



Above: Eça de Queirós (1845–1900), Portuguese diplomat and author. Undated. Artist unknown. Public domain.

Below: Jaime Batalha Reis (1847–1935), Portuguese diplomat and author. Undated. Photographer unknown. Wikimedia Commons.



A Vision of Empire: Irish Home Rule, the Scramble for Africa, and Portuguese Literary Journalism

Isabel Soares

Universidade de Lisboa, ISCSP, Centro de Administração e Políticas Públicas, Portugal

Abstract: Irish Home Rule, a measure of Irish self-rule, was a heated political and humanitarian issue throughout the nineteenth century. If, historically, Ireland was one of the constituent nations of the United Kingdom, pro-Irish Victorian perspectives and twenty-first century hindsight show it was administered as a colony. In the late 1800s, the British Parliament conceded to discuss Home Rule for Ireland. This happened at a time when the British Empire, (in)famously styled as the empire on which the sun never set, for expansionist purposes was encroaching on Portugal's African possessions and thus stressing Anglo-Portuguese diplomatic relations. In this scenario, two Portuguese consuls, who also served as press correspondents from Britain, used their journalistic voices to bring to light, for audiences on both sides of the Portuguese-speaking Atlantic, what they considered the truth behind British imperialism. Through the late nineteenth-century "new" journalism, a pioneering form of literary journalism, these diplomats-turned-unconventional-journalists were among the first critics of formal imperialism. As pieces of literary journalism, their articles on the question of Irish Home Rule are documents of historical meaning, revealing an underlying intention of creating public awareness of the dangers of the British will to imperial dominance, for which Ireland provided an example of territorial occupation and autocratic administration. Their reading of the Irish Question gives evidence that, even at its earliest stages, literary journalism is a journalism of concern about the Other and their plight.

Keywords: Portuguese literary journalism – British Empire – Irish Home Rule – New Journalism – Eça de Queirós – Batalha Reis

Cliché as it may be, literary journalism is a window into the past. Read as journalism, it crystallizes an event, a moment. Read as literature, it goes deep into covert layers of meaning. The zeitgeist of the later decades of the nineteenth century was inseparable from imperialism which, in turn, meant the Scramble for Africa, an expression meaning the rush for and unbridled dispute over the continent's territories. Literary journalism, in its contemporary form, captures the manifold essences of this zeitgeist.

The trigger behind the European appetite for Africa remains undetermined. Many reasons account for why traditional allies such as Portugal and the United Kingdom waged diplomatic wars to determine spheres of influence and territorial occupation in places identified with sovereign states, such as Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, or Mozambique. Colonialism, the formal imperialism shaped in the late nineteenth century that lasted into the second half of the twentieth century,¹ implies bearing in mind that, most conspicuously in the case of the British Empire, there is an impressive smorgasbord of administrative relations. As imperial studies scholar John Darwin lengthily lists, the Empire:

contained colonies of rule (including the huge “sub-empire” of India), settlement colonies (mostly self-governing . . .), protectorates, condominium (like the Sudan), mandates (after 1920), naval and military fortresses (like Gibraltar and Malta), “occupations” (like Egypt and Cyprus), treaty-ports and “concessions” (Shanghai was the most famous), “informal” colonies of commercial pre-eminence (like Argentina), “spheres of interference” . . . like Iran, Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf, and (not least) a rebellious province at home.²

Ireland was the “rebellious province at home,” the administrative and territorial conundrum in both the union of a United Kingdom and in the grand scheme of empire.

Just when the question of how to address “rebellious” Ireland—whether to grant it some extent of autonomous government or punish pro-independence movements—was rife, two Portuguese diplomats in Britain, doubling as press correspondents, witnessed the political turmoil caused by the debate of Irish Home Rule. Shocked and awed by the virulence the discussion caused, they produced articles about it in a genre now called literary journalism. Influenced by the pungent, vibrant journalism they read on the pages of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Eça de Queirós (1845–1900) and Batalha Reis (1847–1935), the journalists examined in this essay, borrowed from that unorthodox journalistic model to express their interpretation of the political and public debate on Irish Home Rule, also called the Irish Question. They acted as translators of that discussion to a Portuguese-speaking readership while verbalizing their

criticism of British empire-building. While the British journalism penned by journalists like W. T. Stead, editor of the *Pall Gazette*, initially inspired Queirós and Reis, it was through *crónica*, a Portuguese-Spanish variety of literary journalism, that they wrote their articles focusing on the Irish Question.

Crónica is a unique journalistic phenomenon present only in Portuguese and Spanish, “unknown in English-speaking journalism.”³ *Crónica* and the late nineteenth-century “new” journalism, precursor of the New Journalism of the 1960s and of literary journalism as defined by the International Association for Literary Journalism Studies,⁴ were combined by Queirós and Reis to draw a profile of British imperialism. More recently, studies have also started to highlight the role of literary journalism in profiling the Empire and the imperial *ethos* of the late nineteenth century.⁵

Through their distinct form of journalism, which combined *crónica*, opinion, and the characteristics now associated with literary journalism, which Hartsock describes as “techniques often associated with the realistic novel and the short story,”⁶ Queirós and Reis left an important historical archive bearing witness to imperialism in the making. To read their articles in a postcolonial age is to look back in time to a period when empire was coming of age and, perhaps, to gain a better understanding of the political geography of the present. John Darwin says that a “truly post-colonial history would allow us to see the imperial past for what it was: a shameful record of economic exploitation, cultural aggression, physical brutality (and periodic atrocity) and divisive misrule.”⁷ As literary journalists, Queirós and Reis were among the first contingents of those who looked at imperialism in the way Darwin proposed. The originality of that viewpoint is that Queirós and Reis did so both contemporaneously and as they critically witnessed the unfolding of formal imperialism without the filters and detachment of the academic historian.

Anglo-Portuguese Imperial Rivalry and the Irish Question

As far as international relations go, there is no older or longer lasting bilateral agreement involving sovereign states than the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance. Celebrated in 1386 between João I, King of Portugal, and Richard II of England, the Alliance, which predates the modern composition of one of its signatories, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, has been a paradigm of cordial relations. In the last decades of the nineteenth century cordial would not be the adjective of choice to describe the Alliance, particularly if the description came from the Portuguese side. The reason: the Scramble for Africa, that is, the sudden interest in the exploration and partition of the continent’s territories among European powers, whose multiple causes prevent a simplistic approach to its occurrence.⁸

Having pioneered European presence in Africa in the sixteenth century, Portugal was interested in establishing a transcontinental belt of influence stretching from Angola to Mozambique,⁹ whereas Britain was occupied in materializing the territorial aspirations popularized by the Cape-to-Cairo dream. Even limited knowledge of geography made it plain to see that the expansionist interests of both nations were bound to overlap and collide in central southeast Africa. In 1890, the inevitable happened. The Portuguese government was given an ultimatum to leave the Shire valley, the territory of the Makololos and Mashonaland, seen by British authorities as within their sphere of influence. If Portugal failed to acquiesce, HMS *The Enchantress* had orders to station at the mouth of the Tagus in Lisbon and aim its cannons on the city. Such a display of force was interpreted by Lisbon as a blow to the cordiality of the Alliance.

In response to the public outcry, calling for a ban on all British products and the suggestion that Portuguese schools should no longer teach English,¹⁰ Lisbon grudgingly obliged. Tension between the two countries had been escalating before 1890 and did not subside after a *modus vivendi*, leading to a formal agreement ratified in the summer of 1891, was reached. Britain became the most formidable rival Portugal confronted in Africa. A decade passed before the more cordial relations resumed. By then, Britain was involved in the Second Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902) and reached out to its old ally. Portugal maintained a collaborative neutrality in the conflict by allowing British troops to go across Mozambique, then known as Lorenzo Marques, to raid the Boer Republics from the north.

