

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

The Ulster Covenant

**The Great Eoghan Ruadh
and the Stuarts**

The English In Ireland

Netanyahu

Sarah Harrison

Editorial

Centenary Considerations

The Ulster Covenant Of 1912

The declared purpose of the *Solemn League And Covenant*, signed by close to half a million Ulster Protestants in September 1912, was to defend their "*cherished position of equal citizenship in the United Kingdom*". The outcome nine years later was that six Ulster Counties were formed into a devolved system of government within the United Kingdom but excluded from the political arrangements by which the UK state was governed.

Northern Ireland was neither a separate state, nor a federal component of the UK state, and its voters did not participate in the electoral contests to determine how the UK state was to be governed.

In recent decades the setting up of the Northern Ireland entity has been widely described as an "*experiment in devolution*". A more unsuitable region for experimenting with devolution would be difficult to imagine. It consisted of two hostile communities, one twice the size of the other, which were at war with each other.

The war in the Six Counties in 1920-21, when they were formed into Northern Ireland, was part of the general war in Ireland that resulted from the decision of the UK Parliament to take no heed of the 1918 decision of the Irish electorate to establish independent government in Ireland, and to authorise the Whitehall Government to continue governing Ireland in defiance of the Irish electorate. British government in Ireland then took the form of military rule. British military rule was disputed on the ground of force by an extemporised Irish Army dedicated to giving effect to the decision of the Irish electorate. There was no other ground on which it might have been disputed effectively. Constitutional debating points would have been futile. In particular circumstances the pen can sometimes be mightier than the sword. Those circumstances did not exist in Ireland in 1919-21. Therefore there was war.

Three-quarters of the population of Ireland supported the military defence of their elected Government against British military rule. A quarter of the population—including the signers of the Ulster Covenant—supported British military rule.

In the midst of this war the British Government decided to Partition the island by setting up subordinate British Government in the Six Counties. The two communities that made up the Six Counties were at war with each other at that point, as active participants in the general war between the elected Irish Government and the British State.

Republicans in the Six Counties, who had been making war on Britain in support of the Irish Government, did not see any reason to lay down their arms when Britain decided to establish the subordinate form of British Government called Northern Ireland under which the local Covenanted Protestant majority, which had been active in support of the British military despotism in Ireland as a whole, would be constituted into a local ruling stratum acting on behalf of, and on the authority of, the Whitehall Government—organised, supplied and directed by Whitehall.

The establishment of Northern Ireland roped off a section of the British battlefield in Ireland, and the majority there, which had acted with Whitehall against the Irish democracy, was given the task of crushing the Irish nationalist minority in the region. The "*experiment in devolution*" was in the first place a stratagem of war, and its first act had to be an act of war.

Reasons can be given for the British decision to divide Ireland politically and establish a state frontier within it. Such reasons have been given; and they seem to have been accepted as valid by all major parties both in the British region of the UK state and in the Irish state, though not stated intelligibly.

British colonial ventures in Ireland disrupted the organic development of Irish society, which was their purpose, but they failed to function as the centre of an organic development of Ireland as West Britain. The colonial residues in most of the country faded under pressure of the strong national development of the native population, which began after the Act of Union of 1800 had destroyed the colonial Parliament in Ireland. By the early 20th century the native social elements, which had been dispossessed by the wars of conquest waged by Elizabeth, Cromwell and William of Orange, and which were assumed to have been broken by the Penal Law system based on the Williamite conquest, had reasserted themselves and had largely come into their own again.

The colonial venture in Eastern Ulster—the Plantation of Ulster—was the only one that had flourished. It had survived because it had not been entirely a state measure in origin, but had been in considerable part the product of migration. The official Plantation failed to take root in a number of the officially Planted Counties. When the matter of Partitioning the country was raised as a practical matter in 1916 the colonial development in three of the officially Planted Counties was so weak that they were given back to the Irish without serious dispute. And the strongholds of the colony were the Counties of Antrim and Down, which had not been part of the official Plantation.

Within the area of the official Plantation official towns were established, and were laid out in official colonial style. The city of Belfast, which was the real hub of the colonial development, was an unofficial city, without a Charter, without official municipal government, and without representation in the Irish Parliament in the 18th century, or in the Union Parliament until the 1832 Reform.

Colonial ventures in other parts of the country had elaborate political forms but lacked substance. The core of the Ulster colonial development had substance without official form.

The other colonial ventures were privileged castes of the Protestant Ascendancy. They were not rounded communities, with all the classes necessary to functional society. The intention that they should displace the native population was not realised. When the native population asserted itself strongly, following the abolition of the Colonial Parliament, the colonial elite went into decline. The Protestant Ascendancy—the monopoly of land and professional occupations by members of the Church of England in Ireland (the Church of Ireland)—withered.

The Protestant Ascendancy stratum also existed in eastern Ulster. But in parts of that region the native population had been substantially displaced, and replaced by a Protestant migration/Plantation that was not Anglican. Where this had happened there was functional Protestant society.

The Penal Laws applied superficially to Protestants who

were not Anglicans, but they could not be applied within Protestantism as they were against Catholics. The Anglican gentry had to live in organic community with a substantial Protestant population that was not Anglican.. The exclusion of the non-Anglicans from the privileges of the Protestant Ascendancy acted as a stimulant rather than a depressant. And it gave to the substantial Ulster colony an internal political life of a kind that could not develop in the colonial fragments dotted around the rest of the country.

The Colonial Parliament in Dublin, based on the Williamite Conquest in the 1690s, was a subordinate Parliament, subject to the English Parliament. In 1780 the colonial gentry, taking advantage of England's difficulty in America, organised the Volunteer movement and demanded legislative independence. England had no option but to concede. But the colony, having gained legislative independence, did not proceed to set up its own Government. It relied on the power of the English Government to protect it from the native population in Ireland. The Volunteer movement in eastern Ulster proposed that the colonial development should consolidate itself by drawing the native population into its affairs. That is essentially what the United Irish movement, which was a mass movement of society only in Antrim and Down, was about.

The colonial Parliament refused to open itself to the native majority. It remained true to the end to its Protestant Ascendancy inheritance from the Glorious Revolution of 1688. When its intransigence led to chaos, the English Government saved it from the Irish and then abolished it with the Act of Union. (The Union was achieved by bribery and corruption—but bribery and corruption was the normality of the Irish Parliament.)

The Ulster United Irish quickly accepted the Union Parliament as meeting their requirement for representative government. An unexpected consequence of the Union was the political resurgence of the native majority. Westminster could not police it as closely as the Dublin Parliament had done.

In 1829 Westminster, intimidated by Daniel O'Connell's mass movement in Ireland, admitted Catholics to Parliament. The Ulster Presbyterians, by and large, supported O'Connell's demand for Catholic Emancipation. The following year they came to a hostile parting of the ways with him on the issue of Repeal of the Union.

It has become the fashion to seek the origin of Partition in something other than the British Act of Parliament that did it. Socially its origin lies in the partly successful British colonisations. Economically it lies in the industrial development of the Ulster colony in the conditions of post-Union free trade. In post-Union politics it lies in the parting of the ways around 1830 between O'Connell's movement and the Protestant Ulster reformers. That rupture was made unnecessarily venomous by O'Connell. After it, the two parties went their separate ways, in ever-increasing conflict with each other. But, as O'Connell is one of the iconic figures of "*Constitutional nationalism*", his blackguarding of the Ulster reformers after they refused to follow him from Catholic Emancipation to Repeal of the Union cannot be acknowledged. (He is iconic in those circles because of his statement that Irish freedom was not worth the shedding of a drop of blood.

Repeal of the Union was a Protestant Ascendancy issue in the first instance. The Union deprived the Ascendancy of its

To page 4

Contents

	Page
The Ulster Covenant Of 1912	
Editorial	2
Encounters	
Julianne Herlihy	4
The Stuarts	
Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin	8
The "J" Word	
Séamas Ó Domhnaill	
(Life & Work Of Eoghan Ruadh, Part 7)	11
Fighting In Syria	
Ted O'Sullivan (Letter to press)	14
Vox Pat: EU Population; Dead Right !;	
Shattering Traditions?; Healthy Superstition?;	
Priesthood; Circumscribed; British View of	
Ireland; Gossip; Islam in Ireland;	
Shatter Again; Trivial Pursuits?	15, 32
The Good Cromwell	
Stephen Richards	16
The End Of Western Civilisation—when?	
Jack Lane (reply to Desmond Fennell)	20
The English In Ireland	
John Minahane (reply to Desmond Fennell)	21
Netanyahu's Dangerous Game	
David Morrison	26
Sarah Harrison	
Brendan Byrne	28

Next issue:

Ireland And The Celts by Bob Quinn
The Truth About Ulster by Pat Walsh

Some web addresses for associated sites—

The Heresiarch:

<http://heresiarch.org>

Athol Books:

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

There is a great deal of interesting reading. Go surf and see!

Sales:

<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney

All Correspondence should be sent to:

**P. Maloney,
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork City.
TEL: 021-4676029**

SUBSCRIPTIONS

€24 (Sterling £15) for 4 issues

ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS

**€8 (Sterling £6) for 4 issues from
athol-st@atholbooks.org**

stronghold in Ireland. O'Connell, who was hardly even a token Catholic when he returned to Ireland in the 1790s, supported the Ascendancy agitation for the restoration of the Irish Parliament on 18th century terms. As the native Irish majority began to assert itself under the comparative freedom of the Union, Protestant enthusiasm for Repeal declined. It soon became apparent that a restored Irish Parliament would have to be representative of the majority in some degree. Repeal then became an issue of the Irish majority. O'Connell adapted to this new movement. As far as one can tell, he became a believing Catholic, and not just a nominal Catholic by family inheritance. He led the Catholic Emancipation movement to success in 1829, and then switched the momentum of that movement onto the Repeal issue. He was also a force in the British Reform agitation which led to the Reform Act of 1832, which brought about the first extension of the Parliamentary franchise since the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

Catholic Emancipation plus franchise reform brought about a situation in which the Protestant interest in Ireland saw no possibility of maintaining its privileged position under a restored Irish Parliament. It became Unionist, relying on the strong anti-Catholic prejudice of the newly-enfranchised English middle class to sustain it. But it found its privileged position in Ireland being relentlessly subverted as English prejudice compromised with the Irish majority as the process of democratisation begun in 1832 was carried on by further Reform Acts.

The Protestant position in Ireland was built on monopoly of political power in the Colonial Parliament, combined with the system of Penal Laws designed to disable the Irish as Catholics and phase them out of existence. When it failed in the latter object, its position became unsustainable in the long run.

The Presbyterians in the Ulster colony had not shared in the privileges of the Anglican Ascendancy. But neither had they been seriously oppressed. Their Church was the State Church in Scotland and many of them were educated there. In the 1790s they demanded reform of the Irish Parliament, but after 1800 they settled down quickly under the Union Parliament. As a carry-over of their own radicalism in the 1780s and 1790s, they supported the Catholic Emancipation movement under the Union, but did so with diminishing enthusiasm.

And only a handful of them followed through from Catholic Emancipation to Repeal.

The Protestant position in Ireland remained exceptionally privileged after 1801, and even after 1829, but it was clear that the dynamic of politics was against it. Its future could not be sustained by institutional power. It could only be sustained by drawing the newly-enfranchised Irish into the party-politics of the British state. And O'Connell prevented that. He failed to Repeal the Union but he ensured that the political system of the Union Government did not take root in Ireland outside the Ulster Colony.

O'Connell began his political life in London in the 1790s as a Whig. He remained a Whig. The English reformers a generation later recognised him as one of them. In 1829 his prestige with the native Irish was such that it seems that he could have made of them what he would. But he did not attempt to ground the Whig Party among the Irish as their medium of reform. While remaining a Whig in many ways, he stood between the Whig Party and the Irish masses. By doing so he set Ireland on a course of nationalist development.

In the 1840s his Young Ireland colleagues became impatient with him for obstructing as a Whig the national development which he had set in motion against the Whigs. And no doubt the Whig reformers in the Ulster Colony, with whom he came to a bad-tempered parting of the ways around 1830, could not understand why somebody whom they knew to be a Whig was making nationalists of the Irish instead of West Brits.

Because of O'Connell, mass politics in Ireland developed outside the party-political structure of the British state. And, given the crucial role of party politics in the British state, that fact carried the implication of an Irish state.

The national development of the Irish went on relentlessly. English Governments, Whig or Tory, might disrupt it for a moment but the next moment it was back again, toughened by experience. O'Connell himself attempted what he considered a Constitutional *coup* in 1844, but he backed down in the face of a British military ultimatum and was imprisoned. That provoked an ideologically tougher Young Ireland development, which was suppressed in 1848. That gave rise to the Fenians, etc.

In 1912 a Constitutional nationalist Home Rule Party, led by John Redmond, who had toyed with Republicanism, held the balance-of-power against the British party-political system. He manipulated British party-politics to disable the House of Lords and get a Home Rule Bill that was certain to be enacted. The Ulster Protestants were rendered helpless within the forms of the Constitution, and were driven distracted by Redmond's attitude towards them. There was nothing they could do.

But they found something to do. They swore a mighty Oath they would not stand for it. And they prepared for war. They made a Covenant with God—and such things usually have to do with war.

Mid-way between the Act of Union and the Third Home Rule Bill—mid-way in the national development of the Irish under the Union—an extraordinary religious event happened in Protestant Ulster. Today one hears much about flash-in-the-pan millenarian phenomena among the Irish connected with the Emancipation movement or the Anti-Tithe movement of the 1820s or 1830s, but the extraordinary religious upheaval in Protestant Ulster that superseded sectarian differences within Protestantism is never mentioned. Yet the 1859 Revival was a watershed in the life of Protestant Ulster. It washed away all the complications that arisen in the life of the colony before then. 1859 was in many ways a Year Zero.

The producers of this journal took some trouble to discover the history of Protestant Ulster in the 18th and early 19th centuries. The object was not to browbeat them with facts about what they had done in 1794, or 1810, or 1825 and demonstrate that they really were part of an Irish nation. We investigated the matter for our own satisfaction, found much that was of enduring interest, and published some of it. We directed the attention of 'Constitutional nationalists' towards it as something they should take on board if they were in earnest. They weren't in earnest.

We also thought that Unionists of today might have some interest in what Protestant Ulster had produced in those times if it was not presented to them in anti-Partitionist wrappings. We found that it hadn't. All that it was interested in before 1859 was traces of the development that led to 1859.

The representative bookshop in Belfast is the Evangelical Bookshop in

Great Victoria Street, facing the Academic Institution. There was once a liberal bookshop in Royal Avenue, but it has long gone. There was a bookshop near the University and it has now gone. These were sectarian bookshops, in the sense that they stood apart from the integral culture of the mainstream. The Evangelical Bookshop lives, and within the Evangelical Bookshop God lives. Catholics do not talk about God in the course of normal conversation: Ulster Protestants do. The Evangelical Bookshop displayed in its window the Collected Works of Spurgeon—a famous London preacher in that last outburst of Christianity in England in the late 19th century. Within the bookshop one might discuss the merits of Spurgeon's theology, but Sampson or Drennan or Nielson or Finlay do not exist for it.

In 1859 the Anglican Church was still the State Church in Ireland. A number of Anglican clergymen felt it was their duty to investigate the Ulster Revival and make sense of it. They did their best, but if they were unable to participate in it, all they could see in it was an outbreak of mass hysteria. But, however one regards it, it is a fact that Protestant Ulster remade its internal life through it. And the Ulster Covenant is hardly imaginable without the mentality generated by the Ulster Revival.

Ian Paisley was never a freak or a throwback. He was a representative man of his community. His rise signified the sloughing off of the liberal secular veneer maintained by the gentry. And it was only when Revivalist fundamentalism came into its own, and put itself in the position of having to make its own decision in the absence of sophisticated upper class scapegoats, that a settlement could be made.

The cultural influence of the Revival was de-politicising. It generated a sense of personal experience of eternal truth, and that is not the medium of political thought. The mass feeling that fed into the Covenant-signing was Revivalist and apolitical. But Unionism in those days was not merely Ulster Unionism. It was a major political party of the British state—a merger of the social-reform Liberals and the Tories against the *laissez-faire* capitalism of Gladstonian Liberalism. The Unionist Party had governed the state for ten years (1895-1905) and had carried out the most thorough reform ever accomplished in Ireland. It abolished the Protestant Ascendancy in land and Local Govern-

ment and established a system of higher education that was acceptable to Catholics. And it took Revivalist Ulster in hand, subordinated it to political affairs in the state, and shepherded it through a couple of years of bold, but carefully-judged brinkmanship, of which Ulster Unionism would have been entirely incapable on its own. And then British Unionism, having shown that a Liberal Party put in Government by the 80 members of the Irish Party—who themselves refused to take part in the Government of the UK—could not apply the Constitution against it even though it had broken the law by raising a private Army, and having brought itself to power during the World War launched by the Liberal Party, discarded its Ulster Unionist component, giving it a subordinate Six County Government to run, in a kind of outhouse of the state, as the condition of remaining 'connected' with the state.

Carson protested in 1920 against the setting up of that hopeless system under which a million Protestants had the job of policing half a million Catholics outside the political life of the state. He retired from the movement which had led, and complained that Ulster Unionist fervour had been made use of by the British Unionist Party for party-political purposes. Did he not understand that the durability of the British system of representative government, once it had been set in motion by Walpole between the death of Queen Anne and the Accession of George 3, lay in the conflict of two parties, each of which made expedient use of whatever cause came to hand?

The two parties of the British state from the early 1890s until the early 1920s were not the Tories and the Liberals, but the Unionists and the Liberals. Beginning with the 1912 Home Rule conflict, the Unionists undermined the Liberals, and polished them off during the Great War. The Labour Party became the alternative party when the Liberals imploded. And then in 1922 the Tory/Social Reform Liberal merger, having been fully accomplished, the Unionist Party began to be called the Tory Party. Ulster Unionism was told that it had got what it wanted when it was shunted out of the political life of the British state and given half a million Catholics to keep down. That is not what it had ever asked for, but it did not have the political resourcefulness to get what it wanted when the Party that had shepherded it through the crisis told it this is what it would have,

and that it had better want it.

The Covenant demanded the continuation of "*equal citizenship*" in the state. What came to it was exclusion from the process of electing the Government of the state, with the compensation of running a subordinate Government in which it was not only allowed to lord it over the Catholic third of the population, but was required to do so in order to remain "*connected*" with Britain. It had to win every election in order to remain "*connected*".

The war that was implicit in the Northern Ireland system was warded off for two generations by the masterful inactivity of two Unionist leaders who saw that the system could not bear much political activity within it—Lords Craigavon and Brookeborough. It broke out within a few years of the arrival of a Unionist leader who set about governing it as if it was a state.

Whose Past Is It Anyway? The Ulster Covenant, The Easter Rising And The Battle Of The Somme, published recently, is a collection of interviews with various people in public life. The most pertinent comment on the *Covenant* is made by Jim Allister, leader of the *Traditional Unionist Voice*, and a barrister, who has a seat in Stormont:

"The core belief that underscored the Ulster Covenant was equal citizenship, and yet we've arrived a hundred years on in a scenario where some of the most basic tenets of equal citizenship in a democracy are denied to us. The right to change your government—we're not allowed that in Northern Ireland because of the absurdities of mandatory coalition. The right to have an opposition. Things that are taken for granted which might seem pretty to basic to any concept of equal citizenship, which might seem basic to any concept of democracy, have been trimmed back, if not obliterated. So I think the core principle hasn't flourished the way I would like to have seen. In fact it has been suppressed—and some of that self-inflicted. Unionists, by buying into that concept of the Belfast Agreement, which suppresses the right to have opposition, the democratic right to change your government, have brought that upon themselves.

"If we look at the signing of the Ulster Covenant, I certainly think that the attachment to the union for me is still strong. I wonder sometimes, when I look around at what some unionists have been prepared to settle for, whether it matters to them as much as I would like it to matter.

"They have settled for incredible proposition; we're supposed to be an integral part of the United Kingdom but we're not allowed to change our government, we're not allowed to have an opposition. In fact, we must have in government those whose organisations set about murdering and butchering us. As of right! Those seem to me light years away from the principles that underscored the Ulster Covenant. I think if you were to say to anyone who signed the Ulster Covenant in 1912 that a hundred years hence, manifestation of those whose politics you fear will be effectively ruling over you, as of right, and you will not be allowed to put them out of government or change your government—they would say, "That's not what we're signing the Ulster Covenant for, it's the very antithesis of what we're signing the Ulster Covenant for. So I think the whole essence of British citizenship has been so suppressed and distorted by the Belfast Agreement that though we remain a part of the United Kingdom, in a notional way and in a more than notional way constitutionally, we do not enjoy the rights of citizenship that everyone else takes for granted" (p51).

It is, of course, not true that the Government never changes. It changed two years ago and will probably change again in three years' time. But that's the Government of the state. And the influence of what the Unionist Party did to Ulster Unionism in 1920-21 remains so profound that even a thoughtful person like Allister is incapable of seeing the state. He can play no part in the process of changing the Government of the state, therefore the local facade of government is what he sees. And that is certainly not democratic—and it never was. And equal citizenship—which in a state as shy of abstract rights as Britain was, meant an equal right to participate in the political process by which the governing of the state is conducted—ended in the Six Counties with the setting up of the Northern Ireland system outside the politics of the state.

(Scotland now has devolved government, and of a more substantial kind than Northern Ireland, but it is not excluded from the politics of the state, and one never hears the devolved system referred to as the *Scottish State*, though it has become usual to refer to the *Northern Ireland state*.)

Northern Ireland is governed as Allister describes because, as Charles Haughey put it long ago, it is not a viable political entity—not to mention a state.

In 1985, when John Hume brought about the Hillsborough Agreement (giving Dublin an official but insubstantial advisory role in British government of the North), the Unionists were driven crazy. Hume gave an interview to BBC Radio 4 in which he justified driving the Unionists crazy. It was necessary, he said, to bring up the Unionist boil in order to lance it. And he expressed confidence that the Unionists—despite their impressive outburst of fury—would give way in the end. His confidence

was based on the fact that they had given way on the substance of their position in 1920-21 by agreeing to operate a subordinate system of government separate from that of the state.

*

Whose Past Is It Anyway? consists of 17 interviews with people across the political spectrum, with two notable exceptions: the Official Unionist Party and Fianna Fail.

