

Church & State

# **An Irish History Magazine**

*And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World*

---

## **Democratic War!**

**Renaissance, Grattan And Cox**

**Reformation's October Revolution**

**Reformation & Traditional Christianity**

**Jefferson & Progressive Cherokees**

**In Defence Of Berkeley**

## Editorial

### On Democratic War

The Irish Government facilitated the destruction of the liberal, secular State of Iraq by American and British military action. It refuelled American war-planes at Shannon. Government spokesman, Martin Mansergh, explained that its policy was determined by a judicious combination of practicality and idealism. The practical consideration was that Irish interests would possibly have suffered slightly from American displeasure if it had not agreed to the use of Shannon in the War. But there was also the idealistic consideration on the American side that a dictator was being overthrown.

The British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, called a Middle East expert to Downing Street to discuss Iraq. The expert must have done a fairly good job of explaining the intricate make-up of the Iraqi State because Blair ended the discussion by saying "*But Saddam is an Evil Tyrant, isn't he?*"

This journal has never pretended to know what "*Evil*" is. It seems to be a mind-stopping notion, of theological origin that remains usable in State propaganda, even though religion has been discarded from State affairs—except for special occasions.

The great Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, William King—by far the greatest there has ever been—gave Evil a secular meaning even though he was writing during the high tide of Protestant Ascendancy. He said that Evil was what obstructs the will—what obstructs the will is Evil.

God is wilful. His will knows no superior authority. What he wills is good, and whatever obstructs it is evil. And, since man is made in the image of God, the same is the case with him. Man is a little God. He is intolerant of anything that obstructs his will, and he calls it Evil.

We can understand that. It is perfectly clear. And it is entirely in accordance with the conduct of the interest served by Archbishop King—the interest of the British State which he played an active part in constructing.

The difficulty arises about why Saddam Hussein should have been seen as Evil from the viewpoint of the British State. In what way was the liberal secularisation of Iraq in the British mode obstructive of the British will in the Middle East?

Baathist Iraq was a multi-cultural State. The three major religions, Sunni, Shia and Christian, were drawn into its functioning. The Christian community was flourishing and its representative, Tariq Azziz, was Prime Minister. The mass support of the State was Sunni, but the Shia population was so far from being in latent rebellion (as the Catholic community in Northern Ireland always was) that it took part in the war against the Shia revolutionary State in Iran—a war that was encouraged by the West.

Iraq, hastily thrown together by Britain for divide-and-rule purposes during its war of conquest in Mesopotamia, for use against the general Arab nationalism to which Britain had made promises, was well on the way to becoming a coherent nation-state when Britain decided to destroy it.

Fourteen years later Tony Blair, who had become a billionaire out of it, is still thrashing around in search of a credible statesmanlike reason for why he did it.

Ireland has forgotten it. And it is hoped that, with the destruction of Mosul, Islamic State will be reduced from the status of an actual territorial State to a movement that can be described as terrorist.

The destruction of the Baath State of Iraq by the application of overwhelming military force, combined with the appeal of the invading forces to the elements of Iraqi life that were being curbed by the development of the Baath State, to come out and give popular support to the invasion, led so directly and predictably to the formation of Islamic State, that a strong case can be made that the purpose of the invasion was the replacement of the liberal secular State by a revolutionary Islamist State.

An argument that the invasion had come for an entirely different purpose can only be made on the basis of assumptions that are grossly unrealistic.

If liberal democracy operating in a secular, or non-religious, medium is the necessary ideal of the West (with Britain and the USA at its core), and if the West is compelled to apply itself to realising this ideal in actual government throughout the world, then it is to the point to remind it how its ideal was realised within itself.

The starting point is a secure national state. The sequence of development is nationality, liberalism, and democracy. The British state gained national stability in Britain during the generation after 1688. It was in the first instance assertively Protestant, in Anglican form. It might be said to have become liberal in 1829 with the repeal of the Test Act, which disfranchised the members of all other religions. The process of democratisation began in 1832 with limited middle class enfranchisement and it was not until 1918, three-quarters of a century later, that the electorate became a majority of the adult population.

(The state remained nationalist—chauvinist— throughout, though heavily camouflaged.)

Liberal-democratic development of the regime of State that was stabilised in 1715 took over two centuries. And there can be little doubt that this development was assisted by the fact that the State became the controlling force in a world Empire from which it drew great resources with which it alleviated internal conflict.

When the possibility of democratisation began to be discussed as a practical proposition in governing circles in the late 19th century, it was frankly said that it was the Empire that made it practicable.

Is a State—or a country—that is not Imperialist, but is subject to Imperialist economic exploitation, and which is subject to the vagaries of Imperialist policy, even after the formal Empires have been dismantled, likely to take more or less time to reproduce the development that took two centuries, under very favourable conditions, in Britain?

Can a liberal democracy, that took two hundred years to develop, and which with its Imperial reach imposes on another country the obligation to undergo liberal-democratic development—can it allow that other country to develop at the snail's pace that it did itself? The evidence suggests that it

cannot.

The question then is whether a powerful democratic State can have a democratic foreign policy? And even: *What is a democratic foreign policy?*

Is a democratic foreign policy just the foreign policy of a democratic State? Or is it a policy that cultivates democracy in other countries.

Suppose a powerful State with an Empire, which it exploited profusely in the interest of its domestic population, and suppose the domestic development of democracy in that state—in other words, look at Britain. Is it reasonable to expect that democratised Britain, whose relationship with the world remains what it was made by the Empire, will conduct a foreign policy which undermines its economic interest?

It was the first democratic British Government that overruled the will of the democracy in Ireland in 1918, and put in the Black and Tans to help it to change its mind.

But that wasn't a *real* democracy? Well, if *real* democracy is to be invoked against actual democracy all the time, then *democracy* becomes a will-o-the-wisp.

British democracy had its first Socialist Government in 1945. It was elected in the wave of euphoria generated by victory in the Anti-Fascist War. One of the first things it did was make war on the Malayan Independence movement, which was led by the Malayan Anti-Fascists who had made war on Japan.

The war was fought by methods that might reasonably be described as Fascist. Racism was fostered in Malaya to assist the War. And the War was not called a *war* but an *Emergency* so that it would not be subject to International Law on war that, supposedly, had just been established by the Nuremberg Trials of the Germans. And the reason for this, which almost everyone agreed with, was that Britain just had to have Malayan tin and rubber.

And as the post-War world began in the late forties, so it has continued.

Meyrick Booth, who was probably the writer of the Meyrick Cramb articles in Connolly's *Workers' Republic*, suggested in the 1930s that the idea of democratic foreign policy should be discarded. We gave some extracts from his argument some years ago as being worthy of consideration. And it must be said that the course of events in the last few years has not refuted them.

The Great Powers of the democratic world obliterated a viable liberal-secular State in Iraq fourteen years ago. They did the same in Libya six years ago. They are currently trying to do the same in Syria.

Islamic State, with Sharia Law and the Caliphate, emerged as the viable alternative to the Baath State which the leading democracies destroyed. Those democracies now seem to be on the brink of destroying Islamic State as a territorial entity. They are using a concocted Iraqi Government as a facade. But does anybody doubt that, if the conflict was left to work itself out between what calls itself the Iraqi Government and Islamic State, the territory of Iraq would become the base area for for Islamic State in a restoration of the Caliphate.

\*

These events naturally have repercussions in the Muslim population of Britain, which has greatly increased because of them. Melanie Phillips, a Zionist who says her primary alleg-

To page 4

## Contents

	Page
<b>On Democratic War</b>	
Editorial	2
<b>Renaissance, Grattan And Cox</b>	
The Reformation, Part 3	
Brendan Clifford	4
<b>October Revolution</b>	
Reflections On The 500th Anniversary of Luther's posting his Theses on Indulgences on the Church door at Wittenberg. Part One	
Stephen Richards	7
<b>The Reformation And Traditional Christianity</b>	
Substance of a Talk given in Belfast	
Peter Brooke	12
<b>Correction</b>	15
<b>Back To Carryduff</b>	
Wilson John Haire	15
<b>Vox Pat:</b> (Our Planters! Bottled Up! A Mystery Solved: Dr. Cohalan; JESUIT Bishop! Fionn Mac Cumhaill; Legal Abortions; Jim Larkin; Rebel Cork and the Union Flag; Macaulay; Jewish History; Mr. A. McCabe; Figures; Pope)	
Pat Maloney	16, 24
<b>Thomas Jefferson and the Progressive Cherokees.</b> The Spanish Polemic on Colonisation. Part 12	18
John Minahane	
<b>Letter to Editor</b>	
Martin Mansergh	23
<b>High Court Action</b>	
Note	23

Some web addresses for associated sites—

**Athol Books:**

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

**The Heresiarch:**

<http://heresiarch.org>

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

**Sales:**

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

### ***Church & State***

**Editor:** Pat Maloney

ISSN: 0332-3625

**All Correspondence should be sent to:**

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS: €20 (Sterling £16) for 4 issues  
ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS: €8 (Sterling £6)

**Cheques/postal orders payable to ATHOL BOOKS please**  
from

**[athol-st@atholbooks.org](mailto:athol-st@atholbooks.org)**

iance is to Israel, propagated the idea of *Londonistan* a few years ago, when the Muslim population was smaller and less provoked than it is now, demands that Islam must undergo a Reformation. She says that General Sissi, who runs his own special brand of democracy in Egypt, agrees with her.

An Islamic Reformation! Perish the thought! What did the Reformation of Christianity lead to? A fanatical Puritanism with a zeal to remake the world in its image.

But, unfortunately, the Islamic Reformation has already happened

Islam, more capable than Christianity of being easy-going and tolerant, maintained for centuries what now seems an idyllic era of peace and harmony in the Middle East under Ottoman rule, was

thoroughly radicalised and fundamentalised and financed by the United States in Northern Pakistan for the purpose of making war on the regime in Kabul that was doing in Afghanistan, with Russian support, what Saddam did in Iraq chiefly through internal development.

When America invaded Afghanistan to suppress the forces which it had cultivated as jihadis against Communists, Richard Pearl was asked if it hadn't made a mistake in radicalising and militarising Islam. Wasn't it now making war on its own creature? Pearl brushed that criticism aside, and said that the US would in every particular situation do whatever served its purpose of the movement there.

The leading democracy of the world gave Islam its Reformation. And it has taken root.

A few centuries later, when the Reformationist impulse in Imperial Britain was in decline, and when it had clearly failed in its project in Ireland, and could no longer stand on its own ground, it became mere anti-Catholicism. And for that purpose it counterfeited a Renaissance origin for itself. It presented itself as Liberalism, as Humanism, and even as Atheism. But the Reformation in its origin, and in its prime, was directed against all of these things, and it charged them against Rome.

Reformation religion was Christianity minus all that was Roman in it. It was the Christianity of Scripture. It was Christianity as it was before Rome got its hands on it. It was Christianity as it was while Rome was persecuting it. It was the Christianity of Scripture pure and simple.

But what was Scripture pure and simple for the first generation after the Crucifixion? Or for the first century?

The Germans of the 19th century took the Bible as a subject of historical investigation. They founded secular Bible criticism. I'm sure that the Roman Church in its inner circles had been doing it for centuries before the German Universities began it, but the Germans were the first to publish it.

I learn from a recent German source that for the first hundred years of Christianity the Christian Bible was what is now called the Old Testament. The Bible of those early generations of Christians was the Jewish Bible. The Messiah of the Jews had come, so the story of Creation was near its end.

