

# Social Organization, Secrecy, and Rebellion – Secret Societies in China and Ireland

By Frank Jacob

*Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg*

**Abstract:** *The following article will compare secret societies in China and Ireland of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century with regard to their genesis, their secrecy and their revolutionary potential. By a comparative analysis it will be shown, that the history of such societies in China and Ireland had been influenced by transnational factors leading to main similarities in their national histories.*

**Keywords:** *secret societies; Triad societies; United Irishmen; Chinese history; Irish history*

## 1. Introduction

There are still many people around the globe, who believe that secret societies are responsible for the course of history.<sup>1</sup> For historians it is not a simple task, to analyze the history of secret societies. Despite this, recent studies confirm, that these societies constitute a global phenomenon, whose manifestations are comparable in many different points. Especially in China, many such societies existed and next to Bruce Lee or Fu Manchu, these groups are among the most known Chinese stereotypes in the United States or Europe.<sup>2</sup> The Chinese secret societies have a long and complex history and there is almost no revolutionary event in the long history of China, for which no secret society had been responsible.<sup>3</sup> In general the term secret society “designates associations whose policies are characterized by a particular kind of religious, political, and social dissent from the established order”<sup>4</sup> and could be used for many organizations in different countries and time periods. There are a lot of similarities between these secret societies, no matter if they existed in Europe or China; especially the Triad lodges were compared to the lodges of the Freemasons by European visitors to China during the 19th century. Their organizational structure, their oaths, their rules and secret signs reminded the Europeans, who traveled to China, of the Masonic lodges of Europe.<sup>5</sup>

In contrast to these early visitors Jean Chesneaux denied a comparability of secret societies in China and Europe.<sup>6</sup> His thesis underlined a European-centered theory, due to which Asian and European developments were not comparable. But secret societies in China, as in other countries, have had their origin sometimes in political circumstances, and sometimes in the desire to maintain a craft, propagate a doctrine, or to advance some object of philanthropy. The political aims of secret societies in China and Europe are definitely comparable

and a detailed analysis will show the similar aspects of their genesis, their reasons for secrecy as well as their revolutionary potential for the course of history.<sup>7</sup> The ideas or political identities as well as the validations of the societies changed through the ages, but even if the Triads became a more criminal society, their history shows, that a comparative perspective is reasonable and will help to overcome a Euro-centric view of history.<sup>8</sup>

The following article will compare secret societies in Ireland and China to show, that the reasons for their foundation are mainly the same. They were not founded to rule from behind the curtain, but were social answers to existing problems in the single countries. In a second step, it should be asked, why the societies became secret. In the most cases, this decision was not made by the leaders of the societies themselves. They just reacted to existing problems or to forceful prosecution. Finally their revolutionary potential during the course of the national histories of China and Ireland shall be researched to show, which real influence the societies were able to carry out. Due to the temporal limitation of those presentations, I only chose a two-sided comparison, which could be broadened by the addition of more societies like the Freemasons, the Illuminati, the Carbonari or African or American secret societies as well.

## 2. Genesis

Secret societies are usually performing a task: the promise of deliverance and a better world, a replacement for family ties, mutual help, proto-democratic structures, and a better chance for survival, the ensuring of identity, resistance and upheaval against social inequity, patriotic motives, and the protection of villages or social groups as well as against governmental suppression. But they could serve criminal aims, too.<sup>9</sup>

Especially in China secret societies were a form of social organization and some kind of non-elitist answer to the challenge of a mobile, commercial, and competitive order of an early modern period.<sup>10</sup> As a consequence, the societies of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century were no new phenomenon, but developed from older forms of mutual help in Chinese rural society. They continued by introducing oaths, signs and secrecy to secure the more political task of Ming loyalty.<sup>11</sup> In foreign Chinese communities the secret societies answered the need of young men to protect their identity by organizing people from the same cultural origin.<sup>12</sup> Finally there were some areas in China in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, where one was not able to find even one village without a secret society. Around the 1850s there were two big systems or labels of secret societies: the White Lotus in the north and the Triads in the south.<sup>13</sup> In contrast to the Triad societies, which had their rule in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the White Lotus was a more religious movement, which became a label for secret societies as a consequence of an upheaval of the White Lotus in Shandong in 1622. In general, there were several small secret societies, which were loosely included under one of these two labels or brands.<sup>14</sup>