Julianne Herlihy

Encounters

UK And The Underclass

On 11th September 2012 the BBC showed a documentary titled *Trouble on the Estate* about an estate called Chadsworth near Lancashire. It was a very sobering experience. The team making the documentary allowed the voices of the people to speak for themselves and that made it all the more grim and disquieting. There were no men for the most part in the homes but single "mums" and their children—some of whom were young adult males but they seemed to live in accommodation by themselves when they were not in gaol. The documentary centred on one of the mothers who was middle-aged and had four children by three different men. Her eldest daughter of 17 also had a baby but again there was no father in the picture. The mother, who lived totally on benefits, spent her days watching TV, taking lots of pills for depression and other disorders which were in some way linked to her lifestyle, as she herself admitted. She also rolled her own cigarettes and used marijuana with the tobacco. When asked by the interviewer why she took the drug—she got a land and said frostily she needed it for her nerves. She also had a bottle of red wine beside her and casually polished off glass after glass. Her youngest son, who was heartbreakingly present, spoke also to the team. He had been expelled from his last school because he had head-butted his teacher. The mother thought this was outrageous for committing such a small infraction but it soon became clear that there were many more of lesser incidents which had led to expulsion. He explained that he only wanted to get to know his father who had visited him twice in his ten-year old existence—once bringing him a birthday gift. But he made clear he only wanted to be with him as he was

his father. His mum poured cold water on his expectations, telling the boy that his father had no interest in him and was an out-and-out blackguard (the language used was awful but my readers can fill in for themselves).

Next up we were introduced to an older gang of young men, most of whom had already been in gaol. The leader, who frightened everyone in the estate especially the elderly, those living alone, and the mentally disabled, in one horrific case of sustained abuse about which the police could do little except gaol him—but he was back out as quick as he went in, carrying on as if nothing happened. He had obvious intellectual disabilities but was big, tough, hard and cruel. He was a ring-leader and the abuse of drugs was widespread in the estate. Everyone wanted their "bubble" (it was never explained by the programme makers what this drug was, but it was dealt around quite openly and for a fiver everyone seemed to have access and also to large amounts of beer/cider *et cetera*). The two community coppers tried to say things weren't as bad as they seemed and then with the TV crew we all watched as a drug deal went down openly. Appallingly it was youngsters who were touting for the bigger lads and they whizzed around on their mountain climbing bikes, dropping drugs off and getting their cut of the take. There was plenty of techno gizmos used by everyone. Big plasma screens abounded in the homes, Gameboys upstairs for the younger boys, the latest kind of mobile phones—you name it and they had it. And for fun they smashed windows, wrecked cars, broke children's play-areas and anything of worth to other people—and stole whatever they could. When asked why—they said because others had things that they

hadn't. But—persisted the TV reporter—these people worked for their things—and this was met by much jeering and words to the effect that anyone who bothered with work were the bigger *eejits*. When asked where they saw their future—without exception they said "gaol" as if it were their rite of passage and indeed that's what it was to them.

The main woman whose life anchored this documentary was visibly angry to learn that she was to come before the benefits people who were "*hassling*" her she claimed as she had been called in only a few weeks prior. She was raging as she went off to town in the bus "*wasting a whole morning*" when she could have done with her sleep-in. Finally she came back with a reprieve but was nervous that she might be forced to go to work when she felt her "*condition*" precluded that. She was a "*single mum with problems*" and she felt that the state owed her what she got. The food she produced for her two youngest children was nearly all canned or take-away and, while there was no question of them being hungry, they definitely were lacking in nutrition.

There were two other families who had the father in the home. One left before the end of the documentary but the married man who stayed had been left off by a nearby factory and ended up cleaning for £100 a week. He saw work as being of part of a necessary obligation to his family, who were considerably worse off compared to those who lived on benefits. His wife shopped with him and they were always looking for cheap food and doing everything to live within their budget. Their eldest son, a young teenager, left and went to live with an aunt which broke his mother's heart even though she was only a mile or two away. But he wanted to go to college and his young girlfriend was from that area. Eventually he came back and settled in at home but one felt it was temporary. The good news is that he is still at college.

The local shop was owned predictably by an Asian man who worked all hours with his family. They were often broken into and terrorised by the local leader and some of his gang who claimed to be doing it for a laugh. To their credit the local police (very demoralised, as they had no resources for that estate and others like it) came time and again to his aid but it looked like a losing battle. The shop-owner didn't want to talk to the TV people but allowed us to see footage of one raid on his premises. It was an act of pure vandalism, a smash and grab of vicious intensity and to my disbelief—they were all the youngsters of the estate

who had talked so openly to us. They were too young for gaol, and the older ones laughed at ASBOs [Anti-Social Behaviour Orders].

I was very dispirited to see such pure blackguarding. I talked about it to a colleague on this magazine and he put it to me that here in Ireland, things were just as bad. In Cork, there were "*no go estates*" also, he contended. I did not agree and began searching the papers for background. I found that, while "*single mums*" were now part of the fabric of our society—anytime the guards were involved there was nearly always "*a partner*" in the home. Stories about the drugs scene in Dublin particularly—especially where killings occurred (and they occur it seems almost daily)—nearly always stated that he was a father who was killed in his home or near it. And it is generally accepted that a mother claiming 'single mum' allowances here co-habits with the father or current father of her children. And one other big difference is that there is usually an extended family nearby. And of course the Catholic Church is still very much involved, even if mass attendance is very seldom by the young in these areas. First Communion, and funerals are huge events and inner-city work has continued to be done all this time, even when the Labour Party throws childish fits if a bishop/priest asks *its laity* to partake in respective dialogue about serious issues that mainly affect society as *they* know it. The Fine Gaelers and their Labour co-horts wouldn't know these areas if they were hit on the head. Their words are cheap and their policies even cheaper. They are *scuits* of the first order and when the locals, under the umbrella of RIRA or Parents against Drugs try to bring order to their communities, they are immediately set upon by the Government and the media.

Well why does the Government sit on its hands and do nothing more than think up a mawkish and reprehensible Children's Rights Bill? This is only for the middle-class professionals who are part of the Labour Party, especially those who *feed* and *prey* on the vulnerabilities of these people who are at last standing up to drugs gangs and looking out for their own children. Till now the State has done nothing but damage to them so they certainly don't possess the moral high ground from which to attack these people via the incessant noise of the chattering classes. Remember the Health Services Executive (HSE) and their 'Report of the Independent *Child Death* Review Group' and the list of dead children featured areas such as above—not

one came from the social group of middle-class professionals that makes up the Labour Party nor their hectoring pals in the media who want to interfere through more changes to the Constitution. It is just another attempt to have even more legal interference for their social engineering because after all they won't be paying this particular piper—only poor people will. For both Fine Gael and Labour their human rights or their children's rights aren't worth the paper they are written on.

Micheál Martín

That Micheál Martín, leader of the Fianna Fáil party (God help us!) is a *gligéan* we have no problem with—he is of the ilk of the likes of Jack Lynch—all sheen and no substance. But while he remains as the leader of the party, he is expected to behave in a manner so fitting considering not much else is asked of him in opposition. On 21st September 2012, *The Irish Daily Mail* ran a headline titled: *Micheál needles Adams with Disappeared badge*.

The article went on to explain that, while Adams and Martín were awaiting their appearances on RTE's 'Prime Time', the latter was in his shirt sleeves. Then as they went live, Martín put on his jacket which had a badge on it. The paper showed the badge which I had never seen before and told us that "*it was the symbol for the Justice for the Disappeared campaign for secret IRA murders*". They maintained that Adams got an awful land "*and became flustered and resorted to clichés during the RTE debate*" and hence the Fianna Fail leader had "*an easy victory over Adams*". But it is Martín's claims about how he got to wear the badge that I found particularly interesting:

"I was given the pin by a supporter of the campaign who asked that I wear it for the debate with the Sinn Féin leader".

If this is true then the leader of Fianna Fail is going down a very dangerous path—because he is there to represent the party's interests and when he veers off to support shadowy campaigns by even more shadowy interests, then truly we have a very serious situation. Such poor judgement has become something we expect from him, after all Miriam O'Callaghan's own brother Jim O'Callaghan, the barrister, has his ear—and we can speculate that the Prime Time presenter was well up on Martín's stupid ambush but people in the party should now be asking tough questions about the latter and what influences are shaping him and to what end and to whose advantage? ©

Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin

The Verses from the Aisling Songs of Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin relating the triumphant return of the Stuart King

The Stuarts

Béidh teine gan mhúchadh i rith na
gcúig gcúigeadh,
Is sinne-ne go súgach cungantach cúrsach
Dó-bhriste i gcaismartibh ;
Taoscaidh daor-phuins éil is beath-uisce
Is léigeadh gach éigeas dréacht im
fharradh-sa,
Ag guidhe chum Muire
Séarlas Réics do chosnamh i gcoróin,
'S an Rí seo suidheadh le díomas
d'ionnarbadh
Ar saoirse ríoghachta Breatan na slógh,
Gan mheidhir gan greidhin gan
radhairse cumais nirt
Go singil gan chiste,
Gan caomhna laoch 'na seasamh 'na
chomhair.

1. [*Im Leabaidh Aréir*] There will be fire
without quenching the length of the five
provinces / and ourselves playful, disposed
to help, well-travelled / unbeatable in battle /
Drinking punch of great price, ales and
whiskey / and let every poet read his verse
along with me / praying to Mary / to protect
King Charles in his reign / and to expel this
King, who sits in pride / from the tenure of
the kingdom of Britain of the hosts / without
merriment, without love, without abundance
of the power of strength / wretched, without
treasure / without the protection of warriors
standing in attendance on him.

Mo ghaol fighte i dtréid-righthe
Gaedhealach do bhí,
Fuair réimeas is cíos na Banba ar dtóir,
Neimheadh is Féidhlim Milésius is Íth,
'S gach aon bhile ríomas léir shealbhas
coróin;
San Saesar dil Séarlas mac Séamais,
mo dhíth,
Chuir daoscar an éithigh le claon-
recht gan ríoghacht,
Seo an t-aon-chás trá a dtáilim-se
shaor-chuise fuinn
'Na dtaosc-shruith óm chíoch ar
Dhanair, mo bhrón!

2. [*I gCaol-Doire*] My kindred were entwined
with the company of Irish kings / who at first
enjoyed the sovereignty and revenues of
Ireland / Neimheadh and Feidhlim, Milesius
and Íth / and every champion I told you of,
with whom I possessed the crown / and the
beloved Caesar, Charles, son of James, my
loss! / whom the perjured dregs dethroned
by crooked laws / this is the unique cause
that I bestow a free stream of pleasure / in
streaming floods from my breasts on the
savages, my sorrow!

Go háitreabh Chuinn dá dtagadh
Spáinnigh ghroidhe le ceannas

Is gárda Laoisigh farra,
Táin do lucht faobhair;
Níl sráid san ríoghacht ná cathair,
Nár bh'árd a dteinte ar lasadh,
Lán-chuid fionta 'á scaipeadh
Is gáirdeachas piléar,
Dánta ag buidhin na leabhar,
Rás is rinne fada,
Cláirseach chaoim dá spreagadh,
Gártha 'gus scléip,
Ag fáiltiughadh an Ríogh tar calaith,
Ní tráchtfar linn ar a ainm,
'S a cháirde díogaidh feasta
Sláinte mo Réics.

3. [*Mo Chás! Mo Chaoi! Mo Cheasna!*] If
there came to the abode of Conn / brave
Spaniards with leadership / and the guard of
Louis with them / a host of armed men /
there is not a street in the kingdom or a city /
whose fires would not be lit on high / full
portion of wine distributed / and celebratory
volleys / poems by the literary folk / racing
and long dancing / gentle harps being plucked
/ laughter and delight / welcoming the King
from over the sea / his name will not be
mentioned by me / and, my friends, drink
forever / the health of my King!

Is béasach stuamdha d'fhreagair mé,
Is í ag déanamh uaille is cathuighthe,
Ní haon dár luadhais id starthaibh mé,
Cíodh léir dam an táin;
'S mé céile is nuachar Caroluis,
Tá déarach duairc, fê tharcuisne,
Gan réim ná buaidh mar chleachtas-sa,
Mo laoch ó tá ar fán;

Fé mar luadhadar sean-draoithe,
Do dhéanadh tuar is tarnгаireacht,
Béidh Flít i gcuantaibh Banba
Fá fhéile Naomh Sheagháin,
Ag tabhairt scéimhle is rugadh ar
fearann Chuiric,
Tar linntibh ruadh na fairge,
Ar gach smeirle mór-chuirp Sacsanaigh,
'S ní léan liom a bprádhainn;

Béidh gearradh cloidhmhe is
scaipeadh truíp is
tréan-treagairt námhad
Ar gach ailp á do chleachtadh puins
is féarta 'san Páis,
Dob aite sult na reamhar-phoc
Ag cnead 's ag crith le heagla
'Ná an racaireacht so cheapadar
Ag féar-leagadh ar phágh.

4. [*Mo Léan le Luadh*] She answered me
with dignity and modesty / and she making
wailing and lamentation / I am not one of

those you mentioned in your stories / though
I know of the hostings / I am the spouse and
consort of Charles / who am tearful, grieving,
slighted / without power or authority as I
was accustomed / since my knight is astray

As ancient bards relate / that made portents
and prophecies / there will be a fleet in the
harbours of Ireland / by the feast of Saint
John / inflicting terror and rout out of the
lands of Corc / over the bloody (?) waves of
the ocean / on every big-bodied churl of the
English / and their crisis is no sorrow to me

There will be slashing of swords and rout of
troops and heavy defeat of enemies / on
every fat person of them who practised punch
and feasting during the Passion / more
delightful is the sport of (seeing) the fat bucks
/ running and trembling in terror / than these
pastimes that they devise / (Who engage in)
mowing hay for pay!

Is gearra an mhoill go bhfaicfir buidhean
tar sáil ag téacht
Go lannach liomhar i mbarcaibh dín
gan scáth roimh piléar,
Ag glanadh críche Clanna Gaoidhil le
hármach tréan
Ón aicme chlaoin nár ghreannuigh
Críosd 'san lá lem Réics.

5. [*Cois na Siúire*] The delay is brief till you
see a band coming over the sea / abounding
in ships, filled in protective vessels with no
fear of volleys / cleansing the land of the
clan of Irish with powerful armies / of the
perverse gang that did not honour Christ,
and my King will win the day.

Tá Séarlas mear 's a thrúip ghroidhe
Dár n-ionnsuidhe go héascaidh ar seol,
Is réidhfídh seal mo chúrsaidhe
Ag búraidhibh le faobhar gleo,
Béidh séadeadh is cartadh is brughadh
síor
Ar bhúraidhibh dá dtraochadh ar feodh,
'S ní léan liom lag gan lúth puinn
Gach trú dhiobh nár ghéill don Órd.

Béidh cléir na gceacht gan púicín
Ag úr-mhaoideamh an Éin-Mhic chóir,
Is éigse ceart ag tabhairt síos
Gach fionn-laoidh go neata i gclódh;
An tréad do threascair dúbhach sinn
Gan lionntaidhe, gan féasta ar bórd,
Is Gaedhil go seascair súbhach síothach
'Na ndúthaidhe go séanmhar soghamhail.

6. [*Im Aonar Seal*] Swift Charles and his
brave troop / are coming easily under sail /
In a while my affairs shall be settled / against
the ruffians in armed battle / Explosions,

overthrow and pressure / the ruffians exhausted
withering / No sorrow to see them weak /
the wretches who dishonoured priests

The learned clergy will be unhooded /
praising afresh the Only Son true / True
poets taking down / every fine story in neat
letters / The robber gang in sorrow / without
their ale or feasting / The Irish secure content
peaceful / in their own place prosperous
happy.

D'fregair ní haon don mhéid sin chanais
Féin id starthaibh lúb mé,
Is ní chanfad-sa scéal do strae dod
shamhail,
Géag do Chlannaibh Lúiteir,
Danar i méinn, i gcéill 's gcealg,
Réics is gaige ó Lonndain,
Tá i n-arm 's i n-éadach gléasta ag
gearradh
Géag is fasc mo Phrionnsa.

Is eagal liom féin, a réilteann lonnrach
Gur reachaireacht bhréag an scéal so
thionnscnais
Atáid danair ró-thréani mbarcaibh, gan
spéis
I gCarolus réx, do phrionnsa,
Atá in easbhaidhgach céime conganta
Is aicme na nGaedhal go cúthail
Gan fearanntas saor mar chleachtadh a
gcléir
Do bheir neartmhar in Éirinn ionnraic.

7. [I *Sacsaihb na Séad*] She answered, "I am
none of those you relate / yourself, in your
lying (?) stories / and I shall not relate a
story to a vagrant such as you / A scion of
the clan of Luther / a savage in mien, in
outlook and in treachery / a rake and a
coxcomb from London / who are in arms
and armour arrayed, lacerating / the limbs
and shelter of my Prince."

I fear, O illustrious maiden / that this tale
you devise is a lying pastime / the savages
are too strong in their ships that have no care
/ for king Charles, your prince / Every
measure of assistance is wanting / and the
Irish people are cowed / with freehold lands
as their clerics were accustomed / who waxed
strong in noble Ireland.

Do fhreagair an bhé dheas mhaordha
mhín tais
Is dearbh nach aon don mhéid a
mhaoidhis mé
Acht ainneir gan bhréag do thaisteal i gcéin,
Le teachtaireacht scéil ó Laoiseach:
Gur gairid go ndéanfadh díoghaltas
Do ghlanfaidh le faobhar na faolchoin
Ó fhearanntas Gaedheal gan
reachtmas, gan réim,
Gan talamh, gan tréid, gan saoirse.

Is eagal liom féin, a speir-bhean mhíonla,
Gur rachaireacht bréige an scéal so d'inns
Táid Galla ro-thréan i mbarcaibh gan spéis
Ar chaise go fraochda nimheach;
Is Carolus Récs go claidhte,
D'fhúig aicme na nGaedheal fá dhaoirse,
Ag fearadh na ndéar go lachtmar le léan,
I n-achrann baoghail ag smístigh.

A fhir ghasta d'fhuil fheil is léigheanta
i laoidhthibh,
Ná tagair gur baath an méad so d'inneas,
Is gur gairidh ón léas, ciodh fada dó téacht,
Bheith caithte do réir, gach scríbhinn,
Do thargair éigse is draoithe,
Is dearbh an scéal mar chítear,
Go bhfuil feartha Mhic Dé dá gcartadh
go faon,
'S ag treascairt na bhfaolchon sínte.

Do thargair éigse, dréachta is laoidhthe
Ar tharraing an léas ghní an téarma
roimhe seo,
Go dtiocfadh an t-éacht so ar
Ghallaibh gan bhréig
Do ghreadfadh go haeidhib an croidhe
aca;
Is do ghlanfadh gach béar don líne,
A fearanntas Gaedheal gan righneas
Is aithchim-se is glaothaim ar
fheartaibh Mhic Dé
Go dtagaidh mo scéal chum críche.

8. [Ar *Maidin i nDé Cois Céidh na Slim-
Bharc*] The kind, gentle, majestic, lovely lady
answered me / Truly I am not one of those
you mentioned / but an honest maiden who
travelled afar / with a message of news from
Louis / that shortly he will exact retribution /
he will sweep the wolves with arms / from
the lands of the Irish, without power, without
authority / without land, without herds,
without freehold.

I myself fear, O gentle lady / that this news
you relate is a lying jest / The foreigners are
too strong, having ships which are heedless /
of venomous, raging waters / and King
Charles is overthrown leaving the clan of
Irish in bondage / shedding tears copiously
in sorrow / in perilous conflict with smiters.

O lively man of noble blood learned in poetry
/ do not say that what I relate is foolish / and
soon the lease, though long in coming / will
be expired, according to every manuscript /
that poets and bards prophesied It is a true
story, as is seen / that the powers of the Son
of God are clearing them feebly / and destroy-
ing the wolves, prostrate

Poetry, verses and lays prophesy / on the
drawing up of the lease whose term is expired
/ that this catastrophe will truly befall the
foreigners / that will crush their heart to the
core / and which will clear every bear of the
gang / out of the lands of the Irish without
sluggishness / and I beseech and entreat the
grace of the Son of God / that my story will
come to conclusion.

Le sámh-thoil Dé fuair páis is péin,
Tá an báire ag téacht na goinne ar buile,
Fágfaid, séanfáid rithfid sin as
Chaomh-chrích Eoghain
Atá Árnold laoch nár stán i mbaoghal,
Ag faghbháil an lae ar an bhfuirinn uile,
An mál so ag maodhm 's ag milleadh-
bhriseadh
An chlaon-dlighidh nua ;
Atá téacht 'na mbarcaibh sár-dhín go
magh mín Cuailgne
Ag traochadh an tseachta cráidh sinn,
an tain le rígh-ghas óg

Claidhfear créimfear díoscfar tréad
An fhíll 'san Bhéarla i n-íomaidh síosma
Is chífear Gaedhil 'na n-ionad suidhte
I saor-shligheadh sogha.

Ní támh don aon so atá gan réim
Ó tháinig dréam an uile tar uisce,
Le gárdas gléasfaid chugainn curadh
Céad ríogh-leómhan ;
Is ádhbhal fraoch gach ársa thréin
Ag cárnadh béar 's ag
Cur an chluiche,
Le ráig ag céasadh an chinidh chiorrbuigh
Féil-dhligheadh Póil ;
Réabfaidh reacht is ráthaidhe an thuathail
Méirleach meabhail tá faoi bhláth i
ríoghacht mo stóir
Is go crích mo shaoghail ní luighfead féin
Le sméirle coimhghitheach cúil i n-
íomaidh,
Ar thígheacht dom Saesar dhil is guidhidh
É shuide i gcoróin.

9. [Tráth i nDé is Mé Tnáidhte i bPéin] By
the benign will of God who endured passion
and pain / the game is going madly against
them / They will leave, they will quit, they
will flee from / the beautiful land of Eoghan
/ Sir Arnold who did not yield in peril is /
winning the day on the whole gang / This
prince is crushing and breaking to destruction
/ the new, crooked law / There is a-coming
in highly protective ships - to the smooth
plain of Cuailgne / harassing the race that
tormented me - hosts of excellent youths /
They will be subdued, gnawed at, expelled -
that gang / of treachery and of English
(speech) - in excess of conflict / And the
Irish will be seen seated in their place / in a
noble way of contentment.

There is no repose for this one who is without
authority / since the evil gang came over the
sea / with pleasure he will array for me
champions / a hundred royal heroes / And
with terrible fury every valiant veteran / in
pursuit, tormenting the gang who destroyed
/ the holy law of Paul / They shall destroy
the charter and customs of the false, base
king / a disgraceful miscreant who is blos-
soming in the kingdom of my love / And to
the end of my life I myself shall not lie / with
the foreign, cowardly boor / On the arrival
of my bright Caesar, and pray ye / that he be
seated in the throne.