It was only when the world kept on existing, generation after generation, that the idea of a distinct and indefinite Christian phase took root; that Christianity as a system began to be counterposed to Judaism; and that a selection was made from the many writings about Jesus that were circulating and was given authority as a New Testament

I would guess that Erasmus, whom Luther expected to follow him, suspected that the origin of Christianity was something like that. He was a citizen of the Holy Roman Empire, of Dutch origin, rather than a Dutchman. He was aware of the complexity of these things. And he was impatient with Luther's simple-mindedness in confining himself to Scripture pure and simple for his understanding of Christianity.

Erasmus took Christianity to be the Roman Church. Instead of taking

## Brendan Clifford

The Reformation, Part 3

### Renaissance, Grattan And Cox

It begins to seem, on its 500th anniversary, that the Reformation was a flash-in-the-pan. Its origin is not being celebrated either in Germany, where it began, or in England, where it became a world force as an element of a world Empire. It is only being very modestly commemorated for the record so that it cannot be said that it has been repudiated. And, for the purpose of modest commemoration, it is blended fraudulently with the Renaissance. But the reformation was an anti-Renaissance event. It aimed to close down the way of life that the Renaissance had opened up.

The Renaissance was a movement within Roman Christianity that began in Italy a generation or two before the Reformation. It enhanced the worldly quality of life in this world while not denying Christian assumptions about another world.

Its achievements were this-worldly within a Christian ambience. It relished the physical and social life of this world while maintaining a sense of the other world. It might be that "*this was no abiding City*", but, by God, it was a City, and it was where we had to live, and it was not sensible to be mean and miserable in it just because it might last

only for the briefest of moments on the scale of eternity—supposing that there was such a thing as eternity.

The Renaissance was a movement within Roman Christianity because it was Roman. Christianity was absorbed into the Roman Empire and, with appropriate modification, it became the official ideology of the Empire. But the Empire did not narrow itself down to its Christianity—and the Christianity which it adopted was a compound of many things. And, when the Empire ceased to exist as a political structure, its Church survived and bore much of its extensive culture along with it.

The Reformation was a constricting deviation from the rich Roman dimension of the Western Christianity that had been the medium of life for a thousand years. It shifted the focus of life away from this world to another world about which it claimed to have detailed information. It curtailed life in this world for the purpose of ensuring entry into that other world on favourable terms.

The Renaissance humanised the Christian world within which it developed. The Reformation, in response, dehumanised it again, and rendered it more unhuman than it had ever been before.

Scripture to be an expression of absolute truth from which absolute truth might be drawn by rigorous deduction, he paraphrased it sensibly. He treated the authority of the Church as being relevant to the reading of Scripture as it had a continuous connection with Scripture, going right back to the time it was written, or close to it.

At the end of his long reply to Luther in defence of Free Will, he made a point of saying he would submit it to Church authority before publication. And the ultimate ground of his rejection of Luther's reasonings on Predestination was that he had no interest in humans as marionettes of God.

Erasmus stayed with the Church. He had never considered leaving it. The Renaissance was what he lived in. He had not much liked the Italians but he wrote in praise of Folly, and even of the vanity of women who put on make-up in sexual display. The Reformation did not tempt him at all.

\*

The Reformation was anti-Catholic in origin, of course. But it also imagined that it was a positive alternative to Catholicism. In the long run, however, it became mere anti-Catholicism, particularly in Ireland. And it is interesting to note how the word "*protest*" has changed accordingly—from "*affirm*" to "*protest against*".

The Reformation in decline could counterfeit a Renaissance origin because the English 1688 Revolution was a very ambiguous event. A kind of Cromwellian gentry had developed through the twists and turns of English affairs during the century and a half since Henry the Eighth made himself Pope.

Cromwell, as dictator over the Reformationist Parliament in the 1650s, had vetoed the strict Reformationist development of State and society to which Parliament was committed. The critical point was the Parliamentary decision to establish the Biblical Laws of Moses in place of the anarchic Common Law which was understood to be law for the gentry.

"When Adam delved and Eve span,  
Who then was the gentleman?"

Well, there wasn't any gentleman. And Cromwell, in his moment of crisis, decided that the gentleman was the salt of the English earth, and he scattered the Parliament that was deciding to cut the ground from under the gentry.

God had stopped talking to him at

that point—or he no longer wanted to hear what God was telling him. So he acted the part of a gentleman in mid-course of the Reformationist revolution that depended on him. The theocratic Republic of the Puritans then became purposeless. Restoration of one kind or another became inevitable. Cromwell toyed with the idea of declaring himself King and founding a reliably Protestant dynasty, but the certainty of assassination made him decide to remain a dictator. But, in terms of British history, he is best regarded as he *de facto* monarch of the Stuart Interregnum.

(300 years later a Socialist Government enacted a number of egalitarian reforms which would have wiped out the aristocracy. But then it decided that English society could not do without the network of Big Houses with landscaped grounds that covered the countryside and it took measures to preserve them.)

During the third of a century between Cromwell's subversion of the Reformationist revolution and the 1688 Revolution there was a rapid development of gentry families of Puritan origin. These merged with the older gentry (many of them of Thomas Cromwell vintage) to form the unique English socio-political institution, a ruling class.

This ruling class, informed by family experience and Clarendon's incomparable account of the "*Rebellion*" of 1641-60, took power in the State by stirring up a popular Puritan agitation and manipulating it. This ruling class came in large part from the two great anti-Renaissance campaigns associated with the names of the two Cromwells. They ruled a country that had been de-cultured. And they yearned for something more than was in the Reformationist cultural desert that they ruled. So they went on Grand Tours of Counter-Reformationist Europe to see what culture was like.

The 1688 event thus both over-ruled freedom of religion and asserted Protestant supremacy, and installed a ruling class that hegemonised the Puritan middle class and looked for something beyond Protestantism for itself.

Colonised Ireland—the colony of the Williamite Conquest considered as Ireland, and the Irish population disregarded—was England in miniature, with certain features exaggerated because, while it had a Parliament it did not govern itself. The Colonial Parliament was subordinate to the English Parliament until 1782, when it availed of the opportunity of England's difficulty with

its American Colonies to assert its independence.

It was an independent Legislature from 1782 to 1800 but it chose not to have its own Government. It legislated irresponsibly under the protection of the English Government. That absurd division of power was 'the English connection' condemned by Wolfe Tone. When England availed of the 1798 rebellion as an opportunity for merging the Colonial Parliament into the British Parliament, the Irish Protestant Ascendancy accused it of adopting the programme of the United Irish movement which had just been suppressed. The Northern United Irish—the best organised—agreed and many of them declared support for the Union from prison.

The Puritans of the Irish colony were more Puritan than the English, being surrounded by the Catholic mass. The gentry were more pretentiously cultured. And the intellectuals intellectualised more freely because they were not constrained by considerations of ruling and guiding a Puritan mass as the English Whigs were. (John Locke wrote *The Reasonableness Of Christianity* and that was just right for the situation. John Toland wrote *Christianity Not Myste-rious* and the book was burned by the public hangman. The abolition of Christianity was inappropriate. It was mere rationalist exhibitionism.)

The Colonial gentry did not only build Great Houses with landscaped grounds with the rack-rents drawn from a native population that was assumed to have been broken in spirit, they also built a grandiloquent city, remaking Dublin in accordance with their pretensions. So who could doubt that the Glorious Revolution was a Renaissance event, and therefore also the Reformation which it consolidated?

Well, Walter Cox could doubt it.

Cox was a native amongst the well-meaning gentry of the Dublin United Irish movement—a wafer-thin margin of the colony that aspired to reform the pretended colonial nation into a nation of the populace. And he saw how the development of the Colony culminated in Orangeism during its last few years of independence. The Orange Order may have been founded in a peasant squabble in Co. Armagh but it was quickly taken in hand by the Colonial aristocracy in 1796 and forged into a Colonial militia of Protestant Ascendancy in support of the heritage of 1688.

Colonial Orangeism provoked more than it could cope with. The Government deployed its Army to clean up the mess. It faced down the Orange threat to resist by force the abolition of Colonial independence. It bribed the Parliament out of existence. The aristocracy followed the Parliament to London. And Irish national development—the national development of the actual Irish who had been able to play no part in public affairs for more than a century—began with the publication of Cox's *Irish Magazine* in 1807.

Cox debunked the notion that the Reformation exerted a civilising influence. He rescued the Renaissance from the Glorious Revolution concoction. And he ridiculed the Reformationist element that remained in Ireland after the Union carried the Renaissance veneer to London:

"The world owes nothing to the reformation, but what the arts owe to the Vandals. The most inveterate hostility to architecture, sculpture, and painting, distinguished the preaching Barbarians; even the silent depositories of the dead were disfigured, and the ashes of the illustrious were violated and dispersed, whenever the elegance of sepulchral ornaments attracted the notice of savages: it has been the received notion with the followers of those men, to believe that the monks were enemies to fine taste, and to letters. The remains which have survived delapidation and ferocity, which at this day are in every part of England and Scotland, are examples of taste, of mechanical execution and grandeur, that give the lie to such absurd and heated assertions. The zeal that the religious orders manifested for preserving the written monuments of classic antiquity, is sufficient proof that the elegant productions of Greece and Rome were not incompatible with the severity of a cloistered life.

"If the world has been improved, if letters are in more universal estimation, the reformation has not contributed any thing; it rather delayed the progress of refinement by the clumsy occupation of its leaders, and the war they made against every existing remnant of taste and genius. The reflecting and judicious mind will see, that the Monks preserved every valuable writing that escaped the hands of the Barbarians, who reduced the ancient world; that the Monks have left colleges, cathedrals, and other living evidences of their attachment to improvement, and to the fine arts, which would not disgrace the reign of Augustus; and, if knowledge has been circulated, it was not the reformation that forwarded it, it was printing,

which... rewarded literary ambition with fame and fortune.

"The Monks, in direct opposition to the manners of the shooting clergy now in Ireland, fed and instructed the poor, and gave lodging and refreshment to the traveller...

"Such a determined enmity to letters sprung from the English reformers, that it settled into a sober and sedate system, and we find the senate, including the bench of English bishops solemnly repudiating school-masters in Ireland, and treating them as wild beasts. We are speaking from memory, we have no books in Newgate, but the written statutes exist which proscribed every school-master, and enacted, that if an Englishman though he could not read his own barbarous language, and consequently knew less of the Irish language, if he assumed the character of a teacher, the Irish schoolmaster was banished—Here is a strong and a legislative evidence of vandalism not to be paralleled in the history of the most capricious and cruel of the most beastly oppressors...

"We want to know how any reflecting man could undertake to insist that such reformation could be said to be a restoration of the mild and meek practice of the fathers of the church..."

That's Walter Cox, in the January 1813 issue of the *Irish Magazine* which he edited in prison.

Cox was a Dublin United Irishman in the 1790s, a practical native amongst the idealistic colonial gentry. He seized the opportunity presented in 1801 by the Act of Union to launch an Irish national movement that shrugged off the Colonial/Reformationist scheme of things that had been comprehensively dominant in public life ever since the Williamite conquest of the early 1690s.

The Act of Union was a major point of rupture in political affairs in Ireland. It abolished the Protestant (Anglican) colonial Parliament, which exercised intimate supervision over the vast Irish majority, leaving the Presbyterian colony in the North largely to its own devices.

The argument was made that British control of Ireland would be better served by integrating Ireland into the British state system than by the system of colonial control. Many colonial opponents of the Union predicted that what it would lead to was not comprehensive Irish participation in British political life—and subordination to it in that sense—but the national independence of the Irish. They were right of course. But the colonial regime, particularly in its development into 'Grattan's Parliament'

in 1782, exercised an aggravating influence on the Irish populace, and had become a nuisance to the British Government, which still had the business of governing Ireland even after the colonial Parliament had asserted its independence.