The end of the Ming dynasty in 1644 laid the ground for a new political aim and Ming loyalists in Taiwan founded the first Triad (ti-hui) society, which spread over all of China during the following decades. Its members were recruited from all social levels and over time the accessibility of the societies grew to a more universal phase of recruitment. Regardless of the fact, that the societies shared the same origin, their organizational structure remained decentralized. The regional groups just had a loose connection, which was underlined by shared traditions. All in all, the societies had a common root, which became politically influenced by the historical developments leading to the end of the Ming dynasty.<sup>15</sup> Similar aspects were responsible for the history of Irish secret societies in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Since 1695 in Ireland the Catholic community was ruled by a Protestant pro-English minority and the Penal Laws restricted the life of the inhabitants of those Catholic communities. The situation of the Catholics became worse and worse in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when they were restricted from carrying weapons as well as having to send their children to foreign countries for their education.<sup>16</sup> As a consequence the number of secret societies in the agricultural areas increased and the Defenders were founded to protect the interest of the Catholic population.<sup>17</sup> In 1791 a new society, the Society of the United Irishmen, was founded and marked the beginning of a new Irish independent movement. The members of the United Irishmen asked for political reforms and tried to unite Catholics and Protestants. They believed that religious conflict should

be abolished and propagated a new concept of peace.<sup>18</sup> Their aim was “the greatest happiness of the greatest number on this Island”<sup>19</sup> and next to the first foundation of Belfast, another branch was founded in Dublin.<sup>20</sup> At the first instance, the society was founded as a public organization of religious tolerance, which asked for a peaceful change of the Irish situation.

The new society was not seen then as dangerous, but the French Revolution had just begun to spread its ideas over Europe and did not simply influence the aims of the United Irishmen.<sup>21</sup> With the outbreak of the English-French War, Ireland became a strategic backdoor for a possible French invasion. The chance for military support from France transformed a national matter into an international one.<sup>22</sup> The United Irishmen were prohibited and became a secret society; it then combined its forces with the still existing societies of the Defenders. This underlines the fact that secret societies were not secret from its origin onwards, a fact that raises the question of the roots of secrecy in a secret society.

### 3. Secrecy

Rituals and secrecy are mostly important factors in the histories of secret societies, because these points were responsible for the image of exclusivity which produced an interest in the different groups. In China by their oaths and secret signs, the Triad societies became especially attractive for new aspiring members.<sup>23</sup> But why did the societies need such secrecy and why did the original social groups begin to transform into secret groups? Due to their Ming loyalism, the societies became dangerous and were forbidden. A hierarchical order, which was an expression of a “social choreography”<sup>24</sup>, a recruitment, which followed the lines of friendships or blood relationships, and strict secrecy were adapted to save the members of the individual organizations.<sup>25</sup> Between 1664 and 1668, the first punishments for a membership in a brotherhood were released by the Qing government, which feared the growing Ming loyalism of the regional groups. Due to this development, more and more groups transformed themselves into secret societies, of which more and more were discovered and punished as of the 1720s.<sup>26</sup>

In 1792, after the rebellion of Lin Shuangwen on Taiwan in 1787/88, the first law against the secret societies was announced. Till 1811, there followed more laws, which dealt with the same problem and defined severe punishments.<sup>27</sup> The increasing severity of the punishments led to a higher level of secrecy and more secret signs, hand signals etc. were introduced by the Triad leaders, who asked for an abolishment of the Manchu rule. The rituals of initiation were now taking place at night, to protect the members, who were needed to carry out the oath ritual.<sup>28</sup> Due to the fact of the laws

against membership, the new Triad members became criminals at the instant of their oath. This makes it easy, to determine the reason for a stronger level of secrecy, the prosecution by the government. This fact was responsible for a heightening of secrecy in Ireland as well.

