by which, as a politico-military legislator for us, “mere Irish,” you might improve upon the imperfect notions of the Philistines, respecting the necessity of keeping arms from those, whom *they* in Palestine, and you in Ireland, would agree in denominating “*improper persons.*” It is this, that, as the Philistines of those days were so careless or stupid as to permit the use of a file, or the means of sharpening such things as ‘forks’ and ‘goads,’—each of which

your legislative measure would style an ‘*instrument serving for a pike or spear!*’—you, my Lord, should show how much superior you are to the wisdom of your legislative precursors in the Arms'-Bill line, by adding a precautionary provision or so, against an undue indulgence in the ‘*lima labor,*’ in the possession of sharpening-stones, or of any such means of improving the penetrating qualities of a pitch-fork or a scythe-blade—these rural instruments being most dangerously adapted, in Popish peasants’ hands, to resist or punish what such plebeians might presume to consider, and to feel as oppression. Thus, in the affair of Carrickshock, pitch-forks were the instruments by which a body of well-trained and fully-armed police, under the command of a gentleman who had been in the army, were overthrown, and nearly all destroyed, by a band of Kilkenny ‘boys,’ not superior in point of numbers. Then, as to the warlike purposes to which scythe-blades may be applied in Ireland, my Lord, even against an English army, under an old and experienced commander, there is, in the Jacobite official account of Irish military occurrences in 1689, published by order of King James, in Dublin, but kept most judiciously unnoticed by all English *historians*, the following passage connected with a martial display of scythes, and their intimidating effects, as occurring at the *unaccepted* challenge of battle, which the King, with a mere raw Irish army, gave before Dundalk, on Saturday, September 21st, of said year, to the Marshal Duke of Schonberg. “The day,” says the narrative, “was very clear, so that the brightness of the arms with the *glittering reflections from the broad scythes (which most of the infantry were armed with instead of pikes)* seem’d to strike some terror into the enemies army!” Then the account adds—“After that his Majesties army had been thus drawn up for THREE HOURS in view of the enemy, during which time, several acclamations and shouts echoed from them, as MEN FULL OF COURAGE AND RESOLUTION TO FIGHT; nothing of which could provoke the enemy from their holes, nor was anything else attempted by them; his Majesty commanded the army to march back to Alerstown, the left wing of each line being then the vanguard; the King himself remaining in the rear of his whole army, expecting the enemy would detach some strong party to observe his march; but NOT A MAN OF THEM STIRRED!” Thus, Marshal Schonberg, my Lord, thought himself and his English troops would be so badly off by stirring from where they were, that he preferred skulking within his fortified camp in the bogs, and losing above 15,000 men there by disease, rather than come out to meddle with the Irish Popish scythe-boys. But returning my Lord, to Carrickshock and the “forks,”—may be I’ll be allowed to suggest, that, in order to guard against any such dangerous uses as those to which a metallic-pointed implement of the kind might be directed, perhaps your Lordship would get a clause inserted in your Arms'-Bill, that, for the future, hay, or straw, or litter, or anything of the kind, is only to be meddled with in Ireland by means of wooden forks, on the principle of the “sword of lath,” mentioned by Shakspeare. With regard to scythes, however, as no method has yet been discovered, at least in these countries, for cutting grass with a wooden scythe-blade, I must leave it to your Lordship’s own powerful ingenuity, or that of your Tory *confrères* in the so-called “United Legislature of Great Britain and Ireland,” to contrive some novel precautions against what other purposes, than those of grass-cutting, a *bona fide* metallic scythe-blade, or one of the Dundalk description, might be applied amongst us. I may likewise be permitted to add, that both scythes and pitch-forks, when turned from grass against men, have done some for-

midable things in our time, on the part of the Popish peasantry of Poland, against the Russians. Perhaps, my Lord, the Emperor of Russia could be of use to you, in legislating upon such matters?

My Lord, I would also recommend you, to introduce into your Arms' Bill, some such prohibitory measure, as one likely to prevent the use, by "improper persons," in Ireland, of sticks and stones—of both of which, but more particularly the latter, I submit, there is rather an alarming or democratic superabundance all over the country. Through the salutary effects of your Arms'-Bill wisdom, thus stretched to its utmost extent, we "mere Irish," may be kept as quiet here, no matter what foreign and domestic oppression may be felt, as things were elsewhere, when, upon the termination of the last Polish struggle for independence, by the Muscovite hordes, it was announced to the world, that "*order reigned in Warsaw!*"

I was going, my Lord, in connexion with my previous allusions to your Lordship's Philistine ancestors in the Arms' Bill way, to venture upon some observations, as to whether the Scriptural account of that anti-Philistine gentleman, Sampson, mentioned in Judges, chap. xiii., as being "of the family of the DAN-ites," whose birth, moreover, as a Nazarite, was connected with a supernatural command, "to drink no wine, nor strong drink," and who, besides, was, to "*begin to deliver Israel out of the hands of the Philistines*"—I was going, I say, to inquire whether this history might not be somewhat emblematical of a DAN, whom *you* know, being able, through the noble effects of the temperance system, to do as much for Ireland, by repealing the Union, as the great Hebrew DAN-ite, when he pulled down the temple upon the demolished skulls of *your* Arm's-Bill predecessors. But, having, I think, been sufficiently explicit, as to what opinion ought to be formed by every honest Irishman, or lover of constitutional liberty, upon the equally despotic and insulting measure that *you* are reported to be the medium of proposing to introduce into this country, I subscribe myself, with as little respect as ever, for an English Tory government, or an English Tory Secretary, for Ireland,

JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN.