Is dúbhach bocht mo chúrsa 's brónach,
Dom dhúr-chreimead ag cóimigh gach lae,
Fá dhubh-smacht ag búraibh, gan
sógachas,
Is mo Phrionnsa gur seoladh i gcéin ;
Tá mo shúil-se le hÚr-mhac na glóire
Go dtiubhraidh mo leomhain faoi réim
'Na ndún-bhailtaibh dúthchais i gcoir
mhaith
Ag rúscadh na gcrón-phoc le faobhar.

A chúil-fhionn tais mhúinte, na n-ór-fholt,
Do chrú chirt na gcorónach gan bhréig,
Do chúrsa-sa ag búraibh is brón liom,
Fá smúit, cathach, ceomhar, gan scléip,
Na ndlúth-bhrughuibh dúchais dá seolfadh
Mac congantach na glóire do Réics,
Is súgach do rúscfainn-se crón-phuic,

Go humhal tapa scópmhar le piléir.

Ar Stíobhard dá dtigheadh chúgainn
tar saíle,
Go crích Inis Fáilge faoi réim,
Le flít d'fhearaibh Laoisigh, is Spáinnigh,
Is fíor le corp áthais go mbéinn
Ar fhíor-each mhear ghroidhe thapa
cheáfrach,
Ag síor-chartadh cáich le neart faobhair,
Is ní chlaoidhfinn-se m'inntinn na
dheághaidh sin
Chum luighe ar sheasamh gárda lem rae.

10. [*Ceo Draoidheachta*] Dejected, poor and
sorrowful is my case / being sullenly gnawed
at by ospreys every day / in dire bondage to
churls, without pleasure / and my Prince
banished far away / My hope is with the
Noble Son of Glory / that he may restore my
hero to power / in well ordered fortified
homesteads / routing the swarthy bucks with
arms.

O gentle, gracious maiden of the golden hair
/ of the right, royal blood, truly / your perse-
cution by churls is grief to me / In defeat,
sorrowful, gloomy, without delight / If (the
Merciful Son of Glory - next line) restored
(your king - next line) to his native strong
residences / then cheerfully I would rout the
swarthy bucks / willingly, swiftly, wholly,
with volleys.

If our Stewart returned to us from over the
sea / in power, to the land of Ireland / with a
fleet of Louis's men, and Spaniards / truly
with sheer delight I would be / on a nimble,
active, strong, swift, sterling steed / ever-
crushing all with strength of arms / And I
would not slacken my resolve after that / to
persist in standing guard in my time.

Do fhreagair sí, ag rádh: Bí lán do
mheanmain,
Táim-se ag tabhairt mo lámh mar
thaca dhuit,
Fón bhfôghmhar go n-amharcfair gleo ;
Is aithris d'fháidhibh Fáil an t-athasc seo
Gan práisc do chanaim le páirt is
taitneamh
Don óg-leomhan do shealbhuigh
m'oghacht ;
Ar talamh 's ar sáil tá an báire casta aca,
Ní'l seasamh i gcás le faghbháil ag
galla-phuic,
Ní fhághfar ainm dá n-ál i mBreatain
Ar thrácht don bhaile don bhán-fhlaith,
ag casadh
Le seol cóir go fearannaibh Eoghain.

Dá chabhair atá na Spáinnigh chalma,
Ar magh 's ar machaire d'fhág fá
tharcuisne
Ar feodh cóip na Sacsan gan treoir ;
Is cath-mhíleadh an Chláir do rás na
seana-stoc
D'fhás i mBanba ársa treasamhail,
An flós leomhan is taca le tóir ;
Ní leagfaid ar lár go bráth a n-arma
Go nglanfaid Whitehall ó ár na nDanara
Gan trácht ar chasadh ná faghbháil ar
aisióg

A stáit ná a mbeatha, is go gárdac canaidh
Le mór-scóip céad ámén le hEoghan.

11. [*Ag Taisteal na Blárnan*] She replied,
saying, "Be full of courage / I am giving you
my hand in support / By autumn you will see
battle / And tell the bards of Ireland this
message / that I relate in love and affection
without extravagance / to the young hero
who possessed my virginity / On land and
on sea the game is turned on them / The
defence of their position is not to be had by
the foreign bucks / The name of their brood
will not be left in Britain / on the journeying
home of the fair prince, turning / in good sail
to the lands of Eoghan (Eoghan Mór, King
of Munster).

Helping him are the brave Spaniards / who
left in disgrace on (battle-)field and plain /
withering, lost - the dregs of England / and
the battle-leader of Clare (Lord Clare?) Of
the race of the ancient stock / who stemmed
from ancient, war-like Ireland / The flower
of heroes who is a support in putting to rout /
they will never lay down their arms / until
they cleanse Whitehall of the brood of
savages / without prospect of return or chance
of recovery / of their estates or livelihoods,
and let ye joyously recite / with great spirit,
a hundred Amen's with Eoghan!

Ar aithris an scéal sin, gan bhladar,
don réilteann,
Is cathach bocht taodhmach fliuch
d'fhág sinn,
Is mo dhearca ag saor-shileadh lachta
tiugh déara,
Go habaidh, 's níor bh'fhéidir a
dtraghaidh linn ;
Aithchim go héagnach ar Athair na
naomh ngeal,
Go scaipidh an daor-scamaill plágha dinn
Do fearadh ar Ghaedhealaibh 's go
bhfaiceam-na Éire
Ag aithearrach céile tar Sheaghán
Buidhe.

12. [*Ag Taisteal na Sléibhte*] On the telling
of that story, without exaggeration, by the
fair lady / it left me grieving, poor, fitful,
wet (with tears) / and my eyes ever-shedding
thick floods of tears / plentifully, and I was
unable to stem them / I beseech grievously
the Father of the bright saints / that he may
scatter the oppressive cloud of plague from
us / hat was inflicted on the Irish, and that I
may see Ireland / with a spouse other than
Yellow John.

Maoidhtear i laoidh-starthaibh dán le
héigs',
Gur innseadar draoithe is fáidhe dréacht,
Go bhfillfeadh ar Stíobhart go
háitreach Chéin,
D'fhíor-scaipeadh an daoirse do rás na
nGaedheal.

Atá Laoiseach ar taoide 's is dána a bhéim,
'S ab t-Impre dá choimhdeacht 's an
Spáinneach tréan,
Ní stríocfaid don scríob sian go
bhfághfaid saor
Maoirseacht trí ríoghachta ag grádh
mo chléibh.

13. [*Cois Taoibhe Abhann*] It is related in
historical verses of poems by bards / that
seers and prophets spoke verses / that our
Stewart would return to the habitation of
Céin / to truly scatter bondage from the race
of the Irish.

Louis is on the sea and his blow is fierce /
and the Emperor accompanying him, and
the mighty Spaniard / they shall not desist
from this course until they give in freedom /
the sovereignty of the three kingdoms to the
love of my breast.

Is caoin 's is caomh an friotal
Do chan an tsídh-bhean mhiochair,
Ní haon mé is fíor dá dtigir,
Acht Éire gan gó,
Atá gan géill gan urraim,
I ndiaidh na laoch tá tuirseach,
Ba bhrónach déarcach imthigh,
Is ba ghníomhach i ngleo.
Acht go bhfuil mo shúil go dtiocfaidh
Chugainn tar tréan-mhuir foireann
Do dhíbhreachaidh gan fuireach
Na méirligh tar tuinn;
Is go mbéidh mo chlann gan tuirse,
Atá anois fá easbaidh,
Go la fearidh an tsaoghail.

Má's tú-sa an spéir-bhean mhiochair,
Geal-chlúid na laoch gan teimheal,
'San chríoch so Éibhir oinigh
Aithris cruinn an scéal:
Cá ngabhann an Réics 's a bhfuireann
Ná tígheann ag réabadh briseadh,
Is do dhíbirt gan treoir?
Aduhairt an spéir-bhean chailce,
Tá an trúp tar tuinn ag taisteal,
Go líonmhar, buidheanmhar, neartmhar,
Chum coimeascair is gleo;
'S is geárr an mhoill go mbéidh scaipeadh
Ar shliocht Lúiteir chlaon is Chailbhín,
I bhfearann cloidhimh dá dtreascairt,
Is na Laoisigh i gcoróin.

14. [*Tráth is Mé Cois Leasa*] Calm and gentle
were the utterances / that the kindly fairy
woman related / I am truly none of these you
suppose / but Éire, without a lie / who am
without homage, without respect / after the
knights who are defeated / who left (me?)
sorrowfully, tearfully (?) / and who were
active in battle / But it is my expectation that
there will come / to us across the mighty sea,
a band / that will expel without delay / the
miscreants over the waves / And my clan
will be without oppression / who are now in
want / prosperous, comfortable, joyous / to
the last day of the world.

If you are the kindly beauty / bright protector
of the warriors without blemish / in this land
of noble Éibhear / Relate exactly the story /
where has the King and his army gone / that
he does not come destroying our predicament
/ and to break the rule of the miscreants / and
to expel them in confusion?" / Said the bright,
fair lady / The army is travelling over the sea
/ plentifully, abounding in hosts, strongly /
for conflict and tumult / It is short the delay
until there will be scattering / on the seed of
perverse Luther and Calvin / in the field of
swords being destroyed / and the allies of
Louis enthroned.

Dá dtagadh i dtír chum caladhphuirt
Laoiseach
Drongathach daoineach déibhtheach,
An curadh cath-bhuidheach cineathach
coimhirseach
Le n-ar snaidhmeadh tú roimhe seo
tréimhse,
Le humhlacht do rachfainn ag
crústadh do namhad,
Dá dtúrnadh, dá dtreascairt, dá draochadh,
Is go mbeadh tiuin ar do bhaillet is
scrúdadh le haiteas
Is búraibh fá'n ama ag Gadelians.

15. [*Ar Maidin i nDÉ*] If Louis came on
shore to the harbour / abounding in armies
and in people, contentious / the affable
warrior with many battle hosts and relatives
/ with whom you were united for a while
before / in obedience I would go fighting
your enemies / destroying the, crushing them,
pressing on them / And your wallet will be
in good order, and examination (of it) merrily
/ and churls under the yoke of Gadelians
(Gaels).

Tá Hanobher séidte le tréimhse in ana-
chruit
'S na méirligh mhalluighthe dá
draochadh ar feodh
Atá Holónt gan géilleadh go
fraochmhar feargach
'S taomach treathan faon Liosbón:
Geallaim díbh gan chúinsí go
bhfuigfidhear Sasana
'Na múrthaibh lasrach gan géilleadh
'ón chóip;
Beidh scrios ar fad ar chamthaí an
cham-dlighe chealgaigh
'Na ndlúth-luighe ar machaire ar
theacht an fhogmhair.

Beidh Aifreann naomhtha ag cléir na
salm suilt
Go séismhar seanmach séadmhair
sógach
Is Carolus réx fá réim in Albain
'S Gaedhil go fleadhmail 'na n-aol-
bhruigh fós;
Beidh an aicme do bhruigh sínn
dubhach fí atuirse
'Na gcúplaibh trascartha le faobhar i ngleó
Beidh scrios ar faid na dúthaí ar an
gclúid chlaoin chealgaigh
Is "Hold thief" feasta ortha dá
draochadh ar fheódh.

Is carthannach caomh-ghlan caomhar
ceannasach
Beidh Searlas Calma fá réim gan cheó
Is clanna Mhiléisius go féastach
fleadhamhail
Go séanmhar seasamhach gan géilleadh
'on chóip;
Gabhaidh seal is cabhruidh a chlann
chaoín Bhanba
Fá Shamhain díbh geallaimse go
draochfa an pór
'S dá bhfaicinn-se mar shamhluighim
na samhailí trascartha
Do bheadh lampaí ar lasadh agam le
héigean spóirt."

16. [*Sealad dem Shaoghal*] Hanover is blown
in trouble this while / and the accursed mis-
creants are weakened and withering / Holland
is unyielding, furious, fierce / And Lisbon is
diseased, vastly-weak, feeble / I promise you
without reservation that England will be
found / in sheets of flame without yielding
to the rabble / There will be total destruction
of the troops of the deceitful, mean rule /
lying thickly on the battlefield by the coming
of autumn.

The sacred Mass will be said by the clergy
of joyous psalms / music-playing, prosperous,
merry / And King Charles in power in
Scotland / and Gaels feasting yet in their
lime-white mansions / This gang who were
oppressing us in gloomy exhaustion /
defeated in multitudes (doubly defeated?)
by arms in battle / There will be destruction
throughout the land on the perverse,
treacherous crowd / and HOLD THIEF on
them thereafter, oppressed and withering.

Amiable, kindly, pure, protective, powerful
/ brave Charles will be enthroned without
doubt / And the clans of Milesius will be
feasting, festive / prosperous, steadfast, un-
yielding to the rabble / Take a spell and help
out, O kindly clans of Ireland / by Hallowe'en
I promise you the brood will be defeated /
and if I saw, as I suppose, the churls over-

thrown / I would have lamps lighting by dint
of merriment.

Ní chanain aon scéalta bréige choidhche
Is faonuigh t'intinn sámh go fóill
Go bhfuil taisteal na laoch ag téacht
tar taoide
'S an ghaoth dá gcoimhdeacht in áird
's i gcóir;
Go mbeidh aicme na nGaedhal 'san
réim is aoirde
'Na bhfearannaibh féin gan aon rud cíosa
Is Carolus gléigeal, an réx, mo Stiobhart,
Ag téacht arís fá Cháisc o gcróinn.

17. [*Do Rinneadh Aisling Bheag Aerach*] I
do not ever relate lying stories / And calm
your mind peacefully yet / The warriors are
travelling, arriving over the sea / with the
wind helping them in direction and in order /
that the Irish people may be in supreme power
/ in their own homesteads, with no issue of
rent / and pure, bright Charles, my Stewart /
to be enthroned again by Easter.

An Fhéile Eoin sula dtiocfaidh mar do
scriosfar na milltigh
Cuainighthe an fhéill as críoch Inis Fáil

18. [*I Steasaibh na hAbhann*] Before the
Feast of Saint John arrives when the destroy-
ers will be wiped out / this gang of treachery
in the land of Ireland.

Séamas Ó Domhnaill

Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin
1748—1784
Aspects of his Life and Work
Part 7

The "J" word

Nearly all of Eoghan Ruadh's Aisling
songs end with a prophetic statement of
an invasion of Ireland by French or
Spanish Armies to drive out the foreign
oppressors and restore the land of Ireland
to the Irish. The exiled royal house of
Stuart would be re-established on the
throne in England and would ensure
freedom of religion for Catholics.

These verses represent a very fine, if
indeed a very late, contribution to Jacobite
literature. The international Jacobite
movement takes its name from King
James II (Jacobus) of England and the
efforts of him and his descendants to
reclaim the throne from which they had
been expelled. Jacobitism had many
facets and meant different things to its
followers in different countries. It was,
for example, pivotal in the establishment
of both the Episcopalian Church in
America and of Freemasonry in contin-
ental Europe. In popular imagination
Jacobitism is overwhelmingly associated
with the rising of the Scottish Gaelic

Clans in 1745, the invasion of England
and the subsequent disaster of the Battle
of Culloden. The iconic figure of the
whole enterprise is of course Prince
Charles Edward Stuart, "*Bonnie Prince
Charlie*" or, as Eoghan Ruadh refers to
him, King Charles III.

Prince Charles Edward Louis Philip
Caisimir Stuart was born in the Muti
Palace in Rome on 31st December 1720
to the Polish Princess Klementyna
Sobieska. His father James Stuart was
English-born but had spent all of his life
since he was an infant in France and
Italy.

Young Charles was well entitled to
be called *Prince*. His mother was grand-
daughter of Jan Sobieski, King of Pol-
and, who led the famous cavalry charge
which drove back the Turks and lifted
the the Siege of Vienna in 1683. On the
other side of his family Prince Charles's
Stuart ancestors had been Kings and
Queens of Scotland and England.

Now dear Reader, I'm not going to try to give a history of the whole Jacobite movement here. There is loads about on the internet. I just want to highlight some aspects which refer to Eoghan Ruadh. I do however give a few paragraphs below on the English royal succession from Tudor to Stuart to Hanover.

Tudor, Stuart & Hanover

Prince Charles' great-great-great-great-great grandmother had been Margaret Tudor, the eldest sister of King Henry VIII of England. She had married King James Stuart IV of Scotland and was the grandmother of the Mary, Queen of Scots who was the closest relative of Queen Elizabeth of England. Catholic Mary claimed that Protestant Elizabeth was a heretic and that therefore her rule was illegitimate, so Elizabeth had Mary captured and beheaded. Mary's son was raised as a Protestant and became King James VI of Scotland. This James had three children, Henry (died young), Elizabeth and Charles. In 1603 Queen Elizabeth died childless and James VI of Scotland also became James I of England.

In 1625 James died and was succeeded by his eldest surviving son Charles I who had three children: Charles, Mary and James. Both boys eventually succeeded to the throne while Mary married William II of Orange and lived in Holland. Charles fought and lost the Civil War against the Parliamentarians. After he was beheaded in 1649, Oliver Cromwell and the Parliamentarians ruled England as a republic until 1659.

Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660 and was succeeded 1685 by his younger brother James II. James and his wife Anne Hyde had two daughters, Mary and Ann. Mary, the heir to the throne, married her 1st cousin William III of Orange. Shortly after Anne Hyde's death in 1671 James became a Catholic and in 1673 he married the Catholic Princess Mary of Modena. This aroused great anxiety amongst the Protestant establishment but they were willing to tolerate the situation on the understanding that James' Protestant daughter, Mary, and her Dutch husband would succeed him.

In 1688 Mary of Modena gave birth to a son, James, who was baptised a Catholic. James' Protestant opponents now invited Mary & William to come over from Holland and seize the throne. James fled with his wife and child to France, where King Louis XIV gave them the use of the palace of St. Ger-

main. In 1689 James landed in Kinsale to lead his Irish supporters against the Williamites but the Jacobite army was defeated at the Boyne, Aughrim and Limerick. When James II died in France in 1701, his followers proclaimed his son King James III.

Mary Stuart reigned jointly with her husband William of Orange until her death in 1694. William then ruled on his own until his death in 1702. He was succeeded by Mary's sister Anne. The Act of Settlement of 1701 nominated the Protestant Sophia, Electress of Hanover, as heir to the throne following the death of the childless Queen Anne. Sophia was the daughter of Princess Elizabeth Stuart and granddaughter of James I. Sophia's son, George Ludwig von Guelph-d'Este, Elector of Hanover, eventually succeeded to the English throne in 1714.

The Jacobite movement can be said to have effectively ended in 1746 with the Battle of Culloden. On the death of King James III in 1766 the Pope formally withdrew his support for the cause of his house. Some say that the movement carried on until 1788 when King Charles III died. Others say that it ended in 1807 with the death of King Henry IX. There are still others, you guessed it, who say that the movement never ended and that the Duke of Bavaria is today the true heir to the throne of England.

Tá an Trúp tar Tuinn ag Taisteal

Jacobite hopes always focused on help from abroad and invasion by foreign armies. Attempts to invade Britain were made in 1708, 1715, 1719, 1722 and 1745. The prospect of invading England and decapitating the British Government was very attractive to the French administration in times of war. The installation of a client Jacobite regime would give France the opportunity to become the world colonial super power. However, France's immediate interests usually tended to centre on mainland Europe so the prospect of invading a hostile England was not seriously considered. An invasion of Scotland was always a more realistic option as that country had a larger Jacobite support base and a range of private armies under the control of Lowland as well as Highland chiefs. There was no real suggestion of a Jacobite invasion of Ireland after the Treaty of Limerick in 1691—which might seem to undermine Eoghan Ruadh's judgement in expecting an invasion at the time he was writing i.e. the 1770s and 1780s.

You could say that the Jacobite prophesies were merely symbolic in the period post 1746. During the contest in the Winter of 1769 in which Eoghan Ruadh composed his satire on old men, *An tAachtach Sean*, an earlier contestant had made reference to the hoped-for Jacobite invasion:

"Go cuantaibh an Daingin dá dtagadh
an Laoiseach
Is Carolus groidhe go buidheanmhar le
n'-ais,
An buadhach-bhile ceannais is fada tá
ar díbirt
Gan talamh, gan saoirse, i dtíorthaibh
tar lear,
Thógfaidís óig-fhir Chláir Fódla mar
chongnamh leo,
Scólfaidís crón-phuic tá i rós-
bhroghaibh Mumhan go sóghach,
Bheith claidheamh ar gach seabhach
nár cheangal le brighdigh
'S an seandúine críonna sínte 'na spreas".

"If Louis came to us to the harbours of Dingle / and brave Charles with hosts along with him / the masterly conquering champion exiled for so long / without territory or freedom in foreign lands / The young men of Ireland would rise up to help them / They would sweep aside the withered bucks who are snug in the rose-mansions of Munster / every hero not tied to a girl would have a sword / and the old wasted fellow stretched out uselessly."

I do believe however that Eoghan Ruadh, and by extension his fellow poets, did really believe that an invasion was imminent. The verses from two of the songs quoted above go against the optimistic grain of the prophesies in his earlier *Aislings*:

Is eagal liom féin, a rélteann lonnrach
Gur reachaireacht bhréag an scéal so
thionnscais
Atáid danair ró-thréan i mbarcaibh, gan
spéis
I gCarolus réx, do phrionnsa,
Atá in easbhaidhgach céime conganta
Is aicme na nGaedhal go cúthail
Gan fearanntas saor mar chleachtadh a
gcléir
Do bheir neartmhar in Éirinn ionnraic.
(7)

Táid Galla ro-thréan i mbarcaibh gan
spéis
Ar chaise go fraochda nimheach;
Is Carolus Récs go claoidhte,
D'fhúig aicme na nGaedheal fá dhaoirse
(8)

Both of these songs were written about the time of Eoghan's service in the Royal Navy and at the Battle of the Saintes in 1782. Having seen the extent of British naval power, he laments that

the woman in the *Aisling* is not telling the truth or is mistaken. This understanding gained towards the end of his life would in turn confirm his earlier strong belief in the possibility of an invasion.

It should be remembered that in December 1796 a Republican French fleet with up to 20,000 soldiers entered Bantry Bay and it was only the very bad weather which prevented them from landing and taking over the country. In 1798 a smaller French invasion force did manage to land in Killala Bay.