The Scramble for Africa coincided with the discussion of Home Rule for Ireland. During the 1880s and 1890s, British public attention was drawn to the violent terrorist outbursts promoted by both the Fenian movement and secret Irish associations such as the Molly Maguires. Faced with the public's outrage, Whitehall was called to action and the government had to make decisions on what form of armed intervention was needed to pacify the Emerald Isle and whether to grant it some, or any, degree of autonomy. Meantime, the career of Liberal Party leader William Gladstone wobbled because of his support of Home Rule. In 1885, Gladstone, then serving his second term as Prime Minister, advocated the creation of an Irish parliament able to rule on all domestic matters except those directly related to the Crown, peace and war negotiations, international and colonial relations, and trade and navigation. His intentions were met with the antagonism of the opposition and fractured his own party. After a defeat of his proposal in the House of Commons, he was forced to resign, and in the general election of 1886, Lord Salisbury led the Conservative Party to victory and assured the nation that local self-

government for Ireland was not on the agenda. What happened before and after the debacle of the defeat of Irish Home Rule was witnessed by the two Portuguese diplomats, Queirós and Reis, and their interpretation of the facts was brought to public light by their literary journalism.

Diplomats and Press Correspondents in Britain

Over the last quarter of the 1800s the Portuguese consulates in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Bristol, and London were successively held by Eça de Queirós and Jaime Batalha Reis. Though diligent diplomats, Queirós and Reis are better known today as unconventional journalists (Queirós is also regarded in Portugal as the epitome of the Realist novel writer). During their lifetimes both were viewed as opinionated intellectuals and unorthodox journalists whose *crónicas* targeted the political elites and all kinds of social ailments afflicting end-of-the-century Portugal. Belonging to an upper-class *intelligentsia* baptized as the Generation of 1870, they were interested in using their public voice to help Portugal join the path of progress of other nations, for which France, Germany, and England, at the time metonymically taken for the whole of Britain,¹¹ provided the models to emulate.

For the Generation of 1870, the name given collectively to this Portuguese group of intellectuals coming of age in literature, journalism, and politics around the 1870s, England was a paradigm of otherness: a developed, civilized nation, a super-power against which it was difficult to compare the perceived decaying of their homeland. Queirós, Reis, and their generational companions used the press as a tribune of discontent against the government. Their articles, oftentimes in the guise of *crónicas*, frequently addressed the corruption of policymakers, the pervasive illiteracy of the popular classes,¹² and a chronic subinvestment in the modernization of public infrastructures and industry. Queirós also used his novels to ridicule contemporary politicians and blame them for the overall state of ruin he saw in Portugal.

Another favored topic of criticism by the members of the Generation of 1870 was *empire*. In the Berlin Conference of 1884–85, Portugal had resorted to historical arguments of priority of discovery to claim its share of African territories. Other rival powers in the Scramble counterargued by insisting on clauses of effective occupation (establishment of police forces, building of schools and hospitals) to prove entitlement to the disputed territories. From then on, territorial claims had to be grounded on proof, not historical precedence. Although the Portuguese government had been investing in scientific and cartographic expeditions to the African hinterland in its claimed sphere of influence,¹³ intellectuals like Queirós and Reis considered that Portugal was doing close to nothing to prove effective occupation of those territories.

Besides, both Reis and Queirós also called public attention to the fact that Portugal reaped meager benefits from holding overseas possessions.

In an article published in 1870, in which they antagonized the Portuguese colonial administration by boldly suggesting selling the colonies, Queirós and his best friend, reputed journalist Ramalho Ortigão wrote:

Our colonies are original in this sense: the only reason why they are our colonies is because they are not in Beira.¹⁴ They give us no profit whatsoever: we do not give them an inch of improvement. . . .

Sometimes the metropolis sends them a *governor*; grateful, the colonies send the motherland—a banana. Contemplating this great movement of interests and trade Lisbon exclaims:

“Such richness that of our colonies!”¹⁵

Ironic and caustic, both journalists were pointing the finger at the neglect to which they believed the government subjected its colonies, in stark opposition to effective occupation.

To avoid the corset of conventional journalism, Queirós and Ortigão took inspiration from the satirical French periodical *Les Guêpes* and founded a newspaper. *As Farpas* (The spears), the name of the newspaper that ran from 1871 to 1882, was a pulpit from which to expose the problems of Portuguese society and politics. For Queirós and Ortigão, the empire was one such problem. Ill-administered, the colonies burdened the public treasury. Investments overseas were scarce, and effective occupation was a seeming failure that weakened Portugal’s position in the eyes of the world. By contrast, the British Empire was seen as an example of success. As Antero de Quental, distinguished member and mentor of the Generation of 1870, noted in a speech in 1871:

Let us look at what England has done in India, in Australia, and with world trade. It exploits, fights: but the acquired wealth remains in its own land, in its mighty industry, in its agriculture, probably the most productive in the world. . . . On the contrary, . . . what destiny have we given the many riches taken from foreign peoples? May our lost industry, our ruined trade, our diminished population, our decaying agriculture answer that.¹⁶

The speech, titled *Causes of the Decadence of the Iberian Peoples*, condensed the main ideas shared by the Generation of 1870 regarding their apparently apathetic, dying nation. Britain, they thought, held an empire for profit; Portugal had one as a memento of a lost past of maritime glory.

In *As Farpas*, Queirós and Ramalho elaborated further on these ideas. More than a controversy-driven newspaper, it represented a new kind of

journalism aiming at sociopolitical intervention. Opinion journalism was, as these authors also believed, lacking in Portugal, where, as they also critically observed, the press was mostly interested in gossip and scandal, and the transcripts of the day's parliamentary debates were the only serious news in newspapers. *As Farpas* thus became a national tribune of discontent and paved the way for other major transformations in Portuguese journalism. These transformations would be enhanced after Queirós and Reis moved to England.

Queirós was appointed to the consulate of Newcastle in 1874, remaining in the country as a diplomat until his transfer to Paris in 1888. Reis stayed in Britain from 1883 to 1911, occupying the consulates in Newcastle and London. Juggling journalism and diplomacy, Queirós and Reis were fascinated by the British press. Acting as press correspondents to Portugal and Brazil, their articles about England praised the press they found across the Channel. Contrasting its vitality to the disengaged press they saw at home, Reis and Queirós marvelled at differences in the professionalism of journalists, the seriousness and truthfulness of the information given, the incredible number of periodicals, and the reading habits of the British public. Reis verbalized his awe when characterizing the British press “as a great power” and English journalists as some of the “most influential” and “respected men in the world.”¹⁷ Queirós, in his bestselling novel *Os Maias* (The Maias), made a clear contrast with British journalists by describing Portuguese journalists as “These dumb journalists! They’re the scum of society!”¹⁸

At about this time, journalism in Britain was undergoing profound changes of lasting consequence. The speed of communications, a result of the telegraph and ocean liners, the proliferation of periodicals, and, as some believed, objective impartiality were eroding journalism. The repetitiousness of the same news in the newspapers presented readers with digested information easily consumed and forgotten. By the last decades of the nineteenth century, many journalists, including Queirós, Ortigão, and Reis, thought journalism needed some degree of innovation. In Britain, W. T. Stead, the editor of the London evening paper *Pall Mall Gazette*, was also spearheading a movement toward journalistic change that would function as an inspiration for these Portuguese journalists who, given their diplomatic responsibilities in Britain, were in a position to have privileged first-hand access to British periodicals.

