Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

Pope Francis I

Jesuit Power?

Benedict—why did he go?

Magdalen Laundries

The Full Facts

Galileo And The Pope

The Freemasons In France During The German Occupation

No. 112 **Second Quarter, 2013**

Editorial

Pope Francis I
and the Scandal of Jesuit Power

Jorge Mario Bergoglio is a Jesuit from the Vice-royalty of the Rio de la Plata which is the name by which Argentina was known before it secured independence from the Spanish Empire in the early 19th century.

It is impossible to predict what the new Pope will turn out to be. But the story of the Jesuits in South America turns history itself upside down and flies in the face of reality as we have come to know and understand it. The role of the Jesuits is a scandal, an affront against the consensus on which present day social reality is based. An affront against reason, in other words. Which is why it is practically written out of history.

It can be argued that the modern world started with the expulsion of the Muslim Moors from Spain and the subsequent Spanish conquest of the 'New' World, setting in train the greatest catastrophe ever to afflict humankind.

The destruction of much of the population of South America, and the virtual extermination of the indigenous North Americans, was resisted and countered by Jesuit missionaries and, less successfully, by Franciscan missionaries, in the 17th and 18th centuries.

In the English and Portuguese areas the Indians were exterminated in the cause of Progress. Though technically under the protection of the Emperor and the Pope, the Indians in the Spanish-run areas were virtually enslaved by the settlers, and were wiped out in many areas.

Except where the natives came under the influence of the mediaeval European mind. Jesuit missionaries armed and trained them so they could protect themselves against the forces of Progress which saw them as naked savages, just another raw material to be consumed for self-enrichment.

In the course of the 17th century the mission Indians in the rain-forests constituted an extensive state consisting of about thirty cities (or Reductions) straddling the continent, under the tutelage of Jesuit missionaries—two unarmed missionaries to each city. The cities were built by the Indians to a standard higher than anything to be then found in North or South America, better than most places in Europe at that time. The ruins of the cities are now a tourist attraction, like Mayan or Inca antiquities, and with just as little significance for present-day reality.

They had universal education, healthcare and welfare. Worse than that, the thriving Reduction economic system did not use money. Private property and rational economic self-interest were no part of it. Just when joint stock companies and capital were in the process of transforming the whole world!

The Jesuits did not set out to create a communist welfare society. Their actual agenda was much worse than that. Their aim was to save Indian souls. In other words, having lost millions to heresy in Europe, they aimed to replenish Catholic numbers by turning the Indians into devout Catholics loyal to the Pope and obedient to the Emperor.

So the Jesuit system in South America was a scandal, a bad example, a throwback to mediaeval ignorance and superstition, an infamy to be erased from the world by Modernity, Reason and Progress.

And it was duly erased. But the Indians have not forgotten it. The sheet-music scores of their orchestras are currently being re-discovered and performed after a lapse of more than 200 years. And here and there the victory of the settlers and Progress is being gradually rolled back.

It remains to be seen whether the South American Jesuit Pope Francis I is in the same mould as his infamous predecessors.

The story of the Jesuits in Latin America is the basis of the 1986 film *The Mission*, in which the main parts are played by Jeremy Irons and Robert de Niro, notable also for the music soundtrack by Ennio Morricone. English language accounts of the Reductions can be read in *A Vanished Arcadia* by Philip Carman, and *A Lost Paradise* by R.B. Cunninghame-Graham.

> "For theories of advancement, and as to whether certain arbitrary ideas of the rights of man, evolved in general by those who in their persons and their lives are the negation of all rights, I give a fico—yes, your fig of Spain—caring as little as did ancient Pistol for 'palabras', and holding that the best right that a man can have is to be happy after the way that pleases him the most. And that the Jesuits rendered the Indians happy is certain, though to those men who fudge a theory of mankind, thinking that everyone is forged upon their anvil, or run out of their own mould, after the fashion of a tallow dip (a theory which, indeed, the sameness of mankind renders at times not quite untenable), it seems absurd because the progress of the world has gone on other lines—lines which prolonged indefinitely would never meet those which the Jesuits drew" (from A Lost Paradise, available on line at: http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext98/vajip10h.htm).

Pat Muldowney's illustrated article, *Paradise In Paraguy* can by found in *Church & State* 97, Summer 2007

Jack Lane

Benedict—why did he go?

The Pope has packed in his job. He has taken early retirements as the Vicar of Christ on Earth. The reason he gives is that he is too old, feeling tired and not up to the demands of the job. Being a theologian, one might have expected some theological justification and explanation for this decision but none was forthcoming. And it cannot be compared to any of the previous resignations in the Middle Ages—which were for completely different reasons and not voluntary. His immediate predecessor was shot at, developed Parkinson's, but did not dream of retiring. Benedict is not ill and, even if he was, Cardinal Stanislaw Dziwisz is quite right when he says that Popes *"do not come down off the cross"*. Even the previous Pope's experiences were as nothing compared with other past experiences of Popes in various wars and revolutions. By comparison Benedict never had it so cushy. So why did he go? Even if he found it difficult to perform all necessary functions, there is a Roman Curia to fill the gaps. There were surely Popes in the past who went senile but the Curia ensured the job was done and that the Vicar of Christ's role in this world was not compromised by such earthly considerations. Benedict was quite lucid and active after his announcement which belied the case that he was simply physically and mentally incapable.

> "In an extraordinary, unscripted talk with priests of the Rome diocese yesterday morning, Pope Benedict XVI spoke of his role in inspiring the Second Vatican Council and the difference between what happened there and how it was presented by the media. He began, "Given the conditions of my age I could not prepare a great, real address, as one might expect, but rather I thought of chatting about the Second Vatican Council, as I saw it."…. There followed a lengthy and theologically dense account of what took place at the council. He continued, however, that there were two councils, "the council of the Fathers—the true council—but there was also the council of the media ... and the world perceived the council through them, through the media"." (Irish Times, 15 February).

This was not the behaviour of a man at the end of his tether. He was dealing here with the issue that really bothers him and rightly so as it was the major event in the life of the Church during his lifetime—Vatican II. He knows it was a disaster for the Church. It's on his conscience and he seeks to blame the media for misreporting it. This is pathetic. The Church has plenty media outlets to explain itself and counter the media if necessary. Benedict set up a Twitter account recently. That alone would give him ample scope to get his message across. What he cannot face up to is that the message of the Council does not make sense to his audience. It did not at the time and has not done so since.

The reason for this is that it was an experiment in what was seen as a necessary theological improvement and that was equated with improving the Church. He claimed in his talk reported above, probably rightly, that as a theologian he played a key role in launching it and the innovations that went with it. It is worth noting that neither Cardinals nor Popes need be

Contents

Due to pressure of space, a number of features have been held over, including Part 3 of *1492 And Its Effects On Ireland*

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
€15 (Sterling £12) for 4 issues

Cheques/postal orders payable to ATHOL BOOKS please

ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS
€5 (Sterling £4) for 4 issues from
athol-st@atholbooks.org

Sales:

https://www.atholbooks-sales.org

ordained. In other words, they do not need the theological qualifications needed for the priesthood. The reason being that they are there to organise and run the Church not to dispense theology and certainly not to promote innovations in that area. In this area it is the law of Occam's razor that should apply, the simplest and most obvious solutions are sufficient.

Benedict seems to have acted as if the faithful are faithful because of the Church's theology. But theology only motivates theologians and the billion faithful are not all theologians.

The previous Pope came from the school of hard knocks in Poland under Communism but he was equally critical of the Liberal West's alternative as it showed its hand in the non-stop wars it launched when liberated from the Communist threat. That kind of perspective is what made him the Pope he was and what Popes should be. Benedict was never in that league and the ironic thing was that he took his name deliberately from a previous Pope, Benedict XV who had a similar perspective in his efforts to stop WWI as John Paul II had with the Iraq and subsequent wars.

The *Irish Times* tells us that:

> "Arguably, in the very act of resigning, in recognising the limitations of age on leadership as the political and corporate worlds have long done, Pope Benedict XVI stamps the name of moderniser on his legacy"
>
> (12 February).

He will certainly be remembered as the Pope who resigned and if that is modern—giving up a job for no convincing reason—then it's not a good omen if the Vatican accepts that form of modernity. But of course if the Papacy has now become modern then the next Pope may be—in fact he must be—a post-modern Pope. And, if the Vatican ever accepts these concepts as applying to it, then it will be simply replacing a religious form of theological thinking for a secular one. God help it!

Report

Speech delivered by Alan Shatter TD, Minister for Justice, Equality and Defence at meeting of Fine Gael *Lesbian Gay Bi-Sexual TransGender* Group

Shatter On Gay Rights

"As you know, Ireland has been elected by the international community to the United Nations Human Rights Council, and, from January 2013, will actively participate in the Council's human-rights work…

Provision for Civil Partnerships contained in the… Civil Partnership… Act 2010 was an important achievement. I also recognise that provision for same-sex marriage in Ireland is a core aspiration together with the full recognition of such marriages where effected abroad. The question of whether the Constitution of Ireland should or needs to be amended to provide for same-sex marriage is one of the matters referred by the Government this year for deliberation by the Constitutional Convention…

I am concerned about the impact that section 37 of the Employment Equality Act has on LGBT persons. This section is designed to allow schools and other institutions to maintain their religious ethos. It was examined by the Supreme Court in 1996 when the Employment Equality Bill of 1996 was referred to it under Article 26 of the Constitution. The Supreme Court found that it is a reasonable balancing in legislation of the different rights involved, including chiefly the right to earn a living and the rights to freedom of religion and association. I am concerned that the balance in practice is not a fair one and that in practice this provision can operate in a way that is unfair to LGBT persons…

The Programme for Government contains a commitment to reform and modernisation of our family law. One of the great gaps in the Act of 2010 was the failure to specifically address issues relating to parental rights of gay couples and the legal relationship of gay parents to children being parented by them in circumstances in which the parents are parties to a civil partnership or individuals cohabiting in an intimate and committed relationship. I am acutely aware that we need to reform family law to secure equal citizenship for lesbian and gay parents and the best interests of their children. This reforming focus must also ensure that children in lesbian or gay family units are able to form a legal connection with their non-biological parent and that kindred relationships flow from such legal connection. Reforms are also needed in the areas of guardianship, custody and access, and to ensure maintenance and inheritance rights for the children of civil partners. If we are to address these matters comprehensively, we must take account of developments that have occurred in the area of assisted human reproduction that have, for too long, been ignored in our family law legislation. There is a need to provide clarity and legal certainty in relation to the parent/child relationship, and all that flows from it, in the context of children conceived as a result of assisted reproduction or born to a surrogate. There is a need to bring our laws in this area into the 21st Century and to ensure that they reflect the welcome new provisions now contained in Article 42A of the Constitution with regards to the rights of the child and ensuring that in this area the best interests of the child are the paramount consideration. It is not in the best interests of either parents or children that we deny the reality of the complexity of the diverse family relationships that factually exist in the Ireland of 2012. With a view to comprehensively addressing this area of the law, I am presently engaged in the preparation of a Family Relationships and Childrens Bill which I expect will be published next year and, I hope, enacted before the end of the year by the Houses of the Oireachtas…

The Government has taken a strong stance on violations of the rights of LGBT persons both in Ireland and internationally… The Government is concerned about developments in Uganda over the past months involving legislative proposals to further erode the human rights of LGBT persons. The proposals jeopardise the very right to life of LGBT persons. The Government has made known its concerns at the highest level with the Ugandan administration and the situation is being monitored closely…

Finally, we take on the Presidency of the EU as from 1st January… I note with interest Commissioner Reding's intention to bring forward proposals for a 'justice scoreboard' to evaluate the rule of law in EU Member States. Our Presidency will support the concept of a **scoreboard on justice, rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights**. …I note the work that has been undertaken by the European Parliament in relation to a roadmap on equality for LGBT persons."

20 November 2012

http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/SP12000321

Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin

Eascaine ar Cháit Ní Laoghaire do chonghaibh a stocaidhe uaidh mar gheall ar thuistín
A curse on Kate O'Leary who kept his stockings from him for the sake of fourpence

Easmailt is Ár

Easmailt is ár gach lá ort go dúbalta
Galar is smáilc it lár gan dúil i sult
Nár mhairir um Cháisc, an tráth go dlúth 'na bhfuil
Mo stocaidhe it mhála i n-áit tuistín agat

Eascaine an Phápa it dheághaidh go dúthrachtach
Gan cheannas, gan áird, ar fán gan cumhdach fir
Go bhfaicead-sa lá thú i ngabhadh, 's ní dubhach liom soin
I ngalar an bháis, gan fagháil ar phiúnt den digh

Gorta 'gus pláigh fá chlár dot dhlúith-threascairt
Gan ola roimh bás ná gáir ós cionn do chuirp
Gan sailm ná páis dá rádh ort ná urnaighthe
Ná golfairt ag mnáibh it dheághaidh le fonn go fluich

Revulsion and wretchedness on you, redoubled every day / Malady and discolouration in your core, with no appetite for pleasure / May you not live until Easter, so long as you firmly keep / my stockings in your bag for the sake of fourpence.

The curse of the Pope relentlessly after you / without affection, without happiness, wandering without the help of a man / May I see you some day in peril, and I not sorry for it / In the throes of death, without the chance of a pint of liquor.

Famine and plague laying you firmly under a board / without oil before death or a cry over your body / without a psalm or Passion being said over you, nor prayers / nor weeping after you, with feeling, copiously.

Mo mhallacht it dhéaghaidh, a Cháit, go dúlaighthe
Go leanaidh det chnámha, is gach smáilc go dlúth fairis
Nár fhaicir do pháiste ar bhán ag súgradh
Acht it chamarthach áir, go bráth, gan chlú, gan sliocht.

Níl file ná fáidh I gClár Luirc Mumhan ná fuil
Ag labhairt im pháirt, 's is nár a gcúis, dar liom
Scriosfad gan tlás le fánaidh an clúmh cas mion
'S an leathar det chnámhaibh, is ca fear tuistín 'ná soin.

Breacfad do chail i dtráth don dúthaigh anois
Gurab airgtheach smáil thug náire 'on chúige thú
Is masla tar barr do mhnáibh na dtriúch fairis
Is an fhaidh mhair-se, a Cháit, díth shláinte chughat 'na rith.

My curse after you, Kate, earnestly following your bones, and every affliction firmly along with it / May you not see your child playing in the field / But you a wretched harlot forever, without reputation, without offspring.

There is not a poet or bard in the whole of Munster who is not / speaking on my behalf, and their reason is disgrace I say I will scrape off without reluctance the short curly hair / and the skin off your bones, and is that worth fourpence?

I will now describe your character in time to the district / that you are a disgraceful plunderer who caused shame to the province / you are a supreme insult to the women of the countryside as well / and as long as you live, Kate, lack of health to you throughout.

Níl mascalach mnámhail chráibhtheach chiuin tais suilt
Ná ainnir dheas bhláth is álainn gnúis is drioch
Ó Gaillimh ná mbárcalán go ciumhasaibh Tuirc
Ná glacfadh mo lámh i ndáil tuistín acht tú.

Easbaidh de ghnáth dhot chrádh 's dhot thúrnadh again
Is fochall an bháis ót lár nár múscailtear
Aineamh gach lá ort is grain ag Úird an chirt
Go hancarach cráidhte cásmhar cúmhach, gan chion.

Masla tar mnáibh go bhfághair-se, a ghnúis sult
'S go mbristear do ghéaga i mbeárnain chumhang 'san trioc
Go bhfaicead-sa gárlach gránna it chlúid agat
Gan a athair la fagháil go bráth ná cunntas ionn.

There is not a womanly, pious, quiet, gentle, good-natured girl / nor a lovely sweet maiden, of beautiful countenance and form / from Galway of the ships all the way to the coast of Turkey / who would not take my hand in settlement of fourpence except you.

May we have want ever-torturing and tormenting you to death / and may the vomit of death not stir from your guts / A blemish every day on you, and the hatred of the righteous Order / Miserable, wretched, burdened, grief-stricken, loveless.

Reproached above all women, you sour-face / and may you break your limbs in a narrow gap among the furniture / May I see a horrible bawling child in your arms / with his father never to be found, nor any account of him.

A Mhic Muire na ngrás, fuair páis is sciuirseas chrios
Is d'fhulaing it dheárnain táirrnge dlúth do chur!
Gan stoca deas bláth, a Cháit, ó fhúigis me
Nár fhillir-se slán faoit bharr don dúthaigh anoir.

Mallacht na mallacht dot threascairt fá channtladh anois
Oirbhire, aithis is eascaine cheall is chluig
Go bhfeicead do sheanchruit marbh go fann gan smig
Gach duine dot fhaire ná folach do bhall agat.

Mallacht gach sagairt ó Ghallaimh gi Leamhain na sruth
Do thuitim it bhaitheas 's go scaipidh do mheabhair mar sin
Go stolltar le cataibh do chreatlach crannda dubh
'Sis miste na cealla nár cailleadh i n-am cheart thu.

O Son of Mary of the graces, who endured the passion and the scourging of the cross / and who suffered the driving of hard nails in your palms / I without a lovely fine stocking, Kate, since you left me / May you not return whole on account of this to the district from the East.