There is one very interesting suggestion that France would have been interested in an invasion of Ireland in the 1740's. When Prince Charles managed to escape from Scotland in late 1746 he was greeted in Paris as a celebrity by the French public. He had one firm supporter in the French Government, namely Cardinal Pierre-Paul Guérin de Tencin who, along with his sister Caludine, was deeply involved in Jacobite plotting. Take a look at the report of their meeting:

"A scheme was conceived by Cardinal Tencin the French minister for restoring his family through the intervention of France on condition that Ireland was to be yielded as an appanage of that kingdom and the Cardinal who had been raised to his present distinguished situation entirely by the influence of the House of Stuart had an interview with Charles to disclose the project. Scarcely had he concluded the proposal when the fiery Chevalier started from his seat in the greatest rage and repeatedly exclaiming 'Non Monsieur le Cardinal tout ou rien point de partage' [No, no Lord Cardinal all or nothing, no partitions], strode through the room with the air of a man who has been insulted on the keenest point The Cardinal alarmed at his demeanour entreated him not to mention the project to the King or ministry as it was entirely an idea of his own which had conceived out of his great affection for the Exiled Family, Charles assured him he should not so much as think of it."

Séarlas Réics do Chosnamh i gCoróin

There is strong evidence that the O'Sullivan clans, especially Sliocht Mhic Craith Ruadh were particularly devoted to the Stuart royal family. A relative of Eoghan Ruadh's, Sir John O'Sullivan of Cappanacusha, was a close friend of Prince Charlie and a senior member of his staff during the 1745 rising. Here is

part of John O'Sullivan's own account of the Battle of Culloden 16 April 1746:

"Our left flinches, the Duke of Perth runs to Clanranolds Regiment, takes their Colours and tells them from that day forth he'll call himself McDonnell if they gain the day. Lord John and Sullivan brings up the left again. About this time Lord George goes off with the most part of the right, Sullivan seeing this runs to Shea that commanded the Fitzjames' Squadron and tells him 'you see all is going to pot. You can be of no great succour, so before a general rout which will soon be; seize upon the Prince and take him off'. The Prince was at this time rallying the right, his horse is shot in the shoulder, he's obliged to change horses; he was not well a horse-back, when his groom has his head shot off with a cannon ball... Sullivan ... runs to the Prince and tells him that he has no time to lose that he'll be surrounded immediately if he does not retire... Sullivan prays him to look behind him and that he'd see the whole moor covered with men that were going off and that half the Army was away. The Prince looks, sees it is true, everybody presses him, in short, he retires..."

Another relation of Sir John O'Sullivan and probably of Eoghan Ruadh as well was Fr. Owen Sullivan, a teacher at the Sorbonne, Paris. In 1752 he wrote to James Edgar, Secretary to King James III at Rome:

"From my tender years I was always ordered by my parents and other loyal subjects under whose care I was brought up, to pray for the King. Until I came to this country, and since my arrival here, I am fully convinced that there are no Irish men or Families whatsoever of that mournful and unhappy Kingdom that pray with more constant zeal for the Kings Restoration, health and eternal happiness than the O'Sullivans do and that would give upon all critical occasions for his Majesty's service more signal and plausible proofs."

Admittedly, this letter was written in the hope that the writer would be nominated for a Bishopric in Ireland. Perhaps the only actual formal power that King James III exercised was the nomination of Bishops to Irish dioceses. When King James II reigned in London the Pope had recognised his right to nominate candidates for vacant Irish Catholic Bishoprics. Even after the defeat at the battle of the Boyne in 1691, the Popes continued to recognise the right of the exiled royal Stuarts to nominate Irish bishops. In 1693, the exiled King nominated Peter Creagh (Bishop of Cork) for the See of Dublin,

and Edward Comerford for Cashel. The right of nomination was passed on to King James' son, James III. His last nomination was in 1760 when he nominated Philip Phillips to the See of Killala. James III was very conscientious in carrying out the role. Unfortunately for Fr. O'Sullivan, whatever other fine qualities he may have had, the King could not recommend him to the Pope. In 1747 he had already written to his Secretary in Paris, Col. Daniel O'Brien, as follows:

"I have received your letter of 9th January and I have seen what you wrote to Edgar. I cannot give a Coadjutor to the Bishop of Cork against the wishes of that Diocese. You know already how much I feel favourably disposed to Mr. O'Brien. In regard to the Abbé O'Sullivan, I see no circumstance where it would be possible to consider him for Bishop.

The *Mr. O'Brien* referred to here is no doubt Seán Ó Briain who was Bishop of Cloyne from 1748 – 1767. He was a great friend of Seán na Ráithíneach Ó Murchú and other poets. His *Dictionary of the Irish Language* was published in Paris in 1768. A Eugene O'Sullivan was Bishop of Ardfert & Aghadoe (Kerry) from 1739 – 1744 but I do not know much about him. Dear Reader, I would be delighted if you could throw some light on his life and background.

The Pope of Rome and the Royal House of Stuart

The cause of the restoration of the exiled royal Stuart family lasted more than a century and during that time it was sponsored and protected by powerful patrons. At various times these included the Kings of France, Spain, Poland and Sweden as well as the Czar of Russia. The most vital of all however was the the Papacy.

In 1716 James III was forced to leave French territory and moved his household to the Papal city of Avignon. In 1719 Pope Clement XI granted them the use of the Palazzo Muti in Rome. This was to serve as the royal residence and seat of the Jacobite Government in exile until the death of Charles III in 1788. The Popes were also generous contributors to various Jacobite military expeditions. The youngest of the Stuart boys, had a genuine religious vocation and he became Cardinal Archbishop of Frascati. From that position he was enabled to support his elder brother in his last impoverished days. It was not until the death of James III in 1766 that that Papal

recognition of the Stuart claim to the throne of England was formally ended. By that time the Papal States were under pressure diplomatically because of the rise of British power and its growing network of alliances including Catholic Powers such as the Portuguese Empire.

The question is why did the Popes expend so much time and resources on such a cause which had such a slim chance of success? I think that the answer can be found in the following report of the conversation between Pope Benedict XIV and Prince Henry Stuart prior to his elevation to the College of Cardinals:

"Benedict XIV made his second promotion on the 10th of April, 1747. On the 3d of July, in the same year, Benedict made his third promotion. It consisted only of Henry Benedict Mary Clement, Duke of York, second son of James III, "King of England". He was born at Rome on the 6th of March, 1725, and died at Frascati, dean of the Sacred College, on the 13th of July, 1807.

Previous to announcing to the English prince his elevation to the cardinalate, Benedict said to him : "Prince, your dignity, our right, and ancient custom, especially in regard to sovereign families, would have justified us two years since in making you a cardinal of the Roman Church. But we have always considered that after your father James III, and your brother who will be James IV (sic), you will have undoubted right to the English throne, and that therefore it was not necessary, determined though you were to take holy orders, so publicly and so completely to cut yourself off from the world and the English throne. Take even yet a few days of reflection. We know that your family leaves you free to choose, and that you desire to enter the Sacred College only from a firmness peculiar to yourself. Nevertheless, consider well; we should not like that either yourself or you should hereafter be accused of a precipitation which, through other ordinances of Heaven, might place us both in an embarrassing position. Consider well, and if, on the 30th of June, you are still of the same mind, we, three days later, will announce your appointment"..."

The Duke of York kissed the pope's hand and replied: "*There is nothing in this world that I so much desire as to enter the Sacred College; and once there, I should never regret my lost chance of royalty*".

Benedict replied:

"Well, we shall create you only

cardinal-deacon, so that you will still have time to consider whether you absolutely will take holy orders. We shall do nothing that may be contrary to the will of God, which is unknown to us. If hereafter, when you are cardinal-deacon, circumstances should make it advisable, you can resign the hat, marry, and thus avoid destroying the hopes of Ireland, that firm friend of the Stuarts, and of that portion of Scotland which has remained pious and faithful."

The last line there is key. The Popes, no more than the poets of Ireland, were not stupid. They knew that England and most of Scotland were firmly Protestant. There was absolutely no question in the 18th century of forcible conversion of that population or any other. While that fact had to be accepted, there still remained the duty of pastoral care of the oppressed Catholics in Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland. In this context therefore, the great sacrifices made by the Papacy to support the Jacobite cause were motivated by one objective—to secure religious liberty for the Irish Catholics. This Papal policy is mirrored at the present time in relation to the beleaguered Christian communities in the Middle East.

Fr. Dinneen gives us a flavour of the position of Catholics in Ireland during Eoghan Ruadh's lifetime:

"It could be said that the Church abandoned the cities and the large towns and she took up residence, shelter and protection in the hovels of the naked and the hungry. Each hut was more or less a church, even though Mass would not normally be said there. They used

to be worshipping God from morning till night. Even in the middle of the night the sick would be sighing to God. The accent of the native faith would be found in the songs and in the stories. Whether the occasion was happy or sad, there was always a flavour of eternity. There was no gathering without devotion."

Seen in this light, Ireland was central to the whole Jacobite movement. Without Papal support the movement would have run into the sand in 1716 if not sooner.

In the years following 1766 there grew up a movement amongst certain rich Catholics in Ireland to offer allegiance to the Hanoverian King George in return for toleration and easing of the Penal Laws. This is precisely the period in which Eoghan Ruadh flourished. His life's work and that of his fellow poets was to oppose that movement and fight to retain the soul of Irish civilisation.

The story of how Princess Clementina was smuggled across Europe to be James III's wife and eventual mother of Bonnie Prince Charlie is told in this memoir.

Agents of the English throne did their utmost to prevent this prestigious wedding but were foiled by the Irish Brigades soldier, Sir Charles Wogan.

The Rescue Of Princess

Clementina Stuart,
an adventure of the
Irish Brigades (1719),

by

Sir Charles Wogan.

Belfast Historical & Educational Society.

Index. 198 pp. 2008. €18, £15

Ted O' Sullivan

This letter was submitted to the
Irish Times on 24th August

Fighting in Syria

A report in your paper of Aug 18 last ("Nun on Irish visit accused of peddling 'regime lies' about crisis in Syria") by Mary Fitzgerald, poured doubt on the reliability of statements made on the Syrian conflict by an Arab Christian nun based in that country, Mother Agnes Mariam, who recently visited Ireland. For some time Mother Agnes has been stating that atrocities and massacres carried out by the rebels have been repackaged in the media

outside Syria as acts carried out by the Assad regime, one example being the Houla massacre of May 25 last.

The article referred to a UN report which held pro-Assad forces responsible for the Houla massacre in which over a 100 are said to have died. At first hand this may appear impressive.

However, the UN is not necessarily a morally pristine and dispassionate organisation operating according to elevated principles. It is at the confluence of various ruthless political forces.

A closer look will reveal that UN human right reports on the Syrian conflict are based on interviews conducted outside Syria. Interviewees can be chosen by political groups in conflict with the Syrian government. In effect, the UN report is merely collected hearsay.

V
O
X

Priesthood
Circumscribed
Postwar British View of Ireland
Gossip
Islam in Ireland
Shatter Again
Trivial Pursuits?
Healthy Superstition?

P
A
T

Healthy Superstition?

"Sometimes it is the small things that tell us just how bad things are.

"The news last week that the Government plans to change car licence plates next year to avoid using the number 13 is confirmation of two things we will have always suspected; that the Government is in thrall to the motor lobby and that this Government is so populist that it will stoop to almost any level.

"A country that makes fear of the number 13 official policy is a country that has lost the right to be taken seriously. What next? A ban on black cats?

"This will undoubtedly have a knock-on effect on investment. In the US, states that insist on teaching creationism find it harder to attract investment than states that promote rational teaching. Countries such as Saudi Arabia, which are also governed by superstition, struggle to get good people to move there despite sky-high salaries. It will be interesting to see what foreign investors make of a Government that is scared of a number" (Thomas Molloy, *Irish Independent*, 30.8.2012).

Priesthood

There are three times as many men studying to become Catholic priests in England and Wales compared with Ireland, new figures reveal.

The Church in England and Wales, with just under four million Catholics, has 196 seminarians training for the priesthood for its 22 dioceses.

In Ireland, with an island-wide Catholic population of 4.4 million and 26 dioceses, just 64 men are in training in the Maynooth seminary.

Twelve new seminarians have just entered Maynooth, aged largely in their 20s and from a range of backgrounds.

The ratio in England and Wales of student priest to parishioner stands at 1: 20,581. In Ireland, the 64 seminarians means a ratio of 1: 69,527.

The number of entrants into the seminary in the Church in England and Wales has been increasing from a low of 22 in 2001, with between 45 and 60 men starting training annually in recent years.

Entrants to Maynooth have been

mixed over the last five years, with 13 last year; 10 in 2010; 24 in 2009; 14 in 2008; and 18 in 2007.

Circumscribed

Muslim and Jewish unity on circumcision in Germany!

"A Cologne court ruling that the circumcision of young boys constitutes grievous bodily harm 'calls into question the future existence of Jewish life in Germany', according to leading European rabbis. (*Irish Times*, 14.7.2012).

At a meeting in Berlin, they joined a growing chorus of condemnation of a Cologne regional court ruling in the case of a four-year-old Muslim boy who died of complications following a circumcision.

The court ruling applies only in the immediate Cologne area and is likely to go to a higher court for a final decision but has already sparked a heated debate.

German Muslim and Jewish groups have vowed to fight the ruling and have urged their respective communities, four million and 120,000 respectively, to ignore the ban.

But many doctors around Germany who perform religious circumcisions have announced they are suspending the practice until the legal situation is clarified.

Chancellor Angela Merkel promised just that yesterday, intervening in a heated debate weighed down in Germany with historical sensitivity.

"It is absolutely clear that we want to have Jewish and Muslim religious life in Germany," said Steffen Seibert, Dr Merkel's spokesman, yesterday. 'Circumcision carried out in a responsible manner must be possible in this country without punishment. Freedom of religious expression is very important to us.'" (*Irish Times*, 14.7.2012).

"A ban is a fundamental problem for the continued existence of Jewish communities... if it is upheld I see no future for Jewish life here", said Rabbi Pinchas Goldschmit, Chief Rabbi of Moscow and President of Europe's main Orthodox rabbinical body, after a meeting in Berlin. "*Circumcision is the basis of*

entrance to Jewish people. We will not change a 4,000-year-old practice."

Muslim leaders have expressed concern the ruling would cause a precedent in other German jurisdictions. The German medical association has warned it could increase the risk to boys by driving circumcision underground.

The Catholic Church maintains a neutral position on the practice of non-religious circumcision, and has never addressed the issue of infant circumcision specifically.

British View of Ireland

Cardinal John Carmel Heenan visited Dublin to mend fences during WW2, as was reported in a recent book:

"The position of the Irish Republic, which remained neutral during the war even though thousands of Irishmen joined the British forces, caused a degree of hostility to Ireland, not least among Catholics. Michael de la Bedoyere, the editor of the *Catholic Herald*, invited him to make an extended visit to Dublin, ostensibly in the guise of spiritual director to the Legion of Mary. While there he met all the leading politicians, and on his return was able to write persuasively in defence of the Irish stance on the war. He also visited Belfast, and in his articles graphically highlighted the discrimination shown to Catholics in Northern Ireland, which he contrasted with the toleration shown by the Dublin government to non-Roman Catholics. They have not even, he said, tried to recover the two once-Catholic cathedrals 'now being used by dwindling Protestant congregations while the teeming millions [*sic*] of Dublin's Catholics have no Cathedral of their own'. It was not all praise. He drew attention to the amount of poverty he encountered in Dublin, and he also commented, presciently, on deteriorating relations between the clergy and the local youths:

"It is remarkable that not only the priest but also Protestant ministers were at one in naming dances as one of the great crises of modern Ireland. I therefore lost no time in seeking the views of the young people themselves. I found, as I had suspected, that they were sullen and resentful at the attitude of the clergy"... (Michael Walsh, *The Westminster Cardinals*, Burns & Oates, 2008, p.171/2).

Gossip

"The County of Cork is one of the great whispering galleries of the world." (*The Last Serjeant : The Memoirs of Serjeant A.M. Sullivan QC.*, Macdonald, London, 1952, p.240).

This bucko never spent much time around the City of Cork, did he?

Islam in Ireland

"A former sales assistant at Dunnes Stores has claimed she was unable to go to work because she was not permitted to wear a religious headdress there.

"Loreta Tavoraite (35), who is originally from Lithuania, began working in a Dunnes Stores in Ballincollig in Cork in July 200" (*Irish Ind.* 12.9.2012).

She later converted to Islam and for religious reasons wanted to wear a hijab—a headscarf that covers the hair, leaving the face exposed—at work.

"Ms Tavoraite, of Parknamore in Ballincollig, is suing Dunnes, of 46-50 South Great George's Street, Dublin, for unfair dismissal. An Employment Appeals Tribunal in Cork was told yesterday that staff at Dunnes wear a standard uniform." (*ibid*)

Her solicitor Patrick Horan said his client was told she "couldn't come to work wearing a hijab".

"As far as she was concerned, being a devout Muslim, you must wear a hijab. It's an obligation," said Mr Horan.

"Her view was I'm ready to work. I want to work, but because of my religion I have to wear a hijab."

In October, 2010, Ms Tavoraite met with Bill Farrell, store manager at the Ballincollig store, and the human resources manager. She explained her religion involved covering her head with a hat or scarf while in public.

Mr. Farrell told Ms Tavoraite that her religion was her own business and her business only.

Asked by Mr. Horan what would happen if a member of staff came into work wearing a chain and cross, Mr Farrell said he had never encountered such a situation.

The hearing continues.

Shatter Again

"Justice Minister Alan Shatter has warned struggling borrowers they will be forced to sell engagement rings and family jewellery to pay back banks under debt arrangements proposed in the Personal Insolvency Bill" (*Irish Examiner*, 6.7.2012).

"Up to 4,000 people are expected to apply next year for a write-off of up to €20,000 from debt on credit cards, hire purchase agreements, or smaller loans under the planned laws debated in the Dáil yesterday.

"They will have to prove their assets are less than €400—with the exemption of the family car, household appliances, tools, or other essential items.

"However, Mr Shatter said that while he was "mindful of the sentimental as much as actual value of items such as engagement rings, etc", they cannot be listed as essential items "given the potential for misuse of such a possible exemption"... (*ibid*).

Trivial Pursuits?

"Advertising is the whip which hustles humanity up the road to the Better Mouse-trap" (E.S. Turner, *The Shocking History of Advertising*, Penguin, 1965).

"Giant TV screens have helped to bring families back together in the living room, new research suggests.

"James Thickett, Ofcom's director of research, said larger and flatter TV screens appeared to be bringing children back into the living room, reversing a trend which saw them watching a separate set in their bedroom" (*Irish Examiner*, 18.7.2012)

In the first quarter of this year, more than 35% of TV sets sold were at least 33 inch in size.

The present writer on a trip around TV stores in Cork city quickly grasped the consequences of this propaganda, in his search for a new TV set! Being the tenant of a modest dwelling, he had no desire to turn his living room into a cinema, so he decided to go no further than a 26 inch set. Not only that, he was paying cash. But recession or no, in each of the three stores visited, the salesmen forecast disastrous consequences if he bought anything less than a 33 inch set!

Mr. Thickett again:

"In the past 10 years we have seen the

development of widescreen television, HD television, screens getting flatter and very importantly screens are getting bigger.

"What this is doing is actually bringing people back into the living room and television is taking on a new role as a family experience whereas 10 years ago, in the early 2000s, we were seeing kids, different members of the family watching different television shows in different rooms using different sets.

British viewers spent an average of four hours each day watching TV in 2011, up from 3.6 hours in 2002.

Some 40% of households had only one TV set in 2011, compared to 35% in 2002.

In 2011, individuals watched around 209 minutes of TV on their main set daily, compared to 187 minutes on a main set in 2002.

While TV watching has remained stable, the long-term radio listening trend has gone down.

In 2011, UK adults spent 22.5 hours a week listening to the radio, down from 24 hours in 2001. But the figure was up by 24 minutes on 2010.

Among 15 to 24-year-olds, the long-term downwards listening trend was even more pronounced, by 22% compared with 2001.

*The Family that views together. . . ******

Stephen Richards

Thomas Cromwell in fact and fantasy

The Good Cromwell?

I never thought the day would come when I would be not only reading a winning Booker, or Man Booker, novel, but urging others to do the same. I delayed as long as I could, of course, and indeed it was only some months after it had been lent to me that I started Hilary Mantel's *Wolf Hall*, her interpretation of the rise of Thomas Cromwell and his part in what is called for the sake of simplicity the English Reformation.

One thing that it demonstrates is how it's possible for a novel to be 'clever', inward, dense, somewhat allusive, and yet tell a full-blooded story in a major key, full of movement, odd angles and changes of pace. What we have here is not some bleak, postmodern vista peopled with shadowy, hopeless characters who bicker and backstab because they have nothing else to do. Plenty of bickering and backstabbing here, I suppose, but carried out by men and women who believe in themselves and what they want to do. I'm already looking forward to *Bring Up The Bodies*, the second instalment, dealing with Cromwell's demise. No doubt I'll get round to it in a couple of years' time when the hype has died

down.

With historical fiction the problem is that the reader usually knows what's going to happen next, so you have to keep within the basic parameters of actuality. But Mantel has taken the story of the foundation of the modern English State, that almost mythical story that none of us remembers learning for the first time, and has made it seem strange to us. When Anne Boleyn is pregnant for the second time you find yourself half-expecting that she'll go on to full term and have a boy, the longed-for heir.

What Lies Beneath

Of course a novel isn't history, but a lot of history is novelistic. The concept of *Heilsgeschichte* is a familiar one to theologians, but the desire to impose a pattern on the past is natural to all historians and the ability to do it is part of the historian's job description. No matter how good your referencing system might be, so that no statement is made that's not backed up by a source, there's still the business of having to put these beads on a coherent interpretative thread. So, despite protests to the con-

trary, the historian tends to impute motives without adequate evidence, and to bring his or her own prejudices to the field of study. Have our ancestors when in high places always put their unvarnished thoughts into official documents, or even private letters? There is always a lot of work left for the imagination.

Historical and novelistic reconstructions may be different in scale but not in kind; and Mantel uses all the latitude available to her to work out her own extremely convincing take. Whether she was always intending to make Cromwell a sympathetic character or whether that was the direction her researches led her in, matters less than her success in carrying off her project.

Lament For Mediaeval England

Most of the recent traffic has been written from a pro-Catholic perspective, directed by Eamon Duffy, the Dundalk man who is Professor of Church History at Cambridge. From this time next year, he'll be hobnobbing at high table with Rowan Williams as the latter leaves Lambeth Palace to take up his new post as Master of Magdalene.

Duffy's 1992 *magnum opus* was *The Stripping Of The Altars*, dealing with the trauma experienced by the English people and clergy as their Churches were vandalised during the six year reign of England's only reforming king, the teenage Edward VI. This was followed by *The Voices Of Morebath*, chronicling the life and times of a Devon priest whose life was turned upside down by the requirements of the new regime. Duffy's most recent book I think is a study of the reign of Mary Tudor, in which he sets out to rehabilitate Mary. He argues that the three hundred or so who were burned to death in her reign (most of whom were "common people") to a great extent had only themselves to blame for being for awkward and sticking out like sore thumbs, so that Mary was almost left with no choice.