The colony wanted Legislative independence without Executive responsibility, and after the 1798 rebellions Westminster would no longer stand for that. It proposed the Union—i.e. the abolition of the Protestant Parliament in Dublin—in the Fall of 1798, when the rebellions had been barely suppressed, and it spent the next two years buying votes in the Parliament for the purpose of getting it to abolish itself.

A new era began in Ireland in 1801, which can be described either as Revolutionary or as Restorationist. It was revolutionary for a Restorationist purpose. Cox dismissed 1688 and all that and sought to connect up with what 1688 had suppressed and had sought to exterminate. The interim period was dismissed as a destructive Reformationist aberration.

Henry Grattan had attempted to reform the Colonial Parliament that bears his name into a national Parliament by phasing Catholic natives and self-reliant Presbyterian colonists into it gradually. He felt confident that these elements could be blended in by gradual emancipation. But the Parliament insisted on being a Protestant (Anglican) Ascendancy, or nothing. It chose to be nothing, in 1799-1800, rather than dishonour itself by making terms with Papists.

Henry Grattan became a Westminster MP. In 1808, by agreement with the Irish Catholic Hierarchy, which had been bred, by Continental education, to a deferential attitude towards the State, he proposed a degree of Catholic Emancipation which included a Government Veto on the appointment of Bishops by the Pope. Cox denounced the Veto, launching the great Veto Controversy amongst Catholics that raged for a generation. Cox triumphed. The Hierarchy recanted. O'Connell became a nationalist of the Catholic populace under its influence. Eventually there was unconditional Emancipation because of it. But it has been written out of history. And there is of course no biography of Cox, even though a glance at his Magazine is enough to show what the 19th century owed to him.

He seems to have been impressed in the first instance by the effect of the

Union on the public life of Dublin. The aristocracy that revolved around the colonial Parliament, making Dublin the second city of the Empire, shifted to London, following the Parliament. Cox wrote, in the first issue of the *Irish Magazine*, six years later:

"The city of Dublin still continues to verge to decline, the activity of our tradesmen, and the busy appearance of our streets so obvious before the union have nearly disappeared. The encouragement which a resident gentry must have given to every rank of our citizens has emigrated with them... Not one house has been erected since the union, in this city, for the use of any nobleman or gentleman of landed property; on the contrary, the superb dwellings of the lords of the soil have been converted into barracks, or other public offices, or sold to adventuring lawyers and attorneys, who like snakes coiled among the ruins of Babylon, peep from their splendid retreats, on the classic desert, or as Ossian expresses the figure of desolation, *the fox looking out of the window*.

"Henrietta-street, once the proud residence of the O'Neills, the Shannons, the Ponsonbys, the Kingsboroughs, the Mountjoys, and the primates of our chief religious establishments, is now a weary, melancholy group of monuments of our recent prosperity, it is literally covered with grass...

"Mr. Burke very handsomely called nobility *the Corinthian pillars of polished society*. Our pillars have been removed to London, and the Irish entablature of polished society has fallen to the ground..." (Nov. 1807).

Cox would have lived within the glory if the Glorious Revolution if it had reformed instead of emigrating. He had taken part in its attempt to preserve itself by reform. But he saw at close quarters that its reformers were too timid to act as the situation required. And now the intransigents who had blocked reform had emigrated—or had returned home, their little adventure abandoned. And what was there for the Irish to do but start again and create something out of their own resources, asserting what they were, and forgetting what some of them had aspired to be, or had pretended to be, during the century when a mere conquest had been mistaken for a superior civilisation?

The Glorious Revolution combined two essentially incompatible elements, Renaissance and Reformationist. It was directed by a Renaissance stratum that had developed out of the abortive

Reformationism of 1641-1660. That combination was reproduced in the Irish colony, with the difference that the entire colony was only a small fraction of the population of the island.

The Act of Union carried the world-Renaissance element back to London, leaving Ireland to the Reformationists, whose future depended on frantic crusading of one kind or another. It was that active Reformationist remnant of colonial rule that was mercilessly, and memorably, ridiculed by Cox in his caricatures.

TO BE CONTINUED

**The Origin Of Irish Catholic-Nationalism**, Selections From Walter Cox's *Irish Magazine*: 1807-1815. Introduced and Edited by *Brendan Clifford*.

136pp. Illus. €14, £11.50

**Walter Cox's *Union Star***, a reprint of his 1797 paper, edited by *Brendan Clifford*.

36pp. €6, £5

**Wolfe Tone: An Address To The People Of Ireland On The Present Important Crisis—1796**. Also includes *Walter Cox's Supposed Speech Of Bonaparte To Irish Parliament (1811)*. Intro. by *B. Clifford*.

€6, £5

**Puritanism And The Theatre**, by *Brendan Clifford*. 156pp. €15, £12

All postfree in Ireland and Britain

## Stephen Richards

Reflections On The 500th Anniversary of Luther's posting his Theses on Indulgences on the Church door at Wittenberg

Part One

### October Revolution

The most recent Luther biography is that by a lady called Lyndall Roper, daughter of an Australian Presbyterian Minister who resigned his charge for reasons of general discontent. Ms Roper is now Regius History Professor at Oxford and her previous *oeuvres* have been in the realms of Renaissance magic. Her Luther book has been well received, and is certainly quite readable. It's no longer the fashion in academic publishing to have footnotes at the bottom of the page, or even at the end of chapters, so they tend to coalesce in a huge heap at the back. This can have the disconcerting effect (as in this case) that you suddenly come to the end before you realise it, akin to reaching the bottom of the stairs before you thought you had; and so you're left thinking, "*is that it?*" I'll come back to Roper later.

'Luther Studies' has been an ever-enticing silver mine (to use an appropriate metaphor!), which in this quincentenary year shows no sign of having been worked to death. Maybe every generation has to re-interpret him for itself. I presume that the Roland Bainton biography, *Here I Stand*, was published about fifty years ago. James Atkinson has been one of the English scholars of the period who has tended to stress the continuity theme. Peter Stanford is a more recent writer who has done the same, from a Catholic perspective. The most attractive writer on Luther for my money is Carl Trueman, English-born, but based at Westminster Seminary

Philadelphia for some time now, as a church historian specialising in the late mediaeval and Reformation periods.

#### The Personal Heresy

*The Personal Heresy* dates back to a reasonably friendly quarrel between C.S. Lewis and E.M. Tillyard in the 1940s. It was the anathema pronounced by Lewis on those who tried to interpret the work in the context of the life. Obviously there is a strong connection in the case of poets, playwrights and novelists, especially in terms of literary influences and so on, but ultimately the key to the work is not in the life. The *reductio ad absurdum* of the other view is the obsession with literary biographies to which we can so easily fall prey, regardless of our knowledge of, or interest in, the work that qualified the writer to be memorialised at all. The problem is that literary biographies crafted by men like Humphrey Carpenter and Michael Holroyd are in a sense literary works themselves.

So, one has a sneaking sympathy for the Tillyard side of the argument. The problem is that we're not only not reading the works themselves, but we're allowing others to mediate them to us, which brings me on prematurely to the pre-Reformation world in which the Scriptures were mediated to the people by the clergy as officers of the Church. Our literary biographers are perhaps a new caste of priests.

But I was really wanting to consider

the problem of personality as applied to Luther, whose personality so overshadows the Roper book that his theology hardly peeps out, except as an emanation of his personality. This may be to some extent Luther's own fault. Trueman has commented that Luther would be more fun to be marooned on a desert island with than any of the other Reformers, with his sometimes mordant humour, his musicality, his pithy turn of phrase, and his generosity, but on the debit side we have his loudness, his vulgarity, and above all his *Anfechtungen*, those periods of stress and deep depression for which he is famous.

The closest parallel I can think of is Samuel Johnson, who for all his rumbustiousness would nowadays have been diagnosed with bipolar disorder. In later Church history there are similarities with C.H. Spurgeon, probably also bipolar, but, like Luther, endowed with prodigious energy. As most of us have noticed in the case of some of our friends and colleagues, if not ourselves, the charm, ebullience and energy come at a price, which is the saturnine dark night of the soul. Artists, writers and musicians seem to be particularly prone to this condition, and I suspect the percentage of sufferers who lurk in the corridors of Church history would be higher than that in the general population.

If I may be forgiven a personal reference, Luther belongs for me in that select club of famous men who experienced Meniere's Disease (of course an undiagnosed condition at that time and for centuries later). I was diagnosed with it myself over thirty years ago, and after a difficult first two or three years, in my case it settled down into simple progressive deafness, thankfully in my right ear only. Other members of the club have been Swift, Van Gogh and Beethoven. In the case of the last-named it must have been bilateral. In the interests of accuracy I should add that it tends to be associated with specially gifted people, though that may just be because the tribulations of the stupid sufferers don't get noticed. Roper doesn't mention the Meniere's Disease: she is too interested in the constipation.

When we come across the likes of Luther who, in common parlance, lets it all hang out, it's perhaps inevitable that the story becomes all about him. In critiquing the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, nobody seems to consider that his psychological makeup is particularly relevant; and certainly the idea that his

theology can be de-legitimised by reference to unattractive personal habits, or the amount of beer he consumed, seems faintly ridiculous. Luther just gives away too many hostages.

### In The Time Of Cholera

At times with Roper it seems that Luther, like the hapless hero of some country song, can't do right for doing wrong. At one point there is cholera raging in Wittenberg and Luther goes back there in the middle of the epidemic. Roper chooses to see this as an act of grandstanding bravado:

"Luther's decision to remain in Wittenberg was bold, but also revealed a reckless disregard for his own safety and that of his family. It may have been a residue of his wish for martyrdom, or, perhaps, another example of the remarkable courage that enabled him not to shirk what he felt to be his pastoral responsibility to his flock"

This is just one of many departures from rigorous historical method. The obvious inference from the facts is left to come out in a grudging cadenza. There is certainly plenty of material in Luther for a hostile biographer to go to town on, but Roper is strangely determined not to give him the benefit of the doubt for anything. Her penultimate chapter is entitled "*Hatreds*".

For all that, she is an enjoyable read. If you want to get a sense of the atmosphere of these North German mediaeval towns and the larger ecclesiastical centres like Erfurt, and engaging pen portraits of some of the major protagonists, you could do no better. The book is also very nicely produced and illustrated. But one might have thought that an Oxford Professor would be more interested in the actual arguments. Her subtitle, "*Renegade and Prophet*" may be eye-catching, but they're just words, lacking any supporting argument in the text of her book. Bainton may be slightly boring by comparison, and lacking in local colour, but he does Luther the compliment of taking him seriously.

### Renaissance Man

The first school history book I ever had when I went to Ballymena Academy in 1970 was called *The Beginning of European Supremacy* (its end being in 1945), and I was very proud of it. With hindsight I'm puzzled that the most important thing to say about Europe from 1450 to 1550 was that it was flexing its muscles to dominate the rest of the world. But the symbol chosen on the

cover to sum up its content was the famous portrait of Erasmus by Holbein. And when you see Erasmus you think one word: Renaissance.

We're very excited by words like Renaissance, and Enlightenment, which in the German *Erklärung* sounds even better. The French Revolution, the stepchild of the Enlightenment, was meant to be a year dot, as the Russian Revolution was in 1917. The world can be remade, cleansed, and shorn of its atavistic pig-headed attitudes, its class system and its inherited privilege, and of those people exemplifying those things. The wheels of progress can be unclogged, to run freely in the direction of, well, we're not sure what the final destination is. We see the same tendencies at work today. Rather than face up to our at times unpleasant history and try, however ineffectually, to learn from it, we prefer to obliterate its traces.

