In 1729 Jonathan Swift proposed that the rich eat the poor. Is this actually happening today?
Jonathan Swift’s 1729 essay *A Modest Proposal* is often called the greatest satire ever written. In the Ireland of Swift’s time, the Catholic majority suffered from poor harvests and greedy absentee landlords. Meanwhile, the government—controlled by England—failed to help. Frustrated, Swift proposed a solution: the Irish elite should eat children. “A young healthy child well nursed,” wrote Swift, “is at a year old a most delicious, nourishing, and wholesome food.”

Swift’s essay can be understood as a reaction to a certain point in Irish history. But does it reflect a universal problem? Do the ruling elite ignore the majority? This issue of *The PLEA* explores that question. Using *A Modest Proposal*, it asks:

- what was Jonathan Swift’s purpose in writing *A Modest Proposal*;
- how did the laws governing Ireland shape Swift’s satire; and
- can the lessons of *A Modest Proposal* be applied to modern law and policy making?

While suitable for most any reader, this issue of *The PLEA* will help English Language Arts teachers use satire so students can comprehend and respond to social criticism.
Jonathan Swift and A Modest Proposal

What motivates a person to write one of history’s greatest satires?

In his youth, Jonathan Swift was a student at Ireland’s Kilkenny College. Kilkenny College teachings were rooted in an idea called political arithmetic. Political arithmetic was a view in the 17th and 18th centuries that statistics and numbers alone can explain society, economics, and politics. This numbers-based approach emphasised “rationality,” but ignored our less-rational human qualities such as passions, opinions, and appetites.

Jonathan Swift didn’t buy into political arithmetic. He believed that a rational idea taken to its limit would produce an irrational result. This led him to write books and essays that challenged the pure rationalism of political arithmetic. The most famous example was A Modest Proposal.

A Modest Proposal made a rational economic argument to propose something unthinkable: have poor Irish families—who mostly were Catholic—sell their children to the rich to be eaten. Swift argued that:

- eating children would reduce the Catholic population. This would encourage the return of wealthy Protestant Anglo-Irish landowners from England, who had left Ireland rather than “pay tithes against their conscience”;
- children could be “liable to distress,” meaning they could be used to pay rent to landlords;
- in addition to freeing up £50,000 of government money that would otherwise be used to support
the poor, “the profit of a new dish introduced to the tables of all gentlemen of fortune in the kingdom” would circulate in the local economy;
- the poor would gain from the sale of their children and “be rid of the charge of maintaining them”;
- a new national dish would induce tavern keepers to create innovative recipes and make them “as expensive as they please”; and
- husbands would treat their wives better because child-rearing held the potential for an “annual profit instead of expense.”

Admittedly, Swift’s argument also dabbled in human considerations such as appetites. At one point, A Modest Proposal said that children were both wholesome and delicious. However, at no point did the essay consider the moral and ethical issues surrounding cannibalism.

Of course, Swift wasn’t serious about eating children. He was using satirical irony to expose the narrow-mindedness of political arithmetic. Put another way, Swift was telling us that pure economic arguments make for poor public policies.

Exposing political arithmetic was not Swift’s only motivation for writing A Modest Proposal. The way England ruled over Ireland in Swift’s time also motivated him.

English Rule of Ireland

In 1729, Ireland’s ruling class were the Anglo-Irish. The Anglo-Irish were Protestants associated with England, Ireland’s colonial ruler. The Anglo-Irish held positions of power in Ireland’s church, government, and business community. They used this power to rule over and discriminate against Ireland’s Catholic majority.

Jonathan Swift was a member of the Anglo-Irish ruling class. Like most of the Anglo-Irish, Swift was no friend of Ireland’s poor Catholic majority. In fact, Swift believed that the poor’s problems were largely the result of their own shortcomings. He preached in St. Patrick’s Cathedral that Irish Catholics were uncivilised and ignorant.

While the Anglo-Irish were the most powerful people in Ireland, they were not free to rule Ireland however they pleased. Ireland was part of the United Kingdom, and the government back in London constantly meddled in Irish affairs. The meddling left the Anglo-Irish unable to independently govern Ireland.