I was reminded as I walked past the big Catholic Church on Hills Road, Cambridge, a week or so ago that it's dedicated to (*inter alios*) the English Martyrs. The Church of England is more reticent about celebrating the English Protestant martyrs. The modest Martyrs' Memorial in Oxford was erected I think in the 1870s, which was the high water mark of English Protestantism, at least in terms of its power and influence. The Martyrs' Memorial on the Ravenhill Road is something else again.

Mary Tudor: A Bad Thing

My own prejudiced view is that

Mary's reign, for all that it was mercifully cut short, was disastrous, and not least for the fortunes of English Catholics. It provided chapter and verse for later Protestant polemicists, on up to the time of the lunatic Titus Oates. Incidentally, I didn't know until I heard it on *Sunday Miscellany*, that Oliver Plunkett was actually betrayed by a Catholic priest from South Armagh. This was a much younger man who apparently had hated Plunkett ever since college days in Rome when he got fed up hearing his lecturers eulogising Plunkett. It would seem that part of his resentment was due to Plunkett coming from Old English stock; and when Plunkett became Archbishop of Armagh the resentment boiled over, and this priest, whose name I forget, provided the phony evidence that led to Plunkett's conviction.

There are echoes in Mantel of the earlier persecutions of the Lollards, the followers of Wycliffe, in the fifteenth century. She has Cromwell as a young boy, on what evidence I don't know, being taken to see an elderly Lollard woman being burned to death, while the crowd laughed and shouted curses at her. The mediaeval and early modern Catholic Church, for all its great achievements in other areas, was vicious towards any hint, much less practice, of heresy. Back in the twelfth century the Cathars of Provence had been more or less wiped out, and then were posthumously excoriated by their persecutors. More recently it has been concluded that they weren't seriously heretical at all, but were relaxed about certain areas of the faith. They were also seriously rich, which may have been a factor. But if you were to read G.K. Chesterton's book on St. Thomas Aquinas, which touches also on St. Dominic, Thomas being a Dominican, you find Chesterton coming out with all this tripe about how the Cathars, or Albigensians, were a cancer in Christendom that had to be extirpated root and branch.

And, of course, from the 1560s onward, the Counter Reformation did its work well, in Poland, France, Bohemia and Austria.

The Man For All Seasons

From everything I've read by or about St. Thomas More I would think he would have been an enthusiastic follower of St. Dominic in his most violent excesses. David Daniell in his biography of Tyndale quotes from some of the polemical exchanges between the two. There's no doubt that Tyndale expresses himself robustly, but he doesn't even begin to

come near that vile scatological language of More. This is not the type of disputation you would expect from a Renaissance scholar and disciple of Erasmus. It's rather like the ravings of a man who should be locked up.

More basically wanted Tyndale dead, the sooner and the painfuller the better. Eventually he got his wish, albeit posthumously. If you were caught with a page of Tyndale's *New Testament* (published, mischievously, "in Utopia") in your possession you were as good as a dead man. The same applied if you were to assert (with Tyndale but against the King James Version) that the three cardinal virtues were faith, hope and love, not faith, hope and charity. If you were rash enough to make the assertion in public you'd best be making your will.

And the death of heretics wasn't simply for More a regrettable but conscientious duty: he seems to have derived considerable pleasure from witnessing their torments. This is where he differed from Wolsey, whom he hated. His hatred for Cromwell was in part bound up with the latter having been Wolsey's right-hand man.

More's refusal to take the oath of supremacy on the ground of conscience was exasperating for Cromwell, Audley, Cranmer and the rest. It was seen by them as a sort of self-indulgent one-upmanship, which would cause trouble for others as well. This is how Mantel imagines one exchange between More and his persuaders in a more or less informal session that wasn't part of any trial. These were men who went back a long way, and were socially at ease with one another. But the issue is very clearly stated:

"Audley's eyes snap open: he thinks More has shown himself the way out. But More's face, smiling, is a mask of malice. 'I would not be such a juggler', he says softly. 'I would not treat the Lord my God to such a puppet show, let alone the faithful of England. You say you have the majority. I say I have it. You say Parliament is behind you, and I say all the angels and saints are behind me, and all the company of the Christian dead, for as many generations as there have been since the church of Christ was founded, one body, undivided—'

"'Oh, for Christ's sake!' he says. 'A lie is no less a lie because it is a thousand years old. Your undivided church has liked nothing better than persecuting its own members, burning them and hacking them apart when they stood by their own conscience, slashing their bellies open and feeding their guts to dogs. You call history to your aid, but

what is history to you? It is a mirror that flatters Thomas More. But I have another mirror, I hold it up and it shows a vain and dangerous man, and when I turn it about it shows a killer, for you will drag down with you God knows how many, who will only have the suffering, and not your martyr's gratification. You are not a simple soul, so don't try to make this simple.'..."

The Man Who Got Things Done

This is one of the very few examples where Mantel has her hero seem to lose his temper. Being the son of a blacksmith in Putney, with a shady past as a wool trader, mercenary, and general wheeler-dealer on the continent, he was the constant butt of snide putdowns by the nobles and gentlemen who clustered round Henry. How did he deal with that? According to Mantel's re-imagining, he didn't do the Uriah Heep act but nor did he try to meet insult with insult. Instead he parried the verbal blows with *bon-homie*, with dry, ironic ripostes that were both barbed and self-deprecating, and somehow got people to like him, even to trust him.

For Henry he was the man who got things done, a political fixer, steady in a crisis, with all of Wolsey's *savoir-faire* and urbanity, but none of the underlying emotional insecurity that afflicted his old boss. Also, he was good company.

Cromwell is just as much the man for all seasons as More. Unlike More, he could have been a ship's captain, a foreman on a building site, a competitive archer, as well as a master of the new learning. Like More, he keeps a hospitable house, at Austin Friars, with a retinue of son, nephews and nieces, extended family, and various likely lads that he would like to help up.

Memories Of Wolsey

Henry is always half-regretful over what he did to Wolsey.

Henry says:

"Stephen {Gardiner} is a resolute ambassador, no doubt, but I cannot keep him near me. I have trusted him with my innermost counsels, and now he turns. He shakes his head. I hate ingratitude. I hate disloyalty. That is why I value a man like you. You were good to your old master in his trouble. Nothing could commend you more to me, than that.' He speaks as if he, personally, hadn't caused the trouble; as if Wolsey's fall were caused by a thunderbolt."

A couple of pages before this Mantel has Cromwell experience a sort of premonition, Wolsey talking in his head

presumably, as opposed to an actual vision:

"He goes home happy, but the cardinal is waiting for him in a corner. He is plump as a cushion in his scarlet robes and his face wears a martial and mutinous expression. Wolsey says, 'you know he will take the credit for your good ideas, and you the blame for his bad ones? When fortune turns against you, you will feel her lash: you always, he never... Do you think there are rules, protocols, judges to see fair play? One day, when you are still adjusting your harness, you will look up and see him thundering at you downhill.'..."

Wolsey hovers over the book as a presence, mostly the presence of his absence. Himself a butcher's son from Ipswich, not much higher-born than Cromwell, he could have been one of the great Renaissance Popes.

English As She Was Spoke

Even from these brief extracts one can see how Mantel deals with the problem of dialogue. Not for her the mock-Tudorbethan that has plagued the work even of great novelists like Scott (say in *Kenilworth*) or decent novelists like Stevenson (see for example *The Black Arrow*, which is almost unreadable for its "I prithee sir of your courtesy" and its grammercies and so on. Yet Mantel's characters don't talk as if they were in Tony Blair's kitchen cabinet, or on the set of some soap opera. There is nothing antique about the language, but it doesn't degenerate into bland political or committee speak either. It has an underlying pulsating energy, with thoughts in Tudor shape, if not in Tudor dress.

I can't resist including this short piece of dialogue between Cromwell and the Lady Mary, formerly Princess Mary:

"How is it I am put out of the succession, Master Cromwell? How is it lawful?"

'It is lawful if Parliament makes it so.'

'There is a law above Parliament. It is the law of God. Ask Bishop Fisher.'

'I find God's purposes obscure, and, God knows I find Fisher no fit elucidator. By contrast, I find the will of Parliament plain.' ..."

The Old, Old Story

The Henry that emerges in *Wolf Hall* alternates between scary and likeable, but he's not a monster, or at least not yet. The point at which the invisible line is crossed, from man to monster, isn't easy to determine, in the case of Henry and other tyrants of history. The chances are that virtually absolute power will

accentuate existing personality defects, the pride, the paranoia. Human nature being what it is, the benign traits are seldom similarly revealed.

The story is so familiar that we've nearly stopped thinking about it, so full marks to Mantel for bringing home to us what a bizarre story it is; and how incredible it would have been as fiction. All Henry wanted was to be a good Catholic king. Had it not been for the absence of a male heir, he would have been content. Female heirs were an unknown quantity in those days. It was only a generation since Henry Tudor had gained the crown, following Bosworth Field in 1485; any dynastic uncertainty could unseat the Tudors, and (though this was doubtless of secondary concern to Henry VIII) reduce the country to the familiar chaos.

So the Boleyn infatuation wouldn't in the normal course have led to the divorce crisis. And the crisis might have been sorted out but for two problems: first, that he had obtained a Papal dispensation to marry Katherine in the first place, she having been married, albeit for a brief and probably unconsummated period, to his deceased older brother Arthur; and, secondly, that Pope Clement VI was in an impossible position. If he ruled in Henry's favour he was going to enrage the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, who was also King of Spain and Katherine's cousin. The imperial troops had sacked Rome a year or two previously, and it would be reckless to risk that again. As against that, a grateful Henry would possibly be an ally against the Emperor, together with Francis I of France, whereas if the ruling went against Henry the Pope's balance of power position against the Emperor would be weakened; and in all likelihood the revenues of the English Church would be lost to Rome.

So Clement dithered and dithered, and events took their course, which ended with him being reduced to Bishop of Rome and Katherine having some title like the Dowager Princess of Wales. By the time the decision eventually went against Henry it was irrelevant, and Clement was dead not long after. One tends to forget how long the crisis lasted that led to the Act of Supremacy: something like six years, during which time Protestants continued to be tortured and burned, the most illustrious of these being Tyndale's associate, John Frith.

The trick was, not to lag too far behind Henry, as with More and his supremacist doubts, or to get too far ahead of him and be executed as a

heretic. You had to think his thoughts before him, and this was what Cromwell was so successful at. Mantel interprets the Dissolution of the Monasteries as a bit of an accident, or a suggestion taken too much in earnest. Even in Wolsey's time there was a rationalisation of the religious houses going on. Cromwell, with his loathing of what he perceived as the monastic stranglehold on economic and intellectual development, was happy to see this taken further, but a chance remark by him on this theme was taken by Henry as a blueprint to do away with the monasteries altogether. That's very much as may be.

Henry certainly had his reasons: the highly seditious prophecies of Elizabeth Barton had received quite a bit of monastic sponsorship. But also his necessities: his obsession with behaving like some kind of warlike, manly, munificent Renaissance prince came at a cost. Like his predecessors he had wasted vast amounts of money chasing the dream of an English conquest of France (quite apart from his Scottish adventures), so he was basically broke. The final solution applied to the monastic houses would kill three birds with one stone: the financial fortunes of the Crown would be restored; the loyalty of his henchmen would be rewarded or purchased; and Rome's nose would be put permanently out of joint.

Catholic, But Not Roman

If the concept of a *Roman* Catholic was nonsensical at the start of the sixteenth century, or at least tautologous, the idea of someone being a Catholic but not Roman was problematic. Luther would probably have said he was a Catholic Christian who didn't acknowledge the Pope's authority, but in his case the break was based chiefly on dogmatic grounds; and the institutional or formal break was an inevitable corollary. Those who used the word "*catholic*" in the Luther, or, later, Calvin, sense, were appealing to the primitive Church or the post-Apostolic Fathers over against Catholicism as understood in Rome. But Henry was Catholic in every Roman sense, except the detail of the Roman authority. His quarrel was not with the Pope *qua* Pope, but with the Pope in his concrete manifestation insofar as the latter presumed to judge him. The solution was for him to be his own Pope. These were powers that he wanted to repatriate; and Cromwell drafted the legislation to that end, and ensured that it got through Parliament.

The English Church therefore was

the creation of a Parliament which was threatened and outmanoeuvred by a tyrannical king guided by a ministerial genius. This is what makes it difficult for the Church of England to act as the conscience of the nation. In relation to the gay marriage controversy, once this is legislated for, the Bishops will eventually have to accept it. Parliament has the ability to determine what is right for the English to do, not just what is lawful.

The Genius Of Anglicanism

The miracle as far as I can see is how the English Church ever did manage to develop a real philosophical/theological framework of its own, first under Lancelot Andrewes and Richard Hooker, and then under the Caroline divines. True, the eighteenth century Evangelical Revival was a phenomenon that arose within the Church of England, but the Church soon saw to it that its strange children were marginalized or forced to leave.

Christianity, like all other belief systems, including atheism, necessarily involves its followers in all kinds of philosophical problems. For myself, I find the Christian problems more interesting. In practice the most insistent of these problems is the problem of authority. Ever since the Decree of Papal Infallibility in 1870 (I think), the Catholic Church has dealt with this by asserting that the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, speaks with the voice of Christ, and therefore commands obedience. But long before that, the Papacy was the only authority centre in western Christendom.

This authority structure turned out to be unacceptable to Henry simply because of the danger that decisions would be made that would be disadvantageous to him. The Protestant alternative, *sola scriptura*, he didn't perhaps so much reject as fail to understand. Of course it has problems of its own. Scripture needs to be mapped by creeds and confessions, which are "*subordinate standards*" no doubt, but become the authoritative interpreters of Scripture, to be departed from only with very good, i.e. scriptural, reason. The Anglican *via media* eventually took the form of a three-legged stool, whereby tradition, reason and scripture were accorded more or less equal weight.

Henry's legacy therefore was a Christianity that lacked both the dogma of Rome and the scriptural systematising of Protestantism. The English Church's brief Protestant dawn under Edward VI was an aberration. The Church thereafter

withstood the Puritan preachers and exegetes, some of them very able, the Evangelical Revival a century later, and even the Oxford Movement—that started off in 1833 as a protest against Disestablishment proposals for Ireland. Anglicanism contains its own inbuilt antidote to 'enthusiasm'. The most representative Anglicans are those worldly clerics who pad about in the pages of Jane Austen, and are to be found hunting and plotting later on in the novels of Trollope.

Because the Church was infected with a kind of undogmatic liberalism, which was quaintly called Broad Churchmanship, it wasn't much moved, as perhaps the Presbyterians and Non-conformists were, by the philosophical liberalism emanating from Germany, or, later, by the phenomenon that was Karl Barth. Anglicans weren't so much principled liberals as fuzzy round the edges, even fuzzy at the centre.

I'm not sure what gets taught at the Anglican theological colleges these days. Their products with few exceptions share a distaste for exclusive truth-claims and either/or reasoning. It's as if there's not enough oxygen in England any more to sustain a lively theological consciousness. That's why vicars sound more like social workers, and why some of the most able Anglican and indeed Non-conformist men have ended up with academic tenure in various North American seminaries and colleges.

It also explains why Anglican comprehensiveness hasn't been able to comprehend the Church in Africa. Such is the numerical imbalance that there are many more practising Anglicans in one Nigerian diocese than in the whole of England. But the native English Anglicans are so inured to a Church that has lamely followed a few steps behind the post-War moral consensus that they're incapable of working the biblical principles out for themselves. In the Church of England the England dominates the Church, just as it did in Henry's day.

Tomorrow To Fresh Woods

Back to *Wolf Hall*. The novel ends in 1535, shortly after More's execution, with Cromwell as undisputed top dog. I was puzzled by the title as I had assumed that it must have been Cromwell's home, or a place of great significance, but it's neither. It gets mentioned a couple of times as the ancestral place of the Seymour family, another dysfunctional Tudor-era family, later to attain some prominence because Jane became wife

The End Of Western Civilisation—when?

Desmond Fennell in his *The Staggered End Of Western Civilisation* (Church & State, No. 109) revisits a constant theme of his recent writings. He says: "During the last ninety-odd years, European or Western civilisation has been rejected by three revolutions: the Russian and German Revolutions and the Second American Revolution". It is not clear from Desmond whether these revolutions were symptoms or causes of the end of Western Civilisation.

The decline he writes of is indeed a fact. He describes it but what he puts as the cause of this decline is not clear to me. I think there is a reason for this omission. In all Desmond's writings on this theme there is an unmentioned elephant in the room—Britain and its Empire. This represented Western Civilisation in the world more than any other socio-political fact of history. It was after all the biggest Empire the world had ever seen and wanted to become even bigger than the extent it reached. And this Empire's *raison d'être* was to spread Western Civilisation by any and every means that helped do so. Ireland was an experimental ground for this task. What happened to that Empire and why it happened to this major element in history must surely give us at least a clue as to what caused the decline of Western Civilisation. But it is totally absent from Desmond's analysis.

Around the end of the 19th century Britain decided that the greatest obstacle to its further advancement was the new state of Germany and decided that it must be destroyed. This followed from the Darwinian principle of the survival of the fittest. Darwinism arose as the philosophy that justified the purpose of the Empire and the methods by which the Empire was successful and it in turn justified unlimited conflict and destruction across all aspects of life as an end in itself. Because such conflicts were inevitable and inevitably resulted in progress—as the fittest inevitably survived and the unfit were destroyed: that's Progress.

That is what justified and necessitated the war on Germany. All existing alliances and strategies were overturned to serve this purpose. The result was the declaration of war on Germany at the opportune moment in August 1914. That War and the way the subsequent 'peace' was directed by Britain was the greatest revolution in modern history. It destroyed all existing political and moral relationships within the Empire's remit, which was most of the world. The millions killed and injured was just one element is this destruction. Europe was reduced to its elements and this was the end of what existed of European civilisation. It had become *'the wasteland'* reflected on by Eliot.

This was this condition to which Communism and Fascism were a response, each being an effort to counter the destruction that *had* occurred. In a real sense they were counter revolutionary as they were reacting to a real revolution. Far from these revolutions causing the end of the Western civilisation, as Desmond's thesis implies, these revolutions were derivative and responsive *to* its destruction and not the cause of it.

It is often forgotten that Lenin came to power on the promise to deliver "*Peace, bread and land*"—quite a conservative programme. In other words, a situation had arisen where these very banal needs had become impossible to meet without overthrowing the existing political order. Hitler's promises on coming to power were along similar lines.

Britain also persuaded America to enter its war on Germany and its involvement had repercussions that necessitated what Desmond describes as the second American 'revolution' initiated by Roosevelt. However, it would be impossible to imagine America becoming what it is today if it had never become involved in Britain's wars on Germany.

My grandmother grew up as a 'servant girl' before WWI and she had one oft-repeated assessment of world affairs along the lines of: "*The world went mad in 1914 and has never been right since*". It was her way of explaining the end of Western Civilisation as she had known it. Of course, it was not a sufficient explanation but I think her focus was as right as Desmond's is wrong about the issue. ✱

number three. By the end of the novel Cromwell is planning a royal progress through the provinces with a lot of meeting and greeting and, as the politicians say now, re-connecting. It's a case of "*next week we go to Wolf Hall*", or something like that, and so the novel ends, and we'll move on to the sequel.

Mantel was obviously attracted by this name, because the real Wolf Hall was Henry's court, where you needed a lot of wit and a lot of luck just to survive, and nemesis was always just round the corner.

It was interesting to read a short interview with Mantel just at the end pages. I didn't know it was there till I had finished, being a good boy who doesn't read ahead of myself. I'd wondered who she was, where she was coming from, as they say, and it wasn't entirely surprising to find she had been educated at convent school, with St. Thomas More looking down on her from stained glass windows:

"As I am a contrarian, it made me ask whether there was more to Cromwell's story than just his opposition to More, and I carried that question with me... ..There seemed to be a lot of blanks in his story, and it wasn't easy to find out anything about him, but it's in these gaps that the novelist goes to work.

"Cromwell didn't deploy his heavy artillery unless he needed to. He was a persuader, a negotiator and, to an extent, a compromiser.

"Cromwell's image hasn't always been bad: in Elizabethan legend and literature he was a hero, but to the Victorians he presented a problem. He wasn't a Varsity man. Historians couldn't get their heads around the idea of a member of the lower orders rising so high in the hierarchy. There was also a sentimentality about the medieval world, with Cromwell seen as one of its destroyers. That idea persists today."

I have let Ms Mantel have the last word.

Thomas Cromwell,

"one of the most unjustly maligned individuals in English history"

—Joe Keenan, *The English Reformation* in:

A Story Of The Armada by *Captain Francisco De Cuellar, Joe Keenan & others*
80pp.

ISBN 0 85034 037 3. 1988.

€10, £8

<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

John Minahane

A Response to Desmond Fennell's *The Staggered End Of Western Civilisation* in the last issue of *Church & State* (No. 109)

The English In Ireland And The Practice Of Massacre

Desmond Fennell argues that a fundamental change in West European and American attitudes to massacre occurred in 1945.

"Massacre was forbidden by Western morality and law. When massacres had previously been committed by Westerners, they had been retrospectively condemned by the prevalent public judgement, and the ban on such action vigorously reasserted. The official American declaration that the Hiroshima and Nagasaki massacres were legitimate had... important consequences It declared indiscriminate massacre to be an optional element of American warfare."

I acknowledge the grim significance of the atomic bombings and their acceptance by mainstream opinion in the West. However, I cannot agree that previously there had been an unqualified ban on massacre. The history of Ireland tells a different story. Throughout most of the 16th century, English Government forces conducted increasingly frequent massacres of non-combatants (women, children, old people, farm workers etc.) in rebellious areas of Ireland. The practice of massacre became systematic during the two Geraldine rebellions: in 1569, and above all in 1579-83. Between 1600 and 1603 the massacres by English forces in Ulster reached such an intensity that, according to a recent historian of the period (John McGurk in *Age Of Atrocity*, p128), they approached the reality of what is now called "*ethnic cleansing*" and "*genocide*".

These practices were not retrospectively condemned, nor did the prevailing political culture proclaim that they were impermissible. Quite the contrary. The agents of massacre boasted of their doings to colleagues and superiors in official state correspondence, and their boasts may be read today in the published State Papers. Such practices were even recorded, as examples of praiseworthy diligence and thoroughness, in contemporary published books. Furthermore, the agents of massacre were not despised, or fastidiously kept at a distance, by their monarchs. They were promoted and enriched, or given means of enriching themselves. An example is Arthur Chichester, the

primary agent of massacre in Ulster, who subsequently became viceroy of Ireland and held that position for over a decade.