The curse of curses overwhelming you in sorrow now / Maledictions, shame and the excommunication of the church and bell / May I see your hunchback dead, prostate without a stir / with no-one to wake you or hide your limbs.

The curse of every parish priest from Galway to Leane of the streams / May you fall on your head and scatter your brains thereby / May cats rend your black, shrivelled entrails / and the graveyards are the worse that you did not die in time.

Dainid is lean gan bhréag is tubaust 'na bhun
Ana-bhroid péine go daor is galar it chruit
A Cháit Ní Laoghaire, d'éimhigh mise go tur
Is d'imigh i gcéin, is let ré nár fhillir anoir.

Grief and sorrow truly and bad luck to boot / Great affliction of severe pain and disease in your hunched back / Kate O'Leary, I pleaded plainly / and you went away, and may you not return here in your lifetime.

Séamas Ó Domhnaill

Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin
1748—1784
Aspects of his Life and Work
Part 8

Satire

In the Irish tradition it was understood that the poet had supernatural power to inflict damage or to bring about prosperity with his compositions. This power had a public character stretching back into pre history. People accepted that poetry was a gift and that part of that gift involved the ability to build some one up or tear her down just with the force of words. The old adage, *"sticks and stones can break my bones but words can never hurt me"* did not apply.

Dathaí Ó hÓgáin gives the following example of the power of the poet recorded in folklore:

> "At that time there lived a scurrilous poet named Mac Cormaic at Cloch Adhna, who satirised Liam's wife, reflecting on her character as a dissolute woman. This irritated Liam's feelings to the highest degree. One morning when going to Mass he happened to meet Séamas Ó Muimhneacháin at Corbhealach, where the pathway to Ballyvourney chapel starts just at the boundary of Togher and Gurtnagross. Here the two retired to a bench of a high rock overlooking the country around, and composed a fulsome *"aoir"* or satire on Mac Cormaic in retaliation for his misconduct. This *"aoir"* was full of the vilest curses and imprecations, from which Mac Cormaic suffered during his life.

The scholar James Carney also puts the power of the *"aor"* in pagan religious terms: According to James Carney, in ancient Ireland—

> "…the composing of poetry was not the occupation of the specially gifted, the aesthete, or the dilettante. Poetry, even in Christian times, partook of the nature of a religious institution and was so closely woven into the fabric of political Gaeldom that without it the society could not continue to exist unless by changing its very essence … The satire is in origin a religious sanction and represents the means which the pagan "church" used in order to exercise power over the state."

When Christianity was officially established in Ireland the Christian Bishops were raised to the level of the old Druid next to the Chief while the former Druidic order assumed the role of the Bardic order.

Carney goes on to describe how this would apply in practice:

> "If an ollav satirises a prince he is in effect telling him that the forces of nature, with which he, the ollave, is in communion, are not satisfied; the result of the satire is an injury to the king's honour and possibly a blight on the land. The converse of this necessarily holds: when a poet praises a king he is assuring him that the powers of nature find him pleasing…"

Down through the ages the poets claimed the right to compose satires on behalf of the community. Dáibhí Ó Bruadair wrote a satire against a man who had beaten up a woman:

Ruanach an suaidhfhear is céasach críon
'S is cuasach i mbualtrach a shéala boinn
Ní fuaire dhuit nuaiseach ná céadfadh a choim
Acht uaire nach buaileas i bplé le mnaoi.

Wild is the rage of this fierce fellow, querulous, withered, and shrunk / and a hollow impression in the dung is the seal of the sole of his foot / colder no noble could be than the feelings which stir in his breast / except at the times when by chance he begins with a woman to fight.

While the Irish satire often merely consisted of a direct verbal assault on the subject, intended to cause harm there are examples of irony and humour. The prose satire *"Pairlement Chloinne Tomás"* describes a mock parliament of Irish upstarts who sided with the Cromwellian administration to the detriment of the clan establishment:

> "As do rinneadh spéicéir do Chian Ó Chaimilín don phairlement sin, dbhrígh go raibh sé 'na buachuill sagairt a bhfad, agas go bhfuair sé eolus mór, ar son nach sgríobhadh et nach léigheadh sé, et nach raibh cur amach an mhadra don bhéarla aige, agas nach raibh an Ghaoidhealg féin ar foghnamh aige."

{"The reason that Cian Ó Caimilín was made speaker in the parliament, was that he had been servant to a priest a for many years, and that he had acquired knowledge even though he could neither read nor write, and he hadn't enough English to put the dog out, and even his Irish was none to good". The editor, NJA Williams remarks that *"dogs appear from the allusion here to have been addressed in English. The same is true for the Gaeltacht today, where Irish is used for most domestic and domesticated animals, but English is for dogs"*.}

Fr. Patrick Dinneen lists Eoghan Ruadh's vicious verbal assault on Kate O'Leary under the category of *"Aor"*, a word he defines in his dictionary as: *"A satire, a lampoon, a personal attack in prose or verse, a curse*". The word *"aor"* originally had the meaning of *"cutting / wounding"*.

The English word *"malediction"* would be appropriate. Good ole' Wikipedia defines a malediction as any expressed wish that some form of adversity or unhappiness will befall another person or persons, a magical phrase or word uttered with the intention of bringing about evil, a curse.

Despite its blatant and grievous offence against Christian charity Fr. Dinneen describes this song in ecclesiastical terms:

> "Irish poets are noted for strong personal satire. This psalm of imprecations is as solemn and sombre as anything we know in literature. It proves that Eoghan's genius was adaptable to many moods. The tone is that of a Pontiff pronouncing solemn excommunication against an heresiarch"

This song does indicate in negative form the attributes which a woman would value. If we spell out the positive version of each characteristic and turn the song into a blessing the woman would receive the following:

Attractiveness, happiness, health, an appetite for pleasure, long life, the blessing of the Pope, affection, a good husband, safety, plenty, a happy death, people to grieve for her, people to pray for her, the sight of her child playing in the field, a good reputation, healthy offspring, poets singing her praises, lovely hair and strong bones, the pride of the town and pride of the women womanliness, piety, quietness, gentleness, a good nature, lovely sweetness, a beautiful countenance and form, the Son of Mary holding her in his palms always, blessing of blessings, overwhelming joy, honour and welcome of the church and bell.

I would wish all of these for our lovely daughter, Kalipay Rosa, who is nearly 5 months old.

Philip O'Connor

Magdalen—An Inquiry and its Context

The Report on the Magdalen Laundries undertaken by a Committee of Inquiry headed by Senator Dermot McAleese has transformed the way Irish society has been conditioned by recent writers to view its past. It deserves to be treated in its full context.

Prison and Social Incarceration in the Modern World

Rates of punitive and social incarceration vary greatly across the modern world but these can generally be differentiated by three categories of country:

1. Highly developed states with a punitive or liberal tendency;
2. Developing countries with a strong (developmental) state;
3. Very poor, underdeveloped countries, with weak states.

The first category includes Europe, North America, Australasia etc. The country in this category with the most punitive state is the US, which has the highest proportionate prison population in the world (716 prisoners per 100,000 population). This is 2.7m prisoners, and a further 5m people are on probation. In Europe, apart from Russia (which approaches the US level), the punitive end of the spectrum is represented by Poland, with England-Wales nearing it (220 and 154 per 100,000 respectively), and Romania and Hungary in the same category. The European norm is much lower, with most countries around the level of 120 per 100,000. A small number—Scandinavia, Germany, Ireland and Portugal—have very liberal, low-incarceration regimes, of between 50 and 100.

Strong-willed, developing countries, perhaps surprisingly, tend to have moderate to low prison populations. China, Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia and much of the Arab world, for example, have prison populations of between 50 and 150 per 100,000. India is even lower, at just 30. But what characterises these countries are high levels of what we might call ancillary social institutionalisation, i.e. orphanages, homes for the psychiatrically ill or people with disabilities, educational institutions that are effectively large scale juvenile detention centres, homes for destitute people etc.

Depending on social, religious and political culture, these are run by public—usually local—administrations (e.g. China), by religiously-related civil society organisations (e.g. in the Arab world) or by a combination of both (e.g. India). These semi-official civil or local systems operate generally with modest levels of state supervision. These states are also characterised by extensive secondary education systems provided by semi-autonomous, voluntary or other 'non-state' bodies.

Countries with the absolute lowest prison populations are very poor, underdeveloped countries, with very small state structures, e.g. much of Africa. The Central African Republic, for example, one of the lowest, has a prison population of just 19 per 100,000.

Irish criminal and social confinement

Ireland has not only a correctional and social confinement system that places it in the most enlightened category internationally, but also one of the most liberal criminal justice regimes in the world. It has a small police force but extensive state-run or -financed back-up social support services and a prison population of just 3,610. This is less than 0.1% of the population (93 per 100,000), comparable at the bottom of the league in Europe only to Scandinavia and Germany. In addition there are about 3,000 people (declining rapidly) in psychiatric or other institutions and 6,160 children in care. 50% of prisoners are under 29 years of age and just 113 are women. Of children 'in care' the majority—over 3,000—are, in fact, not in institutions at all, but in monitored foster care with families. There are less than 60 children in special juvenile criminal detention—one of the absolute lowest rates in the world. The State operates educational, child protection, social and health services of a very high quality (and cost) by international standards to work with people to avoid institutional solutions. The Irish figures for institutional confinement are astonishingly low, but the policy of the State regarding both the prison population and those in psychiatric and other care institutions is to actually *lower* them further (see *Annual Reports 2012* of the Departments of Justice, Health and Children).

Ireland's position in having one of the most liberal and civilised regimes of criminal and social confinement in the world is a result of radical reforms from the 1960s onwards, and particularly over the last 20 years. Prior to that, Ireland had a system characterised by high rates of criminal and social confinement, which had continued over decades, but had been formed in all its aspects prior to that, when the country was an economically underdeveloped region of the UK with an unnaturally large problem of mass destitution.

Under independence, from the 1920s-1950s, Ireland was a strong, development state displaying the characteristics typical of developing countries with strong political leadership, including the provision of many social, disciplinary and educational services through voluntary, mainly religious organisations. These were accompanied—as with India today—by a very low actual prison population: as late as 1984 the daily average number of prisoners in Irish prisons was 1,557 (and just 37 women). This is less than half the prison population today. Thereafter, as the state became more economically successful and affluent, this provision was gradually replaced by State-provided social services and State-funded education (free

secondary education was introduced from 1969). In the 1970s Ireland transitioned to the league of the rich, developed countries and began comprehensively dismantling its State and non-State institutional systems of service provision, and from the 1990s moved to the top of the international league of social provision and criminal justice liberality.

In judging Ireland's process of transition from destitute regional colonial status, through its stage as a strong developing country, and finally to membership at the top of the club of the richest industrial nations of the world, a certain historical perspective is required. As Victoria White put it succinctly in responding to grossly distorted commentaries on Irish development: *"If Fianna Fáil 'ruined' this country, nobody admits that it also built it"* (*Examiner*, 25 Oct. 2012).

Apples and Oranges

Bruce Arnold, a British journalist and author who occupies a prominent position in Irish public life, connects with southern Irish unionism. As this is a political position that is castrate in the Irish Republic and unlikely to generate a mass following, it gets expressed instead through bodies such as the Reform Society, which is associated with the Dublin Orange Lodge and Eoghan Harris, in promoting the First World War as a *"good war"* and the Irish War of Independence as a *"sectarian"* one, and a presentation of independent Ireland as a failed state. The *"failure"* of the state is closely associated with the Catholic identity of the majority of its citizens, and the role of the Catholic Church in its development. The Reform Society advocates Irish membership of the British Commonwealth and on *"Commonwealth Day"* this year (12th March), Arnold addressed the Reform Society to this effect.

Over the last decade, Irish society has undergone a quite traumatic process of disconnecting itself from the large-scale semi-official institutional systems of criminal justice and social provision that had been dismantled several decades previously. Unlike anywhere else in the world, it has concerned itself though numerous Commissions of Inquiry and Tribunals with the minutiae of the less glorious aspects of those institutions, and especially with abuse of individuals in them. Arnold has been to the fore in providing a particular interpretation of the institutions of the pre-1970s era. To get around the awkward fact that every single one of the institutions he damns (as well as the system as a whole) long pre-date the existence of the state, and in fact were established with official encouragement during the final century of British rule in southern Ireland—and were provided by British law with the administrative processes by which individuals were housed in them—he has proposed the theory of a system of remarkable social reform which the Treaty state of 1922 *"took over from the British and then changed"* into a monstrous system of mass imprisonment of huge swathes of the Irish population (*Irish Independent*, 18 Feb. 2013).

But Arnold has no evidence to offer for this view, just the assertion of it. Thus he states:

> "The legal and political circumstances surrounding the industrial schools and reformatories changed in Ireland with Independence. What they changed from and to is not entirely clear and the process was not immediate. The Pro-Treaty side, led by Cumann na nGaedheal, was more accepting of the British heritage, the civil service administration, the laws and the regulations ... With the change of power, in 1932, there were changes and as the country became first Éire, and then in due course the Irish Republic, the steady impact of Fianna Fáil made itself felt ..."
>
> (*The Irish Gulag: How the State Betrayed its Innocent Children*, 2009, p28).

Arnold's theory is of course nonsense: if anything, the problem after 1922 was the *lack of change* the State made to the system it had inherited from the masters of the Commonwealth. And that system, because of the extreme rates of destitution that pertained in Ireland from even before the Famine/Holocaust era, had been more thoroughly applied by Britain in Ireland than at home.

In 1914, while the richest country in the world, Britain operated a social system immensely less civilised than that of its enemies in Germany and Austria. Social insurance had just been introduced, nearly twenty years after Germany, and based on a weaker version of the German model. A vast system of incarceration for criminal and social purposes, much of it outsourced to non-State organisations, had grown up in Britain over the preceding century, and imposed in Ireland in the decades around the Famine/Holocaust. The social and economic under-development of its Irish region, and the acute levels of destitution that pertained there following a century of dispossession and famine, meant that such institutions were employed for social control on a much greater scale in the Irish region. The number of young people in Reformatories and Industrial Schools in Ireland in 1901 (twenty years *before* independence) was about 7,000—the same number as the rest of Britain combined. This represented 6 children for every thousand of the child population—a figure *six times higher than that for England.* In 1905 there were also 2,179 *"unmarried mothers"* and 2,164 *"illegitimate and deserted"* children in the Workhouses alone (*Report of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse*, Vol. 5). The total number of people in all kinds of institutions at this time—Industrial Schools, Homes, Psychiatric Hospitals and Workhouses—was well over 20,000. And the reason was straight forward: poverty and the inherited means of dealing with it.

The *"Irish Gulag"*

But no, this is not it at all. For Fintan O'Toole, Bruce Arnold, Kevin Myers and Eilis O'Hanlon, it is all a unique product of one thing: Catholic Irish independence and the fact that Ireland is not, according to O'Toole, a *"normal society"* (*Irish Times*, 25 Sept. 2012). According to Arnold, *"Church control itself was a product of Irish Independence"* (*The Irish Gulag*, p61), which, O'Toole adds, *"operated a huge, highly organised system of unlawful imprisonment into which hundreds of thousands of people disappeared, sometimes for good"* (op.cit). He declares that old Industrial Schools should be preserved as memorials *"like Auschwitz or Dachau"* (op.cit. p105), while O'Hanlon tells us, *"we are now in an analogous position to Germans after the war who had to analyse what it was in them which made the dysfunctional Nazi state possible"* (*Sunday Independent*, 10 Feb. 2013). Behind it all, according to Meyers, *"Our primitive Catholic, pseudo-Gaelic State laid foundations for Magdalenes'* (*Irish Independent*, 26 Feb. 2013).

In seeking a more nuanced interpretation than the Auschwitz model, unfortunately our current historians are hardly more helpful. In 2006 Dr. (now Prof.) Diarmuid Ferriter provided the historical backdrop piece in the *Report of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse* in industrial schools—better known as the *Ryan Report*. He strews

around poverty statistics in 1920s Dublin, jumps back to 1914 and then up to the 1960s. What he dwells on is not what explains that poverty—a nod towards Irish *"abnormality"* is apparently sufficient explanation—but the views of Churchmen and civil servants on sexual morality, with the ever-present implication that this is what lay at the root of it all. He quotes the feminist Susan McKay on dismissive male attitudes to rape in Ireland in the 1970s as if such views were a distinctly Irish failing. And he refers approvingly to the historical analysis of the late Mary Raftery, an *Irish Times* journalist who produced a few documentaries exposing abuse in Irish institutions, on reform of the Industrial School system in Ireland and Britain:

> "Unlike in England, the Catholic Church demanded and retained exceptional control over the running of institutions for Irish children. Reform of the English industrial and reformatory school system had its origins in the 1913 departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools, which according to Mary Raftery, 'had identified the problem that although the government funded the industrial schools, it had little impact on how they were run. The power lay with the voluntary groups that managed them. In Ireland, of course, this meant the Catholic Church. A key recommendation immediately acted on in Britain was that control of the voluntary bodies should be curtailed, with the state becoming more active in running the institutions, culminating of course with their closure in the 1930s. It is likely that these reforms would have been extended to Ireland, despite the strong resistance from the Catholic Church, which viewed any interference as a direct assault on its power. However, the advent of independence meant that such a challenge was never mounted.' …." (*Report of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse,* Vol. 5).