Stead believed in the power of the press. Both as an editor and as a reporter he engaged in contemporary crusades to raise public awareness of serious social and political problems. The son of a Congregationalist minister, he “brought to journalism the fervor and zeal of the nonconformist conscience.”¹⁹ One of his main concerns was child prostitution. In a polemical and extraordinarily popular series titled *The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon* (1885),²⁰

Stead showed a shocked audience he had purchased a thirteen-year-old girl to prove how frequently children were sold to brothels. In the *Pall Mall*, he experimented with a new kind of journalism. Headlines were on the verge of sensational, interviews were introduced, columns began to appear. This was the kind of journalism Frus says made its way to the New York journalism of the 1880s and 1890s at the hands of Joseph Pulitzer, a journalism that mixed “news and entertainment, breezy headlines and illustrations, crusades and stunts.”²¹

Two years after the publication of *The Maiden Tribute*, critic Matthew Arnold acrimoniously coined the phrase to refer to this, as he called it, “new journalism”²²—energetic, reform-minded, giving out the news in the personal, individual tone of the journalist writing it, sensationalist albeit committed to the truth.²³ At the turn of the next century, most evidently after the advent of the New Journalism of the 1960s, theorized by Tom Wolfe in his now-canonical 1973 book, *The New Journalism*,²⁴ historians and scholars of journalism traced the roots of both the New Journalism of the 1960s and of literary journalism generally back to the “new” journalism of the late nineteenth century, categorizing literary journalism as a genre that:

reads like a novel or short story except that it is true or makes a truth claim to phenomenal experience. Such a literary journalism, then, is a kind of literary “faction,” on the one hand acknowledging its relationship to fiction . . . while on the other making a claim to reflecting a world of “fact.”²⁵

Using literary devices, the literary journalist presents news in a way that the objectivity of the facts is filtered by the subjective interpretation of the journalist.²⁶ The “new” journalism written by W. T. Stead and Henry Mayhew in Britain, Stephen Crane in the United States, and by Queirós, Reis, and Ramalho in Portugal, all in the late nineteenth century, was bridging the chasm between journalist and reader, creating a reflexive reader who “pays attention to the way the message is expressed, that is, analyzes its tropes as they support or contradict or distract her from the referential function.”²⁷

Wary of the Portuguese press, Queirós and Reis saw a window of opportunity for change in Portuguese journalism, inspired by the “new” journalism they were being exposed to in Britain. Consuls in England, therefore privileged observers of a foreign reality, they were recruited as press correspondents by some of the most reputable newspapers of Portugal and Brazil. Their task was to submit articles reflecting on topics as varied as English mores, politics, and the economy. From 1877 to 1878, Queirós wrote a number of articles on England for the Portuguese newspaper *A Actualidade*, for which the collective title was “*Crónicas* from London.” From 1880 to 1882 he wrote on the

same subject a collaboration entitled “Letters from England” for the Brazilian periodical *A Gazeta de Notícias*.²⁸ Similarly, Reis contributed a lengthy series of articles about England to the Portuguese *O Repórter* and to the Brazilian *A Gazeta de Notícias*. All the texts in *O Repórter* were published throughout 1888, and Reis’s articles for the Brazilian newspaper appeared from 1893 to 1896. Suggestively, Reis called the series English Review. These were posthumously compiled and published in book form in 1988 under the same title, *English Review*, whose literal translation into English is *English Magazine*.²⁹

The topics of the articles covered a panoply of subjects, from news about the latest theater performances and book publications to the scandals involving the Prince of Wales. The economic prosperity of the nation and the dynamic transactions of the Stock Exchange were also presented as a paradox to the misery in which the urban working classes lived. However, politics and particularly imperial politics were the core issues of the articles Queirós and Reis wrote. The politics of empire was what most shaped the image both journalists projected of England, one that would provide the stereotype of *fin-de-siècle* Britain or “perfidious Albion” as the Portuguese press called the country’s oldest ally by the time of the infamous 1890 ultimatum.³⁰

Empire and “New” Literary Journalism

The time elapsing from the first articles by Queirós, published in 1877, to the later ones by Reis, dated 1896, witnessed a dramatic succession of events as far as imperialism was concerned. Consequently, the growing awareness of both journalists regarding the imperial British titan reflects that chronological sequence of events. Queirós referred to a nation energized by the exciting speeches of Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield, whom he personally considered a Mephistophelean-like personality, and to whom he dedicated a far from laudatory obituary in 1881. Accusing Disraeli of the evils generated by British imperialism, Queirós penned this epitaph to the former Prime Minister:

His astounding popularity seems to me to spring from two causes: the first was his idea (which inspired all his political thinking) that England should become the dominant power in the world, a type of Roman Empire, constantly enlarging its colonies, taking possession of the uncivilised continents and ‘Anglicising’ them, reigning in every market, deciding by the strength of its sword the question of war or peace in all parts of the world, imposing its institutions, its language, its customs, its art—he dreamed of a globe made up of land and ocean exclusively British,³¹

When Queirós wrote his articles, the imperial idea was (re)awakening. It was not just Disraeli’s speeches and policies that were giving momentum to

the British Empire. The annexation of Egypt in 1882, about which Queirós wrote extensively,³² was also one of the formal starting points for the Scramble.³³ Unlike Queirós, Reis wrote at the heyday of British imperialism. By the 1890s, the Crown had become increasingly more connected with and representative of the idea of Empire, as shown by the extravagant celebrations of Queen Victoria's Golden and Diamond Jubilees (1887 and 1897, respectively). In literature, accolades for the imperial mission came from bards with the stature of Rider Haggard, Robert Louis Stevenson, and Rudyard Kipling, who famously described Britain's imperial fate in his 1899 poem, "The White Man's Burden."³⁴ Explorers and missionaries like the revered Livingstone and his admirer Henry Morton Stanley, whose book *In Darkest Africa*, published in 1890,³⁵ sold an astonishing 150,000 copies upon publication, were the new heroes. War correspondents, like new journalist George Warrington Stevens,³⁶ covered live from the battlefields Queen Victoria's numerous "little wars," exemplified by the Anglo-Burmese War of 1885 or the Ashanti War of 1896. Territorial expansion of the Union Jack had, by Reis's time, progressed at almost vertigo speed either through the implementation of protectorates over Sarawak, Brunei, Nyasaland, Uganda, and Kenya or through formal annexations, as in the cases of Upper Burma, Zululand, Tonga, and the Solomon Islands. At the turn of the century, the British Empire comprised about one-quarter of the land area on the globe and one-fifth of its population.³⁷

Admiring Britain as a developed nation and a mighty imperial power, Queirós and Reis were, nevertheless, aware that this was the imposing imperial Leviathan of the day. As early as 1877, Queirós had warned the Portuguese government that the British press was eyeing Mozambique and presenting it as a "fertile, rich land, with a great future."³⁸ It was also ready for takeover: "in the midst of anarchy . . . everything is described as being in a state of desolation and dissolution."³⁹ To Queirós this should be interpreted as unequivocal British interest in the territory. If Mozambique was in anarchy, Britain could invoke humanitarian reasons for annexation. Eleven years after these cautionary words, Reis proved Queirós right by noticing that Mozambique was being "anglicized" because: "the English monopolize trade. The ships sailing the rivers are English. The only money accepted by the natives is English gold and silver. The language spoken is a pidgin English."⁴⁰ Portugal had reasons to fear an informal British annexation of Mozambique. Due to the Irish situation, Queirós and Reis understood the *modus operandi* of British imperialism and established comparisons that could be used to see British interest in the Portuguese African colonies.

Irish Home Rule as Seen by Queirós and Reis

While at university, Queirós, Reis, and other companions of the Generation of 1870 had voiced concern over Poland, the paradigm of a usurped, tyrannized land by an autocratic nation, Russia. In Coimbra, Portugal's leading university at the time, students organized demonstrations and held public debates in support of Poland. When, years later, Queirós and Reis arrived in Britain, they interpreted the situation in Ireland as a replication of the Polish Question. A major difference existed, however, between Poland and Ireland. In the first situation, Poland was an impoverished land brutalized by a despotic country. In the second, Ireland was an impoverished island brutalized by the nation that stood as the beacon of democracy, Britain.