Unfortunately there is no such thing as year dot, either in our personal or our collective lives. But back to the Renaissance and indeed back to C.S. Lewis. Perhaps in a slightly tongue-in-cheek way Lewis was fond of arguing that there was really no such thing as the Renaissance, that it was an optical illusion. In *The Pilgrim's Regress* he pokes fun at a version of the Renaissance mindset: "*But how do you know there is no Landlord?*" asks John, who is Everyman, to which "*Mr. Enlightenment*" loudly responds: "*Christopher Columbus, Galileo, the earth is round, invention of printing, gunpowder!*" It's plain that the editors of my school history book had something of the same idea, by portraying Erasmus, the archetypal Renaissance man, as the poster boy of not only of philosophical but of technological advance.

### 1453 And All That

It was the new learning, literary and mathematical, exploding on the world out of the cataclysmic fall of Constantinople in 1453, that shook Western Europe out of its centuries-long sleep and kick-started both Renaissance and Reformation. Pivotal to that was Erasmus' edition of the Greek text of the New Testament, published in 1516. That is the conventional narrative, which also fits snugly into Whig and Marxist categories. Before we know it, we have Christopher Hill presenting his economically-driven analysis of the Puritan Revolution.

But these commendable attempts to sniff out the underlying direction and to



create historical processes tend to founder of the actuality of things. I was helped to reconsider the 1516 Testament *annus mirabilis* thesis by a church historian called Ryan Reeves, based at Gordon Conwell Seminary. In an article on the *Reformation 21* website he writes:

"The first misstep in our story, then, is the idea that Greek had been completely lost until the sixteenth century. It is not true that everyone prior to the Reformation rejected the original languages for a view of the Vulgate as a pristine text. Catholic commitment to the Vulgate was as much a result of the Reformation as its cause."

He goes on to say:

"What we find in Erasmus and his readers is not a sense of the recovery of the Greek grammar itself but the dangerous idea that textual studies would solve the problems in the church by exposing bad Catholic teaching."

Erasmus himself had learned Greek while teaching at Cambridge in the period 1510-15. Despite the text of his *Testament* being full of mistakes and confusion, its publication in an inter-linear format it made it easier for other neophytes to compare and contrast with the *Vulgate*. Tyndale by 1530 was a much more profound Greek scholar than Erasmus had ever been, which was the key to the success of his own translation. Probably the resource of the Erasmus Testament stimulated Luther in his vernacular translation work, but if the Greek Testament had not been there he would most likely have simply translated straight from the Latin *Vulgate*. That wouldn't have been as good, but it would have been good enough for his purposes.

In a sense, St. Jerome ("*not a Christian but a Ciceronian!*") was the proto-Luther, who saw the need to translate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue of his own day. The missionaries from the Eastern Church had also realised the need for vernacular translations, in their case into what became known as Old Slavonic. And Luther, though he was the best, was not the first to attempt to bring out a translation of the New Testament in German. His achievement was as much literary as theological, his translation being the foundation of modern German in a way that the 1611 Authorised Version isn't for English. For Roper, however, Luther's spiritual and intellectual struggles at the Wartburg take up less space than his laboured bowel movements.

So Erasmus, who had a fairly

oppositional relationship with Luther, was not the catalyst for the Reformation (nor was the Reformation organically connected to him), though he can be credited for stimulating the later pre-occupation with textual studies, of which the greatest sixteenth-century exponent was John Calvin. This in turn fed into the characteristic emphasis in Reformed and later Protestant preaching, which was to excavate the text in its context before going on to apply it to the hearts and consciences of the listeners. This of course was not textual criticism in the sense understood by Graf and Wellhausen and their successors in the strangely-entitled field of *Higher Criticism*, but there was perhaps an all-too-attractive trajectory from one to the other.

Erasmus and Thomas More were Renaissance humanists whereas Luther and the majority of the Reformers were not. The Reformers weren't excited by classical studies for their own sake. Learning was simply one of the tools by which the Church could be purified and its members become intentional believers. For all their light-hearted banter about the Catholic Church/ More and Erasmus weren't even almost persuaded to come over to the Reformation side. More indeed took great pleasure in the torture and execution of heretics. Erasmus was the ancestor of "*mere Christianity*", a phrase which C.S. Lewis took up from the Puritan preacher Richard Baxter and used as the title of his lucid portable theology.

### Common Denominators?

The point about this mere Christianity as far as Lewis and Baxter were concerned was that represented an attempt to expound a faith that was dogmatic but at the same time catholic: that is, not denominationally partisan. In the case of Lewis, it was remarkable how he managed to carry so many Roman Catholics with him, even though there were certain cruxes that couldn't be elided. On balance I would class Spurgeon also among the mere Christians, a convinced Baptist yet not obsessed with denominational shibboleths, and whose sermons apparently were actually given the equivalent of an *imprimatur* by the Orthodox Church.

But that isn't the whole story. Erasmus' more generalist approach to the faith meant that he was often reluctant to be pinned down to dogmas. He's recorded as saying that to be saved we don't have to know any more than

the penitent thief, which is correct as far as it goes, but begs the question as to how much the penitent thief did know. Erasmus may also be the ancestor of the liberal German theologians of the nineteenth century, some of whom had started off as Lutheran pietists, who were trying to reduce Christianity to its common denominators.

So, if you have five minutes to explain what you believe, you might be tempted to skate over all those awkward spiky bits involving the Virgin Birth, the Cross and the Resurrection, miracles, and the final judgment. If you labour too much on these themes you'll be offensive, incredible, or both. Best to concentrate on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men. Best to stick to the Gospel of Jesus, i.e. the Gospel that Jesus allegedly preached, rather than the Gospel **about** Jesus.

We then end up with the anodyne beliefs of someone like Tony Benn, which he imbibed with his mother's milk. But then, along came John A.T. Robinson, Don Cupitt and co. and the question arose if there was indeed any universal Father God at all. It's harder to have any faith in something called the ground of our being. In this context I would also recommend the poignant memoir by Richard Holloway, one time Episcopal Bishop of Edinburgh, *Leaving Alexandria*, for an honest account of a journey into the void. You can be a High Church sacramentalist and at the same time a virtual atheist, strange as it may seem.

Erasmus of course was not in liberal freefall, but he was far from providing intellectual ballast for Luther. The fault-lines between Erasmus on the one side and the mainstream Reformers on the other were exposed by the controversy between them in 1524-25 over the *Freedom of the Will*, the title of Erasmus' polemical work, to which Luther responded the following year with *On the Bondage of the Will*.

### Born Free: Everywhere In Chains

Writing to Wolfgang Capito in 1537 Luther comments:

"Regarding the plan to collect my writings in volumes, I am somewhat cool about it, because, roused by a Saturnian hunger, I would rather see them all devoured. For I acknowledge none of them to be really a book of mine except perhaps one, *On the Bondage of the Will*, and the Catechism."

Indeed Luther paid Erasmus the

compliment of declaring that he, Erasmus, was the only writer who had penetrated to the heart of the controversy, before going on to demolish him, to his own satisfaction if not to that of his opponent. In this Erasmus was showing himself to be both a faithful Aristotelian and someone who would have been more at home than Luther in the modern world. The ghosts of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine and Aquinas were hovering over the heads of the protagonists in the theological disputes of sixteenth-century Europe. Luther had lectured on the *Nicomachean Ethics* but had concluded that the mediaeval synthesis of Aristotle and Scripture that came to full flower in Aquinas was unsustainable. It came up against the uncompromising facts of human nature.

This thesis, the bondage of the will, is the non-negotiable foundation of Lutheran and indeed later Reformed theology. It was the arena where the youthful Jonathan Edwards, in other respects about as unlike Luther as it would be possible to imagine, tried out his mettle two centuries later in Massachusetts. It could perhaps be called Reformed Anthropology. While the Reformers and their successors were anxious to start with the doctrine of God, their doctrine of Man was equally fundamental. It didn't square with the Renaissance conception of man as lord of the universe.

It's interesting to see this tension work itself out in the Shakespearean canon. "*What a piece of work is a man!*" exclaims Hamlet. Yes, but he's also a quintessence of dust. And that strange speech about how he could be bounded in a nutshell and count himself king of infinite space, "*were it not that I have bad dreams*". Like the eponymous anti-hero of the Scottish Play, he's "*cabin'd, cribb'd confin'd*". He can't fulfil his desires or his potential. Something or somebody always trips him up. And at the back of the Renaissance mind there's a fear, of the God who (in the words of Job) won't leave him alone "*so he can swallow his spittle*", and of death and what lies beyond. Marlowe's Faust is the ultimate Renaissance Everyman, but he ends up too with "*a fearful expectation of judgment*" (*Letter to the Hebrews*). There's a darkness on the edge of town, as Bruce Springsteen would say. W.E. Henley, for all his bombast in *Invictus*, is just whistling in the dark.

Luther's view of all this would have been, get used to it. That is just the way life goes, in the realm of law, sin and death. It's not that we're automata, with

no moral agency, and it's not that our decisions aren't real decisions made in conformity with our will, but unfortunately our will, like our intellect, is diseased, and has an inbuilt aversion to virtue and godliness. We're blinded by our pride to our real helplessness and corruption, so, morally speaking, our tower of Babel will always collapse in on itself. We can do lots of things, but nothing meaningful to get into relationship with the life of the Trinity, which is the only real life. As Townes Van Zandt, sang, "*you don't need no engine to go downhill*". And his friend, Jimmie Dale Gilmore, sings:

"my mind's got a mind of its own, it makes me go out walking when I'd rather stay at home, it takes me out to parties when I'd rather be alone",

emphasising, paradoxically, the "*wilfulness*" of our wills.

### *Simul Justus Et Peccator*

So, contrary to the teaching of the mediaeval Church (at least since 1215), it's not a case of God justifying godly men and women and admitting them to his favour, but rather that he justifies the ungodly, while they're still ungodly. The whole point of divine grace is that it consists in God giving us what we don't deserve (whereas by his **mercy** he withholds what we **do** deserve). The late mediaeval and Reformation world was obsessed with the notion of grace, but God's grace was commonly understood to be locked up in the storehouses of the Church, to be released as the Church saw fit, to deserving objects. The problem is that once you start to lay down conditions whereby we can qualify for God's grace then the whole concept of grace as a free gift is fatally undermined.

For the Roman Church it was a case of 'needs must'. Those Renaissance Popes, being patrons of the arts, were pretty high-maintenance; and when Pius X, one of the Medici Popes, decided to embark on a programme of rebuilding and renovating the Church's real estate in Rome, involving the relocation of the papal HQ from the Lateran Palace to the new St. Peter's at the Vatican, there were serious expenses run up. The works were financed by the Fugger banking dynasty, the Rothschilds of their day, but the scale and cost of the finance were such that the Church was forced to adopt extreme measures if it was ever going to be repaid. These included the effective sale of Bishoprics and Prince-Bishoprics all over Germany, Austria and Poland to the highest bidders, who were then able

to appoint their relatives, deserving or otherwise to the positions.

But the common people had to be subjected to some pressure also. If we don't pay our taxes we can be subjected to various penalties and ultimately imprisoned. How much worse if your failure to purchase Indulgences from the wandering friars would subject you (and also your loved ones who had pre-deceased you) to long millennia of extra torment in Purgatory? The elaborate system of relics is perhaps more defensible by comparison. As I understand it, you would make a pilgrimage to the site of the relic, near or far, pray at it, invoke the blessing of the saint or apostle involved, pay some money at the shrine for its upkeep and for the maintenance of those who looked after it, and you would then return to your house, if not justified than at least feeling a bit easier in your mind.