Without even bothering to come down as far as the Cromwellian period, it is clear from the evidence that, in 16th and early 17th century England, in the official military and governing culture, indiscriminate massacre was considered an optional element in warfare against Irish rebels.

Most of the facts on which these statements are based can be found conveniently in two books published in recent years: *Age Of Atrocity* ed. David Edwards, Pádraig Linehan and Clodagh Tait (Dublin 2007), and *Sir Walter Raleigh In Ireland* by James Pope-Hennessy (Dublin 2009; first published in 1883, and at last reprinted). The introduction to *Age Of Atrocity* records how the leading Irish history journal, *Irish Historical Studies*, for the first half-century and more of its existence, systematically avoided the theme of violence, killing and atrocity during the 16th and 17th centuries. In the relevant volume of Oxford's *New History Of Ireland*, which the IHS editors dominated, "*it was the soft-focus view that prevailed, with the main narrative remaining studiously evasive about killing and atrocity*" (p15).

T.W. Moody and R. Dudley Edwards, the guardians of IHS, felt that in Ireland history had to be soft-focus, otherwise it could be dangerous. Or to put it more neutrally, history should be an ideology of stability. Or to put it very kindly,

"Their determination to avoid the trap of writing history that might lend weight to either Catholic nationalism or Protestant unionism meant that scholars avoided the study of key aspects of the country's past, in particular political and colonial violence and religious discord... A special effort was made to decouple early modern history from current affairs by minimising or passing over the political and religious violence of the period" (pp16-17).

Unfortunately, they went a bit too far, and what they were doing was noticed. "*Far from saving Irish history from abuse, therefore, by their persistent evasion of disturbing events historians*

risked being identified among its abusers" (p17).

And so, after all these years, a handful of Irish historians has been rediscovering what historians in the late 19th century could scarcely avoid mentioning. Even Froude mentions English atrocities, though of course he puts the blame on the Irish: they dragged the well-meaning English down to their own level. Lecky, at the beginning of his *History Of Ireland In The Eighteenth Century*, gives a summary review of what the State Papers in particular had revealed, and comments as follows on the English practice of warfare in 16th and 17th century Ireland: "*The war, as conducted by Carew, by Pelham, by Gilbert, by Mountjoy, was literally a war of extermination. The slaughter of Irishmen was looked upon literally as the slaughter of wild beasts*" (Vol. 1 p5).

Massacre from the 1530s

In his own article in *Age Of Atrocity*, "The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland", David Edwards observes that Ireland could not be called peaceful even before the English took it in hand. The Annals of the Four Masters record considerable numbers of military incursions by Irish forces. 95 in all are mentioned for the first half of the 16th century. But many of these raids were sudden raids for plunder and most of them did not involve battles. Combat mortality was low (*Age of Atrocity*, p43).

Some of the raids involved the burning of crops, and in extreme cases this could lead to famine. But there is no reason to think that, as a general rule, non-combatants were deliberately targeted. "*As a rule, native armies did not look to slaughter the common people*" (p46). Violent death and brutal treatment of one's peers was certainly common among the Gaelic elite, but this did not tend to spill over into large-scale violence (p48).

But then the Tudor viceroys began to raise the stakes. In the 1530s the English forces began a practice of massacring Irish rebel combatants who had surrendered, often on the promise of mercy. The third of these massacres was conducted by the Viceroy, Lord Lionel Grey, in Carrickogunnell Castle, Co. Limerick, in 1536.

"The killings went beyond usual practice in Ireland; as Grey noted in his own account, there were women and children among those he had killed. It is the very fact that he included this information in his report to London, deeming it a piece of service fit to be

recorded, that pinpoints his significance in the military history of sixteenth-century Ireland. Traditionally, Irish warlords only rejoiced in the killing of soldiers, and passed over the killing of non-combatants in silence. Grey (and other English officers of the time) saw all killing as virtuous, an achievement worthy of commemoration" (p59).

This was only the first of a series of massacres which Grey's forces committed. In time, Edwards says, some of the rebels began to imitate the Government style: "*Some of the rebel actions betrayed their desperation, others their growing resolve to match the crown raid for raid*" (p70). Edwards does not have much clear evidence for this: the clearest case seems to be the Anglo-Irish warlord Edmund Butler, who appears to have committed two spectacular massacres in 1568 and 1569.

"But while the Irish resorted to atrocities to an extent not previously recorded, their inclination in this regard was not matched by their capability. Accordingly, as in the 1530s, the scales of atrocity appear to have weighed heaviest on the government's side" (ibid).

An increasingly prominent aspect of Government practice was the killing of civilians.

"One of the grimmer aspects of government activity during this period was the formal extension of military severity over large sections of the ordinary populace... Threatening the peasantry was a guaranteed way to sever the ties binding the broad mass of ordinary people to their traditional local rulers... In the course of the crown campaigns the killing of the low-born became widespread. It was even considered unremarkable. Returning from one of his outings Lord Deputy Sidney joked in a letter to Whitehall that he had killed so many Irish "varlets", he had lost count" (p74).

The Government forces also began burning: not occasionally and briefly, as had been the Irish style, but systematically and thoroughly.

"Far from being reluctant to employ scorched earth tactics because of the high civilian mortality that it wrought (as has been claimed elsewhere), the government forces resorted to land and crop-burning repeatedly during the mid-Tudor and early Elizabethan years, and did so precisely because it promised to wreak the most havoc, and kill the most people... (Sussex tried not to burn too much near the Pale, but...) Once in Ulster's Gaelic heartland Sussex's army moved freely about, burning at will. Presumably because he could not linger in the province for as long as he would have liked, the earl prioritised the fastest

route to a lasting impact: famine. Hence his ordering the slaughter of 4,000 captured cows in Tyrone... As early as 1558 large parts of the country were destroyed by war, whole areas depopulated. According to Archbishop Dowdall, it was possible to ride 30 miles across much of central and southern Ulster without seeing any sign of life. Famine stalked the province" (pp74-75,76).

Still only the 1550s, and already we have the first planned, Government-organised famine in Ireland! And that's before we even get to the remarkable Humphrey Gilbert. This individual is mentioned in *Age Of Atrocity*, but he's scarcely given his due. Gilbert was the half-brother of Walter Raleigh, and like Raleigh he became an American colonial entrepreneur. In 1569 he was made Military Governor of Munster, authorised to put down the rebellion led by James FitzMaurice.

One of his old subordinates later tried to ensure that Gilbert's meritorious service in Ireland was not forgotten. A *Generall Rehearsall Of Warres* by Thomas Churchyard, an experienced mercenary soldier and also an experienced writer, was published in London in 1579. Churchyard explains that Gilbert first of all used to send messages to the rebels guaranteeing them their lives, their lands, and pardon, if they would submit. But, if they spurned this offer, he literally took no prisoners:

"Whensoever he made any... inroads into the enemies country, he killed man, woman and child and spoiled, wasted and burned, by the ground all that he might leaving nothing of the enemies in safety, which he could possibly waste or consume..."

Each night Gilbert created a kind of artwork, guaranteed to impress its viewers, which he would recreate from entirely new materials the following night.

"His manner was the heads of all those (of what sort soever they were), which were killed in the day, should be cut off from their bodies, and brought to the place where he encamped at night, and should there be laid on the ground, by each side of the way leading to his own tent, so that none would come with his tent for any cause, but commonly he must pass through a lane of heads, which he used *ad terrorem*, the dead feeling nothing the more pains thereby, and yet did it bring great terror to the people, when they saw the heads of their dead fathers, brothers, children, kinsfolk, and friends, lie on the ground before their faces, as they come to speak with the said colonel."

Gilbert specifically justified the killing of women:

"The men of war could not be maintained without their churls and calli-

acks, old women and those women who milked their Creaghts (cows) and provided their victuals and other necessaries. So that the killing of them by the sword was the way to kill the men of war by famine" (Cited by D.B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans And Rhe Irish*, p127; see also his introduction to *Voyages And Colonising Enterprises Of Sir Humphrey Gilbert*, London 1940. I have not been able to check Churchyard's own book.)

Massacre during Desmond Rebellion

Age Of Atrocity notably fails to deal with the Government atrocities during the Desmond Rising of 1579-83. Or rather, it includes a chapter on just one of them, the massacre at Smerwick (though another contributor, Hiram Morgan, maintains that Smerwick was just normal contemporary military practice).

There are aspects of Smerwick that will always be unclear: it's the word of Lord Deputy Arthur Grey and his secretary Edmund Spenser against the word of others. The Four Masters (1580) say that the garrison at Smerwick were promised their lives, and in violation of this they were afterwards killed. Nothing is more likely: it belonged to the well-established practice of duplicity by English commanders in dealing with the Irish (see e.g. Edwards, *Age Of Atrocity* p72, on the killing of O'Tooles and Kavanaghs in 1556; Four Masters (1577) on the massacre at Mullaghmast, etc.). However, there were highly-placed people in England who thought it was going too far to behave like this with Spaniards. Cecil, the Secretary of State, was believed to hold this opinion. (*Sir Walter Raleigh In Ireland*, p10). The fact that Spenser has to go to such pains to defend Grey is revealing (A *View Of The State Of Ireland* ed. A. Hadfield and W. Maley, Oxford 1997, pp104-5).

Otherwise, the Smerwick massacre is notable for the fact that once again women were among those killed. This was reported matter-of-factly in Holinshead's *Chronicles*, again without any sense that the fact might be discreditable to Walter Raleigh, who was in charge of the killing (*Sir Walter Raleigh In Ireland*, p9).

Apart from Smerwick, there is a litany of Government atrocities from the early 1580s, most of them cheerfully reported by the authors themselves. Sir Nicholas Malby, writing to Walsingham in April 1580: "*This day the forces I have entertained took the strong castle of Dwnemene from Shane MacHerbert and put the ward, both men, women and children, to the sword*".

Captain Zouche to the Secretary of

State on the capture of a castle in Limerick: "*The house being entered they yielded, and some sought to swim away, but there escaped not one, neither of man, woman or child.*"

Richard Bingham describing a battle in Connacht: "*The number of their fighting men slain and drowned that day are estimated and numbered to be fourteen or fifteen hundred, besides boys, women, churls and children, which could not be so few, as so many more and upwards*" (Sir Walter Raleigh *In Ireland*, p28).

And we can add a few examples of the same practice and policy recorded by the Four Masters. In the first case (1580) Lord Justice Pelham went to Limerick and southwards towards Kerry.

"He sent forth loose marauding parties... These, wheresover they passed, showed mercy neither to the strong nor to the weak. It was not wonderful that they should kill men fit for action, but they killed blind and feeble men, women, boys and girls, sick persons, idiots, and old people."

"(1581). The captain of Adare slew one hundred and fifty women and children, and of every sort of person that he met with inside and outside of that castle." (The castle was in Ballycalhane, Co. Limerick; the captain was a man called Achin. See Maurice Lenihan, *Limerick: Its History And Antiquities*, repr. 1991, p109.)

"(1582) Captain Zouche, when he could not catch the Mac Maurices he was pursuing, "hanged the hostages of the country, mere children, who were in the custody of his people"..."

Finally, of course, there's the great Munster famine of the early 1580s, mentioned and justified by Spenser; mentioned also by the Four Masters who, for complicated reasons (they were using annals compiled by the historians of the O' Briens of Thomond, who were rock-solid Government supporters), put the blame on the Earl of Desmond. But the major contribution was made by the forces of Government, as Spenser acknowledges —and he recommends the creation of famine as a general formula when dealing with rebels. (*A View* p102).

The scale of what was happening in Ireland was appreciated in England. According to Froude, in June 1582 Cecil wrote to the War Treasurer of Ireland that "*the Flemings had not such cause to rebel against the oppression of the Spaniards as the Irish against the tyranny of England*" (Sir Walter Raleigh *In Ireland* p26). But Cecil, so far as I know, never punished any of the tyranny's authors. On the contrary, as one of the masterminds of the Plantation of Munster, he was quick to exploit the success of their tyrannical methods.

Following the pacification of Munster the Four Masters no longer regularly report Government atrocities, though in 1586 in West Connacht the inimitable Bingham and his supporters "*killed women, boys, peasants and decrepit persons. They hanged Theobald O'Toole, the supporter of the destitute and the keeper of a house of hospitality*". (This, incidentally, is an example of how the English destroyed long-established and effective native Irish institutions, without themselves being apply to supply institutions which were effective in social maintenance.)

Massacre at end of Nine Years' War

Massacre and atrocity reached a crescendo near the end of the Nine Years' War against Hugh O'Neill (1594-1603). John McGurk (*The Pacification Of Ulster, 1600-3*) deals with this period in *Age Of Atrocity*.

"A quick end to a war of attrition after Kinsale seems to have been the first concern of the majority of the military commanders... Scorched earth tactics of causing famine by burning barns of corn, destroying cattle and sheep, and ripping up growing crops, proved the most effective means of bringing war to an end. In a frequently cited despatch from Sir Arthur Chichester when he raided across Lough Neagh into east Co. Tyrone in 1601 he claimed:

"We have burned and destroyed along the Lough even within four miles of Dungannon, where we killed man, woman, child, horse, beast and whatever we found. The last service from which we returned yesterday was upon Patrick O'Quin, one of the chief men of Tyrone, dwelling within four miles of Dungannon, fearing nothing, but we lighted upon him and killed him, his wife, sons and daughters, servants and followers being many, and burned all to the ground."

"... Dowcra carried out a similar massacre on Inch Island in Lough Swilly, reporting 150 killed when he attacked the fertile lands of Mac Sweeney Fanad... Sir John Bolles, Dowcra's second-in-command in Derry, attacked Cumber in O'Cahan's country and reported killing nearly 100 people" (pp121-3).

Bolles was a notable killer of priests, accounting for over twenty of them in a single incident.

As for Mountjoy, he was something of a theorist of famine, as well as being its prime creator.

"Mountjoy led the way in scorched earth tactics, as he seemed to have few qualms of conscience about the killing

of civilian non-combatants claiming that "even the very best of the Irish people were in their nature little better than devils". He noted that if fish live in water as rebels do among the people of the countryside, then you dry up the water, repeating Julius Caesar's commentaries on the Gallic wars and anticipating Chairman Mao in the twentieth century. Mountjoy wrote as follows to his fellow Devonian, Sir George Carew, who was using the same tactics against the remnants of resistance among the O'Sullivan and Driscolls after Kinsale: "Here in Ulster we do continually hunt all their woods, spoil their corn, burn their houses, and kill as many churls as it grieveth me to think it is necessary to do so". His secretary and companion in the field, Fynes Moryson, wrote of these last days of the war in Ulster: "No spectacle was more frequent than to see multitudes of these poor people dead with their mouths all coloured green by eating nettles, shamrocks and docks and all things they could rend above ground"..." (p123).

Meanwhile, Carew was seeing to it that Munster too would have its share of atrocity. Pope-Hennessy quotes a report of his in 1602 on how "*there were killed and hanged divers poor men, women and children appertaining to Cormac (MacCarthy)*" (Sir Walter Raleigh *In Ireland* p56). After the siege of Dunboy in 1602 he had a makeshift gallows constructed and in relays "*four score Spaniards and rebels were hanged thereon, 2, 3 or 4 upon it, until all were hanged, as well women and boys as men of service...*" (*Age Of Atrocity* p124).

In summary:

"The slaughter of clergy, women, children, and other defenceless non-combatants who did not carry arms, was perpetrated on a scale hardly paralleled elsewhere in Europe at that time... Mountjoy and his commanders launched an exceptionally harsh campaign to create famine and decimate the civilian population... In Ulster, Sir Henry Dowcra, Sir Arthur Chichester and Mountjoy himself acknowledged the exceptional character of the Nine Years War in their many references to the deliberate slaughter of non-combatants... It may very well be concluded that the post-Kinsale period in Ulster, in the putting down of the fifteen-month resistance campaign, was carried out with unprecedented violence against non-combatants, clergy, women and children, who traditionally were immune in warfare" (p126, pp128-9).

In the face of all these facts, one is surely entitled to conclude that no general prohibition of massacre, and no general principle of the immunity of non-

combatants, was operative in English culture in the late 16th century. If such principles had been operative, this history could hardly have happened.

The principle of the immunity of non-combatants went back a long way not only in the culture of Europe but also in the culture of Gaelic Ireland.

"The medieval church had promulgated the *Lex Innocentium* or Law of the Innocents ever since the seventh century; this was particularly focused on women, who were not to be killed, assaulted or abused, and urged all rulers to protect them from such dangers. The law that women should have no part in warfare, attributed to the work of Adamán at the Synod of Tara 697, was absorbed into Gaelic legal traditions through the Brehon laws" (p126).

The synod in question was actually held at Birr. On the initiative of the Columban monasteries, the most important Kings from all parts of Ireland, or their representatives, were brought together in the midlands to agree to humane restrictions on the practices of war and a procedure to penalise infringements. It was an amazing feat of organisation in the politically-fragmented Ireland of that time.

For men like Chichester and Mountjoy, there could be no question of a *Lex Innocentium*, or not one that applied to Ireland. They did on occasion feel the need to give some sort of reason for all the killing they were doing—though if anyone was pressing them on this, they don't seem to have pressed too hard. "*Many times in excusing the harshness of his men from the Derry/Foyle garrisons, Sir Henry Dowcra stressed to the Privy Council that if the government of England would not feed them he could not be responsible for their killing of civilians when they went foraging and plundering. Here was another variant of the argument that necessity knows no law*" (p127). Mountjoy also, in his letter to Carew quoted earlier, expressed his regret that it was *necessary* to kill so many farming folk.

The Laws of War

McGurk observes that the English officers

"had codes of military discipline (these were not "rules of war", a medieval concept which had faded into oblivion by the late sixteenth century) for the conduct of their men both in field and garrison... {But} medieval chivalric codes of conducting hostilities had virtually disappeared and did not constrain those bringing the higher benefits of Renaissance civility to a putatively barbarous and barely Christian people on a permissive frontier" (p129).

This conclusion is a bit too neat. Granted, it wasn't easy to think out rules of war that would be realistic and likely to be respected generally, but people were still trying. European cultures didn't simply accept that in war anything goes, and therefore that it was impossible any longer to distinguish between what was legitimate, though possibly very cruel, and what was illegitimate and atrocious. (These distinctions continued to exist even in England, or the treatment of Lord Deputy Grey as reported by Spenser would make no sense. Grey would have been thought entitled to slaughter the garrison at Smerwick if he had not promised them their lives. But when he had made this promise, he was despised for not keeping it.)

Without doubt, non-combatants suffered greatly in the wars of 16th century Europe.

"Larger, ill-disciplined armies, extended campaigning seasons, prolonged sieges: the brush-strokes of war in the sixteenth century were broader than formerly, and probably leached out more widely into the fabric of civilian society. Compared with the spasmodic nature of the Hundred Years War, the wars of Italy and the Netherlands were almost unremitting molestations of normal life" (J.R. Hale, *War And Society In Renaissance Europe*, London 1985, p179).

Hale gives plentiful examples of what this meant: food requisitions and seizures, food shortages, sometimes famines, disease spread by armies, forced population movements, the miseries of billeting, rape, destruction, plunder, random killing.

There was plenty of burning, but not the systematic kind: "*Of the most shocking aspect of war's direct impact on civilians, a deliberate scorched-earth policy, there are few early modern examples*" (p184). Of the four examples he gives where this policy was in evidence, two were once-off measures taken by the Castilians and French. The systematic examples he gives involve the English: against the Scots in the first half of the 16th century, and against the Irish later on. "*English armies employed artificial famine again as a weapon against the Irish from 1593, and were answered in kind*". As mentioned above, in fact this weapon had been employed in Ireland since the 1550s; Hale also manages to suggest that the English suffered as much as they inflicted, which is not true.

But this is not to say that Europeans considered scorched-earth campaigns an atrocity. The outstanding Spanish jurist of the 16th century, Francisco de Vitoria,

held the opposite view. "*If the war can be satisfactorily waged without plundering farmers or other non-combatants, it is not lawful to plunder them.*" Otherwise:

"We may take the money of the innocent, or burn or ravage their crops or kill their livestock: all these things are necessary to weaken the enemies' resources. There can be no argument about this... If the state of war is permanent, it is lawful to plunder the enemy indiscriminately, both innocent and guilty" (*On the Law of War*. In *Vitoria: Political Writings*, ed. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrence, Cambridge 1991, p317).

Vitoria also faces the question

"whether it is lawful to allow our soldiers to sack a city?... This is not of itself unlawful if it is necessary to the conduct of the war, whether to strike terror into the enemy or to inflame the passions of the soldiers... It is likewise permissible to set fire to a city when there are reasonable grounds for doing so. But this sort of argument licenses the barbarians among the soldiery to commit every kind of inhuman savagery and cruelty, murdering and torturing the innocent, deflowering young girls, raping women, and pillaging churches. In these circumstances, it is undoubtedly unjust to destroy a Christian city except in the most pressing necessity and with the gravest of causes; but if necessity decrees, it is not unlawful, even if the probability is that the soldiery will commit crimes of this kind. The officers, however, have a duty to give orders against it" (p323).

On a similar statement by another Spanish jurist, Luis de Molina, Hale comments: "*Intellectually, this was sorry, hedging stuff. But it recognised what happens and tried to attach a fetter of conscience to it*" (Hale p195).

Vitoria seems to be coming back into fashion. He has been called the father of international law, the founder of modern cosmopolitanism, and the original philosopher of rights. He has also been called an excellent example of the reasons why for centuries people have hated lawyers. One could certainly have this reaction to his discussion of the key question (fiercely controversial in Spain) of what right the Spanish had to their American territories, and whether they had a right to make war on the natives, overthrow their Governments and treat them as slaves. Here he begins in grand style by demolishing the main arguments used to justify Spain's empire. He then, by a twist of logic, smuggles most of the same arguments back as legitimate grounds for war and conquest.

In one such instance he established our well-known right of humanitarian

intervention. First of all, he denied that if the natives were involved in cannibalism, human sacrifices, or other unnatural practices, the Spanish had the right to make war on them in order to punish them. There could be no such right, because the King of Spain had no claim to sovereignty in those territories (Vitoria pp274-5). But, although the Spanish did not have a right to wage war in order to punish the perpetrators, they did, however, have the right to wage war in order to rescue the victims! "*And if there is no other means of putting an end to these sacrilegious rites, their masters may be changed and new princes set up*" (p288). Richard Tuck says that "*Vitoria's argument swiftly became the most popular official defence of the conquest*" (*The Rights Of War And Peace*, Oxford 1999 p75), which one can well believe.

Treatment of Non-Combatants

In cities it might be impossible to distinguish male combatants from male non-combatants, and Vitoria drew the conclusion: "*In reality all the adult men in an enemy city are to be thought of as enemies, since the innocent cannot be distinguished from the guilty, and therefore they may all be killed*" (Vitoria p317). There are detailed discussions of whether one may execute all the enemy combatants, and whether one may execute those who have surrendered or been taken prisoner.