Situated in the Celtic fringe of the British Isles, Ireland lies in a somewhat marginal status, distancing it from concepts of either Englishness or Britishness.⁴¹ In the nineteenth century it was understood that the Irish Sea operated as the abyssal divide separating a racially distinct people of Celtic origin and Catholic religion from the rest of Britain, but mostly from Anglo-Saxon England.⁴² Not only was Ireland an instance of otherness, Anglo-Saxon England considered it a menace, a harbor for dissidents and the perfect place from where a French invasion could be staged. Moreover, Anglo-Saxon England stereotyped the Irish as ignorant and unfit for self-government, believing the Irish should be submitted to the rule of a more civilized people given their Catholic faith and their ethnicity, which were seen at the time as distinct from that of the rest of the British Isles. Conservative-party views, as for example those of Lord Salisbury, helped perpetuate the idea that the Irish lacked capacity for self-government. Addressing a Conservative meeting in 1886, Salisbury said about Ireland:

This which is called self-government, but which is really government by the majority, works admirably well when it is confided to the people who are of Teutonic race, but it does not work so well when people of other races are called upon to join in it.⁴³

Even Eça de Queirós, in his *crónicas*, or literary journalism, articles about the Irish Question, explained to a Portuguese-speaking readership that the English had an ingrained idea that the Irish were "an impressionable race, excitable, fanatical and lacking in education" that should not be trusted to take care of [their] own fate.⁴⁴ In this context, the Act of Union of 1800 was a mere formality to acquiesce to British imperial domination over Ireland, which, actually, dated back to the Tudor queens and the plantation system.⁴⁵ As Colley has noted, "Ireland was in many respects the laboratory of the British Empire,"⁴⁶ the place where many land reforms and different forms of

colonial government, later to be used in India and other parts of the Empire, were tested.

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Irish Question was perhaps the most pressing issue in British politics. The mid-century Great Famine that ravaged Ireland gave an impetus to agrarian agitation and led to an emigration wave that became visible in the derelict districts of towns like Glasgow, Liverpool, and London, already overcrowded and afflicted by extreme poverty. Demand for Home Rule increased and was better organized after a charismatic leader, Charles Stuart Parnell, emerged as the first president of the Irish National Land League in 1879. Out of the complexities of territorial occupation, in which an autochthonous people were deprived of land rights and engaged in a fight for self-determination, the Irish Question amounted to one of the main concerns of late Victorian Britain.

Queirós was able to read through the intricacies expressed in the press regarding the Irish Question and tried to objectively apprehend the core of the matter. Comparing Ireland and Poland in an article dated April 1881, “Ireland and the Land League,” he presented the situation, explaining:

Ireland can . . . be considered a constitutional Poland: there is here as in Poland an oppressed people, whose land was divided among the great landowners, the historic families of the conquering nation, and who have ever since remained in agrarian serfdom. Only in Ireland have the arbitrary abuses originated by this situation been covered up by a wonderful legal polish of a parliamentary regime: and Ireland suffers the miseries of a vanquished and exploited land—but within constitutional forms.⁴⁷

Not only did Queirós assert Ireland was a subdued land, he also alerted readers that Britain, the implicit tyrant, was acting as an oligarch, albeit proclaiming the values of its constitutional monarchy. Simply put, Britain was no better than Russia, the country that Queirós, until the end of his journalistic career, repeatedly gave as an example of an autocracy, as attested by an 1895 article published in *Gazeta de Notícias*, in which he stated that in Russia “autocracy is absolute and more unlimited than the one of Rome’s Caesars.”⁴⁸ Beneath a polished layer of civility and respect for democracy, Britain, like Russia, was a nation exerting despotic power over a weaker one. In the end, as Queirós argues, “England will rule Ireland through martial law just like any tsar.”⁴⁹ The objectivity of factual journalism was shattered as Queirós revealed his pro-Irish sympathies while guiding the reader to share his point of view.

In 1888, Reis, imbued with the same compassion for Poland as his generational companions, engaged in the Polish-Irish comparison about which Queirós had written earlier. Using similar metaphors and a more pungent tone, he noted: “Russia, the northern tyrant, that *executioner of Poland*, is . . .

the nation that provides the most precious contrasts to glorify England. . . . And, yet, England possesses a conquered nation in Europe—Ireland—which . . . fights, resists and suffers.”⁵⁰ This English tyranny over Ireland was the more egregious because “the nation that is self-enthroned as the protector of the oppressed, the deliverer of slaves, that despises Turkey for its captives, . . . and that abominated Russia for its serfs, consciously keeps a conquered country, not of foreign savages, but of white Europeans.”⁵¹ In this last sentence, published in an article dated 1893, Reis was vehemently caustic, probably because Portugal had only recently endured a clash with Britain in her path towards global hegemony. To prove the British parliamentary antagonism to Irish Home Rule and bring the element of objective, factual journalism to his account, Reis meticulously pointed out that “459 speeches were made in defense of [Irish Home Rule] and 913 against it. The first lasted for 57 hours and a quarter; the latter 152 hours and three quarters.”⁵² This was meant to show the disproportion of those in favor of versus those opposing more autonomy for Ireland. Noteworthy too is that Reis was making an allusion, not only to the situation in Ireland, but to empire as a whole. The British ultimatum on Portugal had occurred two years before and bitterness about that offense had not yet subsided.

It was the empire that was at the core of Reis’s criticism. Britain, constantly accusing Portugal of maintaining the slave trade in its African colonies,⁵³ held a colony in Europe not much different from any other forsaken territory in “darkest Africa” and was intent on carrying on that situation. Therefore, Reis was also drawing attention to the fact that Britain had no moral right to impose its will on Portugal. For Queirós and Reis, Britain was as autocratic and as morally reprehensible as Russia. The difference was that, if in the Russian case the exploitation of Poland should be regarded as a circumstance to be expected from an undemocratic regime, in the British one nothing justified the despotism over Ireland, because Britain was the self-proclaimed representation of a country holding sacred the constitutional liberties of its citizens. For Queirós, the hypocrisy of the cherished democratic principles held sacred by the British Parliament is visible when the issue is Ireland. To demonstrate it, Queirós writes that in England “the most enlightened liberalism can be mistaken for the basest despotism,” adding that “whenever the eloquence of Irish MPs becomes upsetting, it is muffled, thus being unscrupulously broken a centuries-old parliamentary tradition.”⁵⁴

Unmasking what he understood as English hypocrisy, Queirós did not feel constrained in using the sensationalism that was also a feature of nineteenth-century “new” journalism.⁵⁵ As in Stead’s case, his objective was to present real human-interest stories and raise awareness of something that

disgusted him. Blatant misery and social injustice were issues that shocked and hurt Queirós, and many of his consular reports reveal his humanitarian worries. In November 1874, while in Newcastle, he wrote to the Portuguese Foreign Affairs Minister, João de Andrade Corvo, informing him that, among the direct causes for Irish chronic poverty was the unfair economic organization of the land. The Irish were heavily taxed by both the Protestant aristocracy and the clergy that lived off them without even residing in Ireland. As he stated, “the *Land-lords*, owners of the soil, received as rent the better part of all goods produced and, residing in London or in the manor houses of England, did not give back to Ireland in consumption what they had taken.”⁵⁶ For the consul this was an intolerable situation. For the literary journalist, the *truth* could be illustrated in a manner prone to shock the public. Details aside, amply described by Queirós throughout his lengthy article on the Irish Question and the Land League, the situation in Ireland could be summed up as “a horrible darkness of injustice and misery.”⁵⁷

Indescribable misery was exactly what Queirós most wanted to denounce. For him, the poverty of the Irish resulted from the exploitation of a conquering foreign power: “one thing that is well understood . . . is that the working population of Ireland starves to death, and that . . . the *land-lords* feel outraged and ask for the help of the English police when the workers show this absurd and revolutionary need—to eat!”⁵⁸ Again, the Empire was the target of the Portuguese author’s criticism. Imperial occupation deprived the Irish of ownership of the soil, which led to famine and misery.