The "*brazen hawking of indulgences*" (in the language of later Protestant writers) was bound to arouse some disquiet in the breasts of serious believers. It was an innovation in the sense that it purported to deal with future sins as well as past sins, and also in the almost industrial scale of it. But there was also a geopolitical consideration: why should the transalpine Germanic populations pay for the extravagances of an Italian Pope and Italian Cardinals, funding their lifestyles, and the construction of grand buildings that the majority of Germans were never going to see? It may not be fanciful to see here the replay of the twelfth-century quarrel between Popes and Emperors as to their respective jurisdictions, a quarrel which is supposed to have revitalised philosophical debate in the Schools, just as much as the Renaissance did.

Tetzel was actually forbidden to enter ducal Saxony by Frederick the Wise, who was anxious to maintain the prestige of his immense collection of relics, and the income it generated. But the friar's egregious behaviour brought into extreme focus the contradiction at the heart of the mediaeval answer to the question, "*what shall I do to be saved?*" The uniform answer of the Lutherans, the Calvinists and the English and American Evangelicals has been: "*Nothing in my hand I bring, Simply to thy Cross I cling*".

### **Keys Of The Kingdom**

Luther's *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* was published in October 1520, just a week before the famous Papal

Bull of excommunication reached Wittenberg. It consisted of an extensive exposure of the ongoing abuses in the Church, ranging far beyond the sale of indulgences. The underlying argument was that the people of God had been undergoing a kind of captivity, in which both the Word and the Sacraments were being denied them. I don't intend to discuss these charges, but the title suggests to me another captivity.

If I could try to express this very simply I would say that for Luther the problem was that the Church had ceased to be the earthly witness for Christ and had instead become the substitute for Christ. Instead of being Lord of the Church Jesus had himself become locked up inside the Church, approachable only through the Church, and with his saving power being available only insofar as the Church agreed to distribute it. If you were in the Church, baptised, confirmed, and a regular attender at Mass, you might not necessarily be saved, but at least you were on the field of play, and in a sense you were *"in Christ"*. Luther reversed the order: the primary thing was to be *"in Christ"*, through faith, and membership of the Church was not in itself any guarantee of anything.

This gives rise to the question of what exactly the Church is for. When Jesus was accused of setting out to overthrow the Jewish law he replied that he hadn't come to abolish the law but to fulfil it. Luther might have said the same about the Church: the aim was a reformed Church, which would be a proper nursemaid to the faithful. Some might reply that this sounds like the US Generals in Viet Nam who argued that you had to destroy the village in order to save it. I see it as a bit more like the famous quotation from Lampedusa's *The Leopard*: *"if we want things to stay the same round these parts, things are going to have to change"*, or words to that effect. This is the most realistic conservative motto.

### The Pilgrim Church

I come from a tradition which was at best ambivalent in its attitude to the visible Church, disdainfully referred to as *"Christendom"*. There may have been solid authority structures and liturgical practices within Brethrenism, but they weren't formalised. This suspicion of denominational goings-on stemmed partly from a sense of having been marginalised by the four main Churches on the island of Ireland and partly from a genuine wariness of sectarianism, but

perhaps most directly from the writings of J.N. Darby, a clerical refugee from the Church of Ireland. Darby resigned his curacy around Delgany, Co. Wicklow as a reaction to an Oath of Allegiance being imposed on Catholic converts by the then Archbishop of Dublin, William Magee. He judged that the Church, in its pre-Famine, pre-Disestablishment pomp, had forfeited any claim to be a spiritual body, and had become simply an instrument of State conformity.

But that commendable view developed into a more radical thesis that the institutional Church was in ruins. In response to this sad state of affairs the aim was to establish a network of ostensibly independent *"assemblies"* of believers, with *ad hoc*, provisional structures, modelled on what Darby understood to be the practices of the primitive Church: that is, lacking the historical accretions of later centuries, and paying scant regard to the Ecumenical Councils, the Church Fathers, and even to the Reformers and Puritans. For Darby year dot was 1830 or thereabouts. The usages of Christendom were not only unscriptural and sectarian, but also based on an assumption of permanence which Darby, obsessed with eschatological speculations, rejected. Hence Spurgeon's later quip: *"Ye men of Plymouth, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?"* (It should be noted that these millennial pre-occupations originated in the writings of a sixteenth-century Spanish Jesuit.)

A century later, in 1931, E.H. Broadbent's alternative history, *The Pilgrim Church*, was published. Broadbent was a widely-read well-travelled Lancastrian who had spent many years as a Brethren missionary. *The Pilgrim Church* was an ambitious and influential work, still in print, ranging freely over the previous centuries, which simultaneously subverted and provided historical underpinning for Darby's thesis. The argument essentially is that God has never left himself without a witness, throughout all the long declension since the conversion of Constantine. In every generation there have been faithful companies of underground believers, meeting in fear of their lives, despised and persecuted by the institutional Church(es). The rise of the Brethren movement (and indeed some later movements) was on that analysis not actually ahistorical at all.

So we have Montanists, Nestorians, Waldensians, Albigensians (or Cathars),

Mennonites, Hutterites, all somewhat promiscuously grouped together, and, like the early Brethren movement, fulfilling the command of the writer to the Hebrews: *"let us therefore go out to him [Christ], outside the camp, bearing his reproach"*. This is a stream which flows strongly not just in the "Brethren" understanding of the church, but in modern evangelicalism generally. The source of the pollution is not the world, or not only the world, but the institutional Church.

It's interesting to see how even the Catholic Church, under the present Pontiff, has embraced the language of the pilgrim church, a humble body of believers, repentant about the abuses of power that in the past were, on this analysis, characteristic of the Hierarchy. It's a pity that this modesty seems to extend to some pretty fundamental Catholic, and indeed ecumenical Christian doctrine, so much so that some conservative Irish Catholics, including one of my relations, have no hesitation in calling Francis out as the Antichrist. That is a case of literally being more Catholic than the Pope.

### Like A Mighty Army

I see I'm at the risk of sounding like the Belfast woman who told a cousin of mine: *"see me, see my man, see bacon: he doesn't like it!"* So, after this long *excursus* I have to say about the Broadbent thesis that Luther didn't like it, or he wouldn't have liked it, or, insofar as those ideas were abroad in his day, he reacted quite violently against them.

This was understandable in Luther's immediate political context where (unlike in the Ireland of the 1830s) those with quirky, super-spiritual, ecclesiastical tendencies would be quickly squashed by the Papal steamroller. It was essential that the Church, to be a

Church Militant, must have some visible muscle and bone. But this was also Luther's instinctive view of the Church. We weren't supposed to be refugees from a sinking ship, clinging to the wreckage. Instead the Church was to be the purified Catholic Church, with a rich sacramental, liturgical and musical life, and a solid Bible-centred preaching and teaching ministry. The things that were really gone were: any recognition of the authority (much less supremacy) of the Pope, the Mass in its sacrificial aspect, and the cult of relics.

The doctrine of *sola scriptura* wasn't intended to overthrow fifteen hundred years of Christian thought, but only to

correct it where it plainly contradicted Scripture. And for that historical development Luther didn't look to the Waldensians and co. but to the Church Fathers and their successors. He was looking for a city that had foundations. This was a conservative revolution in its intent, and to a great degree in its execution.

Next time I'd like to look in more detail at some of the problems that surrounded Luther in his time and have dominated Luther studies since, namely the Zwickau Prophets, Luther and the Jews, Luther and the Mass, and Luther as German. Maybe also Luther and music.

## Peter Brooke

Substance of a Talk given on Sunday 11th June in Belfast

# The Reformation And Traditional Christianity

I want to approach the Reformation from a religious rather than a political point of view. By 'religion' I mean a world view—the relation ('*religare*' means to link, to establish a relationship) between human consciousness and the world about us. In this very broad understanding of the word, the view that consciousness has evolved out of a long and largely fortuitous series of chemical reactions can be regarded as a religious world view. More usually the word religion is used to characterise the view that that relationship between human consciousness and the Universe is in some way personal. It is possible to enter into dialogue between us and 'it'.

In a polytheist religion the relationship is between ourselves and a number of personalised forces of nature, which can include aspects of our own psychology. Usually these gods relate to us by involving us in their own dramas. They may from time to time help us out in our own projects but they are not in general concerned to guide us—exceptional individuals apart—into their own divine realm.

Monotheism on the other hand envisages a single consciousness behind the world, which usually is concerned with our wellbeing, both earthly and, more important, 'heavenly', posing the problem and the possibility of 'eternal life'.

The Reformation was an event in the evolution of our own, 'modern' world view and I want to concentrate on certain aspects of the traditional Christian world view which the Reformation rejected. By 'traditional Christian world view' I mean here elements held in common by all those Christian communions that can trace themselves back at least to the fourth century of the Christian era—the Church of the Roman Empire (eg the

Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches); the Church of the German Empire (the 'Roman Catholic' Church); the Egyptian Church (Copts); the Ethiopian Church; the Armenian Church; and the several different Churches claiming succession to the old Syrian Church centred on Antioch.

The German, or Frankish ('Roman Catholic') Church occupies a special place in this discussion since it was out of it that the Renaissance and the Reformation (which could be called the shadow of the Renaissance, a shadow that eventually consumed the substance), emerged. The other Churches experienced the consequences of this development as a hostile force coming from outside. The special characteristics of the Western Church that allowed this development might be the subject of another article.

One of the major characteristics of traditional Christianity rejected by the Reformation was *monasticism*. Until the sixteenth century it could have been safely assumed that Christianity, like Buddhism, was a monastic religion. So radical is the rejection of monasticism that the Christianity that did it—Protestant Christianity in all its varieties—could be regarded as a new thing under the Sun, a new religion.

### Monasticism

Monasticism implies the existence of a discipline that can bring its practitioners closer, by their own efforts, to eternal life. The discipline is called 'asceticism'. Although nowadays we tend to think of asceticism uniquely in terms of renunciation it is worth remembering that the Greek word *askesis* actually means 'exercise'. It is a word that would be used for the exercises done by

athletes, and monastic literature (following an example set by St Paul—1 Cor 9:24) often compares the work of the monks to the work of athletes.

The discipline claims its origin in the commandments of Christ, most obviously his reply to the question of the rich young man, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" ... 'If you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me.'" (Mark 10:17 and Matthew 19:21). It entails a rejection of what would normally be considered the social and political virtues—consideration of one's own personal honour, loyalty to the family, loyalty to the nation. We in the West tend to associate the religious orders with good deeds, hospitals, schools etc, but in its essence the calling of the monk is, at least on the face of things, socially useless, concerned primarily with the individual's own salvation.

The movement had its origins in the eremitic movement, the departure to the desert to lead a solitary life. This was not a matter of seeking a pleasant contemplative life in the tranquility of a monastery garden. The conditions of life in the desert were difficult. The hermits went to the desert to do combat with the devil since that is where he was thought to be at his strongest. The battlefield was the hermit's own body. The manifesto of the battle was the Book of Psalms which, to the profane eye, reads as a series of battle hymns. David, the warlike King, was to the monks, a spiritual master teaching the principles of the 'invisible combat'.

The hermits formed into monastic communities simply because of the difficulty, the near impossibility, with the real risk of madness, of the solitary life. But the ideal of the solitary life is embodied in the very word 'monk', '*monachos*', meaning 'single', and the community life of the monks was seen as a necessary training for those few who wanted and were able to pursue what was considered to be the higher life of the solitary hermit (the same is true in Buddhism).