The Anglo-Irish believed that if England just got out of their way, they could solve all of Ireland’s problems. In fact, ten serious ideas to solve Ireland’s poverty problems are embedded towards the close of A Modest Proposal. Each proposal had at one time or another been proposed by the Anglo-Irish elite. And each proposal was ignored or shot down by England.
Of course, the lunacy of a society that leaves the poor to starve is clear to most readers of *A Modest Proposal*. However, Jonathan Swift did not write *A Modest Proposal* simply to expose the cruelty of leaving people to starve. He also wrote it as a reaction to a colonial government in England that would not empower his own class—the Anglo-Irish elite—to independently solve Ireland’s problems.

Jonathan Swift was born in Dublin in 1667. His father died before he was born, and he and his mother moved to England shortly after his birth. Swift returned to Ireland for his education. He received a Doctor of Divinity from Trinity College, Dublin in 1702.

Following his education, Swift preached, wrote, and involved himself in Irish politics. However, he frequently visited London, where he kept company with influential writers and politicians. In 1710, he moved there for a job with England’s Tory government. He hoped the job would be a stepping stone to a bishopric at an English church.

Unfortunately for Swift, Queen Anne did not like his writing, being particularly annoyed by *A Tale of a Tub* and *The Windsor Prophecy*. Her dislike of Swift was a reason why he never received a bishopric in England. Instead, Swift was sent back to Ireland in 1714 to be the Dean of Dublin’s St. Patrick’s Cathedral.

At first, Swift was disappointed. Ireland was viewed as a colonial backwater. However, the move ultimately worked to Swift’s advantage. Being slighted by English colonial rulers opened Swift’s eyes to the dark side of power and authority.

1. Consider the economic arguments for eating children in *A Modest Proposal*. What does the essay tell us about taking a single idea too far?

2. The Anglo-Irish elite believed if they were given the chance to govern Ireland without English interference, they could solve the problems of Ireland’s poor Catholic majority.
   a) Does this solution empower the poor majority?
   b) Who is better equipped to solve problems? People living the realities on the ground or the elite above?

3. When absentee landlords evicted poor Irish people from their homes, they also tore down their houses. If neighbours offered them shelter, they too would be evicted.
   a) Is this fair?
   b) Do you see similar injustices taking place today?
   c) What should the government’s role be in preventing injustices such as poverty and homelessness?

4. Some people believed that Ireland’s Catholics were so poor, they were engaging in cannibalism. Because Swift lacked sympathy for the Catholics, people have speculated that *A Modest Proposal* was meant to be taken seriously. Do you think Swift was being serious?
Ireland of Swift’s Time

In theory Ireland was a kingdom co-equal to England. In reality it was not.

Ireland’s history is a story of colonization. Following 300 years of Viking incursions, the Anglo-Normans invaded Ireland in 1169. This invasion marked the beginning of 850 years of English involvement in Ireland. During these years, England often used Ireland’s presence in the British Empire to advance English—not Irish—interests. Countless laws were enacted that benefited England but hamstrung the Irish economy and harmed Irish citizens.

During Jonathan Swift’s time, Ireland was particularly oppressed by England. The 17th and 18th centuries were a time of expanding global trade and commerce. As trade and commerce expanded, so too did Irish wealth. This did not sit well with English merchants and traders who viewed Ireland’s newfound prosperity as their loss. So the English parliament created laws to redirect Irish trade and wealth to England.

In the realm of trade, England passed the Navigation Acts. These laws restricted trade activities of English colonies, which particularly hurt Ireland. As well, England targeted key Irish industries. In 1665, strict prohibitions were placed on importing Irish cattle and meat. In 1699, the Woollen Act restricted Irish wool exports to a handful of English ports.

England also drained Ireland of money through taxes, profiteering, and rents paid to absentee landlords. Exact figures are unknown, but economic historians have validated Jonathan Swift’s claim in A Short View of the State of Ireland that nearly half of Ireland’s annual income was being sent to England.