In the 1890s, Reis went further than had Queirós in his accusations against British imperialism. Ireland was the main example on which he drew to corroborate his perspective. It was not just the immense poverty of the Irish Reis wished to highlight but also the sort of ethnic cleansing the British government was perpetrating in Ireland and in its overseas possessions. Reis’s explanation was blunt. As far as Ireland was concerned, “the English have . . . promoted emigration to America, death by misery, by lack of housing and food, the diminishing . . . of the despised population, coming near . . . the ideal of *expelling the natives and retain[ing] the island*, just as they have been doing in Australia and in other colonially occupied territories.”⁵⁹ Imperial policy, he thought, promoted genocide as a need for British expansionist desires, with Ireland and Australia being the most flagrant instances. Worse, in their battle against Irish Home Rule, the Lords, writes Reis in an article of 1893, “represent the criminal, yet genuine, opinion of all England,”⁶⁰ thus making it clear for Portuguese-speaking readers that imperial coercion over Ireland was not problematic for the English. For Reis, this was John Bullishness at its most virulent, more so as Britain was particularly aggressive towards those consid-

ered weaker or inferior to her. The core of the issue that might be inferred was that Portugal had been subject to a humiliating ultimatum because, like Ireland, it was perceived to be a powerless nation. Had it been France or Germany, Britain would not have dared issue an ultimatum. In Africa, the easiest way for British expansion was to ignore Portuguese territorial claims and avoid any antagonism with the other two European powers by thwarting them.⁶¹ The major distinction between Queirós writing before the 1890 ultimatum and the post-ultimatum articles by Reis refers to the fact that, though criticizing British imperialism, Queirós guided the readers to pitying the exploited Irish whereas Reis was interested in giving consistency to the image of “perfidious Albion.”

Probably more than Reis, Queirós was able to see the Irish Question as an intricate web of multiple causes and consequences. In terms of sociopolitical analysis, Queirós knew the virtual impossibility of a solution for the problem, which he explained in two lengthy articles published in 1880 and 1881: “Ireland, Its Miseries, Crimes, Secret Associations, Hopes and Customs” and “Ireland and the Land League.”⁶² In the first of these articles, he noted that part of the issue was directly related to Irish bloody resistance against the oppressor. Without food, shelter, or justice, “the Irish, seeing that hunger is in them, England is busy . . . and heaven very far—pack their scarce belongings, go to the nearest village, and present themselves to the *committee* of the Fenians or to the section of the Molly Maguire, and just say: ‘Here we are!’”⁶³ To the literary journalist/political analyst, the Irish resorted to violence and terrorist associations given the chronic misery of the country. Poverty, in turn, derived from exhausted soils and the high taxes imposed by the usurper. Moreover, the British government neglected the administration of the island, concentrating instead on questions related to its remote overseas possessions. In 1879, a year when the outbursts of violence in Ireland were particularly harsh, “the cabinet was more engrossed, and the public imagination more struck, by two blood-curdling disasters in distant fields—that of Isandhlwana . . . and that of Kabul.”⁶⁴

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, secret Irish terrorist associations, such as the Molly Maguires, the Lady Clares, and the Blackfoot, proliferated. Their attacks were characterized by arson and the maiming and killing of people and farm animals. Simultaneously, Fenianism was on the rise. With a solid support basis in the United States, Canada, and Australia, the Fenians were responsible for terrorist attacks, both in the metropolis and in the Great Dominions. Aimed at destabilizing the British government, terror had the perverse effect of promoting an inflammatory image of the Irish as subversive terrorists. Indicating the dissemination of anti-Irish sentiment,

Queirós revealed the English believed that “whenever two people get together in Ireland they are conspiring.”⁶⁵ Because of the atrocities of terrorism, the British public was uninformed on the question of the (il)legitimacy of the landlords to overburden the Irish with excessively high rents and of the criminalization of those who could not pay them. Consequently, “under the gaudy embrace of a Union Flag, politicians and public could disguise the raw nature of the question, make it one of patriotism and decency versus dynamiters and superstitious papists.”⁶⁶

Queirós knew that Fenianism and terrorist associations were partly responsible for the evils afflicting Ireland. It was clear to him that the Fenians were a political sect that strove for independence by means of “future insurrection, battles in broad daylight, a mighty effort of a race wanting to get rid of the foreigner.”⁶⁷ Their nefarious attitudes fuelled the outrage of the public and served the negative image John Bull created of the Irish. Additionally, even Parnell’s more pacifist Irish National Land League was instilling bitter resentment among an already discontented population. The League’s objective was “to promote through meetings . . . a vast agitation . . . able to force Parliament to reform the agrarian system.”⁶⁸ Unsurprisingly, the outcome of the Land League’s actions, combined with the terrorism promoted by the Fenian movement and the Molly Maguires, was the defeat of Home Rule in 1886.

Not an apologist of violence as a way to solve problems, Queirós could nonetheless understand the Irish were taking hold of whatever desperate means possible to fight for their cause. Instead of finding solutions for the administration of Ireland, Whitehall used police intervention to control the island, thus increasing Irish discontent. Furthermore, it was because of the Empire that Ireland was forsaken by the government and it was because of the British imperial destiny that the island was an ostracized colony. Ultimately, it was because of the Empire that Ireland could be shown as an example of Britain’s cruelty and oppression, at a time when Britain proclaimed the Empire had the altruistic purpose of bringing prosperity, justice, freedom, and all the benefits of democracy to the colonies.

Despite being known for shunning expansionist policies—so in opposition to Benjamin Disraeli—Gladstone believed in the virtues of empire. In a famous speech at the Mechanics Institute in 1855, he had defended the need for colonies because:

[They] multipl[y] the number of people who . . . are living under good laws, and belong to a country to which it is an honour and an advantage to belong. That is the great moral benefit that attends the foundation of British colonies. We think that our country is . . . blessed with laws and a

constitution that are eminently beneficial to mankind, and . . . what can be more to be desired than that we should have the means of reproducing in different portions of the globe something as like as may be to that country which we honour and revere? . . . It is the reproduction . . . of a country in which liberty is reconciled with order, in which ancient institutions stand in harmony with popular freedom, and a full recognition of popular rights, and in which religion and law have found one of their most favoured homes.⁶⁹

Queirós, who admired Gladstone as much as he disliked Disraeli, felt betrayed. On the one hand, he saw that during the ministries of Gladstone the Empire had expanded geographically. On the other, it was with genuine difficulty that he admitted that not much separated Disraeli from Gladstone, who had been incapable of bringing Home Rule to Ireland. In the late nineteenth century, Queirós was already alluding to the Manichean allegory of empire or the duplicity of imperial practices, the covert and overt aims of colonialism. The covert objective is the ruthless economic exploitation of the colonies and the overt is directly connected to an imperialistic discourse sanctifying and sanctioning the need to “civilize” the natives.⁷⁰ For Queirós, Ireland was the best instance to prove Britain was only interested in the covert aim of colonialism. No humanitarian interest lay behind, or beside, its domination of the island.

Resorting to irony, Queirós explained that England was not a kind metropolis: “If Ireland rises, may she be crushed! Only John Bull declares that his heart will cry while his hand punishes . . . Excellent father!”⁷¹ In the end, these were “the fatal needs of a great empire,” one where John Bull “rides ferociously through Ireland, . . . drowning in sweetness, eyes full of tears and blood dripping from his bayonet.”⁷²

Addressing British imperialism negatively because of the oppression in Ireland, Queirós distinguished the many intricacies of the Irish Question. Reis apprehended the problem a bit differently. His harshness towards the British Empire emerged as a consequence of the 1890 ultimatum and derived from the very nature of the situation in Ireland in the late 1880s and 1890s, a period of increased repression. For Reis, the continued defeat of Irish Home Rule was a thing of tyrants and lunatics, which explained why, on the day of voting on the bill for Home Rule, a Lord, who was interned at an asylum for mentally ill people, had been brought to the House of Peers to vote. Reis underlined the fundamentalism that brought a mentally incapable Peer to Parliament, writing that British newspapers made allusion to that occurrence by saying that “to vote against an insane measure [Irish Home Rule], written and promoted by a fanatic [Gladstone], you did not need more.”⁷³ That is,

Home Rule for Ireland was seen as such an insane prospect that even insane politicians could vote against it. Because of overall mutiny in Ireland, the British government was under pressure to implement legislation to safeguard the collection of rents owed to the landlords who were, in turn, pressed by Dublin Castle to stay evictions. Simultaneously, Salisbury's politically ambitious nephew, Arthur Balfour, replaced Hicks Beach as Secretary General for Ireland. "Bloody" Balfour, as he became known, presented Parliament a Criminal Law Amendment Bill, approved in 1887 as the Criminal Law and Procedure Act. The Act contemplated heavier penalties in cases of boycott, resistance to eviction, intimidation, and conspiracy. Balfour and Salisbury defended the implementation of these stricter measures because "Ireland was the test case, before the eyes of the world, of British competence to govern."⁷⁴ If London was unable to rule Ireland, it was unfit to administer the Empire.