Although some of the lives of the saints suggest an earlier origin of the idea (and there is a hint of it in Hebrews 11:37-8), the movement took off in the fourth century at the very moment that Rome adopted Christianity, when Christianity for the first time offered good career opportunities as well as the possibility of building a great Christian culture.

On the face of it this departure of many of the most earnest Christians would seem to have been, both socially and politically, a very undesirable development.

The one Christian tendency that does not seem to have been tempted by monasticism was Arianism—denial of the divinity of Christ—and this may have been a reason why, through the fourth century, in defiance of the resolutions of the Council of Nicaea, Arianism was encouraged, in the end unsuccessfully, by the Emperors (and I have a notion that it may eventually have fed into the refusal of monasticism in Islam).

The monastery embodied a total commitment to Christ that was implicitly a reproach to the less than total commitment of the rest of us. It attracted the most serious members of society who might otherwise have been good soldiers or administrators. The monks and nuns devoting their lives to nearness to God could acquire a charismatic authority—perhaps analogous to the authority in other societies of shamans, also believed to be close to an extra-human reality— independent of the merely political authority of the Government or of the Church hierarchy (in the Roman Church centred in Constantinople it became the rule—I'm not sure when—that Bishops could only be taken from the ranks of the monks). But, despite their apparent refusal of the society, it was soon considered to be in the interests of the wider society to support them. To understand this it is necessary to have some notion of what a Christian society was.

It was believed to be in itself an organic unity, the "*Body of Christ*" (1 Cor 12:12-31). As such, each part had a role to play in relation to the whole. The monks were the praying part. This does not mean that the monks were encouraged to think they were engaged in a search for anything other than their own salvation. A belief that their prayers were a service to the wider society and had a special resonance with God would induce spiritual pride or, to use a very useful Russian word, '*prelest*'—spiritual illusion. Nonetheless a virtue in one part of the body had its effects on the whole body. To vary the metaphor, the intense research of the monks after union with God was the leaven that raises the lump.

This of course opened the way for the abuses complained of by the reformers. You could pay the monks to do your praying or your penance for you. But open to abuse as this may be, it has

a logic based on the spiritual interdependence of society. If the struggle to achieve union with God (*'theosis'* or *'deification'* in the technical language of the monks) requires a renunciation of the virtues necessary to maintain a society (including, for example, the warlike virtues), nonetheless the maintenance of the society is necessary to the wellbeing and tranquility of the monks. As the laymen do the sinning necessary to maintain the wellbeing of the monastery, so the monks do the penance necessary to maintain the wellbeing of the laymen.

### Veneration Of The Saints

This spiritual interdependence stretches beyond the grave. Closely associated with the monasteries was another practice rejected by the Reformation, the veneration of the saints. The saints were largely drawn from the monasteries. In the early days they were usually martyrs but the ascetic life came to be seen as a voluntary martyrdom ("*death to the world*", to use the title of a website developed for Heavy Metal-loving Orthodox Christians). These are people who have drawn so close to God that Jesus's promises of miracle working apply to them—

"these signs will accompany those who believe: in my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new tongues; they will pick up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick and they will recover" (Mark 16:17-18).

Although miraculous events may occur during their lives, it is only after their deaths that the Church will recognise them formally as saints—when the closeness to God and the ability to perform miracles are of course amplified

The ability of the saints to hear and heed prayers addressed simultaneously from all over the world, and the fact that there are large numbers of them may put one in mind of the old gods. But it is important to stress that the saints are human and have achieved sainthood through a human discipline, which is to say that they embody a potentiality built into human nature to go beyond the normal limits of space and time. To quote the words of Metropolitan Anthony Bloom, representative of Russian Orthodoxy in London for many years:

"A miracle is not the breaking of the laws of the fallen world, it is the re-establishment of the laws of the kingdom of God" (*Living Prayer*, p.93).

This is a capacity that is in the nature of things and theoretically accessible to everyone, an indication of how things will be after the General Resurrection. The gods, incidentally, representative of forces of nature and of the human passions, have not disappeared in this scheme of things but have been reduced to the rank of demons.

Through the veneration of the Saints, heaven is both populated and immediately present and effective on earth. It is particularly present and effective in the Church. I can't resist quoting Metropolitan Anthony again:

"A church, once consecrated, once set apart, becomes the dwelling place of God. He is present there in another way than in the rest of the world. In the world he is present as a stranger, as a pilgrim, as one who goes from door to door, who has nowhere to rest his head; he goes as Lord of the world who has been rejected by the world and expelled from his Kingdom and who has returned to it to save his people. In church he is at home, it is his place; he is not only the Creator and Lord by right but he is recognised as such. Outside it he acts when he can and how he can; inside a church he has all power and might and it is for us to come to him" (p.87).

And the Saints are his court, present, together with the angels, at the liturgy and visibly present in the Orthodox tradition in the form of the icons which express the ideal of a transfigured humanity, particularly symbolised by the halo—which is not a pretty little chaplet floating above the head of a very human looking saint, but a full circle in which the transfigured human head is glorified.

### Veneration Of Relics

This transfiguration, like the original transfiguration of Christ (Matt 17:1-8) and indeed of Moses (Exodus 34:29-35), is a transfiguration of the body. Christianity from the earliest days taught the resurrection of the body and this was one of the aspects that the classical culture of the pre-Christian Empire found hardest to accept. Platonism had envisaged the possibility of eternal life but it saw this as a purely incorporeal, 'spiritual' affair. We might think Christianity would have had an easier time of it if it had dropped this refusal to separate soul and body. It is highly significant that it didn't.

The Reformation did not formally reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body but one feels it was uncomfortable with it, and it did reject the comple-

mentary practise of the veneration of relics. The veneration of parts of the bodies or clothing of the saints goes back to the very early days of Christianity, well before the conversion of Constantine. It was early established that the presence of such a relic was necessary before a church could be consecrated. To the disgust of mainstream Mediterranean opinion,

"the Christian cult of saints rapidly came to involve the digging up, the moving, the dismemberment—quite apart from much avid touching and kissing—of the bones of the dead, and, frequently, the placing of these in areas from which the dead had once been excluded" (Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints*, p.4). Brown calls it a "breaching of the established map of the universe..."

and continues:

"the impact of the cult of saints on the topography of the Roman city was unambiguous: it gave greater prominence to areas that had been treated as antithetical to the public life of the living city; by the end of the period, the immemorial boundary between the city of the living and the dead came to be breached by the entry of relics and their housing within the walls of many late-antique towns, and the clustering of ordinary graves around them."

Where, for example, Plotinus taught that matter was the product of a process of degeneration and thus contained within itself the potential for evil, the Christians taught that matter itself shared in the capacity to transcend the normal laws of nature and the limitations of space and time and was therefore able to enter into eternal life, indeed to participate, here and now, in eternity. Most spectacularly of course this could be seen in communion, the transformation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ (a doctrine that perhaps may seem less outrageous if we remember that ordinary bread and wine when eaten and drunk is transformed, by a process that, like so much that is 'natural', is nonetheless very wonderful, into our own body and blood).

### What Was Lost

Three characteristics of traditional Christianity, then, rejected by the Reformation:

1. Monasticism, with its implication that the Christian society is a single body with interdependent parts. Salvation is not a purely individual affair and Christians are not all equal before God. There is a hierarchy of saintliness, not identical

with the hierarchy of the administrative structure of the Church. It is in the nature of hierarchy that the very existence of the higher parts can help the lower parts: "*He who receives a prophet as a prophet has a prophet's reward, and he who receives a righteous man as a righteous man has a righteous man's reward*" (Matt 10:41).

2. This unified body is not confined to those still living on earth. It goes beyond the grave, hence the efficacy of prayers for the dead and of prayers addressed to the (dead) prophets and saints ("that the dead are raised, even Moses showed in the passage about the bush where he calls the Lord the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. Now he is not God of the dead but of the living; for all live in him"—Luke 20:37-8). Heaven is present on earth. The saints are still with us and still capable of rendering assistance and hence their humanity, which is continuous with our own humanity, goes beyond the supposed laws of nature and the limitations of space and time.

3. This capacity to go beyond the laws of nature and the limitations of space and time embraces material reality, hence the continued efficacy and power of the bits of matter associated with the Saints. If Heaven is present on earth it is not alien to it. The 'magical' character of the relic is a revelation of the real, eternal nature of matter.

I have singled out these three characteristics of traditional Christianity because I think they were universally accepted. They did not form part of the great debates which divided early Christianity. Also they would have seemed strange and 'unscientific' to the society that first encountered them. They could be contested on the basis of our everyday experience without having to wait for science to prove the great age of the Earth or the great size of the Universe. And they imply an underlying 'philosophical' sense of the reality of things that is different from our own but which could have given birth to other possibilities.

### What Is Left

But they were all rejected by the Reformation. In Reformation thinking there was no spiritual hierarchy in the body of Christ. All individuals are equal and equally responsible before God for their own salvation. The church is a gathering of individuals. They will of

course have different abilities and be able to serve the Church in different ways but this will of itself have no bearing on their capacity to be saved, to enter into eternal life.

There is no discipline that can bring the individual soul closer to God. Luther left his monastery because, he felt, it simply wasn't working. Salvation is a free and quite arbitrary gift of a sovereign God. Not all Protestant tendencies suggest that the individual has no role whatsoever to play in the process but the role is minimal. It is confined to the need to lead a decent life and refrain so far as possible from overt sin. Prayer is the fulfilment of a personal need and it may be effective in realising particular earthly needs but it is not of itself a means of salvation (it is something the saved Christian will want to do and therefore the taste for it carries with it the implication that one is a saved Christian).

The boundary between the living and the dead is absolute. No help can be expected from the dead (the saints) and no help can be given to the dead (prayers for the dead). So, if Protestants are aware of the presence of Heaven on earth, it is a comparatively empty Heaven, confined largely to God as Trinity.

Karl Barth in his massive *Church Dogmatics* has written at some length on the presence of angels, but he complains that they have been neglected in the Protestant tradition. They ought to be present but they really aren't.

Although the resurrection of the body was not, I think, formally repudiated in the mainstream Protestant tendencies, there is a tendency to see the spiritual life in entirely immaterial terms. Not, as in the old gnostic model, that the soul is trapped in a material prison, but more that the material shell is in the last analysis irrelevant—one might say immaterial. Calvin, arguing for a "*real presence*" of Christ in the Communion of the Bread and Wine, saw it as an entirely spiritual presence. As far as material reality is concerned, this side of the grave at least, the laws of nature and the limitations of space and time are regarded as pretty well absolute. Miracles are manifestations of God's exceptional power not, as in traditional Christianity (at least as argued by Metropolitan Anthony), revelations of the real nature of things.

### Where We Are Now

The saints, through their direct

experience of divine things, provided the Church with a source of authority and guarantee of the truth of its teachings. This too, together with the authority that goes with an acceptance of tradition, was lost to the Reformation. The only authoritative source of information about divine things was the Bible (though, perhaps somewhat inconsistently, the mainstream Protestant Churches regarded the findings of the first four ecumenical Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries as authoritative). But the Bible is open to many different possible interpretations. The absence of authority within Protestantism opened the door to an unlimited array of possibilities. This open-endedness is possibly the most important thing about it historically, more important than the actual intentions or teachings of the early reformers.