"In itself, there is no reason why prisoners taken in a just war or those who have surrendered, if they were combatants, should not be killed, as long as common equity is observed. But as many practices in war are based on the law of nations, it appears to be established that prisoners taken after a victory, when the danger is passed, should not be killed unless they turn out to be deserters and fugitives. This law of nations should be respected, as it is by all good men. As for those who surrender, however, I have neither read nor heard of such a custom of leniency..."

"Indeed, when the citadels of cities are surrendered, those who yield themselves up take care to include their own lives and safety in the terms of submission. Clearly this implies that they are afraid that if they surrender without making such terms, they will be killed; and one hears that this has frequently been the case. Therefore it is not unjust, if a city is surrendered without such precautionary terms, for the prince or judge to order the most guilty of the enemy to be executed" (pp321-2).

Vitoria would therefore have agreed that the killing of the garrison at Smerwick could have been legitimate, but if and only if they had not been promised their lives.

What interests me here, however, is the fact that this realistic, well-informed, unsentimental and not over-scrupulous jurist balked at the deliberate killing of women and children.

"Even in wars against the Turks we may not kill children, who are obviously innocent, nor women, who are to be presumed innocent at least as far as the war is concerned (unless, that is, it can be proved of a particular woman that she was implicated in guilt)... It is occasionally lawful to kill the innocent not by mistake, but with full knowledge of what one is doing, if this is an accidental effect: for example, during the justified storming of a fortress or city, where one knows there are many innocent people, but where it is impossible to fire artillery and other projectiles or set fire to buildings without crushing or burning the innocent along with the combatants... Nevertheless,... care must be taken to ensure that the evil effects of the war do not outweigh the possible benefits sought by waging it. If the storming of a fortress or town garrisoned by the enemy but full of innocent inhabitants is not of great importance for eventual victory in the war, it does not seem to me permissible to kill a large number of innocent people by indiscriminate bombardment..."

"One may ask whether it is lawful to kill people who are innocent, but may yet pose a threat in the future. For example, the sons of Saracens are harmless, but it is reasonable to fear that when they reach manhood they will fight against Christendom... It is perhaps possible to make a defense of this kind for killing innocent people in such cases, but I nevertheless believe that it is utterly wrong..." (pp315-6).

Vitoria considered the related question,

"given that one may not lawfully kill children and innocent non-combatants, whether one may nevertheless enslave them.

"One may lawfully enslave the innocent under just the same conditions as one may plunder them. Freedom and slavery are counted as goods of fortune; therefore, when the war is such that it is lawful to plunder all the enemy population indiscriminately and seize all their goods, it must also be lawful to enslave them all, guilty and innocent alike. Hence, since our war against the pagans is of this kind, being permanent because they can never sufficiently pay for the injuries and losses inflicted, it is not to be doubted that we may lawfully enslave the women and children of the Saracens. But since it seems to be accepted in the law of nations that Christians cannot enslave one another, it is not lawful to enslave Christians, at any rate during the course of the war. If necessary, when the war is over one may take prisoners, even innocent

women and children, but not to enslave them, only to hold them to ransom; and this must not be allowed to go beyond the limits which the necessities of warfare demand, and the legitimate customs of war permit" (p319).

Vitoria can hardly be accused of squeamishness. However, he was making distinctions and setting limits. I think it was reasonable to expect that those limits would be acknowledged as realistic and reasonable and respected in practice by Spanish commanders. And, broadly speaking, I think that these limits actually were respected, even by the Duke of Alva, who gained a reputation as a monster for his campaign against the rebellious Dutch.

Froude himself, despite his *animus* against the Irish, when considering men like Gilbert and Chichester, thought it proper to make this point:

"The English nation was shuddering over the atrocities of the Duke of Alva. The children in the nurseries were being inflamed to patriotic rage and madness by tales of Spanish tyranny. Yet Alva's bloody sword never touched the young, the defenceless, or those whose sex even dogs can recognise and respect" (Cited, *Sir Walter Raleigh In Ireland*, pp28-29).

It might be argued that Froude is over-generous. Troops who were under Alva's overall command sacked a number of Dutch cities with great brutality. There are Dutch propagandist accounts which say that in one of these cases, Naarden, there was considerable slaughter of women and children, though this is disputed. But, whatever happened in Naarden and elsewhere, I think it is certain that the Spanish commanders did not order the killing of non-combatants and did not boast about it, or the fact would be paraded in books by the dozen. As it is, what is constantly quoted is the instruction Alva gave his son not to leave a man alive in Zutphen, and his subsequent boast to King Philip II that "*not a man escaped*". So it seems that Froude had grounds for his contrast.

In the Irish case, what is striking is the cheerful openness, the good-humoured matter-of-factness with which the commanders report their practice of local or regional genocide. I don't believe one can find an equivalent in Europe, and I think it indicates something specific in the contemporary English culture. These aristocratic killers had an element in their make-up of what we would now call sadism. In particular cases it is more evident: when D.B. Quinn calls Humphrey Gilbert a bloodthirsty sadist, one can hardly disagree. But one must acknowledge that even Gilbert, Chichester etc. stopped killing when the rebel-

lions ended. They were able to switch themselves on and off. Furthermore, they were all competent soldiers, and some of them were able statesmen.

One could say, to borrow a phrase from Richard Tuck, that they took an "*uninhibited and non-legalist approach*" to war. They were some of the most gifted and resourceful practical men in an England where the vision of empire and potential for empire was maturing. One of the most clairvoyant was Walter Raleigh.

"Successful action against Spain in Europe gave rise to the hope of supplanting it in the world as a whole, a hope articulated particularly well, for example, by Walter Raleigh, in his *History Of The World* (1614), with its

suggestive account of the rise of great empires and their overthrow by small but valiant nations which went on to achieve new world hegemonies. But the English took a very different path from the French when it came to justifying the occupation of the lands of native peoples. It is, I think, safe to say that seventeenth century English writers took the most uninhibited and non-legalist approach to these matters of all contemporary theorists; and it may well be that the disconcerting but historic consequence of this was that in the end the English were the most successful of all these rival nations at constructing a world empire" (Tuck p109).

I hope to say more about these matters in a future article.

Israeli lobby group, issued a statement extravagantly praising the work of the Obama administration and the Congress:

"With Israel and America facing unprecedented threats and challenges in the Middle East, we deeply appreciate the close and unshakeable partnership between the United States and Israel. President Obama and the bipartisan, bicameral congressional leadership, have deepened America's support for Israel in difficult times.

"Under the leadership of Democrats and Republicans, working together, US-Israel security cooperation has reached unprecedented levels. ...

"As Rosh Hashanah nears, AIPAC—its leadership and staff—extends to Israel's strongest supporters heartfelt appreciation for the work of this administration and Congress to strengthen the US-Israel relationship.

"We stand ready to work together in the year ahead to enable both countries to meet the serious challenges we face, especially preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear capabilities." (Jerusalem Post, 19 September 2012 [1])

To put it mildly, these sentiments are somewhat at odds with the view expressed repeatedly by Romney that the Obama administration has "*thrown Israel under a bus*".

The statement also ignores the fact that Republicans in Congress have been very critical of Obama's conduct with regard to Israel and Iran, throughout his presidency. This is understandable in a statement which is clearly meant to emphasise the overriding principle that Israel should always seek bipartisan support in Washington.

The statement was issued shortly after a video came into the public domain in which Romney dismissed as scoundgers the 47% of the US population who pay no federal taxes. Perhaps, after that revelation, AIPAC concluded that Romney wasn't going to win and the time had come to be very nice to Obama lest he exact revenge after his re-election.

Sabre rattling

Was Netanyahu ever serious about mounting a unilateral attack on Iran's nuclear facilities?

I doubt it, given the near unanimous opposition from senior Israeli military and Intelligence personnel, present and past. The last head of Mossad, Meir Dagan, described such an attack as "*the stupidest thing I have ever heard*" in May 2011, a few months after he retired (see Haaretz, 7 May 2011, [2]). Few senior politicians have spoken out publicly in favour of it, the one notable exception being Defence Minister, Ehud Barak.

Shaul Mofaz, the successor to Tzipi

David Morrison

Netanyahu's Dangerous Game

Israeli Prime Minister, Binyamin Netanyahu, is playing a dangerous game by interfering in the US presidential election campaign on the side of Mitt Romney.

Israel has always sought, and received, support from across the political spectrum in US politics. To that end, the Israeli lobby in the US has heaped dollars on both Democrat and Republican candidates for office, and has been rewarded by near unanimous bipartisan support in the US Congress.

This in turn has ensured that Israel has enjoyed unparalleled political support from the US in world affairs for the past half century. It has also ensured that Israel receives more US aid than any other state in the world (over \$3 billion a year), even though its GDP per capita is on a par with that of the EU, and that it gets access to modern US military hardware almost as soon as the US military. Unlike almost every other Government programme, US aid to Israel has been exempt from cuts by the Obama administration.

All this has been achieved despite the fact that its close alliance with Israel doesn't obviously serve US interests, especially while Israel continues its occupation and colonisation of Palestinian territories. The existence of the alliance disrupts US relations with the Muslim world with its 1.5 billion people and vast resources. If Israel didn't exist, the US relations with the Muslim world would improve dramatically.

Bipartisan support in the US Congress has brought about a state of affairs

that is extraordinarily beneficial to Israel. It is not wise of an Israeli Prime Minister to endanger that support by interfering in a US presidential election campaign on the Republican side.

Red lines

Netanyahu has been threatening to take unilateral military action against Iran's nuclear sites unless Obama hardens up US policy on Iran's nuclear activities, by publicly setting "*red lines*" and committing to taking military action if Iran is deemed to have crossed those "*red lines*".

This demand chimes perfectly with Romney's narrative that Obama has been "*weak*" on foreign policy and especially "*weak*" on Iran. Famously, he and his Republican supporters have regularly accused Obama of "*throwing Israel under a bus*".

While it is difficult to believe that Netanyahu's intervention will make much difference to the final result, it has definitely been useful to Romney in backing up Romney's general message that the Obama presidency has been a failure in both domestic and foreign policy. The Romney campaign has been using video of Netanyahu making these demands in TV ads.

AIPAC worries?

There are signs that the Israeli lobby in the US is worried that Netanyahu's interference on the Republican side may undermine its good work in maintaining bipartisan support for Israel. On 18th September, American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the leading

Livni as the leader of Kadima, has spoken out against, as has the Israeli President, Shimon Peres. Mofaz has also criticised Netanyahu for meddling in the US presidential election, which he described as "irresponsible behavior and an error that harms the fabric of relations with [Israel's] biggest ally" [3].

Polls have consistently shown a substantial majority opposed—a poll in early August found 61% of Israeli Jews against and only 25% in favour [4].

It is generally agreed that Israel hasn't got the ability to destroy Iran's nuclear programme, merely to delay it for a year or two.

Some Israeli casualties are inevitable as a result of Iranian missile retaliation—Ehud Barak has predicted that there would be 500 Israeli civilian casualties (which is surprisingly high given that Israel has a modern missile defence system, jointly funded and developed with the US).

Against this background, for Netanyahu to authorise an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would be a big gamble. And he would certainly be held responsible for the outcomes and that might be fatal for him politically.

My guess is that he was never serious about attacking Iran, that his sabre rattling was designed solely to put pressure on Obama to firm up the US position on Iran's nuclear programme and make effective military action by the US more likely under the next President.

Dempsey replies

The US response to Netanyahu's threat to attack Iran's nuclear facilities was remarkable, not least because it involved something approaching public criticism of Israel.

This was delivered by the head of the US military, General Martin Dempsey, when he attended the opening ceremony of the Paralympic Games in London as head of the US delegation. He said that, (a) while Israel might be capable of delaying Iran's nuclear programme (by a year or two, he said elsewhere), it was incapable of destroying it, and (b) he didn't want advance notice of an Israeli attack on Iran's nuclear facilities, because he didn't want to be "complicit" (*The Guardian*, 30 August 2012 [5]).

Needless to say, Israel was not best pleased with Dempsey's message. The use of the word "complicit" was particularly upsetting, since it carries with it the implication that an Israeli attack on Iran would be a "crime". It also implies that, if Israel attacks Iran, it's on its own; that the US won't come to its aid, even

if Iranian retaliation results in substantial Israeli civilian casualties.

However, if Iran were to retaliate against US assets in the Middle East, for example, against its military bases in Bahrain and Kuwait or its warships in the Persian Gulf, then Israel would not be on its own. In that event, the US would have an excuse to mount a prolonged "shock and awe" air campaign against Iran of the kind that it visited upon Iraq in 1991 and 2003, to destroy not just its nuclear facilities but, as far as possible, its military capacity.

While the only sure way of preventing Iran developing nuclear weapons, if it had a mind to do so, is for the US to invade Iran and occupy it indefinitely, a sustained bombing campaign of this kind by the US would set back its nuclear programme for many years. Israel is incapable of mounting such a sustained campaign, which is why Dempsey and others have said at best Israel might be capable of delaying Iran's nuclear programme by a year or two.

Obama's "act of war" against Iran

No matter who is elected President in November, a US military attack of this kind is a live possibility during the next administration. There is no good reason to believe that Obama is less likely than Romney to mount such an attack.

It is true that Obama does not publicly draw the line at Iran having the "capability" to develop nuclear weapons, as Romney echoing Netanyahu has done. But Obama has made no effort to come to terms with Iran during his presidency even on the narrow issue of its nuclear programme.

Instead, just after he came to power, as the *New York Times* reported on 1st June 2012 [6], he authorised cyber attacks on Iran in conjunction with Israel. This involved the introduction of what became known as the Stuxnet worm into the centrifuges at the enrichment facilities at Natanz, which succeeded in putting about thousand of them out of action temporarily.

(Under the Obama administration, the US has formulated a new strategy declaring that a computer attack from a foreign nation can be considered an act of war that may result in a military response [7]. By that definition, Obama committed an act of war against Iran in 2009 and Iran is entitled to respond militarily against the US.)

Obama rejects swap deal

In May 2010, Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey and President Lula of Brazil brokered a deal whereby Iran

agreed to exchange 1,200kg of its low enriched uranium (LEU) for fuel needed for the Tehran Research Reactor, which was supplied by the US in the 60s and is used to produce medical isotopes. Obama had encouraged Brazil and Turkey to broker the deal, writing a letter to President Lula, the text of which is in the public domain [8]. But, when the deal was done, he rejected it, on the grounds that it did not require Iran to halt its enrichment programme, when in his letter of encouragement to Lula he said he was prepared to allow enrichment to continue.

The deal involved Iran swapping around half of the LEU that it had enriched up to then, LEU that would no longer be available for further enrichment to weapons grade, if Iran was of a mind to do so. As Obama wrote in his letter:

"For us, Iran's agreement to transfer 1,200 kg of Iran's low enriched uranium (LEU) out of the country would build confidence and reduce regional tensions by substantially reducing Iran's LEU stockpile."

But he rejected the deal, and proceeded to promote a Security Council resolution imposing further, rather mild, economic sanctions on Iran. (For details of this, see my article *On "dealing with Iran"* in *Irish Foreign Affairs* 5/3, September 2012.)

Then, in December 2011, the US Congress passed legislation at the behest of the Israeli lobby that requires the US administration to bully other states around the world to stop buying Iranian oil on pain of being cut off from the US financial system. This was accepted by Obama, who dared not offend the Israeli lobby. These sanctions are not approved by the UN, but they are likely to make life miserable for a lot of Iranians thanks to Obama.

Settled in 2005

The nuclear issue could have been settled in 2005, before it was referred to the Security Council, if the US had been prepared to accord Iran its rights under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to uranium enrichment.

At that time, in negotiations with the UK, France and Germany, Iran offered a wide range of measures to give confidence internationally that its nuclear activities were for civil purposes. Writing in the *Daily Telegraph* on 23 January 2012, Peter Jenkins, the UK Ambassador to the IAEA from 2001 and 2006, said of this offer:

"With hindsight, that offer should have been snapped up. It wasn't, because our objective was to put a stop

to all enrichment in Iran." [9]

That was the US position under the Bush administration, but there is no reason to believe that it has been changed by Obama—and without a change there will be no settlement because Iran is not going to surrender its right under the NPT to uranium enrichment. A settlement is there for the taking if Obama was to recognise that right and act upon it. But he hasn't done so.

A much bigger game

Obama knows that Iran hasn't got a nuclear weapons programme. He knows that in report after report the IAEA has found no diversion of nuclear material from Iran's nuclear facilities for weapons (or any other) purposes—because Iran's nuclear facilities, unlike Israel's, are under IAEA supervision. He knows that, should Iran set about producing highly enriched uranium, the IAEA, and the world, would know more or less immediately. So, why not settle?

The only plausible answer is that there is a much bigger game being played. That Obama doesn't want to settle, that in reality his quarrel with Iran is not about its nuclear activities at all, but about preventing Iran becoming a major power in the Middle East in opposition to the US. A change in regime to one that is prepared to do US bidding would be ideal, but that is probably outside the realms of possibility.

For now, the game seems to be to keep the pressure on Iran by ferocious economic sanctions and other means, leaving open the option of military action, justified as a measure to prevent Iran developing nuclear weapons—which is why the nuclear issue cannot be put to bed.

26 September 2012

References:

- [1] www.jpost.com/USPresidentialrace/Article.aspx?id=285486
- [2] www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/former-mossad-chief-israel-air-strike-on-iran-stupidest-thing-i-have-ever-heard-1.360367
- [3] www.jpost.com/DiplomacyAndPolitics/Article.aspx?id=284750
- [4] www.peaceindex.org/files/The%20Peace%20Index%20Data%20-%20July%202012.pdf
- [5] www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/aug/30/israeli-attack-iran-not-stop-nuclear
- [6] www.nytimes.com/2012/06/01/world/middleeast/obama-ordered-wave-of-cyber-attacks-against-iran.html
- [7] www.nytimes.com/2011/06/01/us/politics/01cyber.html
- [8] www.campaigniran.org/casmii/index.php?q=node/10195
- [9] www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/9033566/The-deal-the-West-could-strike-with-Iran.html

Brendan Byrne

The following Address about Sarah Cecilia Harrison, 1863-1941, was delivered by Brendan Byrne, President of the Irish Labour History Society, on 12th March 2012 on the occasion of the Hugh Geraghty Memorial Lecture

Sarah Harrison

While Graveyards and Cemeteries strike some people as gloomy lugubrious places to be avoided with a shudder, visiting them can sometimes be a useful starting point for historians of the social and political life of the country.

Many people enjoy wandering around cemeteries reading the inscriptions on the tombstones with the certain smug satisfaction that they still can:

*As you are now, so once was I,
As I am now so you will be.*

The Glasnevin Trust for example has done a magnificent job out in Glasnevin Cemetery in the "Dead Centre" of Dublin creating a necropolis museum which ranks with Pere Lachaise, Montmartre and Highgate as a 'must see' destination.

On the South side of the city, Mount Jerome cemetery—not to be overlooked—contains the final resting place of neglected celebrities and historical figures who in their time made their mark on the social and political history of their times.

In the section just beyond Yew Walk, Grave No. B42 374 24128 is surmounted by a worn Granite Cross Tombstone. Due to the passage of time the inscription has become worn and faded and is now illegible.

It once read *Sarah Cecilia Harrison*—"Artist and Friend of the Poor".

While better known as a portrait artist, lauded for her exact draughtsmanship and consummate realism, Sarah Harrison was also actively involved in politics and deserves to be remembered as the first woman elected to Dublin Corporation in January, 1912.

Born in Holywood, County Down, in 1863, her family was prosperous and well established, originally based in Belfast and involved in business as wine merchants, ship owners and insurance agents. Her brother, Henry, was elected Home Rule MP for Tipperary in 1890 and was a strong supporter of Charles Stewart Parnell becoming Parnell's secretary and loyal supporter during the bitter and acrimonious split arising from the O'Shea divorce and political crisis of 1891 and who later wrote his biography.

The family was a strongly Nationalist one and were related to Henry Joy McCracken of United Irishmen fame—Sarah being Henry Joy's great-grand-niece. Following the death of her father, the family moved to London where Sarah

enrolled as student in the SLADE School of Art, where she spent seven years from 1878 to 1885.

A gifted pupil she won a scholarship, many prizes and certificates spending time perfecting her techniques on the Continent.

Returning to Dublin in 1889, she pursued her career as a portrait painter and developed her reputation as one of the leading portrait artists in Ireland and was a regular exhibitor at the Royal Hibernian Gallery. Submitting over 60 paintings mainly portraits during her career. She also showed in the Royal Academy in London.

She was a tall, striking looking woman : six foot, two inches in height.

Given her family background she also became an actively involved in politics and was a strong advocate of social reform in Dublin. She was an occasional contributor to a number of political journals which flourished during this period of the early 20th century—for example in an article entitled *The Workers and the Nation* published in the *Dublin Labour Journal* in the May, 1909 edition, which commemorated the International May Day Festival, she decried the scourge of unemployment making the point that

"...it was in the interests of the organised working classes {her words} to bond together with the unemployed to confront the problem and that the working class should have their own newspaper to help workers keep in touch."

In an article in *Ireland's Hope*, published in London in 1913 by the Irish Inter Colligate Christian Union, Harrison, while reviewing public housing in the cities of Ireland and Britain and the degrees of overcrowding, urged ratepayers to use their powers to insist on decent standards—stating that the two chief difficulties facing the poor were lack of regular and fairly paid employment and decent housing at a fair rent. She said that improving Public Housing at a higher rent is no good to the poor as they could not afford it.

The reform of the structures of Local Government in Ireland following the passage of the Local Government Act of 1898, introduced a more democratic local government than the Old Poor Law Guardian system. This reform (seen as an unwanted gift from the Conservative Government) gave an opening to and provided a useful training ground in practical political activities to citizens hitherto excluded from the opportunity to seek the

elective office. Its introduction was welcomed by some who favoured the use of Local Councils as a foundation on which to build a substitute to Westminster. Up to 1899, the right to vote in local elections was confined to those who were rate-paying occupiers or owners.

The Act extended the right to vote in local elections to women who qualified. However, it wasn't until 1911 that qualified women were allowed to stand for election to Local County and Borough councils. Describing herself as an independent Nationalist, Sarah Harrison stood for election for the South City ward of Dublin Corporation and topped the poll being elected on 15th January 1912 with 397 votes. (Her opponents, Thomas Scott (Unionist) and Charles McNamara received 248 and 83 votes respectively.)

(The electorate itself was restricted as under the 1898 Act, only 38,000 Dubliners out of a population of 250,000 had the vote and the term of office for councillors was three years. This was before the introduction of Proportional Representation.)