Reis concentrated his attention on the fact that England and its Parliament were hateful because they did not care to legislate in favor of an oppressed people. Whereas Queirós had been disillusioned with Gladstone, Reis resurrected that prime minister's image as the champion of just causes. To seek readers' empathy, Reis inserted a scene in his article of July 10, 1893, featuring a warrior-like Gladstone, who, due to his defense of the rights of the Irish, was vehemently antagonized in Parliament. Tired and old, Gladstone was verbally abused by MPs who showed no respect for his opinions. As Reis wrote:

In last evening's session—around midnight, Gladstone[,] weakened by a work he had started at 8 a.m., was delivering a speech in the House of Commons, stopping at times, hesitating a little, under the weight of his extraordinary 80 years of age. Meantime . . . , next to him, a group of the so-called *respectable English gentlemen* was interrupting the word of the great minister with laughter and invectives.⁷⁵

The message for the reader was clear. The only person defending Home Rule was a phenomenal politician, exhausted by old age, whom nobody wanted to hear. Conversely, Salisbury stood for the paradigm of the Irish oppressor, and Reis, again interested in calling on readers to share in his perspective, wrote:

The illustrious statesman Salisbury regretted a few days ago . . . that *Ireland could not be drowned* in the bottom of the sea. To him, all current questions arise from the fact that Ireland is a country that England has not yet fully conquered—that is, reduced by force. Thus, for Lord Salisbury, the Irish are, still today, *foreigners*, and it is as conquered foreigners that he treats them.⁷⁶

In his English Review series, Reis described a battle between Gladstone and Salisbury, one the fighter for Home Rule, the other an ogre trampling

over the Irish and no better than his obstructionist nephew, who, according to Reis had declared he would interpose so many amendments to the law that the government would be forced to withdraw it after years of fruitless discussion.⁷⁷ Before the new Gladstonian attempts to bring Home Rule to Ireland, what Reis was implying was that under no circumstances would autocratic, imperialist Britain let go of the colony. It was, as shown by history, an imperial question that always stood behind the reluctance to confer some degree of autonomy to Ireland. As such, “men like Chamberlain persuaded themselves that to allow Ireland to have its own parliament—as it had before 1800, and as the other white colonies already had—would somehow undermine the integrity of the Empire as a whole. This, above all other reasons, was why Gladstone’s attempts to grant Ireland Home Rule failed.”⁷⁸ In September 1893, the discussion of the project for Irish Home Rule met its epilogue when it was finally, and overwhelmingly, defeated in the House of Lords.

Conclusion

Analyzing how these two Portuguese literary journalists interpreted the Irish Question reveals that both used it to draw a very negative image of British imperialism. For them, England was a fearsome, imperialist power subduing other weaker nations, including Portugal, in order to attain its expansionist objectives. Self-entitled as a democratic country, it was a hypocritical nation, not much distinct from tsarist Russia. However, if Queirós was able to read through the complex web of all the problems afflicting Ireland, Reis opted for a univocal vision, much conditioned by a change in historical moment: Portugal’s African possessions were encroached by British territorial claims and the humanitarian problems in Ireland were ever more pressing. In his articles, Reis showed a single side of the Irish Question that was centered in the rapacity of Britain.

Through an early form of literary journalism, much influenced by the “new” journalism they read in the British press and written as *crónica*, it was possible for Queirós and Reis to show the Portuguese voice of discontent at the atrocities committed against the oppressed Irish people and to present that as an example of what a developed, civilized, democratic nation was willing to do to enlarge and secure its formidable Empire. Their *crónicas*, that variety of literary journalism existing in the Portuguese and Spanish languages, are not only a Portuguese contribution that helps shape an image of a period in history characterized by formal imperialism and the rise of the British Empire, they also show that a form of literary journalism that scholars identify as a late nineteenth-century occurrence that provided the root of its modern form was apparent in work produced by Portuguese writers. The Irish Ques-

tion as apprehended by Queirós and Reis has a two-fold importance. On one hand, it allows a vision of British imperialism outside the frontiers of the English language as it unfolded contemporaneously. On the other hand, it is a testimony of Portuguese literary journalism in the nineteenth century, thus confirming the international stature of the genre, even at that early stage, while also showing that this specific journalistic genre is one that has always been permeated with “empathy”⁷⁹ and awareness of social issues.

Isabel Soares holds a PhD in Anglo-Portuguese studies and is associate professor at Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas, Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal), where she coordinates the Language School and serves as vice-dean. She was a founding member of the International Association for Literary Journalism Studies and its president between 2016 and 2018. She is a research fellow at the Centre for Public Administration and Policies (CAPP) and the African Studies Centre. Her research areas include literary journalism, cultural and language studies, and imperialism.



Notes

¹ Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire*, 56–57.

² Darwin, *Empire Project*, 1.

³ Cuartero, “Periodismo Narrativo,” 703.

⁴ The International Association for Literary Journalism Studies defines literary journalism as “journalism that is literature,” also going by the names of “literary reportage, narrative journalism, creative non-fiction, the New Journalism, *Jornalismo Literário, el periodismo literario*, Bao Gao Wen Xue, literary non-fiction, and narrative non-fiction.” IALJS, “Our Mission.”

⁵ Soares, “Literary Journalism on War and Imperialism,” 2:111–24; Soares, “John Bull Scrambling for Africa,” 137–50; Griffiths, “Literary Journalism and Empire,” 60–81.

⁶ Hartsock, *A History of American Literary Journalism*, 11.

⁷ Darwin, *Unfinished Empire*, 6.

⁸ See Sanderson, “The European Partition of Africa,” 1, and Chamberlain, *The Scramble for Africa*.

⁹ Portugal sought international arbitration for a dispute maintained with King Léopold of the Belgians over possessions on the mouth of the Congo River. The Berlin Conference of 1884–85 was the response to this call for arbitration and the pivotal moment triggering the Scramble for Africa. The Portuguese representatives at the Conference laid claim to the territories between Angola and Mozambique in a map known as the Rose-Colored Map, because pink was the color used to show the areas under Portuguese interest.

¹⁰ The Portuguese press was a linchpin in the anti-British campaign. Among its many suggestions to cut connections with Britain were to expurgate Portuguese vocabulary of Anglicisms and change the denomination of the British currency from pound to thief (e.g., *Pontos nos ii*, January 13, 1890). Accessed February 11, 2020, <http://hemerotecadigital.cm-lisboa.pt/OBRAS/PONTOSNOSII/1890/1890.htm>.

¹¹ In the late nineteenth century, as today, the distinctions between England and Britain, English and British, were enmeshed in complexities best described by Taylor: “As the largest component of Britain, especially in population and wealth, England, in many foreign languages and in English itself, is commonly taken to mean the whole of Britain. . . .

The result of this . . . is a confusing mixture of national identities. . . . for instance, Scottish identity exists alongside British identity; a person may call themselves ‘Scottish and British’. But the equivalent phrase ‘English and British’ has no meaning since, for the English, to be English is to be British . . . This has been called a fused identity and provides the cultural underpinning of the English presumption.” Taylor, “Which Britain? Which England? Which North?” 130–31.

¹² As late as 1890, illiteracy rates in Portugal still amounted to 79.2 percent. Medina, *Reler Eça de Queiroz*, 17.

¹³ Among the most renowned Portuguese explorers of Africa in the last quarter of the nineteenth century are Serpa Pinto (1846–1900), Hermenegildo Capelo

(1841–1917), and Roberto Ivens (1850–98). In 1877 they headed the first major expedition to explore the basins of the rivers Zaire and Zambeze but because of differences of opinion, the party split with Pinto following one course and Capelo and Ivens another. More expeditions were undertaken in the aftermath of the Berlin Conference. The report of Serpa Pinto's expeditions was published in 1881 under the title *Como Eu Atravessei África* [*How I Crossed Africa*]. Capelo and Ivens wrote their travel accounts in two books: *De Angola às Terras de Iaca* [From Angola to the lands of Iaca], published in 1881 regarding their first voyage of 1877, and *De Angola à Contracosta* [From Angola to the Countercoast], published in 1886 about the cartographic expedition they led between 1884 and 1885.