So, if it hadn't been for independence none of the problems with these institutions would have happened! In fact, far from the recommendation being *"immediately acted on in Britain",* it took sixteen years before the British Government passed the *Children and Young Persons Act*, establishing the Approved Schools (1933) *"to cater for all classes of neglected and delinquent children"*, effectively taking over the role of the Industrial Schools and Reformatories in Britain from the mid-1930s (www.workhouses.org.uk/IS/). And even these, far from the State bodies inferred by Raftery, continued as before as subcontracted voluntary institutions, simply taking over where the old schools had left off, and implementing well into the 1970s a *"more severe version of the caning or strapping that was common in ordinary secondary schools"* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Approved_School).

So let us go back a little and help our commentator and historian friends with some context.

The English System of Institutional Care as applied in Ireland

Even before the Famine—which was the real Irish holocaust, that swept away millions, rather than the one in the displaced imaginings of O'Toole-O'Hanlon—visitors to Ireland from the Continent arrived as enthusiasts for British progressivism. But they were shocked to the core at the desperate and primitive conditions in which they observed the mass of the population to be living, the absence of any social provision by the State and the undeveloped and desolate condition of the countryside. How could this part of their great liberal Nirvana be in such a state of social devastation the likes of which could not be witnessed even in barbarous Russia? The continental visitors were of course witnessing the results of the great colonial experiment of England's Glorious Revolution of 1688, which in the succeeding hundred years had uprooted, dispossessed and destroyed the Irish civilisation.

In the 1830s England was grappling with the disruption and pauperisation of its own rural society that its industrial revolution was causing, and was beginning to recast the system of aiding its own new poor and dispossessed. This process was to result in the Poor Law of 1834 which provided subsistence aid to limited categories of people in the form of Outdoor Relief (work and payments) and Indoor Relief (Workhouses) for the unemployed. Extending the system to Ireland was a cause of major controversy as, in the absence, outside of the north-east of Ireland, of any comparable productive industry, provision of assistance at even the minimum level envisaged, to be borne by local ratepayers, seemed impossible given the extent of the impoverishment of the people. In its 1830s report, the *Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Conditions of the Poorer Classes in Ireland,* chaired by the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately,

> "estimated that the sheer scale of destitution in Ireland was such that a Poor Law system of workhouses would require accommodation for almost 2.4 million people.... Not even the most rigorous workhouse test would deter the poor from resorting to the poorhouse" (Anthony McCashin, *Social Security in Ireland,* 2004, p8).

A version of the English Poor Law was nevertheless extended to Ireland in 1838 but, as Cashin relates, never functioned properly—*"the workhouse could not operate as a deterrent in the way that it might in England's industrialised, wage-labour economy"*. Then came the Famine/Holocaust, and the Workhouses became a last resort for the *"starving and diseased"*, places of death, as opposed to temporary relief for the poor as in England. By 1850 there were 163 of them. The English Poor Law for Ireland—unlike on the 'mainland'—did not confer a right to relief, did not have the power to grant Outdoor Relief in urgent circumstances, and the conditions for relief were a lot more stringent than in the mainland system:

> "The net effect of those differences was that the incidence of relief in Ireland (standardised for population size) was a lot lower in Ireland than in England, Scotland or Wales, notwithstanding Ireland's vastly greater level of need" (p10).

While the results of the Famine were viewed in London Establishment circles as a successful culling exercise (see editorial in *The Times*, 2 Jan. 1852), the extent of destitution in Ireland changed little. To deal with it, the English State encouraged the development of the Catholic Church in a role of social control over the disorderly masses, or as Pearse put it, a mob that was trying to realise itself as a nation. Catholic Orders were encouraged and Maynooth was endowed by the State. This was not a role it initially sought, as was reflected in the development of primary education as recounted by the late Garret Fitzgerald:

> "In order to meet long-standing Catholic educational grievances, the Irish chief secretary of a new Whig government, Edward Stanley, wrote to the liberal Protestant Duke of Leinster to invite him to head a Commission of National Education which was to establish, in response to joint requests from Protestants and Catholics in any parish, a network of state-aided non-

> denominational schools under local patronage. It is notable that the Catholic hierarchy initially supported this scheme ..., influenced by their concern to block the proselytising efforts of many Protestant evangelicals. So the genesis of our *de facto* Catholic primary school system does not lie with the Catholic Church—which many people wrongly blame for the emergence of denominational schools in Ireland. That development was in fact a consequence of the initial bitter hostility of Presbyterians to the new schools and of the strong opposition of a majority of the Church of Ireland. (*'Decision to change schools into Catholic institutions was flawed', The Irish Times,* 23 April 2011).

The British state thereafter encouraged the role of Maynooth in organising the social and educational affairs of the disorderly colony and in the process hoisted it into a position of maximum power in the society.

In the absence of a functional Poor Law system, and with destitution at levels unknown in the rest of Britain (or indeed Western Europe), Orders such as the Christian Brothers and the Sisters of Charity were used to fill the gap in providing the *"voluntary bodies"* required under English law for the outsourcing of its Irish poverty, health and education problem. Among these were Hospitals, Secondary Schools, Industrial schools, Reformatories, Refuges for destitute and "fallen" women, Homes for orphans and so forth. With a population in a downward tailspin—sinking catastrophically through emigration from 6.5m in 1851 to 5m in 1914 (from probably 10m in the mid-1840s)—it was a society in some turmoil, even apart from the protracted land war of the 1880s.

By the 1890s there were proportionately far more people in County Mental Homes, Asylums, Reformatories, Workhouses and other institutions than anywhere else in the Kingdom. Referrals to these institutions took place through the courts under the provisions of English law for dealing with vagrancy, destitution, *"imbecility"*, truancy, family status etc. As the Child Abuse and Magdalen reports have unanimously shown, in all instances there were also very high levels of family- and self-referrals, overwhelmingly determined by one common feature: poverty. Mini and local famines remained a feature of the West of Ireland until into the 20th century.

In his *"historical"* paper for the Child Abuse inquiry (*Ryan Report*), the historian Dr Ferriter presents some statistics to illustrate the extent of poverty in Ireland—but devoid of any historical context. He tells us that confinement in Industrial Schools was six times higher than in England, but gives no indication of why this might have been so. He tells us that 78,934 lived in single-room tenancies in Dublin and that the city had a child mortality rate of one in eleven (*Report of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse*, Vol. 5). But he doesn't give us comparisons that would make sense of these figures. For some context we must look back to the official reports quoted by James Connolly:

> "According to the latest returns, the death-rate in Dublin was 27.6 per 1,000. This was the highest of any City in Europe, as given in the Registrar-General's list, the next highest being that of Moscow—26.3 per 1,000. In Calcutta, in the presence of plague and cholera, the rate was only 27 per 1,000 ... In 1908 the mean death-rate in the 76 largest English towns was 15.8. The death-rate in the Dublin Registration Area was 21.5, the rate in the City being 23" (he adds an official statistic on break-down by class, giving a mortality rate of 32.6% among the "General Service Class and Inmates of Workhouses"; see *The Re-Conquest of Ireland*, 1915, Chapter 3).

Much is rightly made of the Irish Parliamentary Party's 'success' in preventing certain aspects of the Social Insurance reforms of 1909-10 being applied in Ireland, and certainly Redmond's fear, as with the Wyndham Act that previously had resolved the land ownership issue in 1903, was that it would indeed help *"kill Home Rule with kindness"*. In both cases he was to be wrong of course, as the drive for independence proved itself a political affair that no measure of social reform was likely to derail. But in the Irish context where the vast majority of the population were small landholders, agricultural workers, or casual labourers, rather than industrial workers, the Social Insurance issue was not of immediate concern.

After Independence

But destitution confronted the first Dail in 1919 as a major problem, as was the inheritance of an out-sourced institutional system of proxy welfare for an overwhelming population of destitute people. Non-industrial Ireland in the 1920s survived on a tiny revenue base—the national budget in 1929 was £24m. To give some perspective, the Land Annuities being collected by the Irish Government for transfer to the English Treasury from farmers—for the buy-out by the former tenants of their landlords—at the time amounted to £3.2m per year, or nearly a sixth of the national budget, while the British annual budget was about two-hundred times the size (Dept. Industry and Commerce, *Ireland—Statistical Abstract*, 1931, pp35, 126 ff). In addition, until negotiated away by the Free State Government in the mid-1920s, Britain was demanding that it pay a portion of the British National Debt created by its Great War.

Despite these conditions, the Poor Law was amended. Unemployment Insurance was introduced, with additional rates for "dependents" being added in 1921 just a few years after Britain. The "Workhouses" were renamed "County Homes" and "Outdoor Relief" changed to "Home Assistance". They remained, as in Britain, a County-level responsibility (and liability), but under a 1924 Act came under central national guidelines. Although benefit rates were lower than Britain by up to 25%, the system, apart from health provision, tended to track British developments over the succeeding two decades (P. Kaim-Caudle, *Social Policy in the Irish Republic*, 1967; Anthony McCashin, *Social Security in Ireland*, 2004; Angela Clifford, *Poor Law in Ireland*, 1983).

The rate of institutional detention did not come down from the very high pre-1918 levels, and remained until the 1950s at up to 30,000 people in any given year—the biggest groups being young people in Industrial Schools and Reformatories (up to 7,000) and adults in County Homes and mental illness institutions (up to 20,000)—many of the latter being the genuinely mentally ill, but also including many people with disabilities, people regarded as *"destitute"* and old *"infirm"* people, referred by both health authorities and families.

Why was this so, and did it diverge as drastically as Ferriter, O'Toole and Raftery claim from experience in other comparable countries? Institutionalisation of the mentally ill and even intellectually disabled people was a phenomenon across at least the Western world until attitudes began to change in the 1960s. Until the 1970s, as Mary Ellen Synon has pointed out, sterilisation of the *"mentally deficient"* was Government practice in the model welfare state of social democratic Sweden and some States of

the US ('Magdalene laundries: or how British-bred eugenics put Magdalene across the world', *Daily Mail*, UK ed., 5 Feb. 2013). Even in the much vaunted British welfare state, the treatment of poor children separated from their parents remained harsh until the 1960s—a study by the human rights campaigner, Margaret Humphreys, revealed that up to 150,000 babies and young people were removed from homes in Britain and sent for adoption to Australia, Canada, New Zealand and other parts of the Empire-Commonwealth, often without their parents' knowledge (*Empty Cradles*, 1996).

A "Catholic" system?

The Catholic issue is central, though not as central as the out-sourcing model established in the 19th century and inherited by the independent Ireland of the 1920s. Catholic power was developed under British rule with a specific, structured and institutionalised role of social control, a system that could not simply have been sloughed off by the new state even had it so wished or had there been any popular clamour to do so.

But Arnold, or the other writers in similar vein, make no reference to the fact that the vast sub-contracted institutional system inherited from British times was meticulously sub-divided by religion, with parallel institutions under Protestant (Church of Ireland and Presbyterian) control, mirroring their Catholic brethren in almost every detail of physical and sexual abuse, forced labour and every other negative feature of the Catholic institutions. The Bethany Homes earn not a single mention in Arnold's 350-page book, nor in the newspaper columns of his fellow travellers. It is difficult not to concur with Victoria White, a columnist with the *Examiner* and herself what she describes as a *"Dún Laoghaire Protestant"*, that the curious silence on this issue of voices so outraged by the Catholic abuse is *"because the majority doesn't want to share the story. For most it's not about the kids at all. It's about getting back at the Catholic Church"* ('We shouldn't turn our backs on Protestant survivors of abuse', *Examiner*, 13 Sept. 2012).

Indeed, in this context, after Bethany, what remains of the elaborate theories of unique Catholic politico-perversion and of what Eilis O'Hanlon has called the *"shame"* of our Nazi-like Catholic *"collective guilt"* (*Sunday Independent*, 10 Feb. 2013)? Well, the *"Magdalenes"* of course.

Magdalen Report Ends the Propaganda

The report on the Magdalen Laundries that appeared in early February this year is radically different in content and tone from previous reports into related issues. (*Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalen Laundries*—available at www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/MagdalenRpt2013). It includes among other things a historical analysis which in its sober objectivity far surpasses that, for example, of Dr. (now Prof.) Diarmuid Ferriter, which formed the *"historical context"* of the 2006 Ryan Report.

Indeed, the meticulous investigation of the documentary record puts the whole Magdalen Report apart, as the Ryan Report, apart from the *"historical report"*, relied exclusively on oral evidence. The objectivity and reliance on careful examination of both documentary and oral evidence that characterises the Magdalen Report stunned Irish society and for the first time allowed it come to terms with its actual history.

In a refreshing contrast to other Tribunals and Inquiries of the last decade, the Magdalen Report cost the State virtually nothing, apart from the considerable work McAleese got its Departments to undertake for him: *"No member of the Committee received a salary or stipend in relation to its work. The only direct costs arose from travelling expenses and room hire for meetings. These costs amounted to €11,146.06."* The 1,000+ page report took 18 months to compile with the assistance of research teams of officials in all Departments involved, and Mc Aleese provided his own work pro-bono. On completion, he presented the Report to Government and promptly retired.

The Magdalen Laundries had been presented by commentators as the ultimate expression of the Catholic shadow State, perpetrated against women, and a mirror of the society that allowed them to exist. Emotive documentaries, movies and publications in the 1990s and early 2000s had portrayed them as slavery institutions, characterised by physical and sexual abuse, through which up to 30,000 women had been condemned on a largely arbitrary basis by Church and State. The figure over a sixty year period was in fact just over 11,100. Bruce Arnold had classed them in *The Irish Gulag* as in a continuum with the Industrial School system *"that justified the comparisons, made by some of the victims, with the Nazi system of concentration camps"* (*The Irish Gulag*, p81). On the appearance of the Report he slammed its findings as flying *"in the face of the painful evidence of laundry victims"*. (*Irish Independent*, 18 Feb. 2013). But Arnold was an exception—the strength of the evidence meant that its findings could not credibly be challenged. Some, like Fintan O'Toole, realising that caution was the better part of valour, stayed silent on it. He has taken off instead to stir some other waters (in his case, psychiatric hospitals—*'Dark stain of Irish gulag system'*, *Irish Times*, 25 Sept. 2012).

Senator Dermot McAleese has done society a considerable service.

Framework of the Report

The Report is built on a vast trawl through state records, including very obscure and often difficult to locate Garda and court records. Despite most of these not having been digitised, a meticulous cross-referencing of names and cases was carried out. In addition, on a commitment to ensure the anonymity of persons concerned—both the women themselves as well as other individuals identified in the records—the Religious Orders involved in running the laundries, without exception, opened their records to the Committee. This was a major and unique coup, and it is hard to believe that, were it not for the obvious non-vindictive and objective approach of McAleese, that this would have happened. A full archive of the Committee's work has been lodged for future research purposes with the Department of the Taoiseach.

It overthrows virtually everything that was popularly believed about the laundries and—in a serious indictment of the academic history profession, some of whose opinions it cites—establishes a great many previously unknown facts in relation to the history, legal basis and practices of committal by State authorities and others of women to these institutions.

The mandate of McAleese's Committee had restricted it only to State involvement in committals and to the post-1922 period. McAleese, being what he is (a northern Catholic and husband of the former President), knew that, if he stuck rigidly to this, the results would be a distortion. He therefore included a substantial section on the pre-1922 history of the laundries, the basis on which women were committed to the

institutions, and details of the majority of referrals to the laundries in which the State had no involvement whatsoever. He wrote that these aspects were essential to understanding the context.

History

The first Magdalen Home was established in England in 1758 (the Magdalen Hospital in Whitechapel) *"for the reception of the penitent 'fallen'"*, taking in females aged between fifteen and twenty *"desirous of reform"*. The first in Ireland was a Protestant asylum established in 1765 *"to rescue first fall Protestant cases only"*. The Church of Ireland *"Lock Penitentiary"* in Dublin followed in 1794 *"to employ and reform destitute women leaving the lock hospital"*, and the *"Female Penitentiary"* in Dublin in 1813 *"for fallen females of every religious persuasion"*. Several more Protestant Homes followed. By the mid-century most were taking in destitute women with no connection with prostitution. The ten Catholic laundries examined by the report were established mostly by lay individuals in the period 1820-40 and were later transferred by their founders to Religious Orders committed to helping the *"poor and destitute"*. By 1898 there were more than 300 Magdalen Institutions in England alone, collectively housing 6,000 inmates and employing at least 1,200 full-time staff. In Ireland in the late 19th century there were 41 institutions.

