

the bond between the Presbyterians and the British Government.

### English Leaders organise Belfast Riots

By the time Gladstone introduced the Home Rule Bill of 1886 the leaven had completely worked. The Protestant population of Ulster had since 1798 been united by British policy into opposition to the wishes of the majority of the Irish people. Yet the riots in Belfast which synchronised with Gladstone's Home Rule campaign were not the natural expression of this opposition. They were organised then as now in England. Lord Randolph Churchill, (father of the Mr. Winston Churchill, who ten days ago predicted "civil war" for Ireland if the nation secured a recognition of her independence), went to Belfast accompanied by Sir Stafford Northcote, an ex-Cabinet Minister, to organise Ulster's resistance to Home Rule. It was he not any Ulster leader who preached the policy: "Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right." The "fight" took the form then that it takes to-day. Armed mobs attacked the Catholics in the streets, Catholics were driven from their work, Catholic homes were wrecked, and looted. The riots went on from week to week and instead of any effort to suppress them the British Government actually withdrew its forces from the city and justified the pogroms to the British public. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, answering the charge that the riots were instigated from England, said the Orangemen "were urged on to riot," not by English political leaders, but "by loyalty and religion." Gladstone again brought in a Home Rule Bill in 1893, and again the policy of "Ulster will fight" was preached to the Orange mob, not by its own leaders, but by English Tories acting through a Convention of landowners held in Dublin. The bloody riots recommenced and again the British Government stood aside and gave a clear field to those unwittingly carrying out its policy. The self-same situation recurred in 1911, when Mr. Asquith's Government began the "hypocritical sham" of giving Ireland Home Rule. The Ulster Protestants armed and drilled openly. They threatened the authority of the British Parliament itself. But the British Parliament did not interfere. Sir Edward Carson, who later became a Cabinet Minister, attended by the present Lord Chancellor of England, reviewed the Ulster Volunteers and encouraged them in their resistance to British law; the British Unionist party provided funds for arms and made speeches of incitement. Arms bought at Hamburg, Germany, were run into Ulster under the noses of the British Admiralty and the British military officers at the Curragh mutinied in Ulster's favor. Again it was from England and English political leaders that the Protestants of North-east Ulster received their orders.

### No Irish Demand for Partition

During the whole of this period the Ulster Protestants never once put forward the demand for Partition. They were opposed to the policy of Home Rule, but they never conceived an Ireland divided into two fragments to suit British policy. Even their English allies and instigators made no separate claim for them. Mr. Walter Long, who up to a few months ago was a member of Mr. Lloyd George's Cabinet committee on Irish affairs, declared in the spring of 1914, at a Convention of Unionists in Dublin:

"The proposal to separate Ulster from the rest of Ireland was the most ignominious and cowardly suggestion for the solution of the Irish problem that had ever been brought forward; it was not Ulster that needed special treatment; under any settlement of Irish affairs Ulster was strong enough to protect its own interests; not Ulster but the scattered Unionist minority in the other parts of Ireland required special provisions for their protection."

This was then and remains to-day the policy of the Unionist minority in Ireland, North and South. The Partition policy, like the Orange pogroms, had its origin in the British Cabinet. It was first proposed in 1914. It was crystallised into a British Act of Parliament in 1919. It became law in 1920 against the wishes of all the Unionists in Ireland, and in spite of the protests of the whole Unionist press. The North-east Ulster leaders to-day declare with vehemence that they would not have accepted a separate Parliament if they were not compelled by Great Britain to do so.

The policy of Partition and the present pogroms in Belfast and elsewhere in the six-County area are the modern expression of Archbishop Boulter's fear that whenever the Protestant and Papist united "good-bye to the English interest in Ireland forever." "The English interest" will alone be furthered by them and in that fact lies the explanation of the division of Ireland on religious lines and the creation of a fanatical and sectarian mob into one of the British Crown forces, not now as in 1798 as "Yeomanry," but under the infinitely more inappropriate title of "Constabulary."

## The Frivolity of England

A few days ago Burgomaster Max, a civilian hero of the war, whom we once glorified like Garibaldi or Gordon, visited and left this country without being noticed save for a line or two in the corners of the newspapers (says the *New Witness* for September 16). It was impossible to insert more, as there would not have been room for the fifteen portraits of Charlie Chaplin, or the reproduction of the menu of his meals at the hotel. Only here and there, there creeps into the correspondence column a bitter note; to the effect that Charlie Chaplin was not one of the civilian heroes of the war, or that he was too civilian to be heroic. We have not ourselves any such bitterness on that subject. The comedian is of a type which we always thought it unjust to conscript for the national fights of Christendom; a clever Jew wandering and living on his wits as readily in America as in England; and he at least uses them artistically to amuse people and not financially to fleece them. It is none the less extraordinary that a man of whom such a complaint could ever have been made at all should have a popularity so colossal and free from complaints; and it is still more extraordinary that it should wash away the words of the Great War, which we thought we were graving on a rock, as if it were a wave washing out words traced upon the sand.

The great vice and virtue of the English is frivolity. It is a virtue because it involves many elements of charity and cheerful forgiveness, and a power to survive the mere morbidity of memory. It is a vice because it produces inconstancy and cowardice of the intellect, and an impatience of realities and responsibilities. The Englishman is always longing to escape into a playground, where antagonisms are not serious and blows do not fester into wounds. That is why he tolerated first the absurd thing called "Party," and then the more absurd things that were said to be "Above Party." That is why he loves the world of sport; because men never need fear to have a quarrel, so long as they will contend without a cause. And that is why his emotions melt naturally into such a world of shadows as the cinematograph; and he can make a hero of a single dancing shadow. In his heart the Englishman would love to live in a world like that of the film, where a man can be kicked downstairs without being hurt; where smashing blows fall without sound or pain, where the comedian still his hat pursues, the comedian and the hat a shade. To love energy without evil is not a small thing; to combine farce with friendship is a contribution to ethics; and the English would have much to say for themselves if they only knew what to say. But when they begin to talk seriously they say all the wrong things; they even tell all the wrong lies. Just as they appear to be tyrants precisely because Imperialism is unsuitable to them, so they appear to be hypocrites precisely because solemnity sits uneasily upon them.

Now we can understand this attitude, and sympathise with it, because being English ourselves we are inside it. But it is none the less necessary to realise sharply what it looks like to the people who are outside it. It is none the less necessary to consider what is said by people of more serious minds, of firmer convictions, and more constant policies; such as the French or the Irish or the Italians or the Poles. These people have their own vices; but they are the vices of tenacity; we might almost say the vices of loyalty. They are vengeance, morbidity, cruelty; the vices of the vendetta. But so long as we are content to call these things vices without seeing that they are also virtues, and content to call our own qualities virtues without seeing that they are also vices, we shall go deeper and deeper into a very dangerous misunderstanding about our