¹⁴ Beira is a province in the north of Portugal.

¹⁵ Queirós and Ortigão, *As Farpas*, 115 (Unless otherwise specified, translations from Portuguese texts are mine).

¹⁶ Quental, *Causas da Decadência*, 51.

¹⁷ Reis, *Revista Inglesa*, 182.

¹⁸ Queirós, *Os Maias*, 135.

¹⁹ Baylen, "A Victorian's 'Crusade' in Chicago," 418.

²⁰ For Stead's *Maiden Tribute* articles in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, go to <https://attackingthediabol.co.uk/pmg/tribute/mt1.php>.

²¹ Frus, *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative*, 41.

²² Matthew Arnold (1822–88) was an Oxford professor, literary critic, and poet credited with having coined the phrase "new journalism" in 1887 to refer to the groundbreaking investigative and vivid journalism practiced by W. T. Stead and other journalists of the late Victorian Era. Despite earlier regular contributions to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, when W. T. Stead took the helm of the periodical, Arnold was critical of the "new" kind of journalism introduced by Stead, to the point of calling it "featherbrained." Arnold, "Up to Easter," para. 21.

²³ Kerrane, "Making Facts Dance," 17. The expression, however, stuck and the late nineteenth century precursor of the New Journalism of the 1960s, in particular, and of literary journalism, in general, is also commonly called New Journalism with the necessary historical contextualization. We have debated this elsewhere and, for clarity, use the term, "new journalism," in quotation marks, to refer to the nineteenth century early literary journalism. See Soares, "Literary Journalism's Magnetic Pull," 118.

²⁴ In *The New Journalism*, Wolfe presents a characterization and describes the emergence of the U.S. New Journalism of the 1960s, of which he was a practitioner, a pioneer, and a pivotal influence on other journalists. However, he was the first to confess that the expression "New Journalism" was not the most apt: "To tell the truth, I've never even liked the term. Any movement, group, party, program, philosophy or theory that goes under a name with 'New' in it is just begging for trouble." Wolfe, *The New Journalism*, 23.

²⁵ Hartsock, *A History of American Literary Journalism*, 1.

²⁶ Focusing on the role performed by the literary journalist as opposed to the factual journalist, Kerrane explains that, in literary journalism, "the eye of the writer

is an omnipresent lens, no more and no less intrusive than the mind behind it. The literary journalist enjoys greater freedom in researching a story and greater flexibility in telling it, . . . to take us beneath the surface and into the psyche, either a character's or the writer's own." Kerrane, "Making Facts Dance," 20.

²⁷ Frus, *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative*, 32.

²⁸ Queirós, *Cartas de Inglaterra e Crónicas de Londres* [Letters from England and Crónicas from London].

²⁹ Reis, *Revista Inglesa: Crónicas*.

³⁰ A *Província*, January 17, 1890. In her study *Apocalipse e Regeneração* [Apocalypse and Regeneration], Teresa Pinto Coelho analyzed the negative image with which the Portuguese press depicted Britain at the time of the Ultimatum on Portugal. From the analysis, she concluded that "perfidious Albion" was an epithet used to characterize Britain and its imperial rapacity. Coelho, *Apocalipse*, 75–99.

³¹ Queirós, "Lord Beaconsfield," 122 (translated by Aiken and Stevens).

³² See Soares, "Literary Journalism on War and Imperialism," 2:111–24.

³³ Historically, the occupation of Egypt was "the real trigger for the African Scramble" because it led to other annexations meant to secure Egypt and the Suez route to India. See Ferguson, *Empire*, 233.

³⁴ Kipling, "White Man's Burden."

³⁵ Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*.

³⁶ See Griffiths, "Literary Journalism and Empire," 60–81.

³⁷ Porter, *The Lion's Share*, 135.

³⁸ Queirós, *Cartas de Inglaterra*, 210.

³⁹ Queirós, 210.

⁴⁰ Reis, *Revista Inglesa*, 82.

⁴¹ Cohen explains the marginal position of Ireland in relation to the rest of the British Isles, thus: "The Celtic fringe . . . is a familiar but inexplicit internal boundary. For the English, the boundary is marked by irresolution, uncertainty, incongruity, derogation or humour. 'Humour' . . . is still directed against the 'dumb Irishman,' derogation is still aimed at the Welsh though, in the case of the Scots, ethnic humour has been in rapid decline . . ." Cohen, *Frontiers of Identity*, 12.

⁴² During the nineteenth century the concept of English ethnicity was reshaped and the concept of a "Saxon race" replaced by the notion of Anglo-Saxonism. That is, "[w]ith the rise of modern nationalisms, the English as a Saxon race were replaced by the English as an Anglo-Saxon race. . . .

'Anglo-Saxon' was sometimes used to mean 'Saxon', as opposed to 'Celt.' "

Young, *The Idea of English Ethnicity*, 181.

⁴³ Robert Cecil Salisbury, speech at Conservative meeting, May 15, 1886, as quoted in Welsh, *The Four Nations*, 310. The endnote (25) that follows on page 311 cites "A. Roberts, op cit., p. 384," 432n25. No earlier citation for A. Roberts was found in Welsh's endnotes. The Welsh bibliography, 437–78, lists only "C. Roberts, *Schemes & Undertakings* (Columbus, 1985)," 450; cf.: *Schemes & Undertakings: A Study of English Politics in the Seventeenth Century* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1985). This latter source ends on 333, with no mention found

of Salisbury's 1886 speech. For further background on Salisbury's speech, see J. L. Hammond's cite of Lady Gwendolen Cecil, *Life of Salisbury*, vol. 2, 302, in *Gladstone and the Irish Nation* (London: Longmans Green 1938), 468–69.

⁴⁴ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 128.

⁴⁵ As an answer to the island's chronic instability, the British government divided Ireland in parcels of land given to English and Scottish tenants. This policy was a strategy to create a bulwark against any possible invasion from Catholic France. Ferguson, *Empire*, 55.

⁴⁶ Colley, "Britishness and Otherness," 327.

⁴⁷ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 126.

⁴⁸ Queirós, 547.

⁴⁹ Queirós, 127.

⁵⁰ Reis, *Revista Inglesa*, 56 (italics in original).

⁵¹ Reis, 145.

⁵² Reis, 145.

⁵³ The British press and government accused the Portuguese of being interested in human trafficking, denigrating them as a breed of "half-caste traders." Behind the accusations were Cecil Rhodes's pejorative assertions against the Portuguese, an obstacle to the expansion of his British South African Company in Gungunyana's territories. The Portuguese were accused of selling alcohol to the natives "with the deliberate intention of weakening their resistance." Nutting, *Scramble for Africa*, 237.

⁵⁴ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 127.

⁵⁵ Sensationalism in literary journalism does not correspond to sensationalist journalism, being rather a different form of "objectification." Hartsock, *A History of American Literary Journalism*, 133. In the nineteenth century, sensationalism was a response to the disillusionment caused by the abuses of objectivity in journalism. Frus, *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative*, 106.

⁵⁶ Queirós, *A Emigração Como Força Civilizadora*, 65–66 (italics in original).

⁵⁷ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 133.

⁵⁸ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 129 (italics in original).

⁵⁹ Reis, *Revista Inglesa*, 151 (italics in original).

⁶⁰ Reis, 151.

⁶¹ Porter, *The Lion's Share*, 106.

⁶² Queirós, "Ireland, Its Miseries, Crimes, Secret Associations, Hopes and Customs," 1880; "Ireland and the Land League," 1881. Both articles are compiled in the critical edition of the articles Queirós wrote for *Gazeta de Notícias*: Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 77–85 and 125–36, respectively.