There was a serious prostitution problem in Dublin, where 19 Magdalen Laundries operated. Diarmuid Ferriter (*Occasions of Sin: Sex and Society in Modern Ireland*) is quoted as estimating that in 1868 there were 132 brothels with at least 1,000 prostitutes in the city. The women came from rural Ireland or the slums of Dublin, overwhelmingly from a background of destitution. The clients were provided by the large British military garrison and the better-off classes living in the outer suburbs, as graphically portrayed in Joyce's *Ulysses.* The withdrawal of the British army, the work of *"rescue"* societies, and the suppression of the vast *"Monto"* red light district in the 1920s greatly reduced these numbers. But even before that, women were ending up in the Laundries from a great variety of reasons, mostly related to poverty.

Work in the laundries, according to the historian engaged by the Committee, Maria Luddy of NUI Maynooth (author of *Magdalen Asylums in Ireland 1765-1922*), was provided for two reasons—*"not only to keep the inmates busy but also to train them for new occupations once they had left the asylum"*. Neither *"hardened prostitutes"*, nor pregnant women were accommodated, and the practice of giving women names other than their own occurred only in some institutions. Before 1900 the *"majority of women who entered these refuges did so voluntarily … just over 66 per cent"*: *"entering a refuge was, for the majority of women, a matter of choice"*, favoured over the Workhouse.

Most also left the laundries voluntarily. After the turn of the century, referrals by the courts and other statutory agencies began under new legislation, notably the Children Act 1908. The Report establishes that there was no change in the patterns of referral and admittance to, or exit from, the laundries between this period and the post-1922 period.

Legal Framework

The Report states:

> "It is possible that a lack of modern awareness of these Acts may have contributed to confusion or a mistaken sense that the Magdalen Laundries were unregulated or that State referrals of girls and women to the Laundries occurred in all cases without any legal basis."

It then lists the wide range of applicable legislation that *"pre-dates the establishment of the State and was carried over from the pre-independence period"*. These included the 19th century Lunacy Acts, Truck Acts, Truancy Acts and the Dangerous Lunatics (Ireland) Act as well as the post-1900 Youthful Offenders, Probation and Children Acts. Under the Free State in the 1920s the Local Government Act (1923) regulated the role of the local Health Boards (which were responsible for welfare) and later Irish legislation modified or reformed the powers of police, courts or health authorities to commit women to non-State institutions.

From 1901 the law provided for the referral of young or female prisoners on remand or probation to outside institutions rather than prison. A system of *"voluntary probation officers"* was introduced by the Criminal Justice Administration Act 1914, which also allowed for residence in an institution as a condition of probation. It empowered the police to return offenders to institutions where they broke a probation order by leaving. The 1908 Children Act empowered the police to remove child victims of abuse to a *"place of safety"* and also determined that on leaving Industrial Schools at 16 young people remained under the authority of the Home Manager until reaching 18 (the 1941 Act extended this to 21) and could in this period be transferred to Homes where release to a family was not an available option.

The Criminal Justice (Amendment) Act 1935 and Children Act 1941 introduced some reforms, in particular widening the basis for probation rather than imprisonment, and also extending the provisions of the 1908 Act to all persons up to 21 years of age. A series of major reforms in 1945-50 removed many powers from County Council health authorities and centralised them in new Departments of Health and Social Welfare. The 1960 Criminal Justice Act, introduced by Justice Minister Charles Haughey, greatly liberalised the criminal justice system. Among other provisions, it expanded considerably the system of early release. Haughey also commissioned a report on establishing a borstal for young women to replace the system of committal to non-state institutions, but this was not acted on.

Numbers and "routes of entry"

The three findings which came as most of a revelation to public opinion were, firstly, the much lower level of confinements than generally assumed (11,198 rather than 30,000 over a sixty-year period), secondly the relatively low extent of State involvement in referrals (26.5%) compared to the much more extensive role of families, relations and *"self referrals"*, and, thirdly, the generally short duration of stay of most women (47.4% less than 6 months, and 61% less than 1 year, with the median duration 7 months).

But why were the women there at all? The *"routes of entry*" of women to the laundries could be identified in over 72% of cases:

	No. women	%
Self	1,319	16.4%
Transfer from other Laundry	1,186	14.8%
Other congregations	898	11.2%
Family	845	10.5%
Priest	705	8.8%
Criminal Justice System	646	8.1%
Industrial/Reformatory Schools	622	7.8%
Legion of Mary	394	4.9%
County Homes & City Homes	349	4.4%
Mother and Baby Homes etc.	313	3.9%
Hospitals, Doctors, Nurses	193	2.4%
Other	185	2.3%
NSPCC	176	2.2%
Psychiatric hospitals & institutions for intellectually disabled	107	1.3%
Health/social service authorities	87	1.1%

While state involvement in committals is 26.5% of known routes of entry, when *"unknown"* routes of entry are included, the percentage is actually just 19%. Committals through the criminal justice system over 60 years amounted to the following: 203 on probation, 185 through the Gardaí, 160 from the courts, 52 on remand, and 46 transferred from prison. These referrals happened on the basis of legal provision.

The Committee examined claims that the laundries were run as profitable businesses and that the State comprised their main customers. The report notes that—where records survive—the State (e.g. armed forces) accounted for about 18% of the business: *"The remainder of the customer base of the Laundry was made up by private institutions, primarily hotels, schools and individuals."* State contracts were awarded bureaucratically on the basis of competitive tender, and this was enforced in response to complaints of unfair competition by private companies.

The popular perception of many women spending their lives in these institutions is not true. Just 7.7% spent over 10 years in them, mostly women with intellectual disabilities, or who became *"auxiliaries"*. Most women left the laundries at their own request (23%), returned home or were reclaimed by their families (22.2%), left for employment (7%), *"ran away"* (1.7%), or were simply discharged (7.1%). Of the remainder who left, 10.3% moved to another laundry, others departed *"for homeless shelters, hostels or other places"*, moved to County Homes or psychiatric institutions (approx. 6%) or to a hospital as employees or patients (2.8%). The vast majority of women were young on entering the laundries. 60% were under 25 (40% under 18), and the median age on entry was 23.

Despite the strong historical associations between the Magdalen Laundries and prostitution or unmarried mothers of over one child, the Report found that these formed a very small number of the women in the laundries and that:

> "these categories of women were by no means found only in Magdalen Laundries: unmarried mothers and their children were in some cases retained in County Homes for up to 2 years, while psychiatric institutions also housed significant numbers of women who had given birth to children out of wedlock."

The vast majority of unmarried women in Ireland giving birth to a child did so either under the care of their families or in the voluntarily religious-run Mother and Baby Homes. In many cases—though by no means all—the children were then put up for adoption.

Criminal Justice and Health System

Committals under the criminal justice system included placement for remand, or probation for preceding charges, for offences ranging from vagrancy and larceny to serious crime (murder, infanticide), but overwhelmingly for petty larceny. Most of these referrals occurred under the Penal Servitude Act 1891, the Probation of Offenders Act 1907; the Criminal Justice (Administration) Act 1914 and the Criminal Justice Act 1960. In addition:

> "Although much less common, the Committee also found other informal Court referrals by way of adjournment of charges or suspension of sentencing on condition of residence in a Magdalen Laundry for a set period. These informal referrals did not have a specific legislative basis."

As regards referrals by members of the Garda:

> "in some cases, the Gardaí were simply transferring women from the Courts to the Magdalen Laundry following a Court Order as set out above. In other instances, the Gardaí brought women to the Magdalen Laundries on a more ad hoc or informal basis, for instance where a woman was temporarily homeless; or where, in the years prior to out-of-hours health services, a juvenile girl needed overnight accommodation."

Committals from the criminal justice system conformed to a general view that prison was an unsuitable place for women. As late as 1984, the daily average number of women in all Irish prisons was just 37 (compared to 1,557 men). In addition, despite several State initiatives to establish one, there was no borstal for young female offenders in the state, not least because of the hostile attitude of strong lay religious organisations. Women serving time in prison—especially long sentences—were sometimes transferred to the laundries following a plea to the courts from the women concerned themselves. But the majority of women referred by the justice system served very short periods either on remand or as a part of a probation arrangement. This was encouraged by the role of Voluntary Probation Officers appointed by the State from organisations such as the Vincent de Paul (for Catholic women) and the Salvation Army (for Protestant women), and similarly the NSPCC, who generally sought terms in such Homes in preference to prison.

The vast majority of women referred through the justice system were very young (mean age 20 years). A large number were from broken homes, were orphans, or their parents were unknown. Many such young women were referred from Industrial Schools when they reached 16 years of age and remained during their period of post-discharge supervision (which continued to 19, or after 1941 to 21). The Committee found that women referred from prisons to the laundries after 1941 often sought a review of their confinement by the Minister for Justice, with early release regularly resulting.

As regards referrals from the health and social services, official regulations authorised transfer to Magdalen Laundries as an alternative to *"home assistance"* (i.e. state payments) for people who were poor, mentally disabled or disadvantaged in many other ways and dependent on state or voluntary service supports. There were cases of foster children sent to the laundries when foster parents *"gave them up"* on the ending of state payments, *"unmarried mothers"* removed from County Homes after the latter were directed to change focus to the elderly and sick, women with an intellectual disability placed in preference to confinement in a psychiatric institution, and women using the laundries as a short term *"half way house"* on leaving psychiatric institutions, or simply when homeless. There were also young women referred from Mother and Baby Homes where they required further accommodation, though apparently, contrary to popular belief, this occurred only in isolated cases.

Where probation officers or social workers were involved, they regularly visited the laundries to ensure conditions of commitment were being met by the Orders and other inspections by health and safety authorities also regularly occurred.

In all cases where there was State involvement in the committal the costs were borne by the State and the woman concerned notified of the exact duration of her committal.

Industrial Schools

While the majority of girls and young

women who were in Industrial or Reformatory Schools did not subsequently enter a Magdalen Laundry, the report identifies 622 who did. These occurred under *"circumstances permitted by the legislation"* and largely involved temporary placement pending identification of a place in an Industrial or Reformatory School, girls referred to such schools but refused entry as they were too old, girls released from Industrial School before the age of 16, or referred to a laundry on reaching 16 during the period of their post-discharge supervision.

The report also identifies cases of very young girls who were taken into laundries because of exposure to prostitution (one as young as 5 was committed before the foundation of the state). There were also mothers of children in Industrial Schools, in some cases where these women were accused of neglect or abuse of the children, sometimes entering the laundry as a condition of probation. These were often the cases involving the NSPCC. In the majority of referrals from Industrial Schools, either one or both parents of the girl concerned were listed as *"unknown"*.

Other Referrals

While the great majority of women were in the laundries for reasons other than action by the State, the Committee concluded that most referrals were consequent on:

> "poverty, homelessness, domestic abuse, physical disability, mental illness, intellectual disability and family disputes. Regarded by some as places of temporary or short-term refuge or alternatively as a means of discipline for young girls, or providing for women in old age."

Many girls and women were committed by their own families *"for reasons that we may never know or fully understand, but which included the socio-moral attitudes of the time as well as familial abuse"*. Women referred by non-State organisations or by their families were, contrary to State referrals, generally unaware of the intended duration of their stay. The Committee advanced its own interpretation of family and self referrals:

> "Church, State and family views on morality in Ireland were mutually self-reinforcing. A person deviating from the prevailing norms ran the risk of ending up in a religious-run institution. While such institutions could legitimately claim to be a charitable outreach to the marginalised, they were at the very same time a powerful reinforcer of those self-same moral norms."

Conditions in the Laundries

The Committee investigated the accounts of the Orders concerned and found no evidence of the laundries having *"recruited"* women themselves or having made a profit from the the laundries:

> "The Laundries operated for the most part on a subsistence or close to break-even basis rather than on a commercial or highly profitable basis. The financial accounts tend to support the fact that, what came to be known as the Magdalen Laundries, were historically established as refuges, homes or asylums for marginalised women and girls. The subsequent establishment of the Laundries was for the purposes of financially supporting and maintaining them."

As regards working conditions, the Committee examined reports by factory inspectors, interviewed many retired inspectors, and women themselves. Nine of the ten Laundries voluntarily submitted to factory inspections, even before being legally required to do so. In some cases laundries had state of the art industrial facilities and were well-managed, while others were old fashioned in both their equipment and supervisory management. Some laundries included outside full-time workers and managers on their staffs. While the work regimes were harsh, they were not brutal. The Committee found that the laundries were—

> "generally compliant with the requirements of the Factories Acts. Records suggest that where minor breaches occurred, they were remedied when brought to the attention of the operating Congregation ... [S]tandards then required under the Factories Acts were not equivalent to those currently applicable to workplaces."

The work of the women in the laundries was unpaid—apart from pocket money which seems to have been provided—and considered part of the terms of accommodation and *"training"*. This too pre-dated 1922. Attempts to extend the Trade Boards Act (minimum wages) to the laundries in 1913-14 were prevented by the State, which believed that this would force nine-tenths of such institutions to close. The British Ministry of Labour at the time concluded that a contract of service (i.e. employment) did not exist.

The Committee found it *"difficult to reconcile"* its evidence with claims of abuse in the laundries found in the Ryan Report and other accounts in the public domain. It was not granted access to the sources of the Ryan Report (allegedly for reasons of *"confidentiality"*!). That report had relied for its findings exclusively on oral accounts. The McAleese Committee, however, interviewed 118 women and could find no evidence either from them or from documentary sources of any sexual abuse (except one case involving another woman in the laundry) or physical abuse. While the work regime was tough and conditions sparse and puritan, disciplinary actions tended to be more of the kind of *"being sent to bed without supper"*. Women repeatedly compared the laundries favourably with the Industrial Schools, from which many of those giving evidence to the Committee had been referred. One quote succinctly expresses the general view of interviewees on abuse:

> "I don't ever remember anyone being beaten, but we did have to work very hard. We were robbed of our childhood, but then, I had a mother that beat the crap out of me."

Until the early 1960s, women in at least four of the laundries exercised their right to vote in elections and this extended to eight laundries in 1963. In two laundries it is unknown whether this was the case.

Different than the Rest of the World?

Fintan O'Toole believes that Ireland has been a uniquely awful place, which ran a Gulag system of containment for its inhabitants and was something other than a *"normal society"*. Bruce Arnold thinks we should re-join the Commonwealth as a first step towards re-connecting with the civilised world. Eilis O'Hanlon believes:

> "What we're only now coming to terms with is what a dark, brutal, unfeeling, sick country this was. Something was festering inside it. Some say the disease was Catholicism, but Catholicism did not manifest itself the same way everywhere; it was Irish Catholicism which did that, and it's the "Irish" part of that epithet which we're only now confronting" (*Sunday Independent*, 10.02.2013).

Whatever about that, the McAleese Report identified in a factual and objective manner the realities of the Magdalen Laundries and also the type

of social and sexual mores of Irish society in relation to *"unmarried mothers"* and prostitution which led to a process of *"mutual self-reinforcement"* of social values. A representative of *Justice for Magdalenes* on radio following publication of the report, with its objective information and its discrediting of abuse claims, was reduced to saying that maybe they weren't uniquely bad, that Irish society was a poor place at the time, and the real problem was the social attitudes to women, the patriarchy. And as far as it goes, that is not incorrect.

But was Ireland all that different regards such attitudes?

According to Jill Nicholson *(Mother And Baby Homes: a survey of homes for unmarried mothers,* London, 1968) there were still 172 Mother and Baby Homes in Britain in the 1960s, of which 138 were provided by Church organisations. They catered for around 12,000 of the 70,000 extra-marital pregnancies a year, mostly referred to the Homes by social workers or self-referred. They were benign if austere institutions, with good provision for babies and a requirement to spend several hours a day in house cleaning duties. They functioned down to the 1970s.

A review in the London *Independent* ('This Britain', 26 May 2012) of *Sinners? Scroungers? Saints? Unmarried Motherhood in 20th-Century England,* by Pat Thane and Tanya Evans (OUP), recounts the following:

> "Nowadays, it seems incredible that women should have had to hide their 'shame'—a Victorian word still in common currency in the 1950s—in such forbidding institutions, austere relics of 19th-century workhouses and 18th-century penitentiaries. Even worse were the cases of unmarried mothers discovered in mental asylums in the 1970s, having been incarcerated there for decades, thanks to the post-war influence of such notorious experts as the child psychiatrist John Bowlby who condemned 'the neurotic character' of the 'socially unacceptable' unmarried mother...
>
> "The official stigma surrounding illegitimacy, together with queues of childless couples wanting to adopt in the days before fertility treatment, meant that the mother-and-baby homes that were widely established in Britain between the two world wars by the main churches and the Salvation Army were seen to be neatly solving two societal problems at once ...."

The review quotes some individual cases:

> "At 40, my mother was young for her age, and knew little of the facts of life after a very religious upbringing in south-east London with a Baptist foster family. She dreaded their reaction, particularly as history was repeating itself: she herself was the illegitimate daughter of an abandoned birth mother. Birdhurst was just one of three such institutions in which my mother stayed...
>
> "{Another woman at the home} was aged 17 when she got pregnant ... and her banishment by her family now sounds like something from a Victorian melodrama: 'When I told my father I was expecting, my stepmother gave him an ultimatum and said it was her or me. So he packed my things in a brown paper parcel, gave me a 10-shilling note and told me that he never wanted to see me again. Cousins of mine said to me years later, 'Why didn't you come to us?'. But in those days it was considered a real sin that you had committed, and you didn't land yourself on someone's doorstep. ... {In the} Birdhurst Lodge, run by the evangelical Mission of Hope ... we handed over the government maternity allowance to pay for our keep, we still had to work very hard at keeping the floors clean, scrubbing the huge staircase and doing all the washing; and they would make us get down on our knees in a group to repent.' ..."