Even Irish currency was the subject of English interference. In 1722, Englishman William Wood bought a patent to produce Ireland’s halfpennies. The deal—made without the consent of the Irish parliament—caused a currency panic in Ireland, as rumours spread that Wood was counterfeiting his own currency. Public uproar convinced the English government to cancel Wood’s patent. However, as compensation Wood was granted an annual £3,000 pension that was secretly paid from Irish tax revenues.

The Anglo-Irish could not do much about interference from London because England had curbed the power of Ireland’s parliament. Poynings’ Law, which dated back to 1495, required that any meeting of the Irish Parliament and all Irish legislation be pre-approved by England. By Swift’s time, Irish legislators had found convoluted ways to get around Poynings’ Law, so England passed the Declaratory Act in 1720. The act removed the Irish House of Lords as the Irish Supreme Court, and granted England the power to create Ireland’s laws. These changes gave England ultimate power over Ireland.

Trickle-Down Oppression

Sadly, the Anglo-Irish elite often took out their frustration with English oppression from above by oppressing the native Irish population below. With England’s approval, the Irish Parliament...
England believed that it best-knew how to run Ireland. As Jonathan Swift wrote in *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture*, Ireland was nothing more to England than “one of their colonies of outcasts in America.” At the time, England considered its North American colonies to be backwater hinterlands.

Swift’s belief that Ireland was treated like a backwater American colony helps explain why *A Modest Proposal’s* baby-eating proposition came from “a very knowing American of my acquaintance in London.” At the time it was believed that North America’s Indigenous people were cannibals. If the Irish were treated like outcast Americans, they may as well start acting like Americans and be cannibals.

In fact, because Swift tried to give his proposal credibility by saying it was an American idea, he was making a statement about just how low Ireland’s place was in the British Empire. Consider:

- Swift wanted to live in London and be part of the centre of English power, but the English rejected him, and
- Swift’s serious proposals to end Irish poverty were rejected by the English.

Because the idea originated with an American in London—and not an Irish person—Swift was suggesting that the English held outcast Americans in higher esteem than their Irish neighbours.

passed laws that discriminated against Irish Catholics and to a lesser-extent Irish Presbyterians.

For example, education for Catholic children was strictly restricted under the Penal Laws of 1695. Even though Catholics were the majority, they were not allowed to run for office. Catholics even lost the right to vote under the *Disenfranchisement Act* of 1728. And to help ensure that they stayed poor, Catholics were barred from owning land.

It is little wonder that Swift said in *A Modest Proposal* that “instead of being able to work for their honest livelihood, [the Catholic poor were] forced to employ all their time in strolling to beg for sustenance.” Laws and policies created by the English and the Anglo-Irish hit Ireland’s poor Catholic majority the hardest. Catholics were discriminated against by landlords, they could not vote, they could not run for office, and they could not go to school. They had almost nothing left but reliance upon acts of charity.

---

**CHEW ON THIS**

1. Ireland faced many problems as an English colony. One problem was that its government had no power of self-determination.
   a) What problems could come from a lack of self-determination for Ireland?
   b) Has colonialism caused similar problems for Indigenous peoples?

2. When oppressed by the English above, the Anglo-Irish ruling class often reacted by oppressing the Irish Catholics below.
   a) Why do you think the Anglo-Irish acted this way?
   b) What would be a better way to react to this oppression?

3. The Anglo-Irish elite restricted Catholic access to education.
   a) How would restriction make it more difficult for Catholics to overcome oppression?
   b) Canada’s federal government under-funds on-reserve schools by thousands of dollars per student, when compared to provincial education systems. How is the Irish situation similar to Canada today?
Historian Kenneth Campbell warns that it is dangerous to simply view Ireland’s history as “a tale of eight centuries of oppression followed by the triumph of Irish nationalism that ignored anything that may have complicated the story.” While one-sided explanations of the past can be dangerous, England’s role in Irish history looms large...