The Defenders were founded to protect the interests of the Catholic population in the agricultural regions of Ireland. Due to their aims, it had to be kept secret, because the Protestant government prosecuted its members. The members of the Defenders were anti-English agitators, but became criminal as well, because the organization, which had been founded following the example of the Spanish *Garduña*, started raids against Protestant land owners and their families. They claimed the Irish land to be an Irish possession and were strongly connected to the Irish agricultural areas.<sup>29</sup> The organizational structure followed Masonic examples, which means they were organized like the Triads, in local groups which were decentralized, just sharing the same traditions.<sup>30</sup> In contrast to the Defenders, the United Irishmen were not originally founded as a secret society and “their design was not systematically traitorous from the first moment of their career”<sup>31</sup>. At the beginning neither a republic nor a revolution was part of the discussions with regard to the foundation of the society.<sup>32</sup> Its members met and discussed in public about a possible more tolerant future of Ireland.

Starting in 1792, the government had held trials against the members of the United Irishmen and as a consequence of the war between England and France in 1794 and 1795 the English government put more pressure on the United Irishmen.<sup>33</sup> In May 1794 the United Irishmen were prohibited and they then built secret lodges, to prepare the members for an open rebellion, which hopefully would be supported by the French.<sup>34</sup> The public society became a secret one and the aim transformed into an open rebellion. Unification with the Defenders was the result and the United Irishmen became a Catholic-dominated mass organization. From 1795 till 1797 the number of members multiplied and in 1798 the Irish secret societies were a major part of the rebellion, which was intended to abolish the Protestant rule of the pro-English minority.<sup>35</sup> It was not just Ireland, or China, secret societies have always had revolutionary potential, but in these two countries in particular, this potential broke out in a decisive way.

#### **4. Revolutionary Potential**

The potential for revolution could be a consequence of natural catastrophes or times of hardship. We can trace a revolutionary potential for many cases in the 18th and 19th century, but in China and Ireland this potential is visible from the outset.<sup>36</sup> In China it were the Triad

societies and its members, addressed their anger as well as their proto-nationalism against the Manchu rulers, and the traditional societies that transformed into a liberation movement in the 19th century, that was able to gain the support of the masses.<sup>37</sup> In times of social confrontation this phenomenon was not unusual, due to a realignment of status, the revolutionaries sought for support from non-members as well. Despite the fact, that the Triad societies became the most important assemblage of anti-Manchu forces, striving for an overthrow of the Qing and a restoration of the Ming dynasty, the Triads alone were not able to win the fight against the actual government.<sup>38</sup>

The same was essential for the later revolutionary movement, which was not able to abolish the Qing rule on their own. As a result of that, they were willing to use an already existing tool of rebellion, the secret societies, which were able to activate and recruit the masses. In co-operation with the traditional forces of rebellion, the republican movement was able to succeed and to achieve the change of 1911.<sup>39</sup> The revolutionary movement of Sun Yat-sen adapted the organizational structure of the Triad societies and combined their forces, because both wanted to overcome the Manchu rule. Due to this, Sun co-operated with the Southern secret societies and used the traditions of the societies as predecessors to his revolutionary movement. He had to do this, but it is clear that the secret societies acted as powerful supporters for Sun’s own ideas, because he did not want to return to a monarchy, but wanted to create a modern nation, the Republic of China.<sup>40</sup> Despite the fact that these societies had a high potential for revolution, on their own they were not successful. This was particularly true in the case of Ireland.

The harsh reaction of the government cleared the way to plan for rebellion. As a result of the unification of the United Irishmen and the Defenders, there was a shift of the independent movement into a civil war between the government and the society of Ireland. The universal republicanism of the United Irishmen became displaced by a Catholic nationalism led by the Defenders.<sup>41</sup> The membership structure changed from a regional to a national one. On May 23, 1798 the rebellion broke out in South Ireland (Wexford), but was struck down by the governmental troops. In the north, the rebellion was a failure as well. It was obvious that the plan for rebellion had been a failure, because the rebels were poorly equipped and their actions had no organization.<sup>42</sup> Following the fast defeat, the leading United Irishmen were imprisoned and around 500 of them were sentenced to death. The defeat of the rebel forces marked the end of an enlightened proposal for an Irish national state, and Ireland became even more closely tied to the English government.<sup>43</sup>

A French supportive army was defeated as well, because the revolutionary forces had been beaten already and the troops from France were not able to establish some kind of bridgehead, a fact that led to their fast surrender against the pro-English forces. The rebellion of 1798 was one of the most significant events in the tortured history of Ireland,<sup>44</sup> but due to its failure, it was not able to change the disadvantaged position of the Catholic minority and the religious conflict should have been a decisive factor of Irish history in the following decades and centuries until today.