An article in *The Guardian* ('I had to give up my baby for adoption', 17 March 2012) recalled the story of a woman who gave birth in an English Mother and Baby Home in 1964:

> "There was no alternative. Unmarried mothers suffered a huge social stigma—she would not have been able to work, there were no benefits, and she could not live at home. The Loreto Convent Mother and Baby Home for Unmarried Mothers was as joyless as its name suggests. Run by nuns, it fed and sheltered young pregnant women in the run up to childbirth and a few weeks beyond. It was a Victorian institution with few comforts: the shared bedrooms were cold and the bathrooms communal. The girls were put to work in the laundry or, in Angela's case, the "milk kitchen", preparing bottles of formula for the newborns who had returned from hospital before they were adopted. In the nuns' eyes, the girls were there because they had sinned, and must atone."

In Australia until the 1970s young women could also be referred by the courts to Magdalen Laundries run by Catholic sisters. Court referral to the Australian asylums was restricted to girls between the ages of 14 and 18. One such was the Holy Cross Retreat in Brisbane, established in 1905 and co-located with a Magdalene Asylum for unmarried mothers:

> "The retreat was based on the Magdalene asylums of Ireland, the object being to provide 'a home for the destitute and needy, irrespective of creed or country, to aid and reform the erring, to shelter the weak minded, and to train the wayward, uncontrollable and erring, to habits of self restraint by necessary instruction and kind but firm discipline.' The young unmarried mothers who were placed in the home worked without pay in the laundry for the duration of their stay at Holy Cross. Their babies were cared for during the day by other inmates of the retreat, which included destitute women and women suffering from physical and mental disabilities. Holy Cross ... discontinued accepting State Ward girls in care and control from 1973."
>
> (www.originsharp.com/papers/id20.html).

According to the Australian newspaper, *The Age* (26 Apr. 2003), the Good Shepherd laundries remained open until the 1960s. In 2003 a national inquiry was instituted into the extent and legacy of abuse of up to 80,000 former state wards in Government and Church orphanages and foster homes between the 1920s and 1970s.

All in all, Irish attitudes to people in difficulties are very much in keeping with what happened in other comparable countries. There was a basic support framework, but it was not an attractive one. But it has to be remembered that the people who had to turn to the State or to institutions were an infinitesimal number, 11,000 over sixty years. In many parts of Ireland there was community tolerance and a network of local support for people with such problems.

Report

The Bethany Home - Deaths can't be ignored

The Catholic hierarchy hid for far too long behind the shield of ignorance when confronted by accusations of child abuse…

…the Church of Ireland is taking refuge in an equally weak and unconvincing defence in regard to the deaths of babies —at least 132—at Dublin's Bethany Home between 1935 and 1944.

Time has not dimmed the outrage provoked by the treatment of these women and their children. Surely it is obvious that there will be negative consequences if there is not a proper, honest account of what went on in Bethany Home all those years ago? Like other horrors it must be confronted or it will fester forever.

4 January 2013 Irish Examiner Editorial

VOX

Immigrants
Marion Keyes
Out Of Tune?
Tiger
Jack Lew
Protestant Schools

PAT

Immigrants

"More than one million immigrants came to Ireland over the last decade but just a quarter of these were still working here in 2011" (*Irish Independent*, 2.3.2013).

A new report from the Central Statistics Office shows a dramatic fall-off in the numbers of foreign nationals arriving in Ireland to work in the last few years.

Only 58,300 foreigners of working age were assigned PPSN numbers in 2011, compared with almost 204,000 in 2006. And just 21,800 of them got jobs, compared with 120,700 back in 2006.

Looking back at the entire period from 2002 to 2011, the figures show that a massive 1.148 million foreigners of working age came to Ireland and were allocated PPSN numbers.

And though only one in four of them was still working here at the end of the period, that's still 310,000 foreign workers. It remains a sizable chunk of the working population of around 1.8 million.

The CSO report on Foreign Nationals shows that the huge drop-off in employment levels since 2006 has not resulted in a corresponding increase in social welfare claims.

Only 28% of those allocated PPSN numbers that year were claiming welfare in 2011.

And that number would include thousands of parents whose only welfare claim was for child benefit payments.

Among migrants who came here in 2011, social welfare uptake was just 9%.

The Integration Centre, which works with immigrants, said the report debunks the myth about high numbers of migrants on social welfare—provided the CSO figures are a little more accurate than those mentioned in the last issue (No. 111, p14).

****

Marion Keyes

"Best-selling author Marian Keyes has been forced to apologise after suggesting that there should be a "National Throw A Stone At A Priest Day"…" (*Irish Catholic*, 17.1.2013).

Ms Keyes then posted a message to social networking site Twitter stating: *"no matter how 'nice' a priest is, no matter how many raffles he runs, he is still a foot soldier for a f*cked-up misogynistic regime"*.

Amid a flurry of protest on the site, Ms Keyes later removed the offending message and apologised *"unreservedly"* for what she described as *"an ill-thought-out tweet"*.

The Association of Catholic Priests has rejected the anti-Church tone of much of the recent debate around abortion.

Following Senator Ivana Bacik's accusation that Catholic Bishops opposed legislating for the X case on the basis of *"misogyny towards women"* and a belief in the *"innate deceitfulness of women"*, Fr P.J. Madden of the ACP said such suggestions were *"inappropriate, obnoxious and seriously objectionable"*.

Fr. Sean McDonagh added:

"I might not agree with every position that the Church has taken on women in recent years but Senator Bacik's comments were appalling. With her {Senator Bacik} and many more there is a deep seated and pervasive bias against Catholicism."

****

Out Of Tune?

"A Choir conductor who claims she was bullied out of her prestigious job at Dublin's Christ Church Cathedral {Church of Ireland} has settled her constructive dismissal claim" (*Evening Herald*, Dublin, 16.1.2013).

Judy Martin (45), who was Ireland's first female cathedral organist, claimed she was forced to resign her €34,000-a-year job owing to an on-going campaign of *"bullying, harassment and intimidation"* by the Dean of Christ Church, the Very Reverend Dermot Dunne.

However, following several hours of discussions between representatives of the Church and Ms Martin, and after three days of evidence, an employment appeals tribunal was told the case was being withdrawn.

Peter Shanley, for Ms Martin, told the tribunal he was pleased to announce that the case has been *"resolved amicably to the satisfaction of both parties"*. No details were given.

Ms Martin, who was once described as *"the greatest conductor of her generation"*, did not comment.

****

Tiger

Editorial headline in *Irish Independent*: *"Our tiger cubs must learn that it's now a real jungle out there*" (12.3.2013).

****

Jack Lew

In January this year, Jack Lew, became the first Jew to be named as US Treasury-Secretary.

Mr Lew's life which has seen him move from humble beginnings in the Bronx to Wall Street and then chief of staff at the White House contains many lessons but perhaps the most interesting in this age of 24/7 gadgets, is Mr Lew's ability to cling to his faith.

Mr Lew, is an Orthodox Jew who observes the Jewish Sabbath, which means he cannot switch on a computer or answer an email from dusk on Fridays to Saturday evenings.

Despite this apparent handicap, or perhaps because of it, Mr Lew has prospered in business and politics.

He worked at Citigroup from 2006 to 2009 and for both the Clinton and Obama administrations.

His former boss on the National Security Council, Sandy Berger, has said that *"Lew's faith never got in the way of performing his duties"* and added that he *"was able to balance the requirements, which was very, very hard—and he was determined to observe his religious traditions"*.

An entire day without phones, emails or tweets every week while running the world's biggest economy? The Punt feels humbled and can only doff its cap in awe.

For eight years he was an adviser to legendary house speaker, the famous Tip O'Neill.

Just imagine an Irish Catholic Finance Minister telling his Leinster House masters that he wouldn't be available Sundays or Church Holidays?

****

Protestant Schools

"The Constitution does not allow for positive or negative discrimination in education based on religious ethos, the Dáil has been told amid concerns about the survival of smaller Protestant schools.

"Minister of State, Seán Sherlock (Labour) told Fine Gael's Charlie Flanagan the Constitution disallowed discrimination, as the Laois-Offaly TD expressed concern about small rural Protestant schools once changes to the pupil-teacher ratios come into effect.

"Mr. Flanagan said there were 199 Protestant schools in the State, including 124 Church of Ireland institutions, 24 Presbyterian, one Methodist and one Quaker. He said 50 of them had fewer than 30 pupils and 149 outside Dublin.

"Twenty schools would become one-teacher by the year after next. He added: "I want it addressed by the Minister". He was also concerned that there were no proper guidelines for amalgamations" (*Irish Times*, 14.3.2013).

****

Cathy Winch

The Freemasons In France During The German Occupation

The Freemasons were banned by the Vichy Government from the start, on 19th August 1940.

The defeat had been complete and lightning fast; the Government had fled from Paris, then from the Loire (where Churchill visited it), and on to Bordeaux. The choice was between Armistice and Capitulation. Then the choice was continuing to have a national Government or giving that up.

A new French Government was improvised, with a historically popular but marginal figure, Marshall Pétain. He was willing to take on the inglorious role of leader of a defeated country, for the time it would take for peace to come.

Once in power, he set about reassuring the population: he would explain to them why the country had been defeated, expose those responsible, and offer an alternative organisation of society, one that would make the motherland strong again.

This was the *"divine surprise"* of Charles Maurras. That phrase is sometimes pretended to mean that the right wing thought that being beaten and occupied by the Nazis was a divine surprise. What Maurras meant was that he was very pleasantly surprised that Pétain had political ideas, which he was prepared to put into practice, ideas which corresponded to Maurras's own ideas. He had not expected it. The 569 Parliamentarians who had voted full powers to Pétain probably had not either. Pétain had not been active in politics and was not a member of a party.

So Pétain and his Government set about explaining the defeat. They could not simply say that the army had failed to foresee the unforeseeable German plan of attack.

So instead they blamed the Government which preceded the War. It had declared war but not prepared for it.

That Government was Republican, but by 1940 that was generally accepted. But it was also dominated by the Radical party, the Party that had turned Catholic France into a secular country.

After the end of the Second Empire in 1871, the right wing had been monarchist, when there was still a chance of establishing a constitutional monarchy, but gradually it rallied to the Republic. The right wing had been consistently beaten and put on the defensive since the mid 1870s. It had witnessed the separation of Church and State, led in Parliament by A. Briand, a mason; the end of the dominance of Church schools, with free, compulsory secular schools established by J. Ferry, a mason; divorce legislation, pushed through by E. Naquet, a Jewish scientist; religious orders banned and expelled from France by E. Combes, a mason, etc—and been powerless to stop any of it. They saw Freemasonry as the anti-Catholic ideology which animated liberal politics, and Freemasons as the devils who had destroyed the foundations of society. They would eliminate them from public office and roll back the tide of so-called progress. Protestants had taken part in the secular movement, giving up their own protestant teacher training colleges and their 1000 Protestant schools, to promote the establishment of secular schooling. But there was no question of attacking Protestants.

French Freemasons are different from English or American ones because in 1877 the most numerous 'obedience', the Grand Orient, decided that it was no longer compulsory for Masons to believe in a personal God and the immortality of the soul, and for meetings to invoke God, and for oaths to be taken over an open Bible. English Freemasonry then outlawed the French version, refusing it the title of 'regular', and forbidding contact with it. One minority FM obedience in France remained 'regular'. The other obediences maintained contact with the Grand Orient and were excommunicated by England as a consequence.

Since 1848 the motto of the Grand Orient was the motto of the Republic: *Liberté Egalité Fraternité*. Its philosophy was the search for enlightenment, humanism and progress and a rejection of superstition and obscurantism. Grand Orient means Great Eastern, the East being where the sun, the light, rises. The Grand Orient today publishes a magazine called *"Humanisme"*; its emblems are the tricolour flag and the bust of the Republic (Marianne).

The belief that FM was the ideology of the IIIrd Republic was not delusional on the part of Vichy. FM was nicknamed *"The Church of the Republic"*.

According to Ligou, a FM historian and a socialist, the majority of masons supported the Popular Front of 1936. The Grand Orient marched officially in the 14th July parade of 1936. Some socialist MPs were masons. The topics discussed in the lodges included the content of the programmes of Trade Unions, the situation in the Soviet Union, the colonies and a desired progressive emancipation; the colonial lodges condemned abuses committed against the local populations. French FM helped refugee Spanish freemasons.

Some facts had established the reality of mason influence on French society; for example the filing cards scandal of 1904. The Minister for War, a General and a mason, had established a system of filing cards, to facilitate the promotion of republicans at the expense of clerical, right-wing officers. The cards detailed the officer's political opinions and religious convictions, and were established through information provided by lodges throughout the country, and in particular in garrison towns. This was found out and there was a major scandal. This specifically involved the Masonry as a network of Brothers. Other scandals involved masons on a personal level, or by implication.

The Stavisky affair (1934) involved masons, and since it involved public finances, the fact that the President of the Council of Ministers was a mason was pointed out as a contributing factor. Some masons were Jewish, so there was talk of a judeo-masonic plot, the combination being a constant theme. Besides Masonry is international! Foreign Powers must have been at work. (If a digression may be allowed here, clericals and anti-clericals accused each other of being the representatives of foreign Powers: one argument of the anti-clericals against Catholicism was its international nature: it was the Black International! The Jesuits' influence was especially sinister because it came from abroad.)

The *Cartel des Gauches* (Left alliance, not actually left-wing), came to power in 1924 with the open support and participation of masons; it dabbled in financial measures and was promptly brought down by financial interests, showing that masons do not wield the real power in crucial areas. When lists

of members were published from 1941, these were shown to be mostly primary school teachers, post office and railway employees, and tradesmen. After this 1924 failure, Freemasons decided to make their involvement less public.

An anecdote from 1924 illustrates the place of masons in French society. The Soviet writer Ilya Ehrenburg, back in Paris despite a ban, and trying to get permission to stay, was advised by a friend to go and see the head of the Grand Orient lodge. He was received in a friendly manner and told that he should go and see the Prefect of Police, another mason. There he was received not so kindly, but the upshot was that he stayed in Paris.

There was an anti-mason campaign in the 1930s; in 1935 Parliament discussed banning masonry. (It had been banned in Portugal that year.)

Important politicians who were Freemasons were Léon Blum (Popular Front Prime Minister), E. Daladier, E. Herriot, C. Chautemps. Blum and Daladier were tried by Vichy for being responsible for starting and losing the War: during their trial at Riom their membership of the Freemasonry was not mentioned, (nor, for that matter, the fact that Léon Blum was Jewish). In 1940, of the 569 parliamentarians assembled at Vichy, 85 were masons, of which 20 were among the 80 deputies and senators who voted against giving Pétain full powers.

Some influential organisations were closely linked with FM: the League of Human Rights, and the League for Education.

Vichy set out to expose the Freemasons to public scrutiny as the secret power behind previous Governments. It published magazines, held touring exhibitions, organised conferences which also toured the country, and made a film. It relied on curiosity provoked by the secrecy, the rumours about rituals, costumes, coffins etc and rumours that Masons helped each other get on to the detriment of the non-initiated. Exhibitions and lectures were well-attended.

FM temples and other buildings in occupied Paris were taken over by official anti-mason bureaus, to use as offices. The German occupiers went through the confiscated material first, and kept the keys of all buildings and offices. The occupiers soon found that there was no wealth to speak of, and no links with Britain. They lost interest, while still finding useful the information gathering network, especially since the anti-mason legislation targeted, not Freemasonry as such, but secret societies in general.

A large multi centred administration grew around the endeavour. The head of the Bibliothèque Nationale (The 'National Library') was sacked because he was Jewish (he was reinstated after the War) and he was replaced by a historian specialised in anti-mason studies. The confiscated FM documents and objects were stored in the Library, to be catalogued. A museum was created.

The material included lists of names of people who had been dignitaries; those were published in the *Journal Officiel* (Official government publication, featuring the text of laws etc, mainly sent to administrations), and from there published in the local press. This was haphazard: Since the compilation went back to 1920, it featured men long dead, or who had long left the masons; people complained that so and so, a well-known mason, was not on the list; in other cases, the names revealed were those of people well-liked and appreciated in their area.

The 'purge' of Masons from the civil service led to unintended consequences.

All civil servants, and that included teachers, had to sign a document saying that they were not masons. When Vichy dismissed dignitaries from public service, the result was the disruption of public administration, especially in the colonies, to the point that Vichy had to bring back sacked administrators. The law of 10th November 1941 allowed people who had left the masons a long time ago to keep their post, as well as masons who said they were now ready to serve the new order. An exception had already been made for a couple of Vichy Ministers who happened to be masons.

When Laval, who had been dismissed in December 1940, came back to power in April 1942, with Pétain as mere head of State, he did all he could to minimise the anti-mason effort. He was not ideologically opposed to them; he had lectured at Masonic meetings, and was on good terms with his local lodges. Many masons were reinstated then.