There is indeed something very moving about the earnestness, the anguish with which this open-ended search for truth was conducted and, like it or not, we are all products of it. We all of us, now, live in an age of private opinion, even those of us who may have chosen to adopt the more traditional forms of Christianity. We can only turn to them on what might be called a Protestant basis. Rather than a frame of mind common to a whole society, it is a personal choice, even if it is a personal choice made by large numbers of people. The frame of mind common to the whole society is the frame of mind formed (even, I suspect, in Christian countries that didn't receive the Reformation) by this Protestant open-endedness. Which essentially means a bedrock (whatever structures we might individually build on it) of nihilism, as defined by Nietzsche. Heaven is empty and the predominant human value is the Will to Power, as exemplified by the great concern we all have for technical inventiveness, for gadgetry.

The question is posed—is this state of affairs irreversible? Is it being reversed in Russia? Is it a road that other religions, Islam for example, have managed to avoid?

### Heidegger

I would like to finish with a brief comment on Heidegger.

I never read, nor did I ever expect to read Heidegger until John Minahane launched his *Heidegger Review*. I started reading him then because I thought that was an exciting project and that I would like to be involved in it. Like, I suppose, most people I found him pretty unread-

able but nonetheless found myself getting drawn in. What got my attention was the notion that from the start—even before, in the mid-thirties, Heidegger went, according to his critics, 'mystical' —it seemed to me he had a coherent project of restoring a religious frame of mind more humanly satisfying than the view that consciousness is the consequence of a largely arbitrary series of chemical reactions. But he was persuaded that this could not be done by any of the Churches or by any already given theological framework. The Christian cycle has come to fruition and its fruit is nihilism.

He argues that this Christian cycle was part of a larger philosophical cycle beginning in Greece, with Parmenides. The Greeks established the idea of the fundamental reality of things ('being') that enabled acceptance of Christianity. What is required now is what was done then, the radical examination of the assumptions that we think render everyday life supportable—something similar to what we find in, for example, the Platonic dialogues. One might say a plunge into nihilism to overcome nihilism, creating the necessary philosophical preconditions in the hope, perhaps, that something more radical will come along ("Only a god can save us").

I'm not sure that I go along with that. But I think it's interesting.

**Note: Part 7 of the series on Solzhenitsyn will appear in the next issue.**

## CORRECTION

In Brendan Clifford's article, *Carlstadt And Luther, Bishop Berkeley And The Irish* in the last *Church & State*, the title of a Swift pamphlet, "An Argument Against Abolishing Christianity", was inadvertently omitted. The section on page 17, column 3, should read:

"...The clergy of the Protestant Church as a State Establishment were instruments of government appointed by the State and not allowed to meet in Assembly lest they become religious. Jonathan Swift, an Anglican Clergyman, wrote a satire entitled "*An Argument Against Abolishing Christianity*".

The point of it was that Christianity as it existed in England had many secular uses and did not get in the way of the pursuit of pleasure or profit, so why make an issue of it—as anti-Christian fanatics like John Toland were doing...."

## Wilson John Haire

### Back To Carryduff

After the US Army vacated their camp in Carryduff, in preparation for D-Day, and after WW2 ended, refugees from Gibraltar settled in it. They had been evacuated from The Rock, after WW2 broke out, and living mostly in England. The British Government seemed in no hurry to allow them back home in transferring them to Carryduff. It was 1949 before that happened.

Now the almost 100% Protestant Carryduff had hundreds of Catholics on their doorstep. But they were cautious in protesting against this or in attacking them individually. These Gibraltarians looked foreign with their Spanish and Arab mix and there was the fear they carried knives, both male and female. They were very devout Catholics and very family-orientated, with elderly women acting as chaperones. Here were plenty of young teenage Catholic girls in the area for the first time and lonely Catholic Carryduff boys, who couldn't date the local Protestant girls, faced with these fierce old chaperones who waved you away if you stopped to talk to girl on the road.

The old US Army chapel was again thrown open to the few local Catholics and these frustrated boys got to sit beside them and kneel with these exotic creatures. Broken hearts was the result for a few of the Catholic Carryduff boys.

The what was called 'the refugee camp' was run by the Gibraltarians. They seemed to be able to get jobs in Belfast, both male and female, with some of the men working in the shipyard. Maybe the British Government made sure of that as they were very pro-British, though the Carryduff Protestants just saw them as foreign fenians. Some of the labour hired to maintain the camp were local Protestants and they didn't look too grateful for the jobs as they shuffled around looking sullen. I was at Mass in the camp one Sunday, and we were waiting for the priest to appear when we noticed that the asbestos pipe used to carry the smoke of the stove away was smashed. Shortly afterwards one of the Protestants employed there came in with a bucket of coal, wood and paper, to light the fire. He had been one of the gang that had attacked our house. I knew immediately he had smashed the pipe. The administrative head of the camp came in and

V  
O  
X

**Our Planters!  
Bottled Up!  
A Mystery Solved:  
Dr. Cohalan  
JESUIT Bishop!  
Fionn Mac Cumhaill  
Legal Abortions  
From Jim Larkin  
Rebel Cork and the Union Flag  
Pope**

P  
A  
T

**Our Planters!**

"Whatever god or demon may have led the first of them to these shores, the Anglo-Irish and Scottish Ulstermen have now far too old a title to be questioned. They were a hardy race, and fought stoutly for the pleasant valleys they dwell in. And are not Derry and Enniskillen *Ireland's*, as well as Benburb and the Yellow Ford?—and have not these men and their fathers lived, and loved, and worshipped God and died there?—are not their green graves heaped up there—more generations of them than they have genealogical skill to count? A deep enough root those planters have struck into the soil of Ulster, and it would now be ill striving to unplant them".—John Mitchel: Preface to *The Life and Times of Aodh O'Neill*.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Bottled Up!**

*Major Cooper:* My information, such as it is, is that we are overstocked with bottles in this county.

*A Deputy:* Empty ones.

*(The Wit and Humour of Dail Eireann, Padraic O'Farrell, Mercier Press, 1986)*

\*\*\*\*\*

**A Mystery Solved:**

"The Irish language is so much spoken by the common people in the city of Cork and its neighbourhood, that an Englishman is apt to forget where he is and to consider himself in a foreign city. There are many circumstances also which tend to excite the same idea. Cork never having been the seat of government, its inhabitants have not acquired that urbanity and polished behaviour which are communicated by the vicinity of a court, and which are extended, in some degree, to every rank in society. This great city has entirely arisen from commerce and manufactures. These pursuits are the great sinews of the state, and merit encouragement and support; but they communicate to the manners, habits, and ideas of the people, a peculiar cast, which is perceptible even by those who do not possess very acute powers of discrimination." (p.14)

The above comment on Wakefield

comes from James Carty's book "A Documentary Record of Ireland from Grattan's Parliament to the Great Famine (1783-1850)". Published by C. J. Fallon Limited Dublin. 1952.

*Edward Wakefield [1774-1854]*, an authority on agriculture, undertook the Irish tour, which produced two massive volumes, at the suggestion of John Foster, Lord Oriel, last Speaker of the Irish Parliament. Wakefield agreed with Arthur Young that a work on Ireland needed "a combination of agricultural and political knowledge". Carty adds: "Though his knowledge of the people was obviously very imperfect, he was honest and painstaking."

\*\*\*\*\*

**Dr. Cohalan**

"On the day that Dr. Cohalan died, in 1952, [24.8.1952] a meeting of Cork County Council was in progress, and despite the appeals from Sean Buckley from Bandon, who was leader of the Fianna Fail party in the chamber, we, the party members, refused to be associated with a vote of condolence. I for one was very conscious of the fact that Dr. Cohalan's decree had come as a terrible shock to the Volunteers, who were all devout Catholics. They were told by their leaders that, if they had any religious scruples or doubts or conscience about carrying on, they were free to leave the IRA, but not one of them did so." (*Memoirs of an Old Warrior, Jamie Moynihan's Fight for Irish Freedom 1916-1923*. Compiled and Edited by Donal O Heailithe, Mercier Press-p.236/237, 2014),

On the 13th December 1920, Dr. Daniel Cohalan, Bishop of Cork issued an excommunication decree, he ordered his priests not to give absolution to any Republican Volunteer in confession. Prior to this, on 24th September 1920, a Pastoral Letter from Dr. Cohalan was read in all Catholic Churches in the diocese of Cork, in which he warned his flock that "according to the declaration of the Bishops of Ireland, the killing of

*national soldiers is murder*". The national soldiers he referred to were the British Military. However, he made no reference to the killing of Republicans, who at this time were being murdered in large numbers.

The following report appeared in *The Irish Times* on the 27th February 1939:

"While one hundred men from the German naval cadet training vessel *Schlesien* were at Mass at St. Colman's Cathedral, Cove, yesterday, the Bishop of Cork (Dr. Cohalan) announced his support for the action of the Lord Mayor of Cork (Councillor James Hickey, TD) in refusing to welcome the officers and crew.

Dr. Cohalan, speaking to the Cork Catholic Young Men's Society, said: "*I congratulate the Lord Mayor, and thank him.*"

The Lord Mayor said his refusal was because of "*the insult given to the Catholic world on the death of the Pope, when the responsible German Press termed our Holy Father a political adventurer.*"

Herr Thomsen, German *Chargé d'Affaires* in Dublin, and other officials, including Captain Power, representing the Irish Army authorities and the Ministry of Defence, went on board the training ship and greeted the officers, cadets and crew.

Commander Lindenaue, captain of the *Schlesien* and other officers, motored to Cork on Saturday to the headquarters of the Southern Army Command at Collins Barracks and paid a courtesy call on the officer commanding.

The Bishop said:

"The head of the German state is a nominal Catholic. You will remember that a few years ago, when he went to Rome, he did not go to pay homage to the Holy Father. Well, that is past; but after the death of the Pope the language of the official Press in Germany was outrageous—the language with regard to the Holy Father.

"It is not for such occasions as this to refer further to the general persecution of the church in Germany-Austria," said the Bishop, "but I take this opportunity of congratulating the Lord Mayor in what he did on his own initiative. I did not ask him to do it, nor do I suppose did anybody else. He did it himself. He is a Labour man and a great Catholic"" (*Ir. Times*. 27.2.1939)

The chattering classes frequently posed the question of who ruled the country : the crozier or the Dail? Had they been present at the Courthouse in Washington Street in August, 1952, the "*mountainy men*" of Baile Mhuirne, Drishane and Cuil Aodha would have



given them the true answer!

\*\*\*\*\*

**JESUIT Bishop!**

"Pope Francis made ecclesiastical history when he appointed Fr Alan McGuckian as the new Bishop of Raphoe, the first Jesuit to ever lead an Irish diocese" (*Irish Independent*-10.6.2017).

Fr McGuckian, a native of Cloughmills, Co. Antrim, replaces 77-year-old Bishop Philip Boyce, of the Order of Discalced Carmelites.

The 64-year-old has two older brothers who are also Jesuit priests.

Fr McGuckian co-founded the Sacred Space prayer website and the online faith resource [www.catholicireland.net](http://www.catholicireland.net).

He studied Irish and Philosophy at Queen's University before joining the Jesuits and is a fluent Irish speaker. He also has degrees in Spanish, Latin and theology.

The bishop-elect taught in the prestigious private boarding school, Clongowes Wood College, Kildare, for six years and also spent time on the missions in Shembaganur, India.

Following media training in St Luke's, Missouri, he acted as director of the Jesuit Communications Centre in Dublin.

He has worked with the former police ombudsman for Northern Ireland, Nuala O'Loan, in setting up consultation groups in some dioceses.