## 5. Conclusion

All in all the comparison of the Chinese secret societies and the Irish ones has shown that there are many similarities between both cases. The groups developed from regional groups of social help or protection, which became secret as a result of governmental prosecution. The secrecy was needed to protect the members and their aims. Even if there had been some criminal activities by several members, most of the societies sought a better political future. While the Triad societies wanted to abolish the Manchu rule of China, the United Irishmen wanted to overcome religious conflicts to create a united Ireland no longer dominated by the British.

The revolutionary potential was visible for both cases and the secret societies had been the bearers of unrest as well as a dangerous factor in several national histories. The members were ready for rebellion and in times of unrest, they were the leaders of it. Consequently, the comparison has shown that the secret societies of China and Europe are comparable and that the history of these societies is definitely a global one. The national history of these organizations was influenced by transnational parameters, which had the same influence on the different social groups in countries around the globe.

A more complex and more detailed comparison with societies, which existed in Europe, Asia and the Americas, is able to underline this thesis and put an end to the mistaken claim that secret societies in China and Europe are not comparable. As a global phenomenon, the roots, memberships, activities and traditional views of many secret societies are equal consequences of transnational parameters, which influenced the single aspects in the same manner.

<sup>1</sup> John Morris Roberts, *The Mythology of the Secret Societies*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1972, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Serge Hutin, *Les Sociétés Secrètes en Chine*. Paris: Éditions Robert Laffont, 1976, p. 9; David Ownby, *Brotherhoods and Secret Societies*

*in Early and Mid-Qing China. The Formation of a Tradition*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Kingsley Bolton and Christopher Hutton, eds., *Triad Societies. Western Accounts of the History, Sociology and Linguistics of Chinese Secret Societies*, Vol. I, *Selected Writings*. London: Routledge, 2000, ix; John Lust, "Secret Societies, Popular Movements, and the 1911 Revolution", in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 165-200, especially p. 165.

<sup>4</sup> Jean Chesneaux, "Secret Societies in China's Historical Evolution", in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 1-21, especially p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Frederic Henry Balfour, "Secret societies and their political significance", in Kingsley Bolton and Christopher Hutton, eds., *Triad Societies. Western Accounts of the History, Sociology and Linguistics of Chinese Secret Societies*, Vol. I, *Selected Writings*. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 289-306, especially p. 292; Jean DeBernardi, "Epilogue: Ritual Process Reconsidered", in David Ownby, Mary Somers Heidhues, eds., *"Secret Societies" Reconsidered. Perspectives on the Social History of Modern South China and Southeast Asia*. Armonk/London: M. E. Sharpe, 1993, pp. 212-233, especially p. 212; Charles Gützlaff, "On the secret Triad Society of China (1846)", in Kingsley Bolton and Christopher Hutton, eds., *Triad Societies. Western Accounts of the History, Sociology and Linguistics of Chinese Secret Societies*, Vol. I, *Selected Writings*. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 93-101, especially p. 96; John Kesson, *The Cross and the Dragon or, The Fortunes of Christianity in China: with Notices of the Christian Missions and Missionaries, and some Account of the Chinese Secret Societies*. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1854, pp. 265-271.

<sup>6</sup> Jean Chesneaux, *Secret Societies in China*. In the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1971, p. 188.

<sup>7</sup> Jonathan Unger, "The Making and Breaking of the Chinese Secret Societies Unger", *Journal of contemporary Asia* 5, no. 1 (1975). pp. 89-98, especially p. 89.