Lordship of Ireland, 1177-1542

Prior to 1169, Ireland was a collection of loosely-connected kingdoms. In 1169, the Anglo-Normans invaded Ireland. By 1171 Henry II of England personally intervened to help secure the island. His forces gained the upper hand, leading to the Treaty of Windsor in 1175. It turned over much of Ireland to Henry II, who viewed himself as Ireland’s protector, not its conqueror.

Henry II’s protection did not bring peace. Battles carried on, so Henry II declared Ireland a Lordship in 1177—a territory under the rule of a Lord assigned by the British Monarch. Lordship did not bring peace, either. Parts of Ireland passed back and forth between feuding forces for years to come. There was even a Scottish invasion in 1315 that attempted to liberate Ireland from the English.

Kingdom of Ireland, 1542-1800

In 1538, King Henry VIII of England was excommunicated by the Roman Catholic Church. Afraid that his excommunication was weakening English power in largely Catholic Ireland, Henry VIII had the Irish parliament declare him King of Ireland in 1542. He dissolved Ireland’s monasteries and created the Church of Ireland.

Not long after, Elizabeth I—a Protestant—became queen. Because she controlled the Church of Ireland, the church switched to Protestantism. Ireland’s Catholic majority was powerless to stop her. Changing Ireland’s state religion to Protestantism marked the beginning of state discrimination against Catholics in Ireland.
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, 1801-1922

In 1798, the Irish Rebellion broke out. It was an independence movement inspired by the French and American Revolutions. Britain and Ireland’s ruling elite—afraid of losing control of Ireland—formally merged Britain and Ireland into one country. The merger emancipated Irish Catholics, who had previously lost most of their rights. State discrimination against Catholics continued, so the Church of Ireland was removed as the official state church in 1871.

These changes could not quell the desire for independence. Irish nationalists formed the Home Government Association in 1870. They advocated for an independent Ireland that was loyal to the British Crown, much like Canada today. The association’s successor, the Irish Parliamentary Party, came close to gaining independence in 1886, 1893, and 1912.

Republic of Ireland/United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 1922-Present

The political party Sinn Féin led the early 20th-century charge for Irish independence. A key moment was the 1916 Easter Rising, an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the British. Meanwhile, many northerners remained loyal to the UK. As a compromise, in 1922 Ireland was partitioned into the Irish Free State (a self-governing Commonwealth country in the south) and Northern Ireland (six northern counties that remain part of the UK). The full constitutional break came with the Republic of Ireland Act of 1948.

Northern Ireland’s place within Ireland or the UK is still contested. In the 1960s after the Civil Rights movement led to a violent backlash against Catholics, the Irish Republican Army began a guerilla war to push for a united Ireland. This period—called the Troubles—led to over 3,600 deaths. A 1998 ceasefire agreed to keep Northern Ireland in the UK, but allows for citizens to demand a referendum on joining the Republic.
Who’s Really Empowered?

Have the rich always been eating the poor?

The Ireland of Jonathan Swift’s time was filled with oppression. The poor Catholic majority was oppressed by Ireland’s Anglo-Irish ruling class. And the Anglo-Irish were oppressed by their English rulers in London.

Oppressive power frustrated both Irish Catholics and the Anglo-Irish. But frustration with oppression was not unique to Swift’s Ireland. History and current events are filled with people who are fed up with power and authority. Sometimes, that frustration is widespread. Today seems to be one of those times.

Why are so many people frustrated today? By almost every measure, society has been on a path of improvement since Jonathan Swift’s time. Most western nations still have serious poverty and homelessness issues, but they are nothing like the poverty and famines that ravaged pre-20th-century Ireland.

Despite society’s long-term trajectory of advancement, there appears to be a growing sense today that our rulers simply rule for themselves. In fact, one widely-cited American study has shown that the lower classes only get the laws and policies they want if their demands coincide with upper-class desires. In other words, most laws created today—at least in the United States—are the laws that the rich and powerful want.

Whether or not this study’s findings are entirely true, thinkers such as former American Secretary of Labor Robert Reich have pointed out that over the past 40 years, many changes to the law appear to primarily benefit the upper classes. Taxes have decreased for corporations and the wealthy, labour laws have been weakened, and social programs have been cut.