On the other hand, the development of the war gave the anti-mason campaign new themes: Masons were accused of being Gaullists (De Gaulle had re-established masonry in Algeria in August 1943), of handing over French colonies to the enemy, Britain; at home they *"favoured the black market, they undermined Pétain's policies"*.

Conclusion

The anti-masonic theme was the least important of all Vichy propaganda themes. A stock of 1078 propaganda posters and other illustrated material, studied by the historian Dominique Rossignol, showed that in first place, with by far the greatest number of images, was the campaign against England and America; in second place came a positive: praise of France the motherland; number 3 was anti-bolshevism and number 4 another positive: defence of the family. Anti freemasonry came last.)

Freemasons, especially dignitaries, were disturbed and publicly exposed. Around 1500 lost their posts. 6000 were arrested. 989 were deported, not as masons but because of their Resistance activities, of which 549 died.

After the war 130 people were tried for their anti-mason activities; the then head of the National Library was sentenced to hard labour for life. He escaped while in hospital and was let alone after that.

Germany paid for the refitting of some mason premises which had been looted or damaged.

Masons are still today the target of criticism: When scandals occur, some point out that those involved include masons, for example the 'Elf affair'; books are still being written alleging the excessive influence of Masonic networks, in particular among magistrates.

The Grand Orient on its website still claims a political role in society, as a guarantor of the secularity of the state and of equal rights.

Attacking the Freemasons was attacking the progressive liberal ideology (*Liberté Egalité Fraternité*) and trying to replace it with old-fashioned priorities: *Travail, Famille, Patrie*—Labour, Family, Motherland. For Labour, Vichy attempted a Charter of Labour with a view to improve the lot of the working class; nothing came of it. The Family was missing 1.5 million men in POW camps, households lived in penury and women had to work. As for the Motherland, it had never been so low. Only Pétain and some of his entourage believed in this new order, and they were soon marginalised and their ideas ignored.

Note

In *Freemasonry and the United*

Irishmen, Reprints from the *Northern Star* 1792-3.t, Brendan Clifford wrote in an introduction entitled *Freemasonry in Ireland* :

> "The Catholic Church not very long ago used to teach that the modern world of sin and error is the product of the Freemason conspiracy. While that might not be entirely true, I think it is true that the Freemason conspiracy went into the making of the modern world, and that the liberal dimension of the modern world could not have developed without Freemasonry."

and

> "One of the most remarkable things about the 1688 Revolution was the way it subverted the social force of theological zeal. The history of the 17th century England is theocratic. But 18th century England is suddenly liberal.
>
> "In the generation after 1688, the English state was grounded in a new body politic and a new condition of public opinion, and the force of the theocratic impulse was marginalised in the political sphere. And that new public opinion seems to me to have been made effective by the institution of Freemasonry, which gave the new, sceptical oligarchy a network of support throughout society and a countervailing force against theocracy." (Available from Athol Books. **€6, £5**)

This process seems to have happened in France two hundred years later. The Republican order founded itself against the theocratic forces, with the help of Freemasonry. One wonders, however, whether the theocratic forces in 1880 were as strong as they were in England in 1688, and whether the fight against them was really necessary to install a new liberal order. It may have been. But by that time a new element had appeared in the society: a working class. It had demonstrated its strength in 1848 and in 1871, and had to be hemmed in. The anti-clerical struggle was a displacement activity, which allowed the liberals to avoid social issues. Not all Socialists were blind to this. Some complained that they were given *"du curé à bouffer"* (priests to eat) instead of bread, and that they had had enough. Some socialists analysed that the Dreyfus Affair was an internal bourgeois quarrel (Jews, Protestants and Free-thinkers against Catholics), and nothing to do with what mattered to the working class. When the great socialist leader Jean Jaurès started speaking for a retrial for Dreyfus, he was told by the party to desist. More on that in the next issue.

Rev. Michael O'Riordan

Extract from a lecture rebutting John William Draper's remarks on Galileo delivered in Limerick and Cork in 1897

Galileo And The Pope

Introduction

It continues to be asserted by certain ideologists of progress that scientific investigation is obstructed by religious belief. It is asserted that people who believe the world was created cannot investigate its existence scientifically. It is not demonstrated how Creationism prevents investigation of the world, but it is firmly believed by anti-Creationists that it does—that it must, and therefore it does.

The question of whether the world was or was not created is not a question that science can investigate. Science investigates the workings of the material world. It knows nothing of how the material world came to be there.

If one feels under an irresistible compulsion to have an opinion about how the world came to be there, that opinion will be a belief.

The contention that religious belief prevented a scientific investigation of the world tends to focus on Roman Catholicism and Galileo. Protestantism tends to be exempted from the charge.

Anti-Catholicism is ingrained in English culture. That is entirely understandable. England wrenched itself apart from Europe in the 16th century, declared itself an Empire, and developed itself Imperially against Europe under the banner of a kind of Protestantism that had little inner coherence of its own and was little more than anti-Catholicism.

Within the English state, the bulk of the population of Ireland remained obstinately Catholic, despite generations of Penal Laws against Catholicism in support of English State Protestantism. This fact was useful to English propaganda. It 'explained' the condition of Ireland under English rule as resulting from the refusal of the population to break with disabling Romanist superstition, rather than from the repressive actions of English government.

That view was expressed within Ireland by the Anglo-Irish regime. It was rebutted comprehensively by a priest, Michael O'Riordan, in his book *Catholicity And Progress In Ireland* (1906). But it has been revived in recent times by elements within the English-inspired 'revisionist' movement in the Irish Universities—regardless of the obvious fact that the most productive and best-regulated part of the European economy is found in the region where Romanist superstition flourishes: Bavaria and the Rhineland.

We are therefore reprinting the Chapter on Galileo from O'Riordan's reply to John William Draper's *History Of The Conflict Between Religion And Science*.

Draper

Draper had written as follows:

"Galileo was summoned before the Holy Inquisition, under the accusation of having taught that the earth moves round the sun, a doctrine *"utterly contrary to the Scriptures"*. He was ordered to renounce that heresy, on pain of being imprisoned. He was directed to desist from teaching and advocating the Copernician theory, and pledge himself that he would neither publish nor defend it for the future. Knowing well that Truth has no need of martyrs, he assented to the required recantation, and gave the promise demanded.

For sixteen years the Church had rest. But in 1632 Galileo ventured on the publication of his work entitled *"The System of the World"*, its object being the vindication of the Copernician doctrine. He was again summoned before the Inquisition at Rome, accused of having asserted that the earth moves round the sun. He was declared to have brought upon himself the penalties of heresy. On his knees, with is hand on the Bible, he was compelled to abjure and curse the doctrine of the movement of the earth. What a spectacle! This venerable man, the most illustrious of his age, forced by the threat of death to deny facts which his judges as well as himself knew to be true! He was then committed to prison, treated with remarkable severity during the remaining ten years of his life, and was denied burial on consecrated ground. Must not that be false which requires for its support so much imposture, so much barbarity? The opinions thus defended

by the Inquisition are now objects of derision to the whole civilised world…" (*History Of The Conflict Between Religion And Science*, 1902).

O'Riordan On Draper

"…The charge made against the Church over Galileo's condemnation is shortly this—From the 2nd to the 17th century the prevailing opinion was that the earth was stationary, and that the sun and heavenly bodies went round it. Since the 17th century the opposite opinion has prevailed, and all now take it as certain that the earth, besides its daily rotation on its axis, revolves also round the sun in the course of a year. The Church, they say, condemned Galileo for teaching that. Therefore time has proved that Galileo was right, that the Church was wrong in condemning him for heresy, was cruel in torturing him in the prison of the Inquisition, and has therefore proved itself not only not infallible in its dogmatic teaching but even the determined enemy of science. That is the charge in all its baldness.

Galileo was born in Pisa in 1564. He studied in the university of his native city, and afterwards became professor in Padua and Florence. He was a faithful Catholic; his two daughters were nuns; he was all his life patronized and petted by Popes and Cardinals—perhaps a spoiled child. But was he condemned? Yes.

Now to begin. Galileo was not the first in Christian times who taught the motion of the earth. I set aside that it was taught by Pythagoras before Ptolemy's time.

1. Nicholas of Cusa was born in 1401, the son of a poor fisherman on the banks of the Moselle. Destitute and a stranger, but with talent and virtue, he found his way to one of the Italian universities. He published a work which he called *Docta Ignorantia*, in which he wrote:

> "It is manifest that the earth is truly in motion although it does not appear so to us, since we do not apprehend motion except by something fixed. For if any one were in a boat on a river, not thinking that the water was flowing and no seeing the banks, how could he apprehend that the boat was moving? And thus, since every one, whether he be on the earth or in the sun or in any star, thinks that he is in an immovable centre and that everything else is moving, he assigns different poles for himself, in the sun, in the moon, and so on. Hence, the machine of the world is as if it had its centre everywhere and is circumference nowhere."

And he did not keep his views a secret from ecclesiastical authority. He dedicated his book to Cardinal Cesarini, his former professor of Canon Law. What did they do to him? In 1436 we find him as one of the theologians of the Council of Basle, proposing a reformation of the Calendar. He was afterwards called to Rome and created Cardinal. He died in 1464. Was his theory let die? One of the first books ever printed was his book, and at the expense of Cardinal Amboise.

2. Calcagnini was born in 1479. He wrote a work in which he defended the proposition—*Quod cælum stet, terra autem moveatur* (that the heavens are fixed and the earth moves).

3. Novara, the tutor of Copernicus, taught it; also Tagliavia, and Richard of St. Victor.

4. It appears from a manuscript written by Leonardo Da Vinci in 1500, that he held it also.

5. In 1533 Widmanstadt defended the theory in the presence of Pope Clement VII.; and in the Royal Library of Munich is still preserved a volume presented to him by the Pope on the occasion, as may be seen from an inscription written in it by Widmanstadt himself.

6. Copernicus was born in Poland in 1473, a century before Galileo. He studied law at Bologna and medicine at Padua. In 1500 he lectured in Rome under the patronage of the Pope, and in those lectures he expounded his theory on the motion of the earth. He now became a priest and returned home; he was made Canon of Frauenburg in 1503. *"In addition to his theological duties"*, says Sir Robert Ball in a work published last year, *"his life was occupied partly in ministering medically to the wants of the poor, and partly with his researches in astronomy and mathematics."* (*Great Astronomers—Copernicus*. The same was said before him in nearly the same words by Sir David Brewster in his *Martyrs of Science*.)

Professor Tyndall writes:

> "In 1543 the epoch-making work of Copernicus on the paths of the heavenly bodies appeared The total crash of Aristotle's closed universe with the earth as centre followed as a consequence, and the 'earth moves' became a kind of watchword among intellectual freemen." (*Belfast Address*, p19).

But Tyndall's anti-Catholic bigotry could not be restrained, and he adds: *"Even to those who feared it and desired its overthrow, it was so obviously strong that they refrained for a time from meddling with it."* It is quite true that it had many opponents, ecclesiastic and lay; every new theory is sure to have opponents; but, as we shall presently see, opposition did not come from the Pope.

Draper is less cautious than Tyndall. He says:

> "Copernicus, aware that his doctrines were opposed to *revealed truth*, and foreseeing that they would bring upon him the punishment of the Church, he expressed himself in a cautious and apologetic manner." (p167.)

Yet in the next paragraph he acknowledges that Copernicus *"brought out his work at the entreaty of Cardinal Schomberg"*.

The whole truth is that Copernicus dedicated his work to Pope Paul III., as a protection against his scientific assailants. I give the following translation from the words of dedication:

> "I cannot help feeling that, as soon as what I have written about the notion of the earth will be known, cries of indignation will be raised against me. Moreover, I am not so tied to my own convictions as to disregard what others may think . . . All these reasons—the fear of being made an object of ridicule on account o the novelty and absurdity (as people will think) of my view—would almost have made me give up the thought of publishing. But friends, amongst whom are Cardinal Schomberg and Cardinal Tiedman Giese, Bishop of Kulm, overcame my timidity. The latter specially insisted earnestly that I should publish this work."

Here then we have in the words of Copernicus himself, *(a)* That it was not the Church he feared, but the scientists of the time, lay or ecclesiastical as they were;—they would laugh at the *"novelty and absurdity of my view"*. *(b)* He was urged to publish his book, and his fear was overcome by the persuasion of two Cardinals, who also bore the expense of publication. So that we owe it to Paul III. and to those two Cardinals that Copernicus published his work at all, and gave his name to the system which has revolutionized astronomy. *(c)* Mark also the modesty which becomes a great man. If it happened that Tyndall or Draper made the discovery, their anti-Catholic kindred spirits of the last three centuries would rise from their graves and join with their living brethren to

make a shout that would shake the nation.

And was his theory let die? Christopher Clavius, a Jesuit, defended it in Germany; Diego de Zuriga, an Augustinian, proclaimed it in Spain; Foscarini, a Carmelite, and Castelli, a Benedictine, sustained it in Italy; Cardinal Barberini, afterwards Pope Urban VIII., in whose Pontificate Galileo was condemned, gave it his protection in Rome. And in spite of these facts Mr. Lecky writes these words: *"It is indeed marvellous that science should have ever revived amidst those fearful obstacles which theologians cast in her way"* (*History Of Rationalism*, vol. i. p274), and Sir Robert Ball, in the work I have already named, says that *"on the appearance of the immortal work of Copernicus orthodoxy stood aghast"*. It is plain from the facts I have given that those who by their office truly represented *"orthodoxy"* stood quite otherwise than aghast at the work of Copernicus. As against Lecky's words, I should rather say that it is *"marvellous"* how the Church has lived, and is still living even in youthful vigour, in spite of the fact that, to use the words of De Maistre, *"history has been lying against it for the last three hundred years"*.

> "What is admirable, incomparable, truly Divine, is", says Pascal, "that the Catholic religion, though always combated, always subsists".

Now, without going into any detailed examination of the decrees issued against Galileo, let us put ourselves this plain question, and let us get our common sense to give a straight answer. How did it happen that Nicholas of Cusa taught the theory for which Galileo was condemned, nearly two hundred years before Galileo's time, and was made a Cardinal nevertheless? that Calcagnini, Novara, Tagliavia, Richard of St. Victor, Leonarda Da Vinci, Widmanstadt, and others taught it before Galileo's time, all with impunity and some with tokens of high approval? that Copernicus, from whom the theory takes its name, taught it publicly in Rome before Galileo was born, and dedicated his book to the Pope as a security against the *"cry of indignation"* which the scientists would raise against him? How was it that Galileo was condemned for having taught that theory which those men had taught before him without let or hindrance, even with the positive approval and patronage of ecclesiastical authority? Evidently it was not because of the theory, but because of Galileo himself. It was not so much with the theory the Congregation found fault, as with Galileo's aggressiveness and with the methods he used to force his views upon his opponents. He would not be satisfied to have his theory treated as a provisional working hypothesis awaiting further proof; he would have it forced as a demonstrated truth on a public unprepared to receive it. He subjected his opponents to all manner of sarcasm, and he demanded that the interpretation which the faithful had been accustomed to give certain texts of Scripture should be reversed to suit his as yet unproven views.

If there was one man more to blame than another for having the Congregation of Inquisition examine his position at all, it was Galileo himself. He provoked the examination, and he was condemned in March, 1616. Nevertheless he had an audience with the Pope before leaving Rome immediately after the condemnation.

> "He was received very graciously ", Sir David Brewster writes, "and spent nearly an hour with his holiness. When they were about to part, the Pope assured Galileo that the Inquisition would not receive on light grounds any calumnies that might be propagated by his enemies, and that as long as he occupied the Papal chair he might consider himself safe" (*Martyrs of Science*, pp. 65,66).

No person, not even Galileo himself, thought that the Inquisition considered his theory heretical, or condemned it in that sense; which the Inquisition could not do even though it would. *(a)* The day after the condemnation Galileo wrote to Picchena, exulting in the disappointment which his scientific opponents should feel who had hoped that he would have been condemned as a heretic. *(b)* Cardinal Del Monte wrote to the Duke of Tuscany that Galileo was going back to Florence without the least imputation attaching to his faith. *(c)* He was made to retract nothing of his theory, but he was ordered to restrain himself in future. *(d)* Cardinal Bellarmine, who was his warm friend, warned him not to mix theology with his theories; and Monsignor Dini said to him, *"Write as freely as you like, but keep out of the sacristy"*. *(e)* In October, 1623, he wrote an essay against Father Grassi, and although it contains passages which support the Copernican theory, he dedicated it to his patron Urban VIII., who had ascended the Papal throne two months before.

When persons who are not trained theologians or canonists, and do not understand the technical value of Congregational Decrees, undertake to pass sentence on the church for condemning Galileo, they should beware and look at the case in the light of such facts as these I have given.