<sup>8</sup> For the meaning of political identities see Charles Tilly, "Political Identities", in Michael P. Hannagan, Leslie Page Moch and Wayne te Brake, eds., *Challenging Authority. The Historical Study of Contentious Politics, Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, Vol. 7. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 1998, pp. 3-16, especially p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Peter Kuhfus, "Rot und Schwarz – Einige Beobachtungen zu Männerbund. Aspekten der Geheimgesellschaften Chinas", *Ethnologica* 15, no. 1 (1990). pp. 135-142, especially p. 136.

<sup>10</sup> DeBernardi, Epilogue, p. 212; David Ownby, "Introduction: Secret Societies Reconsidered", in David Ownby, Mary Somers Heidhues, eds., *"Secret Societies" Reconsidered. Perspectives on the Social History of Modern South China and Southeast Asia*. Armonk/London: M. E. Sharpe, 1993, pp. 3-33, especially p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Ownby, *Brotherhoods*, pp. 31-33.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> Chesneaux, *Secret Societies* (1972), p. 5; C. A. Curwen, "Taiping Relations with Secret Societies and with Other Rebels", in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 65-84, especially p. 65.

<sup>14</sup> Ivan Light, "Mak Lau Fong: The Sociology of Secret Societies: A Study of Chinese Secret Societies in Singapore and Peninsular Malaysia (Book Review)", *Contemporary Sociology* 12, no. 4 (1983). pp. 402-403; Barend Ter Haar, *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History*. Leiden: Brill, Leiden, 1992, p. 227-228.

<sup>15</sup> Thoralf Klein, *Geschichte Chinas. Von 1800 bis zur Gegenwart*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007, p. 143; Light, *Sociology*, p. 403; Frederic Jr. Wakeman, “The Secret Societies of Kwangtung, 1800-1856”, in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 29- 47, especially p. 29-30.

<sup>16</sup> Rosamond Jacob, *The Rise of the United Irishmen 1791-1794*. London: George G. Harrap & Co.Ltd., 1937, p.14; Kai Wehmeier, *Geheimbünde in Irland 1760-1870*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr.Kovač, 2008, p. 14.

<sup>17</sup> Jacob, *Rise*, p. 211; Wehmeier, *Geheimbünde*, p. 42; Kevin Whelan, *Fellowship of Freedom. The United Irishmen and 1798*. Cork: Cork University Press, 1998, p. 11.

<sup>18</sup> Thomas Barlett, “Protestant nationalism in eighteenth-century Ireland”, in Michael O’Dea and Kevin Whelan, eds., *Nations and nationalisms: France, Britain, Ireland and the eighteenth-century context, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. 335. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995, pp. 79-88, especially p. 87; Jacob, *Rise*, p. 32 and pp. 62-66; Paul Weber, *On the Road to Rebellion. The United Irishmen and Hamburg 1796-1803*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997, p. 15.

<sup>19</sup> Anonymous, *Application of Barruel’s Memoirs of Jacobinism, to the Secret Societies of Ireland and Great Britain by the Translator of the Work*. London: E. Booker, 1798, p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> George D. Boyce, *Nationalism in Ireland*. London: Routledge, 1995, p. 125; Jacob, *Rise*, pp. 67-72.

<sup>21</sup> Weber, *Rebellion*, p. 15; Whelan, *Fellowship*, ix.

<sup>22</sup> Weber, *Rebellion*, p. 16; Whelan, *Fellowship*, p. 31.

<sup>23</sup> Ownby, *Brotherhoods*, p. 2; Roberts, *Mythology*, p. 12; Wakeman, *Kwangtung*, p. 34.

<sup>24</sup> *Application of Barruel’s Memoirs of Jacobinism*, p. 217.

<sup>25</sup> DeBernardi, Epilogue, p. 219; Ownby, *Brotherhoods*, p. 38.

<sup>26</sup> Robert J. Antony, “Brotherhoods, Secret Societies, and the Law in Qing-Dynasty China”, in David Ownby, Mary Somers Heidhues, eds., “*Secret Societies*” *Reconsidered. Perspectives on the Social History of Modern South China and Southeast Asia*. Armonk/London: M. E. Sharpe, 1993, pp. 190-211, especially pp. 192-196.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* pp.203-205.