These changes have coincided with—and may very well have contributed to—a sharp rise in economic inequality. Following World War II, everyone shared in economic growth. However, starting in the 1970s the richest few began taking a disproportionate share of the growth.

For example, in 1965 the 350 top American CEOs earned about twenty times more than the average worker. By 2018, the top CEOs were earning 287 times more. Because the rich earn more, they also save more. Globally, half of the world’s wealth is now owned by the richest 1% of people, an imbalance not seen since the 1930s.
Economic inequality in Canada has followed suit. By 2016, Canada’s top 100 CEOs were earning 209 times more than the average worker. In fact, Canada’s richest 87 families have as much wealth as everyone in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick combined.

Whatever the causes of economic inequality may be, when societies become more economically unequal, everyone’s well-being worsens. Literacy, life opportunities, and life expectancy go down, access to justice is reduced, and crime and drug abuse go up. Perhaps even more disturbingly, extreme disparity can lead to a breakdown of society and democracy.

Warnings that economic inequality could break down society have come from the highest levels. For example, Janet Yellen—the former chair of America’s central bank—said that growing inequality “can shape [and] determine the ability of different groups to participate equally in a democracy and have grave effects on social stability over time.” Put more simply, democracy is undermined as wealth disparity grows.

Such claims give reason for pause. That said, one must be careful not to directly transpose America’s experience to Canada. This is especially true given that the USA generally has looser political financing laws, greater income inequality, and a weaker social welfare state.

Nevertheless, the broader point should not be missed: Everyone’s voice should count equally in a democracy. But economic inequality can result in a ruling class that actively serves its own interests and oppresses lower classes. Just like in Jonathan Swift’s Ireland, today’s lower classes are at risk of being ignored or actively oppressed by upper classes with too much power.

---

1. Look back at Janet Yellen’s comments about the breakdown of democracy.
   a) Are populist uprisings an indication that democracy is breaking down, or are they a sign of the strength of democracy?
   b) Aside from economic inequality, what other inequalities exist? How are they harmful?

2. Do governments generally create laws and policies that favour the rich? If so, why?

3. Have the rich and powerful always been “eating” the poor? Explain.

4. Irish citizens fought for independence so that their government would look after their interests. Can this be squared with Ireland’s bank bailout?

---

**HISTORY REPEATING?**

In 1994, an economic boom hit Ireland. During the boom, banking regulations were loosened and tax laws were changed to favour the rich. Looser regulations and lower taxes were sustainable until the economy collapsed in 2007.

With the collapse, average people lost their jobs and homes. The Irish government did little to help. In fact, taxes were raised, social programs were cut, and the minimum wage was reduced. However, when the collapse pushed Irish banks towards ruin, the government rushed in a €64 billion bailout.

The bailout led to even more tax increases and program cuts for average citizens. As well, it created a huge public debt. As Irish historian Thomas Bartlett put it, “the billions deployed to bail out the delinquent banks in the first decade of the twenty-first century would be a charge on the future, unborn generations: the Republic had eaten its young.” Swift’s idea of the rich eating poor children metaphorically returned to Ireland.

Economist Paul Krugman agreed. He pointed out that the Irish government could not find money for average citizens, yet found billions to backfill the losses of “private wheeler-dealers seeking nothing but their own profit.” Krugman concluded that “only a satirist—and one with a very savage pen—could do justice to what’s happening to Ireland now.”
Sources and Resources

PLEA learning resources explain how to create and change laws. Find them and order your copies at teachers.plea.org.

DIRECT DEMOCRACY
How can referendums and plebiscites be used to change laws?

MUNICIPALITIES MATTER
What do municipal governments do and how you can influence them?

REVOLUTION
What happens when people reject oppression?

DEMOCRACY AND THE RULE OF LAW
How does democracy support the rule of law and how does the rule of law support democracy?

Sources

Here are just a few of the sources used to create this issue of The PLEA. Find them online or at your public library.