In 1624 Galileo went to Rome to congratulate Urban VIII. on his elevation to the Papal chair, and he renewed his promise of self-restraint. But in 1632 he published a dialogue in which he bitterly satirized his opponents, and broke his promise made to the Inquisition. His book was examined, and he was condemned again in June 1633. I pass over the blood-stirring descriptions which anti-Catholic writers and lecturers give of the great man tortured for truth in his old age, and running blind from the long years of confinement he spent in the dungeons of the Inquisition. The truth is, his imprisonment lasted only a few days and was merely a legal formality.*

It meant his residing for those few days in some of the best apartments of the Vatican. Nearly all the time he stayed in Rome, before his trial and after it, he lived with the Florentine Ambassador in his beautiful residence on the Pincian Hill, at present the French Academy of Arts. The dungeon in which Galileo was left to pine for years in his old age is pointed out to this day. Cardinal Moran (*Occasional Papers*, p33) once described it to a Protestant gentleman visiting Rome, and the latter at once said, *"I wish to heaven somebody would imprison me there"*. I also pass over the

---

* It is too much for modernized nerves that there should ever have been a law under which a man might be imprisoned for what he should think or write. But those excellent people could see that such a principle is active in England to-day if they would only open their eyes and look. It is not very long ago since Mr. Stead was imprisoned for publishing a pamphlet, although its purpose, whatever we may think of its prudence, was to crush out an evi [sic] by exposing it. When the law was made which empowered the Inquisition to imprison a heretic, heresy was a very different thing from what it was later on or from what it is now. The Albigensian heresy, which first called the Inquisition into existence, was subversive of society as well as blasphemous. But the law was there, and even those who only technically came under it had to pass through the legal formality. Heresy in Canon Law has a much wider application than in theology. A man might be a heretic in a legal sense without being so in the strict theological sense. But the very same principle on which the Inquisition acted then is in full swing to-day in every State in Europe.

cock-and-bull story, that when Galileo was leaving the Inquisition he stamped his foot and said *"E pur si muove"*. I find that the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* brands it as a fiction; and I remember reading a note in Lecky's *History of Rationalism* in which he traces its first appearance in a French work published in 1788. It was hardly worth while to make a lie that took 150 years to manufacture, and which met its natural fate before it was a hundred years old. Of Galileo's condemnation the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says:

> "This edict, it is essential to observe, of which the responsibility rests with a disciplinary congregation in no sense representing the Church, was never confirmed by the Pope, and was virtually repealed by Benedict XIV. in 1757."

It will throw some light on his position also to observe that Galileo left Rome a few days after his condemnation and spent a few months with the Archbishop of Siena as his guest, and on his return to Florence the Pope allowed him a pension for the rest of his life. He died in 1643. Sir David Brewster says of that act of the Pope:

> "The generous pension thus given by Pope Urban was not the remuneration which sovereigns award to the services of their subjects. Galileo (a Florentine) was a foreigner at Rome. The Pope owed him no obligation, and we must therefore regard the pension of Galileo as a donation of the Pontiff to science itself, and as a declaration to the Christian World that religion was not jealous of philosophy."

It is not the duty of any Catholic, nor is it my intention to justify the action or to pry into the purpose of the individuals who tried and condemned Galileo. My business is done when I have shown that, whether or not any personal enmity was mixed up with the motives of those who tried him, the Church, its dogmas or its laws, were no more responsible for their action than is the king or the legislature of a country responsible for the action of a judge who, for some reason or other, allows himself to be swayed by some personal spite against a prisoner at the bar.

At the same time it is stupid for any one to think that those who condemned Galileo should have considered his theory in the light in which we can view it at the present day; and yet that is implied in all the reasoning, or rather irrational strictures, which anti-Catholic hatred has been passing upon the Church ever since. Very few, Catholic or Protestant, believer or infidel, accepted the theory then, and those few, curious to think, were mostly Catholics and ecclesiastics. Tycho Brahè, a great Protestant astronomer of the time, rejected it. Kepler, another Protestant astronomer of the time, accepted and ventured to teach it; but he was banished for his pains from the Protestant Duchy of Wurtenburg, and he found shelter in the Catholic University at Gratz. The Pope also offered him a professor's chair in the University at Bologna, and, that notwithstanding, Tyndall speaks in his Belfast address of *"Kepler who from his German home defied the power beyond the Alps"*. In France, Ramus, the Huguenot Professor Royal in Paris, repudiated it ten years after Galileo's death. Thomas Lydiat, a distinguished astronomer of that time, wrote against it in England, where one would think its Roman condemnation would have been its surest passport to assent. Lord Bacon, to use the words of Hume, *"ejected the system of Copernicus with positive disdain"*; and, according to Hallam, for a quarter of a century after Bacon's time it was rejected by scientific men in England. Even at the present day I believe that not one in a thousand of those who accept it do so as a conviction caused by proofs, but rather because every one else believes it.

The truth is, the proofs on which Galileo mainly relied to support his theory do not prove it at all. At the present day a Junior Grade Intermediate boy would have his ears boxed if he offered such proofs to his teacher. Galileo chiefly relied for proof on the ebb and flow of ides, but every schoolboy now knows that they are not caused by the motion of the earth, but by the attraction of the sun and moon. Nor let it be said that tides were caused by the motion of the earth, as far as any one then knew; for Kepler suggested that the moon had something to do with them, but Galileo rejected the idea with scorn. He might also have learned it from the Venerable Bede… The true conclusion from the phenomenon of tides should have been, not that the earth moved, but that there was a moon in the heavens.

On the other hand, the Copernicans were unable to answer several objections of their opponents. It was objected, for instance, that if the earth rotates on its axis, a stone thrown up perpendicularly into the air could not fall again on the spot whence it was projected. That difficulty remained unanswered till it was solved by Newton, who was born just when Galileo died; and the Copernican theory was put into acceptable shape by the three laws of Kepler, which also Galileo steadfastly refused to admit. The proofs commonly offered in support of it even at present have some strong objections against them.

This, then, is the plain conclusion which a dispassionate investigation of the Galileo case must arrive at; namely, that although the scientists generally of Galileo's time and for long after, Catholic and Protestant, lay and ecclesiastic, rejected the theory of Galileo, the Church never condemned it; moreover, that Catholic ecclesiastics were, in fact, its chief supporters. The scientific consciences of some excellent persons, especially of those who are not remarkable for scientific attainments or for caring much for scientific pursuits, are very much scandalized that so evident a theory should ever have been thwarted. But if it was all so clear, it is curious that for long after Galileo's time it was generally rejected by English men of science, for whom a strong motive to receive it might have been that the "story ran" that it was condemned in Rome…"

Some Comments

Draper was not an atheist propagandist who held that no account should be taken of religious sensitivities in the pursuit of scientific truth. He was a Protestant anti-Catholic, and a Professor at New York University. He believed in some form of *"true Christianity"* that existed before it became a force in the world through connecting up with Greek philosophy and Roman political organisation.

He wrote that:

> "A few years ago, it was the politic and therefore the proper course to abstain from all allusion to this controversy [over the conflict between religion and science], and to keep it as far as possible in the background. The tranquillity of society depends so much on the stability of its religious convictions that no one can be justified in wantonly disturbing them…"

It was *"politic and therefore proper"* for a New York Professor in the late 19th century (until *"a few years ago"*), not to affront widespread beliefs on which the stability of society depended. But, when it became safe to stir up this issue in late 19th century Protestant New York, Roman authorities could be denounced for curbing propaganda which would disturb the *"tranquillity of society"* in Italy three and a half centuries earlier. ✻

Stephen Richards

An Iconoclast In Academia

Adam Sisman's generally sympathetic biography of Hugh Trevor-Roper was published (by Phoenix) in 2010 so I'm a bit late in drawing readers' attention to it. Indeed I was taken aback to see, when I was idly flicking through the contents of the *Dublin Review of Books* recently, that a perfectly decent review of it appears there. If I'd spotted that sooner I might have been spared the trouble of writing this, and you of reading it. Still and all, there can never be enough said about this doyen of twentieth century historical studies. The more one finds out the more there is to wonder at, and be puzzled by.

In another sense I'm early, because I'm anticipating the Trevor-Roper centenary next year. I'm hereby putting the big beasts of Church and State on advance notice that I'd like to see something substantial from them when that time comes. It will be an early anniversary too, 15th January.

Yeats's slightly rueful self-description as a *"sixty-year old smiling public man"* might be applicable to the older Trevor-Roper, without the smiling bit. Most of his smiles were probably sardonic. An Establishment figure *par excellenc*e with first-hand acquaintance with the social and political elite, he nevertheless at different stages of his career felt compelled to launch lacerating attacks on colleagues, attacks in which legitimate robustness in debate often degenerated into contempt. *"Mr. Smith, are you trying to show your contempt for this court?"* the irate judge asked F.E. Smith, who replied, unforgettably, *"No My Lord, I'm trying to conceal it"*. Concealment wasn't something that came easily to Trevor-Roper.

What I've found most remarkable as I've traversed this biography is the subject's uncanny instinct for being caught up in the major intellectual controversies from 1945 onwards, like an Oxbridge version of Forrest Gump.

I only wish that forty years ago, when he was still in his prime and I was just moving into the middle school at Ballymena Academy, I'd been told something about this phenomenon that had (with a bit of help from A.J.P. Taylor and Robert Blake, and not without a fair bit of *sturm und drang*) transformed the academic landscape in the study of early modern Europe.

The Ulster Connection

To call Trevor-Roper an Irish historian would be fanciful, so I won't. I was totally unaware though that his mother, Kathleen Davison, was the daughter of a Belfast businessman. No more information is given, but I'm led to believe that this may have been the boss of the old Sirocco plant. The Ulster connection is maybe one of blood only, without any sense of kinship. No mention of Irish relations or childhood holidays in Northern Ireland (none seemingly) appears in Sisman's book. Neither biographer nor subject appears to attach any significance to this random circumstance.

The downgrading of an ancestral connection to Ulster is something I've noticed elsewhere, most egregiously in the case of Tony Blair. Denis Healey in his autobiography mentions casually that his father came from *"a small village in County Fermanagh"*. Yes, but what was that village? No clue is given. It doesn't really matter much to the English liberal elite in what huddle of nondescript houses and pubs his father saw the light of day. I've since found out it was Kinawley.

One can't but wonder though, if some of Trevor-Roper's pugnaciousness in debate might have been a product of his Ulster genes. That combative quality was also characteristic of Healey and of that great Ulster polemicist, C.S. Lewis.

A Cold House

The mother's influence however wasn't a positive one. She was in fact a frightful snob, and someone who was either without any emotional warmth at all, or, what amounts to the same thing, totally unable to give or receive affection. His father was a country doctor—who had some aristocratic lineage, going back to the well-off Ropers, Kentish recusants in the sixteenth century, a junior branch of which later married into the Welsh Trevors.While this was something, it wasn't enough to enable the family to hobnob with the denizens of nearby Alnwick Castle near their home village of Glanton, Northumberland, but it was enough to prevent Hugh and his siblings from being able to mingle with the village children.

As a sort of excuse for his own emotional coldness Hugh had to explain to his wife-to-be that he had never seen any sign of affection between his own parents and he basically didn't know how normal, well-adjusted people were supposed to behave.

> "I'm sorry about the 'reserve'... I hope you will just ignore it, or treat it as an unfortunate but unavoidable defect, like shortsightedness or deafness, which one can get round in one's friends by shouting a little louder or gesticulating a little more obviously at them."

Significant Men

The most important relationships in his life were with men, and, while there is some suggestion of underlying homosexual tendencies, these don't seem to have translated into any active homosexual relationships. One gets the impression that Trevor-Roper didn't have any sexual relations with anybody until he was nearing forty.

Arguably the two most influential figures in his life were both much older men. The first of these was Logan Pearsall Smith, the Chelsea-based New England-born man of letters, who cultivated younger men whom he found socially, intellectually or sexually attractive, or all three, and who might satisfy, if nothing else, his taste for high-class gossip. It was Smith from whom Trevor-Roper learned the importance of a crisp astringent prose style. Though Smith had died by the time *The Last Days Of Hitler* was published, it was in a sense written for Smith.

The second was the altogether more exotic Bernard Berenson, the Lithuanian Jew who had climbed by his wits to become a leading authority on the provenance of Italian Renaissance paintings, and lived in the hills above Florence in a splendid villa, with his younger female companion. Even though Berenson was nearing eighty when Trevor-Roper first met him, they immediately established a close *rapport*, involving frequent visits to Berenson, and a lengthy correspondence, which has recently been published.

Strangely enough, as time went on Trevor-Roper found himself occupying the same territory as Berenson, as an authenticator, in his case an authenticator of Hitlerania, culminating in the dreadful debacle of the Hitler Diaries.

Social Insecurities

The young Trevor-Roper, product of Charterhouse and Christ Church, who could justifiably have been accused at times of being a snob, was at the same time acutely conscious that socially he wasn't in the top flight. In part his determination to make a name for himself may have derived from his longing for social acceptance by an Establishment that in another sense he despised. He was never content simply to be a scholar working in a specific field, like the mediaeval historians clutching their manor rolls, whom he likened to a nuns' knitting circle. This kind of plodding academic distinction was never going to be enough for Trevor-Roper.

Beyond the world of myopic mediaevalists was the world of the big historical vision and letters as a whole, and beyond that was the world of politics and finance, where the real decisions were made.

Another aspect of the drive to be an all-rounder was the passion for fox-hunting, despite his admittedly limited standard of horsemanship. This led to some alarming mishaps, and the decision soon after his marriage to retire from the field while still in one piece.

Ostensibly his enthusiasm for hunting owed nothing at all to any desire to consort with hunting types, whom he found boring, but was all to do with his love of the excitement and the outdoor life. During the War he would go to extraordinary trouble to organise his hunting trips, which often involved hitching lifts on lorries at odd hours of the day and night.

There's something here redolent of that other eminent literary man from the previous generation, John Buchan, Lord Tweedsmuir, who from his inauspicious start in a Free Church manse in Fife by the time of his death in 1940 was Governor-General of Canada and scion of the Establishment. Leaving the pot-boilers on one side, Buchan too yearned to be a gentleman, even an aristocrat, as well as a scholar, and was an enthusiastic practitioner of field sports.

On His Majesty's Secret Service

Trevor-Roper's first experience of the big wide world beyond academia arguably shaped, and to some extent bedevilled, his future career. Hot on the heels of the publication of his *Archbishop Laud* (according to Harold Macmillan *"written from a detached, rather critical—even Gibbonesque—point of view"*), and while he was in some sort of Junior Fellowship at Merton but still dining at Christ Church, came his induction into the world of espionage, courtesy of the Merton bursar, Walter Gill.

Because Gill's experience, even from Great War days, was radio Intelligence, Trevor-Roper ended up in the Radio Security Service, part of MI8. From this initial base at Wormwood Scrubs a number of important friendships, and enmities, would grow.

One key friendship was with Dick White, an old Christ Church man and the only person ever to be simultaneously head of MI5 and MI6. Other associates were H.L.A. (Herbert) Hart, future jurisprudence doyen, the philosophers Gilbert Ryle and Stuart Hampshire, and his future Christ Church colleagues Robert Blake and Charles Stuart.

Following transfer to SIS headquarters at St. Albans and elevated to the rank of Major, he became a colleague of Kim Philby, unmasked many years later as the Third Man, whose stimulating if detached conversation provided a welcome contrast to some of the bigwigs in the department. Some of the liaison meetings were attended by a Captain Anthony Blunt.

Trevor-Roper's area of radio interceptions and code-breaking (he himself managed, Archimedes-like, to crack an *Abwehr* code while lying in the bath) got him involved in the most frightful spats and turf wars with the MI5 chiefs, in particular with one Major Felix Cowgill, ex-Indian Police, who headed up its counter-espionage section. The former military policemen and the bone-headed Establishment twits were equally objects of Trevor-Roper's contempt. Cowgill and people like him apparently operated on the basis that the sharing of Intelligence within Intelligence Departments was a suspect activity.

An Innocent Abroad

Even at times when any thought of hot water was far from his mind, Trevor-Roper managed to land in it frequently. While convalescing in the depths of Cornwall after a sinus operation in the Spring of 1941 and wandering around the byways and hedges, no doubt with his pocket *Horace*, he was picked up for a spy, and the police were at first far from impressed by his army credentials. His Teutonic looks had told against him. A day or two later he decided to go out fishing for mackerel, a bad decision in retrospect. He found himself piggy in the middle as a *Luftwaffe* squadron suddenly arrived on the scene, firing all round them, answered by machine gun fire from the shore. Miraculously he survived unhurt but was taken to hospital where he was greeted by a cheerful young nurse, with *"So, you're the spy!"*

Then at the end of February 1942, at the invitation of his old Oxford friend Dickie Dawson, Trevor-Roper thought it would be a good idea to go over to Ireland for a week or so of fox hunting around Dublin and Limerick, for which, being in the Forces, he needed no special permission. He made the mistake of phoning Frank Pakenham (the future Labour peer Lord Longford) beforehand, to ask for some introductions, to be met by an assumption that the hunting visit was a cover for espionage. The trip duly went ahead, and other contacts were taken advantage of, even if *"he found himself assumed to be a British spy wherever he went"*.