⁶³ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, in "Ireland, Its Miseries, Crimes, Secret Associations, Hopes and Customs," 1880, 81 (italics in original).

⁶⁴ Ensor, *England*, 57.

⁶⁵ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 83.

⁶⁶ Wilson, *The Victorians*, 460.

⁶⁷ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 128.

- ⁶⁸ Queirós, 83.
- ⁶⁹ Gladstone, "Our Colonies," 368–69.
- ⁷⁰ JanMohamed, "The Economy of Manichean Allegory," 81.
- ⁷¹ Queirós, *Textos de Imprensa*, 85.
- ⁷² Queirós, 85.
- ⁷³ Reis, *Revista Inglesa*, 152–53.
- ⁷⁴ Wilson, *The Victorians*, 531.
- ⁷⁵ Reis, *Revista Inglesa*, 127–28 (italics in original).
- ⁷⁶ Reis, 131–32 (italics in original).
- ⁷⁷ Reis, 127.
- ⁷⁸ Ferguson, *Empire*, 253.
- ⁷⁹ Sue Joseph stresses that empathy is the "key to clever and evocative nonfiction writing," one form of which is literary journalism. Joseph, *Behind the Text*, xvii.

Bibliography

- Arnold, Matthew. "Up to Easter." *Nineteenth Century*, no. 123 (May 1887), 638–39. W. T. Stead Resource Site. Accessed February 21, 2020. <https://www.attackingthediabol.co.uk/related/easter.php>.
- Baylen, Joseph O. "A Victorian's 'Crusade' in Chicago, 1893–1894." *Journal of American History* 51, no. 3 (1964): 418–34.
- Capelo, Hermenegildo, and Roberto Ivens. *De Angola às Terras de Iaca* [From Angola to the lands of Iaca]. Vol. 1. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1881.
- , and Roberto Ivens. *De Angola à Contracosta* [From Angola to the Counter-coast]. Vol. 2. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1886.
- Chamberlain, Muriel E. *The Scramble for Africa*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Coelho, Teresa Pinto. *Apocalypse e Regeneração: o Ultimatum e a Mitologia da Pátria na Literatura Finissecular*. Lisboa: Edições Cosmos, 1996.
- Cohen, Robin. *Frontiers of Identity: The British and the Others*. Longman Sociology Series. London and New York: Longman, 1994.
- Colley, Linda. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument." *Journal of British Studies* 31, no. 4 (October 1992): 309–29.
- Cuartero Naranjo, Antonio. "Periodismo Narrativo (2008–2016): Una Nueva Generación de Autores Españoles." PhD thesis, University of Malaga, 2017.
- Darwin, John. *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830–1970*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . *Unfinished Empire: The Global Expansion of Britain*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2012.
- Ensor, Robert C. K. *England, 1870–1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963. First published 1936.
- Ferguson, Niall. *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World*. London and New York: Penguin, 2004. First published 2003 by Allen Lane (London).
- Frus, Phyllis. *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative: The Timely and the*

- Timeless*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Gladstone, William Ewart. "Our Colonies (1855)." In *Imperialism and Orientalism: A Documentary Sourcebook*, edited by Barbara Harlow and Mia Carter, 363–78. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999.
- Griffiths, Andrew. "Literary Journalism and Empire: George Warrington Steevens in Africa, 1898–1900." *Literary Journalism Studies* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2017): 60–81.
- Hartsock, John C. *A History of American Literary Journalism: The Emergence of a Modern Narrative Form*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.
- IALJS. "Our Mission." The International Association for Literary Journalism Studies. Accessed July 7, 2017. <http://ialjs.org/about-us/>.
- JanMohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." In *'Race,' Writing and Difference*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 78–106. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Joseph, Sue. *Behind the Text: Candid Conversations with Australian Creative Nonfiction Writers*. Melbourne: Hybrid Publishers, 2016.
- Kerrane, Kevin. "Making Facts Dance." In *The Art of Fact: A Historical Anthology of Literary Journalism*, edited by Kevin Kerrane and Ben Yagoda, 17–20. New York: Touchstone, 1998. First published 1997, Simon & Schuster (New York).
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The White Man's Burden: The United States and the Philippine Islands, 1899." In *Rudyard Kipling: The Complete Verse*, 261–62. London: Kyle Cathie, 1990. First published February 1899, *McClure's Magazine* (New York).
- Medina, João. *Reler Eça de Queiroz: Das Farpas aos Maias*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 2000.
- Nutting, Anthony. *Scramble for Africa: The Great Trek to the Boer War*. London: Constable, 1970.
- Pinto, Serpa. *Como Eu Atravessei a África*. 2 vols. Mem Martins: Publicações Europa-América, 1998. First published 1881 by Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, 3 Rivington (London).
- Porter, Bernard. *The Lion's Share: A Short History of British Imperialism, 1850–1995*. 3rd ed. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1996. First published 1975.
- Queirós, Eça de. "Lord Beaconsfield [1881]." In *Eça's English Letters: Written by Eça de Queirós, Portuguese Consul in England, 1874–1888*, edited by Alison Aiken, translated by Alison Aiken and Ann Stevens, 111–29. Manchester: Carcanet, 2000.
- . *Os Maias: Episódios da Vida Romântica*. Lisbon: Livros do Brasil, 1888.
- . *Cartas de Inglaterra e Crônicas de Londres*. Lisbon: Livros do Brasil, 2001.
- . *A Emigração Como Força Civilizadora*. Lisbon: Publicações D. Quixote, 2001.
- . *Textos de Imprensa IV (da 'Gazeta de Notícias')*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2002.
- , and Ramalho Ortigão. *As Farpas: Crônica Mensal da Política, das Letras e dos Costumes*. 2nd ed. Cascais: Principia, 2004.

- Quental, Antero de. *Causas da Decadência dos Povos Peninsulares nos Últimos Três Séculos*. Lisbon: Guimarães Editores, 2001.
- Reis, Jaime. *Revista Inglesa: Crónicas*. Lisbon: Publicações D. Quixote/Biblioteca Nacional, 1988.
- Sanderson, G. N. "The European Partition of Africa: Coincidence or Conjuncture?" *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 3 (1974–1975): 1–54.
- Soares, Isabel. "Literary Journalism's Magnetic Pull: Britain's 'New' Journalism and the Portuguese at the *Fin-de-Siècle*." In *Literary Journalism across the Globe: Journalistic Traditions and Transnational Influences*, edited by John S. Bak and Bill Reynolds, 118–33. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.
- . "Literary Journalism on War and Imperialism: The British Annexation of Egypt Viewed by Portuguese Eça de Queirós." In *Global Literary Journalism: Exploring the Journalistic Imagination*, edited by Richard Lance Keeble and John Tulloch, 111–24. Vol. 2. New York: Peter Lang, 2014.
- . "John Bull Scrambling for Africa: A Portrait of the English at the Heyday of Empire." In *Profile Pieces: Journalism and the "Human Interest" Bias*, edited by Sue Joseph and Richard Lance Keeble, 137–50. New York and London: Routledge, 2016.
- Stead, W. T. "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon I: The Report of Our Secret Commission." *Pall Mall Gazette*, July 6, 1885. W. T. Stead Resource Site. Accessed February 21, 2020. <https://attackingthediabol.co.uk/pmg/tribute/mt1.php>.
- Stanley, Henry Morton. *In Darkest Africa, or the Quest, Rescue, and Retreat of Emin Governor of Equatoria*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner, 1891.
- Taylor, Peter J. "Which Britain? Which England? Which North?" In *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality, and Identity*, edited by David Morley and Kevin Robins, 127–44. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Young, Robert J. C. *The Idea of English Ethnicity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008.
- Welsh, Frank. *The Four Nations: A History of the United Kingdom*. London: Harper-Collins, 2002.
- Wilson, A. N. *The Victorians*. London and Sydney: Arrow Books, 2003.
- Wolfe, Tom. *The New Journalism: With an Anthology*, edited by Tom Wolfe and E. W. Johnson. New York and London: Harper & Row, 1973.