<sup>28</sup> William Milne, “Some account of a secret association in China, entitled the Triad Society”, in Kingsley Bolton and Christopher Hutton, eds., *Triad Societies. Western Accounts of the History, Sociology and Linguistics of Chinese Secret Societies, Vol. I, Selected Writings*. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 17-39, especially pp. 19-25.

<sup>29</sup> Captain B.C. Pollard, *The Secret Societies of Ireland. Their Rise and Progress*. Kilkenny: The Irish Historical Press, 1998, pp. 1-13.

<sup>30</sup> *Application of Barruel’s Memoirs of Jacobinism*, p. 4-5.

<sup>31</sup> Alexander Knox, *Essays on the Political Circumstances of Ireland, written during the Administration of Earl Camden*. London: Anti-Jacobin Press, 1798, v.

<sup>32</sup> Wehmeier, *Geheimbünde*, p. 49.

<sup>33</sup> Weber, *Rebellion*, p. 34.

<sup>34</sup> R. B. McDowell, “The Age of the United Irishmen: Revolution and the Union, 1794-1800”, in T. W. Moody and W. E. Vaughan, eds., *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 4, Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691-1800*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986, pp. 339-373, especially p. 348.

<sup>35</sup> Wehmeier, *Geheimbünde*, pp. 50-52.

<sup>36</sup> Chesneaux, *Secret Societies* (1972), p. 5; Wolfgang Franke, *Das Jahrhundert der chinesischen Revolution 1851-1949*. München/Wien: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1980, p. 20-21.

<sup>37</sup> Chesneaux, *Secret Societies* (1972), p. 10; Guillaume Dunstheimer, “Some Religious Aspects of Secret Societies”, in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*.

Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 23-28, especially p. 28.

<sup>38</sup> Michael P. Hannagan, Leslie Page Moch and Wayne te Brake, eds., *Challenging Authority. The Historical Study of Contentious Politics, Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, Vol.7. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 1998, xxii; Boris Novikov, “The Anti-Manchu Propaganda of the Triads, ca. 1800-1860”, in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 49-63, especially pp. 49-52.

<sup>39</sup> Lilia Borokh, “Notes on the Early Role of Secret Societies in Sun Yat-sen’s Republican Movement”, in Jean Chesneaux, ed., *Popular Movements and Secret Societies in China 1840-1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 135-144; Chesneaux, *Secret Societies* (1971), p. 190-191.

<sup>40</sup> Borokh, *Notes*, p. 138-139.; John DeKome, “Sun Yat-Sen and the Secret Societies”, *Pacific Affairs* 7, no. 4 (1934). pp. 425-433, especially pp. 426-432; Wakeman, *Kwangtung*, p. 46-47.

<sup>41</sup> Nancy J. Curtin, *The United Irishmen. Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791-1798*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, p. 4 and p. 32; Wehmeier, *Geheimbünde*, p. 53.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 47-53.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* p. 54; Kevin Whelan, “United and disunited Irishmen: the discourse of sectarianism in the 1790s”, in Michael O’Dea and Kevin Whelan, eds., *Nations and nationalisms: France, Britain, Ireland and the eighteenth-century context, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* Vol. 335. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995, pp. 231-247, especially p. 246-247.

<sup>44</sup> Curtin, *United Irishmen*, p. 9.

#### About the author:

Dr. Frank Jacob is Assistant Professor for Modern History of University of Würzburg. He got his Ph.D in Japanese Studies from University of Erlangen-Nurnberg in 2012. From 2011 to October 2013, he was Editor of the Serial *Comparative Studies from a Global Perspective*, and Editor of the Journal *Global Humanities, Studies in Histories, Cultures and Societies*. Since Oct. 2013, he has been Assistant Professor for Modern History, University of Würzburg. He is a member of International Association for Comparative Studies of China and the West, The Historical Society, and The Society for Military History. His research interests and teaching areas cover modern Japanese history, Asian history since 1600, comparative history, global history, history of secret societies, modern German history and transnational history. His publications include *Dictatorships without Violence? – How Dictators assert their Power and The Changing Nature of Power, Status and Hierarchies in Japan (1600-1877)* and dozens of others.