Things didn't go so smoothly on the next Irish visit in the early Summer, when he and Dawson planned to be walking in Connemara. They were

> "lunching together at the Unicorn restaurant {in Dublin} when Frank Pakenham walked in with another man. Hugh gave his old friend a genial wave; Pakenham glanced at him in fright and shepherded his guest to the furthest corner of the dining room. Determined not to be ignored, Hugh waited until he had finished his lunch; then he sauntered over to Pakenham's table and began chatting about his plans for the holiday, despite Pakenham's obvious embarrassment. Though clearly loath to do so, Pakenham was obliged to introduce Hugh to his guest, Frank Gallagher. Hugh left after securing a promise from Pakenham to join him and Dawson at their hotel for an evening drink, on their return from the west.

"A week later he and Dawson were back in Dublin, refreshed after an energetic holiday. When Pakenham

failed to appear at the appointed time, the two of them went out to dine and then retired to their hotel for the night. Hugh was due to leave by ferry early the next day, so he packed his suitcase, asked for an early morning call, and went to bed. Some time after midnight he was woken by a knock on the door. It was the hotel 'Boots', who announced that there was a 'gentleman' to see him. Hugh sent him away, grumbling that he could see no one at that time of night. A few minutes later the Boots returned. 'The gentleman says it's very urgent.' Hugh reluctantly agreed to allow the visitor to come up. A minute later he heard the sound of heavy feet climbing the stairs; the door was flung open, a voice shouted 'Police!' and four hard-faced men entered, each clutching a pistol. Hugh sat up in bed, watching astonished as the intruders spread out to the corners of his bedroom. Then one of them told him that they wanted to search his luggage. Hugh demanded to see a warrant and, on being shown an official-looking document, motioned his assent. …The search revealed nothing more sinister than a pair of silk stockings, unavailable in wartime England except on the black market…

"A pyjama-clad Hugh was cross-examined about his movements in Ireland while the plain-clothes policemen scanned his letters and papers, noting down the names of anyone mentioned in them. Eventually, after confiscating his undeveloped camera film, the four withdrew in some disappointment, leaving their host to contemplate the significance of what had happened. Clearly they had expected to find something. Someone had alerted them to his presence in Dublin, and someone had suggested that he was there on some covert mission. Trevor-Roper suspected that he had been 'fingered' by Frank Pakenham."

Love And Marriage

Some of the contradictions in the Trevor-Roper psyche are evident from his decision to marry the already-married mother of three, Lady Alexandra ("Xandra") Howard-Johnston, daughter of *the* Alexander Earl Haig. They were married in October 1954, at a Presbyterian Church in London (bizarrely for an aggressive non-believer), when Trevor-Roper was forty and his bride forty seven. Her first husband, lately promoted to Rear-Admiral, was certainly not a kindred spirit, and indeed had turned out to be a bit of a bully and philanderer. Early in the relationship she wrote to Trevor-Roper that she had been *"having a terribly difficult time with my husband. He has written me some horrible letters"*.

Post-marriage, Trevor-Roper wasn't a particularly engaged or engaging stepfather, though he later came to have a very good relationship with Xandra's children. It was perhaps slightly late in the day for them to have any children of their own.

Xandra comes over as somewhat (in modern parlance) high-maintenance, but not just emotionally: also in literal financial terms. This might partly explain her husband's tally of major books 'on the blocks' which never actually got published, albeit one or two did post-humously. These books became major projects, written and re-written, but never finished. The contrast with his fluent contemporary A.J.P. Taylor was embarrassing at times.

The demands on Trevor-Roper weren't just of the normal academic kind—teaching, marking essays, sitting on college committees etc.—but also the demands of journalism with the *Sunday Times*, book reviews for the *New Statesman*, lecture tours abroad, and the ongoing post-War interest in Hitlerania, where he was seen as a world authority. All this acted as a massive constraint on the production of a *magnum opus* and resulted in Trevor-Roper's *oeuvre* increasingly taking the form of collections of essays.

But, on the plus side, the marriage was stable and affectionate. However maddening she could be, Xandra's social status was an attractive feature; and as Trevor-Roper came in late middle age to have his own access to the dining tables of Prime Ministers and monarchs, this was all grist to the mill for Xandra. I wondered at times if this was an example of the supposedly frequent occurrence whereby men marry their mothers. Xandra's emotional instability apart, certain similarities emerge with the formidable social climber from Belfast.

The Scots Connection

Trevor-Roper had spent some time at a prep school near Dunbar, which was a positive experience for him. With the coming of Xandra, his connections with the Scottish Border country would be revived. Haig's title had included Bemersyde, the estate near Melrose that had been gifted to him by the nation for his wartime exploits in sending huge numbers of men to their deaths. Xandra's brother Dawyck (sic) was the new laird. The great Earl Haig is I think buried at Melrose Abbey, while the body of Sir Walter Scott rests at nearby Dryburgh Abbey.

Trevor-Roper later succumbed to marital coercion to buy the nearby gentleman's residence called Chiefswood, which had been built by Scott for his daughter and son-in-law/biographer, John G. Lockhart. This turned out to be good move. It was the one place where he could have some interrupted peace for writing—because of the dearth of intelligent society as he argued!

An interesting postscript is that both husband and wife went up to Scotland to vote in the 1966 election that sent David Steel to Westminster as the youngest MP. Xandra was aghast to find that Trevor-Roper had voted for Steel as against the Conservative candidate, so after all the trouble they had gone to they had succeeded in cancelling each other out. But one of Steel's election pledges had been to see to it that a new general hospital was built in the constituency. When that plan eventually bore fruit in the mid-1970s it turned out that the site was on the doorstep of Chiefswood. For Trevor-Roper that was the end of it as an idyllic retreat and they sold shortly afterwards.

The placement of that hospital was controversial for other reasons, not mentioned by Sisman. Melrose General Hospital is built right on top of *"Huntly bank"* where, according to the great mediaeval Scots poem, *Thomas the Rhymer*, "True Thomas" was lying when the Queen of Elfland came along. There must be something about planning authorities that makes them impervious to the claims of beauty, magic and mystery alike.

I'm very conscious that this article has become just a lengthy preamble to its advertised theme, that of the historian as iconoclast. But this is such an admirable biography, and Trevor-Roper such a strangely beguiling personality, that the shrewd analysis will have to be postponed to a future issue. I hope that the 1914 anniversary will end up not just as the year of the Great War debate but the year of Trevor-Roper, without whom it might have taken a lot longer for us to get out of the clutches of the Marxists and economic determinists.

Wilson John Haire

Fairy Tale Of Belfast

The bulbs blaze Peace on Earth
from Belfast City Hall.
The RUC band plays White Christmas
as a jig, for mirth.
Watch the bulbs flash Good Will to All
Men.

She danders by listless,
ach, my poor wee hen.

Stay up the Falls,
it's no place for ye down here,
our flag appals ye
and Victoria in marble still jeers,
eye thon Crossley tender's slow pass,
ten armed men back to back
as Basil Brooke gasses
his Merry Christmas craic.

I waited for ye by the American war
monument,
an hour in the freezin' cold
so angry I hypervent.
Forget the ring of pure gold,
the remembrance in earrings-filigree,
we'll not be together in the mould
for I'm as green yon dome of verdigris.

I was Cary Grant
you were Betty Grable.
Down to Caproni's,
a quare jaunt
by the County Down Railway.
Our waltz became
a Bangor ballroom fable.
Then back through Helen's Bay,
kissin' boldly to everyone's bane.

The RUC band plays
Hark! The Herald Angels Sing.
The trombones sway,
the Santas on the lampposts swing.

What would our children be
half-clingin' to ye and me.
To be definite is the key,
teach them when on your knee.
But they have to follow your way
while I stay dumb and blind
if your faith I obey.

We must part though we'll pine.

The RUC band plays
the Irish Washerwoman,
the drums almost flayed.
An oul doll does the can-can.

Let's change our minds and reconcile,
forget where we came from,
to hell with our differences for a while
have no more alarums.

But ye're not here.
We could have gone into exile
for this place has cost our love dear,
livin' in denial.

The RUC band plays
God Save the Queen.
Dusk, the winter's fadin' rays.
It's stand or run, there's no in-between.

9th January, 2013

Report

In 1938 a Parish Priest challenged the Health Board policy of effectively forcing unmarried mothers into Homes by refusing them relief. The report below is part of *Fr.om The Archive*s, the *Irish Times* series, 28th September 2011

Unmarried Mothers

"At a meeting of Carlow Board of Health today, Fr. Donohoe, PP, Leighlinbridge, complained about the harsh treatment of home assistance recipients.

He said that poor people had not been treated according to justice or . . . Poor Law. He knew of a case where the doctor had given a certificate stating that the person was in need of immediate help, and the relieving officer said that he would have to wait until the next meeting of the board of health. A person could die of starvation in the interval. The board could not compel unmarried mothers to go into the County Home against their will. They were faced with either going in or being deprived of assistance.

The Chairman—The County Home is . . . a form of relief. We thought it was a wise policy to bring unmarried mothers into the County Home for their own sakes. Why should we give them the right to refuse? They are living on the charity of people who have to pay for these services.

Fr. Donohoe—You have no right to force them to come into the County Home.

The Chairman—I would expect, Father, that we would have your co-operation in trying to get girls like that into the County Home, where they are better looked after and safer than in their own place. Their children are sent out to decent homes, where they are properly looked after.

Fr. Donohoe—That is not the law.

The Chairman—Do you disagree with the policy of the board in trying to get such women into the County Home?

Fr. Donohoe—. . . I say you are forcing people into the County Home, which is against the law. By refusing assistance . . . you are taking the risk of allowing them to die of starvation.

The Chairman—We can give relief in kind or cash, or offer the County Home.

Fr. Donohoe—If a girl refuses to go will you allow her to die?

The Chairman—A person who refuses to come in here is not destitute.

Fr. Donohoe—Every person has a right to his or her liberty…" *

Eoghan Rua O'Sullivan

To the Blacksmith with a Spade

Make me a handle as straight as the mast of a ship,
Seamas, you clever man, witty and bountiful,
Sprung through the Geraldine lords from the Kings of Greece,
And fix the treadle and send it back to me soon.

Because the spade is the only thing keeping me now,
And you know that my thirst for knowledge was always deep,
And I'll shoulder my traps and make for Galway that night
To a place where I'm sure of sixpence and my keep.

And whenever I'm feeling low at the end of day
And the ganger comes round and tells me I'm dodging it well,
I'll give him a bar about death's adventurous way
And the wars of the greeks in Troy and the kings that fell.

And I'll speak of Samson that had great strength and pride
And Alexander the man that was first of men,
And Caesar that took the sway on the Roman side
And maybe I'll speak of the feats of Achilles then.

Explaining, of course, how it came to MacTrain to die,
And Deirdre the woman that put the world astray,
And he'll listen and gawk and not notice an hour go by,
And so my learning will lift me through the day.

They'll give me my pay in a lump when the harvest's done,
And I'll put it in a knot in my shirt to keep
And back to the village, singing and mad for fun,
And not a sixpence spent till the minute we meet.

For you are a man like me with an antique thirst,
So I needn't say how we'll give the story an end;
We'll shout and we'll rattle our cans the livelong night
Till there isn't as much as the price of a pint to spend.

From:

Eoghan Rua Ó Súilleabháin: *Danta* / Poems With translations by *Pat Muldowney*. Supplementary Material by Seámus O'Donnell and others. *Eoghan Rua Ó Súilleabháin: Collected Writings, Vol. 2*. 230pp. Index. ISBN 1 903497 57 9. Aubane Historical Society, 2009, **€20, £15**.

https://www.atholbooks-sales.org

Donal Kennedy

Why Change The Constitution?

Maybe I've missed something, but I've never seen a case put yet for a complete rewriting of Ireland's Constitution. On January 1st next it will have been in force 75 years.

By the time the US Constitution was in force 72 years the United States erupted into Civil War, because some of those who drafted and enacted it were slaveholders.

Ireland's Constitution, enacted by ordinary citizens, free from external constraint, helped remove the conditions for Civil War. The Constitution of Saorstat Eireann, which preceded it, was the cause of Civil War, because, for all its acceptable elements, it had unacceptable ones dictated to Michael Collins by Winston Churchill whilst British troops were still in Dublin. The Saorstat Constitution was never trusted to the electorate in a plebiscite, but was replaced by the electorate at the first opportunity.

At 75 Bunreacht na hEireann has already had a lifespan three years longer than the Communist span inaugurated by Lenin in Russia.

Perhaps instead of stampeding into abolishing it, the Taoiseach might consider inviting some of the remaining Bolsheviks in Russia to visit Ireland and learn something of the genius of de Valera?

VOX PAT

Tax

"Scout and girl guide dens and accommodation used for similar types of gatherings will be exempt from the property tax under amendments to legislation being published today" (*Irish Examiner*, 13.2.2013)

There will also be waivers for thousands of homeowners affected by pyrite, as already signalled by the Government.

But by far the single biggest exemption will apply to the Catholic Church.

The Church, widely acknowledged as the biggest private property owner in the Irish State, will be exempt from the charges under the Finance (Local Property Tax) Bill 2012.

With up to 10,000 properties on its books, the Church will save a small fortune on charges.

The Catholic Church has an exemption from all property taxes because it is a charity.

All Parochial Houses and even Bishop's Palaces are exempt under the ruling.

Charities which have obtained a charity number (CHY) are exempt from payment of taxes. Church property in the majority of Irish dioceses is held in a diocesan trust and has a CHY number.

Where it is held under another structure, and the title holders clearly hold the property in trust for the diocese, the property has the same status.

"All Church property—which includes churches, schools and priests' houses—are the property of parishes and dioceses. As such, they are exempt from tax."

The Church has sought clarification on the issue after the Italian Government reversed a similar ruling.

In December, 2012, the Italian Government won EU regulatory approval for a new property tax scheme, which stripped the Catholic Church of its exemption from local property taxes on its real estate used for commercial purposes.

The Italian Church owns a vast portfolio of properties, which includes private clinics, hotels, bed and breakfast accommodation and guest houses, which have enjoyed tax-exempt status if part of the building was occupied by priests or nuns or had a chapel.

"Estimates on how much the new scheme will bring the Italian government range from about €700 million Euros to more than €1 billion Euros." (*Reuters, 19.12.2012*)

****

Andy Cooney

"Included also are a number of distinguished academics and writers of history, whose scholarship, in these revisionist days, has only been surpassed by their professionalism and independence of thought. Significantly most are not employed in an Irish university" (Michael MacEvilly author of "A Splendid Resistance—The Life of IRA Chief of Staff Dr. Andy Cooney, Edmund Burke Publisher, Dublin, 2011).

A splendid work of historical scholarship that covers *"many matters related to events and dramatis personae in the life of Andy Cooney and Irish Republicanism in the 1920s"*. The book also contains an interesting list of IRA Chiefs of Staff 1917-1999.

****

Reformation

"Emerson {US poet, 1803-1882} was much impressed by this side of the English character. 'There is no country', he wrote, 'in which so absolute a homage is paid to wealth… The Englishman has pure pride in his wealth, and esteems it a final certificate… There is a mixture of religion in it. They are under the Jewish law, and read with sonorous emphasis that their days shall be long in the land, they shall have sons and daughters, flocks and herds, wine and oil. In exact proportion is the reproach of poverty… The last term of insult is a 'beggar'. Sydney Smith said 'poverty is infamous in England'.

"It is interesting to note in this connection that the sumptuary regulations among early Calvinists made property the measure of distinction between the different classes. Troeltsch opines that this may have been the genesis of the plutocratic attitude of modern Dutch and American society.

"Baxter thought that poverty was often a sign of spiritual evil.

"The trading spirit in Scotland was first observed about 1700, at which time religious tracts and pamphlets become less common, and political and economic ones began to take their place.

"'Heretofore', according to Buckle, 'persons were respected solely for their parentage; now they were also respected for their riches… Instead of asking who a man's father was, the question became, How much had he got?'…" (*An Essay on the Economic Effects of The Reformation*, George O'Brien, London, 1923)

****

A *Provo*king Motor!

Kia Motors, the South Korean automobile manufacturer, have stated that they would not market any future car as a Provo in the UK or Republic of Ireland.

Kia insists the name stems from the word *"provoke"*.

But Democratic Unionist Party MPs Gregory Campbell (East Londonderry) and William McCrea (South Antrim) claimed the name has caused *"deep offence"*.

In a Commons motion the MPs said:

"This name has caused deep offence given that the Provisional IRA were known as the Provos when they were murdering and bombing in Northern Ireland, the rest of the UK, as well as in Germany, where the name is supposed to have been chosen."

The car-maker is not the first to upset people with an unfortunate choice of name for a model.

In Spanish, Chevy's Nova means *"doesn't go"* and Mazda's LaPuta translates as *"the whore"*.

Even worse, for Greg and Willie: In Utah, Provo is the name of the city in which Brigham Young University is located, the College is called after the founder of the Church of Latter-Day Saints, or Mormons.

Surely a seance is required here?

****

Conundrum

Tuesday, March 12, 2013:
Falklands: Yes: 1,513; No: 3

Wednesday, March 13, 2013:
Argentine: Yes, 1.2 billion + 3

****

More *Vox* on page 16