One of her keenest supporters was Alderman Thomas Kelly who befriended Sarah Harrison through her work on the committee for the Municipal Gallery Project.

In a speech, on her behalf, before the election he stated that:

"He had been told repeatedly that Cork Hill was no place for a woman—however, to his mind many women were wanted in that assembly and where a woman was needed : was assuredly a woman's place. He would welcome to the Corporation not alone Miss Harrison but all the other women who would without doubt be elected in the future."

The Freeman's Journal for 15/1/1912 reported on the candidates comments

"Miss Harrison who was greeted with prolonged applause thanked those present for their kind reception, whether she got in or not she intended to make a fight and a fight to the finish—She had frequently visited Dublin Corporation on deputations concerning the question of unemployment but she always felt when doing so that the work done in the half-hour during which the deputation was heard was negligible compared to what she could do if she were a member of the Council and able to press the question—when elected she would continue to devote herself to this question and allow nothing to come between her and it."

True to her word she concentrated her energies during her three years on the Council on the question of unemployment, the welfare of the poor, allotments and the ongoing campaign to secure the establishment of a Gallery of Modern Art in the city.

She had become actively involved in the campaign to establish a New Gallery

in the early 1900s when a collection of modern paintings which had been on loan to Dublin for exhibition at the Royal Hibernian Gallery. A number of these were offered to Dublin for £20,000. On foot of this she involved herself in a Committee formed to collect money to buy the pictures and subsequently sought to have a separate Gallery of Modern Art for the city established. Countess Markievicz, W.B. Yeats, Douglas Hyde, George Russell (AE), Lady Gregory, and Emily Lawless were among the group of strong supporters for the concept, and Sarah Harrison became Secretary of the Committee.

From the outset, Sir Hugh Lane, an Irish-born collector and art dealer and later close friend of Sarah Harrison, was an enthusiastic advocate of this campaign and the City Council had agreed in 1905 to put aside a sum of £500 (€60,000 in to-day's money) per annum for the maintenance of a Municipal Gallery of Modern Art and for the reception of the valuable pictures which had been presented to the State.

The campaign eventually resulted in the opening of a new gallery in Clonmell House (17 Harcourt Street) in 1908.

Dublin Corporation showed its appreciation to Hugh Lane for his many gifts to the new gallery by passing a resolution to make him a Freeman of the City of Dublin.

The Clonmell Gallery which was funded by Dublin Corporation was seen as an interim measure only. A long period of negotiation, fund-raising, and public controversy raged about the provision of a permanent site—which Lane had insisted on as a condition of his agreement to formally transfer some 39 of his paintings on permanent loan to the city.

A new fund raising committee (the Mansion House Committee) with Harrison as Secretary was set to raise funds for the new Gallery.

The City Council at a meeting in January, 1913 agreed to apply the sum of £22,000 (being a farthing in the pound on the rates) for the erection of such a building.

A number of sites were suggested leading to a public controversy on what became known as the Battle of the Sites (not unlike the upheaval currently raging over the location of the Children's hospital site). Suggestions ranging from a location in Merrion Square, the old Turkish Baths in Lincoln Place, and to a location in Stephens Green opposite the College of Surgeons.

Sir Edwin Lutyens was invited to Dublin by Lane and suggested that a solution to all the site difficulties could be solved by the erection of a Bridge with two flanking galleries linked by an open public bridge above a closed-in corridor across the Liffey in the city centre where the Halfpenny Bridge stands. The site would have involved no cost.

Many people queried the expense of

building a special gallery to house a loan collection of pictures. Prominent among this group was William Martin Murphy, who published his views in a letter sent to the *Daily Express* in January 1913. He proposed that the Lane pictures go to the National Gallery and that Corporation funds were more urgently needed to replace slum dwellings in the city. In a further letter to the *Herald* he argued that "*the bridge structure would blot out forever the fine view from O'Connell Bridge.*"

The leaders of the Labour movement in Dublin vigorously pronounced in favour of the scheme on the basis that the building of the gallery would give much employment and that when built it would be an everlasting source of pleasure and education to the poorer classes.

The Anti-Bridge site campaign gathered momentum and Murphy organised a public meeting to protest at the proposed site, objections also being raised to the fact that Lutyens was only half Irish! The saga continued and in late September after a stormy meeting of the Corporation, the proposal to continue with the site ended with a drawn vote, which essentially put the kibosh on the project.

Harrison then moved an amendment in favour of the site subject to financial guarantees to be given by the Mansion House Committee but this was defeated 23 to 21.

The failure to proceed with the scheme led to Lane withdrawing his offer to donate 39 pictures to Dublin and instead, offered them to the National Gallery in London. This led to a later controversy with which Sarah Harrison was involved when, after Lane's death with the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, a dispute arose over his will and the Lane bequest (a row which was only resolved during the 1970s).

Around the time of her election, Harrison was living in Harcourt Street. Just after her election, she initiated an enquiry by the Local Government Board into the actions of the Distress Committee in providing employment for those unable to find work in the city. This enquiry was requested by Dublin Corporation on a motion proposed by Richard O'Carroll, seconded by Laurence O'Neill. The Corporation agreed to underwrite the costs of the enquiry (£100.00) which took place during July/August, 1912 and was presided over by Inspector McCabe.

The Freeman's Journal for the period reported extensively on the enquiry during which Harrison personally conducted the case against the Distress Committee, alleging that private work was being done by them using Corporation materials, that the unemployed were being unfairly used instead of Corporation workers; and that the accounts and general regulations were not being observed. During her contribution, Harrison alleged that the unemployed poor were being cruelly ill-

treated and robbed of their rights.

She insisted that the inquiry be shifted to another location to enable the public to attend. This was done

While the inquiry found that the charges made against the officers of the Distress Committee was unsustainable, the Corporation noted for the record the sincerity of Councillor Miss Harrison motives, the ultimate outcome appears to have been the extension of relief to able-bodied unemployed in the city and credited to the efforts of Harrison and Alderman Alfie Byrne.

The events arising from the Great Lock Out of 1913 was a huge source of concern for many members of the City Council.

In the early days of the dispute, the City Council had proposed that a Peace Committee be convened to arbitrate between the Tramways Company and the Irish Transport and General Workers Union, the committee to include the Lord Mayor and 12 councillors in all, including Councillor Harrison and Alderman Tom Kelly who had proposed the motion.

The conduct of the police during the Lock-Out and Bloody Sunday when they indiscriminately batoned passers-by on O'Connell Street (then Sackville Street) also exercised the minds and sympathies of councillors.

Prior to the O'Connell Street meeting of August 31st, 1913, which is best remembered in history as Bloody Sunday, the military authorities had arranged to draft in 313 members of the Royal Irish Constabulary in order to supplement what they considered the inadequate number of Dublin Metropolitan Policemen to "*contain the industrial riots which they felt likely to develop*". (An important distinction was that the RIC which usually did not operate in Dublin were armed while the DMP was not).

The uproar arising from the conduct of the police continued to reverberate in the council chamber. However a motion proposed by William Partridge demanding that RIC men drafted into Dublin to assist the DMP during the dispute to quell disturbances wear identification numbers and supported by Harrison was watered down by the Council, as was another motion proposed by Partridge, seconded by Harrison, demanding that an impartial commission be appointed under statute to inquire into the charges made against the authorities in Dublin Castle including the outrageous conduct of the police and their connection with the employers who locked out their workers.

Harrison had also moved a motion, seconded by W.T. Cosgrave:

"That as several Limited Liability companies in the city of Dublin have united together to prevent their employees doing what they have a perfect right to do, namely joining a certain Trade Union organisation, it called on the Law Agent to submit a report as to whether

such Companies have any power to enter in such combinations and whether such action is legal."

Tom Kettle, the former Irish Parliamentary Party MP and then Professor of National Economics at University College, Dublin, once seen as a potential Prime Minister of a Home Rule Ireland, organised a meeting in the Mansion House to call for a truce in the industrial conflict. To that end, attempts were made to set up an Industrial Peace Committee. While the tone of most of the contributions were avowedly neutral, pro-worker Sarah Harrison in her contribution strayed so far towards the workers' corner that Kettle had to call her to order and remind her that the speakers had agreed to adopt a non-partisan attitude.

She was also a member of a Committee set up by Dublin Corporation in the aftermath of Bloody Sunday in which capacity she appeared as a witness at the hearings held by the Dublin Disturbances Commission established after the lockout.

At these hearings, four months after the events, she was brought to tears when she recalled the injuries to people and damage to property in Corporation Buildings she saw during a visit the Committee made on Tuesday, 2nd September, 1913, following the disturbances when the police ran amok.

In the final report of the Commission she is quoted as follows:

"She went into the Kelly's house and she saw this poor woman in a very bad state it was quite evident that she had been shockingly ill-abused, her face was swollen and quiet green with bruising and her face was bandaged—when she removed the bandage her eye was blackened and much injured—in another house, the altar was broken (and) the rooms we visited seemed to have been wrecked with windows broken, pictures were broken, the whole place was absolutely wrecked—from the Square, she saw that a great many windows were broken. When she visited Michael Whelan's room the windows had been smashed and the locks on the doors broken."

Her sympathies were obvious and the minutes of the Council meeting of 20th October 1913, record Harrison attempting to press the Council to seek compensation arising from "*...the serious damage done by police to persons and property at Corporation Dwellings, Corporation Place when an unwarranted violent baton charge was made against inoffensive people*".

She demanded that the Council seek compensation from the Government for the injured persons as well as payment for the property destroyed. While this motion seeking compensation was ruled out of order, it was felt at the time important enough to be included in the official minutes of the Council as an indication of the level of concern and strength of feeling amongst some councillors at the time.

The Corporation's Law Agent, how-

ever, stated that the Corporation had no power to take legal action to secure justice for any citizen injured in the streets by police.

In 1914, she supported a motion calling on the Imperial Exchequer to provide funds for the purpose of providing proper housing accommodation for the poorer classes in Dublin, as the provision of funds from the local rates were inadequate for that task, as the unduly large proportion of the poor and helpless people in Dublin arose from the emigration of five million strong and healthy people from Ireland because of iniquitous laws.

During her time on the Council, she argued strongly in favour of public access to Council meetings, stating that it was important that the citizens should have full knowledge of the views and actions of their representatives.

To this end, she had proposed that unrestricted access be given to ten members of the public to attend their ordinary Council meetings.

A member of the Housing Committee of the Corporation, she also gave evidence to a Local Government Departmental Committee set up to enquire into the housing conditions of the working classes in the city of Dublin, at which she favoured building societies and private enterprise providing house for artisans and tradesmen with the Council and the state taking the responsibility of providing housing for the poorest groups.

Strongly favouring the building of houses inside the city as casual labourers needed to be near their work, she advocated the application of fair rents, also maintaining that owners of properties and landlords of tenements should not be allowed to sit on the Public Health or Housing Committee—never being afraid to name a number of Corporation members to whom this applied.

Nationalists councillors were proposing that tenants in a new scheme in Inchicore should pay rents of five shillings per week, Harrison argued that the Council should be providing homes for the neediest families at rents of Two shillings and Six pence or Three shilling and Six pence at the most.

When taken to task by the Law Agent for disregarding his advice she replied: "*I do not always take the opinion of one lawyer as to what is the law*".

Regretfully, in the Municipal elections of 1915, she lost her seat on Dublin Corporation: her opponent in the South City Ward, Joseph Isaacs was strongly backed by big business firms and William Martin Murphy. This group, a sort of 1915 version of the Superpacs currently operating the US election primaries, was organised into a Citizens' Association which included Companies such as Jacobs, Arnotts, Switzers and others. Harrison secured 296 votes to Isaacs' 355.

In her final speech to her supporters, Harrison said she had no complaint except for the weather because many of her supporters who were poor could not get out to vote.

An interesting footnote as to the influence of William Martin Murphy in Dublin city affairs occurred during a heated debate in the City Council when Lorcan Sherlock, then running for an unprecedented Third term as Lord Mayor, reacting to the accusation of doing nothing during the tramways strike said:

"Who would believe that anything we could have done would move Mr William Murphy—Didn't the man take the Corporation by the throat on the Gallery question and beat them all by himself."

After Sarah Harrison's defeat, there was no woman elected to Dublin Corporation until 1920 (the PR system introduced that year resulted in the election of Hanna Sheehy Skeffington, Jennie Wyse-Power, Anne Eliza Ashton as councillors and Kathleen Clarke widow of Tom Clarke, was elected as Alderman.)

Harrison nevertheless continued her involvement in public affairs.

She had established the Vacant Land Cultivation Society in 1909 but made little progress in the avowed aim to nurture home growing of vegetables and fruit on allotments to be made available for that purpose, until in 1915, responding to food shortages and price increases resulting from the First World War and which were impacting severely on both the lower middle class as well as the poor, the Corporation handed over 10 acres of land in Fairbrother's Fields (off Donore Avenue) to Harrison, who was then Secretary of the Society—this land had been previously earmarked for housing.

The Society, with the acquisition of other vacant and derelict sites, had by the end of that year 31 acres under cultivation rising to 60 acres by the end of 1917.

Rathmines Technical College and School of Gardening located in Kimmage provided expert advice to small-holders and by 1916 to quote from Pdraig Yeates, who recently published *A City in Wartime*:

"...an exhibition in Leo Hall, Inchicore was graced by Massive Cabbages from allotments on Pigeon House Road, Burly potatoes from Broadstone and Huge Onions from Inchicore."

Involving herself in the anti-Conscription campaign, she and a number of other Protestant women who had embraced the Nationalist position during the campaign, had attempted to hold a prayer meeting in Christ Church Cathedral but the door was closed to them despite the group having notified the Dean of their intentions. Nevertheless, despite it pouring with rain they knelt down outside and held their prayer meeting.

(A small footnote to this—an unidentified

church official came out, took a copy of the anti-conscription pledge from one of the women and tore it into pieces saying "*he would not allow any rubbish of that kind in the church*".)

Sarah Harrison was a long-time active supporter of the Suffrage movement and member of the Irish Woman's Suffrage Association founded by Anna Halsam.

In 1918, the right for women to vote in parliamentary elections was established.

The Suffrage movement had hoped that many women would be nominated and Cissie Cahalan, Secretary of the Irish Woman's Franchise League wrote to newspapers urging Sinn Fein to nominate woman listing such potential candidates for that party as Hannah Sheehy Skeffington, Mrs. Tom Clarke, Kathleen Lynn, Maud Gonne MacBride and Nora Connolly and urging the Irish Parliamentary Party to nominate such as Sarah Harrison, Mary Hayden, Alice Stopford Green and Mary Kettle (widow of Tom Kettle, who had been killed in France in 1917).

A Special Conference of the Labour Party had by majority decision, despite the urgings of the Leadership, decided not to contest the 1918 Election for fear—some said—of splitting the Nationalist vote.

In the event Countess Markievicz was the sole candidate to secure a nomination, Sheehy Skeffington declining her nomination for the Harbour Division.

On the 14th December, 1918 (Polling day) in an emotive display a large procession of women, including Harrison, escorted Anna Halsam, then 90 years of age to vote in William Street Courthouses (which later became the Civic Museum and is now closed).

Resuming her career as a portrait painter during the 1920s and 1930s, Cecilia exhibited regularly at the Royal Hibernian Academy and she lived at 7 St Stephen's Green for the remainder of her life. Her subjects include Tom Johnson, leader of the Labour Party, (to whom she has submitted a memorandum on inadequate relief given to the poor and the need to strike a proper Poor Rate in line with other cities in Ireland and Britain), Michael Collins (this from photographs and memory), Colonel Maurice Moore, Senator Thomas Mc Partlin, and Thomas Kelly. Her interest in public affairs continued and she was a frequent visitor to Dail Eireann and continued to serve on several committees dealing with civic affairs, including the Lane Bequest Claim Committee set up in 1933 and a committee on Housing with Big Jim Larkin.

She used a room in her home in 7 Stephen's Green as an office and operated a sort of one woman citizens service where, as reported in the *Irish Press* obituary notice after her death, "*she received the needs and grievances of hundreds of poor*

people every week".

In late 1941, Sarah Harrison's good friend and fellow councillor, Alderman Tom Kelly, in the course of a lecture he gave to members of the Old Dublin Society, supplied a personal anecdote:

"I had not seen her for some time and I knew she was not in good health, her death was announced in the press of 23rd July, 1941 and her funeral appointed to be private—I respected her family's wishes and I did not make any inquiry as to the place of interment although I desired very much to be present—On the morning of 25th July, 1941, I was in Aungier Street just as the bell for 11 o'clock Mass in the Carmelite Church was ringing, when a funeral slowly moved consisting of a motor hearse containing a flower bedecked coffin followed by seven or eight private motor cars—I said to myself this is her funeral on its way to Mount Jerome. As I hoped she would not go away without saying farewell and after a friendship of over 30 years, I believe my hope was fulfilled."

Tom Kelly, incidentally, was an interesting character in his own right, being a founder of the Old Dublin Society, and who had a significant and influential career as a member of Dublin City Council for many years up to his own death in 1944. He had served briefly as a Dail Deputy in the 1930s, representing Fianna Fail. During the course of a debate in the Dail he admitted hadn't seen anything wrong with electoral impersonation and that he had encouraged a lot of it in his day saying, "*If one knew the opinions a man held when he was alive there would be no harm in voting in his place when he was dead*". His philosophy in the recent General Election (1933) being "*vote early and often*".

To-day his name is commemorated in the Housing complex up at Portobello Bridge, known as Tom Kelly Road.

As well as recognising her considerable talents as a painter whose work is highly appreciated and represented in the National Gallery, The Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery in Parnell Square and in the Ulster Museum, Sarah Harrison's achievements in being the first woman elected to the City Council, her commitment to service as a Councillor, (she was an assiduous attendee at committee meetings attending over 100 meetings each year), and the selfless contribution she made towards serving her adopted city deserves to be remembered in this the 100th Anniversary of her election.

A suitable way might be during this centenary year of her election to seek funding towards the cost of restoring the inscription on her gravestone.

Sarah Cecilia Harrison
1863—1941
ARTIST and FRIEND OF THE POOR

VOX

PAT

**EU Population
Dead Right!
Shattering Traditions?**

EU Population

"Almost 300,000 immigrants from other EU countries now live in Ireland, making up 6.5% of the population. We have the fourth highest proportion of foreign EU citizens when compared to our European neighbours.

"Luxembourg recorded the highest proportion at 37% of its total population, followed by Cyprus at 13% and Belgium at 6.8%" (*Irish Independent*-14.7.2012).

However, the number of foreign nationals living here is dropping very fast, according to the latest figures.

Five years ago, Ireland had the second-highest percentage of foreigners in the EU as workers flocked here during the boom.

But in the last few years the figure has been falling dramatically. In 2009, more than 11% of the population were born abroad—the fifth highest percentage in the EU.

Last year the figure fell to just over 8%, placing the country tenth.

The vast majority of non-Irish in the country are from other EU countries, especially Poland, Latvia and Lithuania.

Despite the numbers leaving as the job market contracts—about 36,000 last year—the country still has the fourth highest percentage of people from other EU countries.

In the EU overall more than 33 million people are living outside the country in which they were born, accounting for 6.6% of the EU's population. This was an increase from 6.4% in 2009. The majority, 20 million, were non-EU citizens.

Luxembourg has the biggest proportion of foreigners at more than 40%, with close to half of them coming from Portugal. Poland, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Slovakia had less than 2%.

Germany has the biggest with more than seven million foreign nationals, followed by Spain. More than three quarters of foreign citizens live in Germany, Spain, Italy, Britain and France.

Dead Right!

"STOP PRESS! Spare a thought for New York journo, Siros Tuthill, who had been sitting stone dead at his desk for five days before anyone noticed. A newspaper hack for 30 years, Siros was always absorbed in his work as a political analyst.

"He was noticed on a Saturday morning when an office cleaner asked why he was working through the weekend. Moral of the story: don't work too hard writing about

politics. Nobody notices anyway!" (*Southern Star*, Skibbereen, 14.7.2012).

A journalist who thinks? Even more incredible : a journalist who died thinking!

Shattering Traditions?

"Defence Minister Alan Shatter has been accused of being prejudiced against the Catholic Church over his refusal to allow the army to provide a guard of honour for a procession during the International Eucharistic Congress in Dublin recently" (*Ir. Exam*. 17.7.2012).

Limerick Fianna Fail TD, Willie "The Eighth Commandment" O'Dea, a former Defence Minister, accused Mr Shatter of "blind prejudice" in blocking the army from taking part.

Members of the Defence Forces have regularly taken part in religious events throughout the State.

"An army spokesperson was quoted in this week's edition of *The Irish Catholic* as saying: "The department was not in a position to approve such involvement as military participation was not considered appropriate"... (*ibid*).

The last major Catholic event in which the Defence Forces took part was in 2001 when the relics of St Thérèse of Lisieux came to Ireland.

Members of the Defence Forces provided full military honours on a number of ceremonial occasions.

The Irish Catholic said:

"The unprecedented move has raised fears that religious events around the country, where members of the Defence Forces have traditionally played an important role, will become 'no-go' events for military personnel.

"It will also increase suspicion among people of faith that the Coalition is increasingly hostile towards Catholics."

"It demonstrates a strange petty-mindedness by Mr Shatter", stated O'Dea, "which I must say does not surprise me. His response to the request seems like one of blind prejudice and his reaction is totally inappropriate"...

"He should now give a proper explanation why this decision was taken. The army have participated in Church ceremonies since the foundation of the State, irrespective of what Church was involved."

Mr. O'Dea said the clergy served as full-time, paid members of the Defence Forces, and a Catholic priest was based at Sarsfield Barracks and had travelled with the troops on UN missions.

Catholic chaplains in the Defence Forces do not have any rank and wear a non-rank Celtic Cross insignia.

More VOX on page 15

LAUNCH All Welcome

Irish Bulletin

Dáil Éireann's official paper with war reports, first reprint
 Volume 1, 12th July 1919 to 1st May 1920. 514pp
 Aubane Historical Society lane.jack@gmail.com
 Paperback €36,£30; hardback €55,£45

Friday, 16th November, at 8pm
 Ireland Institute, 27 Pearse St., Dublin

Nora Comiskey, President, 1916-1921 Club, Hosting
Dr. Brian P. Murphy OSB, Historian, Launching
Philip O'Connor, Chairing Discussion

LAUNCH AND PUBLIC MEETING
 Teachers' Club, 36 Parnell Sq., DUBLIN
 SATURDAY, 17th November, 7.30 pm

Northern Ireland, What Is It?
 Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind by *Brendan Clifford*

The Genesis Of National Socialism
 by *T. Desmond Williams*

<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>