Nation Office, May 12th, 1843.

ERRATUM.

In page 21, after the Letter to T. M. Ray, Esq., read the following paragraph, as taken from the report of the proceedings of the Loyal National Repeal Association, published in the NATION newspaper, of May 27th, 1843.

On the conclusion of the reading of this letter by Mr. Ray, several portions of which received the repeated acclamations of the meeting.

Mr. John O'Connell rose and moved, that the talented letter of his valued friend, the author of the GREEN BOOK, should be inserted upon the minutes of the Association, and its thanks passed to the writer by acclamation; which was accordingly done, with several rounds of cheering.

THE GREEN BOOK.

Price 10s.

EXTRACTS FROM AMERICAN, ENGLISH, AND IRISH PAPERS.

"A production, which was the first to break effectually through the mass of misrepresentation with which our national history was covered."—*Letter of Dr. MacHale, R. C. Archbishop of Tuam, July 10th, 1841.*

"Un œuvre de talent et de gout."—*Letter of M. de Beaumont (Député de la Sarthe, and author of the celebrated work on Ireland), Paris, August 19th, 1841.*

"The Lord Mayor (Mr. O'Connell) said he would give notice of a motion, that half-a-dozen copies of THE GREEN BOOK be furnished to the Loyal National Repeal Association. No man could properly understand the history of Ireland who did not read that book. It was written by a man who possessed the first-rate talent, with the most thorough knowledge of the history and antiquities of his country."—*Freeman's Journal, Nov. 30th, 1841.*

"We rejoice at the step taken by the Repeal Association, in placing their imprimatur on THE GREEN BOOK—not that to the Irish historian the value of that book requires to be made known, but something more than merit was wanted to carry it into the farm-house and into the parlour of the country shopkeeper. It has been now some months published, and not one jot or tittle of it has been answered. * * * To the people it will be much. The bridge of Athlone and the walls of Limerick—our mailed men and heroic women—the aliens reeling under Hamilton's charge, out-generaled by Berwick, humiliated by Sarsfield—the mighty struggles of the Boyne and Aughrim—these will be a vision and an inspiration to the people, filling them with unrest, till they are honoured and free!"—*Freeman's Journal, Dec. 7th, 1841.*

"There is no one who takes any interest in the cause of Ireland, but, most assuredly, no one of Irish birth or descent, who should be without the GREEN BOOK."—*New York Truth Teller, 26th March, 1842.*

"The appearance of this work at the present crisis, must exercise a momentous influence upon the fortunes of Ireland. The GREEN BOOK must be seen and read to be appreciated, and no Irishman, at least, who retains a spark of nationality, will fail to possess himself of a copy."—*Canada Times.*

It is Irish, nobly, earnestly Irish, and puts forth sentiments that go home to his countrymen's hearts, and stir within them a spirit like that which clung to the stakes of Clontarf. * * * It should be at the hearth-side of every Irishman: its stern and glorious lessons should fall upon the ear and sink into heart of his offspring; and, perhaps, some day not far off, the GREEN BOOK may prove the direst foe to English ascendancy which the last century has given birth to."—*Boston Pilot, 16th July, 1842.*

Dublin: T. O'GORMAN, 35, Upper Ormond Quay.

NOW PUBLISHED,

The following cheap and valuable publications for the Irish People, price one penny each.—The celebrated IRISH BLACK LIST, AND NATIONAL MIRROR OF CORRUPTION—The celebrated IRISH RED LIST, AND ANTI-UNION MIRROR OF PATRIOTS—The SUPPLEMENT to the IRISH BLACK LIST AND NATIONAL MIRROR OF CORRUPTION.

Compiled by JAMES M'CORMICK, and to be had Wholesale and Retail, at his General Printing Office, 16, Christ-Church-Place.

For the convenience of the public, these celebrated Lists will shortly be published in books.

A
44 DA914
028
1843

THE IRISH IN THE ENGLISH ARMY & NAVY, AND THE IRISH ARMS BILL, IN FIVE LETTERS,TO

MICHAEL STAUNTON, ESQ.,

PROPRIETOR OF THE "REGISTER;"

T. M. RAY, ESQ.,

SECRETARY TO THE LOYAL NATIONAL REPEAL ASSOCIATION,

AND

LORD ELLIOT,

THE "ENGLISH" SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND.

"Nor need I tell, when dangerous deeds require
The boldest hearts, and claim the warrior's fire,
First in the field, the flames and sword we bear,
And 'midst a thousand deaths provoke the war:
The battle o'er, when bloody tumults cease,
And spoils and laurels crown the soldier's peace;
In vain our merits equal share may claim,
Theirs are the lands, the triumphs, wealth and fame".

TASSO.

BY

JOHN CORNELIUS O'CALLAGHAN,

AUTHOR OF "THE GREEN BOOK."

DUBLIN:

PUBLISHED AND PRINTED BY JAMES M'CORMICK,
16, CHRIST-CHURCH-PLACE.
1843.

PRICE ONE PENNY.