"His appointment is perceived as the first in recent years to reach out to Irish Catholicism's middle ground". (*Irish Independent*-10.6.2017)

The modern Catholic diocese of Raphoe includes all Donegal exclusive of the peninsula of Inishowen, the eastern part of Raphoe barony and a territory south of Ballyshannon, together with a small area in Co. Derry.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Fionn Mac Cumhaill**

*Mr. Byrne:* One Deputy went back as far as Fionn Mac Cumhaill yesterday.

*Mr. Gorey:* I am sorry he did not stop there.

(O'Farrell, *ibid*)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Legal Abortions**

Twenty-five terminations were carried out under the *Protection of Life during Pregnancy Act* last year, the Department of Health has confirmed.

This is the first time the number of terminations carried out has fallen since

new abortion legislation was introduced in 2013.

Minister for Health Simon Harris has put a report from the Health Service Executive before the Oireachtas detailing the number of terminations under the 2013 Act from January 1st December 31st, 2016.

Abortion is prohibited in Ireland except in three circumstances: where there is a real and substantial risk to the life of the woman arising from a physical illness; when there is an immediate risk to the life of the woman arising from a physical illness; and when there is a real and substantial risk to the life of the woman arising from suicidal intent.

*The Protection of Life During Pregnancy Act 2013* was enacted on July 30th, 2013, and commenced on January 1st, 2014.

In order for a termination to take place, two medical practitioners have to examine the woman and jointly certify that the risk to her life can only be averted by carrying out the procedure.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From Jim Larkin**

He was me—he was every mother's son of us,  
Ourselves—strong as we would wish to be

As we knew we could be  
And he bellowing battle and promising—redemption  
Following his coffin through the mouth of the empty city,

In great roars of fury

Following his coffin through the mouth of the city last night.

Is it we who are in the coffin?

Certainly not; We are in the street marching

Alive—and thankful to the dead

**Brendan Behan 1923-1964**

*Translated from the Gaelic by Ulick O'Connor*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rebel Cork and the Union Flag**

"Cork stands in solidarity with Manchester after the 'unimaginable tragedy' of Monday's attack" (*Evening Echo*, Cork 26.5.2017).

The Union Jack flew over City Hall yesterday, while the Lord Mayor of Cork, Cllr Des Cahill, (Fine Gael) opened a book of condolence for the victims this morning.

The Lord Mayor of Cork said that flying the flag over City Hall is a sign of solidarity between the cities.

"Ireland has very strong links with Manchester and this gesture is a way of showing that. Cork is standing with the people of Manchester—it is a show of unity and solidarity."

Yes, we're sure a lot of Tricolours flew around Manchester and London after the terrorist attacks on Dublin and Monaghan on 17th May 1974 which killed 33 civilians and a full-term unborn child, and injured almost 300. This is one terrorist attack the Irish Establishment and their media hacks run a mile from discussing. (*The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings 1974: A Military Analysis*. John Morgan. Belfast Historical & Educational Society, 2013. 248 pages. £20.)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Pope**

"Pope Francis will "do everything he can" to come to Ireland next year, a senior Vatican official has said.

"Several months after Taoiseach, Enda Kenny broke news of the intended visit, the Holy See confirmed plans are being made for the pontiff to travel.

Cardinal Kevin Farrell, Prefect of the Holy See's Dicastery\* for the Laity, Family and Life, said it is hoped the Pope will attend the church's World Meeting of Families in Dublin in August, 2018 (*Irish Independent*-31.3.2017):

"If the Pope is possibly able to be there, and circumstances around the world permit him to be able to go there, I'm sure he will do everything he possibly can, at least that's what he has expressed, to be there", the Cardinal said.

A visit by the pontiff would be the first by the head of the Catholic Church since Pope John Paul II came to the Republic in 1979.

"Just five years ago, amid a wave of inquiries into decades of clerical child sex abuse, the Taoiseach branded the Holy See "a dysfunctional, elite hierarchy" which was determined to frustrate the investigations of "a sovereign, democratic republic".

"The Vatican recalled its Ambassador to Ireland just days later. The Irish Embassy to the Holy See in Rome was also shut that year, ostensibly as a cost-cutting measure. It reopened three years later" (*Irish Indel*. 31.3.2017)

The papal visit will coincide with the Citizens' Assembly issuing recommendations next year on the Eighth Amendment, which effectively bans abortion.

\* A dicastery (from Greek meaning law-court, judge/juror) is a department of the Roman Curia, the administration of the Holy See through which the Pope directs the Catholic Church.

\*\*\*\*\*

# John Minahane

The Spanish Polemic on Colonisation

Part 12

## Thomas Jefferson and the Progressive Cherokees

In 1780 Thomas Jefferson suffered a serious fall from a horse which incapacitated him for a few months. He devoted some of this time to writing detailed answers to questions by a French diplomat. The result was *Notes on the State of Virginia*, published in French in the late 1780s and in English soon afterwards.

Virginia was a state in a pivotal position. It was a long-established colony with an Atlantic coastline, which served as a bridge between the colonies of North and South. Pennsylvania and Maryland were north of it, the Carolinas and Georgia to the south. When Georgia and the Carolinas mounted a major campaign against the Cherokee tribe in 1776, Virginia joined them.

As Governor of Virginia, Jefferson was responsible for campaigns against rebellious Indians who were still to be found within that state in smaller numbers. He told his militia general that if necessary, "*the end proposed should be their extermination, or their removal*" i.e. driving them far to the west. In a more detached frame of mind, however, he could think very positively about the Indians. *Notes on the State of Virginia*, written in the same period, show him firmly rejecting the argument, put forward by the French naturalist Buffon, that they were a degenerate human breed.

"It is said, they are averse to society and a social life. Can anything be more inapplicable than this to a people who always live in towns or clans? Or can they be said to have no 'republic' who conduct all their affairs in national councils, who pride themselves in their national character, who consider an insult or injury done to an individual by a stranger is done to the whole, and resent it accordingly?"

Putting forward "*with great diffidence*" the view that blacks were inferior in reason and imagination to the whites, he maintained that the Indians, by contrast, were essentially the whites' equals. "*Before we condemn the Indians of this continent for wanting genius, we must consider that letters have not yet been introduced among them.*" To prove

themselves they would need time. The illiterate northern Europeans had needed quite a lot of time, even after the Romans introduced them to culture: sixteen centuries to produce a Newton!

"The Indians, with no advantages of (familiarity with cultural models), will often carve figures on their pipes not destitute of design and merit. They will crayon out an animal, a plant, or a country, so as to prove the existence of a germ in their minds which only wants cultivation. They astonish you with strokes of the most sublime oratory; such as prove their reason and sentiment strong, their imagination glowing and elevated."

There was one example of Indian eloquence which made a profound impression on him. A Mingo chief named Logan sent an explanation to Lord Dunsmore, Jefferson's predecessor as Governor of Virginia, of why he had not associated himself with a peace proposal from other Indian leaders. Logan explained that he had long been a proponent of peace, but without any provocation or excuse a white officer had massacred his entire family. Since then he, Logan, had sated his desire for vengeance; now he was happy that peace was in prospect. But he wished never to give the impression that he was doing anything from a motive of fear, and he did not feel he could honourably be associated with any peace proposal. "*I may challenge the whole orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, and of any more eminent orator, if Europe has furnished more eminent, to produce a single passage superior to the speech of Logan*", Jefferson said.

It was true that since the coming of the whites the Indians had been in sharp decline. In a little over 60 years from the founding of the Virginia colony, the tribes on that territory had been "*reduced to about one-third of their former numbers. Spiritous liquors, the smallpox, war, and the abridgement of territory, to a people who lived principally on the spontaneous productions of Nature, had committed terrible havoc among them,*

*which generation, under the obstacles opposed to it among them, was not likely to make good.*" The Indians' decline had continued in the century since then, and Jefferson gives several examples of tribes in his own day that were reduced to a dozen people or less. But these were situational or circumstantial facts. They said nothing about the Indians' fundamental character or potential.

### From Hunting to Farming

Jefferson continued to hold and express such views throughout his life. "*I believe the Indian... to be in body and mind equal to the white man*", he would sometimes say plainly. In his Inaugural Address on being re-elected President, he said that the Indians were "*endowed with the faculties and the rights of man, breathing an ardent love of liberty and independence*" (March 1805). But to understand what these statements meant, one must see them in the context of the ideology of *Progress*. Jefferson subscribed to progressive ideology in its full-blown Enlightenment form.

It was possible to bring the Indians into American civil society, he told George Washington in 1789.

*"To deny that... it could be accomplished, is to suppose the human character... incapable of melioration or change—a supposition entirely contradicted by the progress of society from the barbarous ages to its present degree of perfection"*.

The key to the Indians' progress was a decision that they had to make, to stop hunting and start farming. Jefferson's basic question was: "*Are you prepared to lay off hunting and mark out a farm for each family?*" (as he once asked a group of Cherokees). He envisaged "*leading them thus to agriculture, to manufacture and civilisation and preparing them ultimately to participate in the benefits of government*".

While Jefferson was the outstanding proponent of this view of things, it was actually the mainstream view of the American elite for some decades.

*"If the Indian were transformed, if he adopted civilisation and lived like a white man, his savage ways would disappear and he would endure to become a useful member of the white man's world. Every administration from Washington to John Quincy Adams and a variety of private philanthropic organisations supported this policy"*. says Bernard Sheehan (The Washington-to-

Adams period was from 1789 to 1829. The next president after that was the fearsome Andrew Jackson).

President Jefferson tirelessly encouraged any Indians who showed an inclination to abandon hunting. The United States, he said, will "*with great pleasure see your people become disposed to cultivate the earth, to raise herds of the useful animals and to spin and weave, for their food and clothing: these resources are certain; they will never disappoint you, while those of hunting may fail*". He was a master of benevolent language that was laced with obscure menace. "*Compared with you,*" he told a delegation of Choctaws in 1803,

"we are but as of yesterday in this land. Yet see how much more we have multiplied by industry, and the exercise of that reason which you possess in common with us. Follow then our example, brethren, and we will aid you with great pleasure."

Following through the logic of his ideas, Jefferson envisaged white-Indian racial mixing without any qualms. "*You will mix with us by marriage, your blood will run in our veins and will spread with us over the great island*", he told the members of one Indian delegation. And again, according to Sheehan, he was not just expressing a personal view: "*Jeffersonian opinion almost universally recommended the policy*", though not with any practical effect. When some young Cherokee chiefs (ardent progressives and champions of Jeffersonianism) married girls from the white elite in the 1820s, there was a ferocious outburst of denunciation from the white community. But then, Jeffersonian thinking was futuristic and some would have seen this as a sign that the Cherokees still needed to change a lot more.

The truth is, the avowedly altruistic desire to help the Indians along in the march of progress had an ulterior motive: land. The United States was land-crazy. Its numbers were increasing rapidly and there were throngs of discontented land-hungry people at or around its frontiers. "*In order... to provide an extension of territory which the rapid increase of our numbers will call for*", Jefferson said, "*... (we must) encourage (the Indians) to abandon hunting, to apply to the raising of stock, to agriculture and domestic manufactures, and thereby prove to themselves less land and labour will maintain them in this*". And, while committing himself to the preference for

Indians to take this course, he never quite forgot those two possible alternatives: extermination, or removal to the west. A voluntary removal would have suited him perfectly well. While in communication with one group of Cherokees about the possibility of them becoming US citizens, his agent was trying to persuade another group to go west beyond the Mississippi in pursuit of good hunting!

When speaking with Indian representatives Jefferson did not try to hide his motive of acquiring land. But he assured them that force would not be used to dislodge them: everything would be done legally and by mutual consent.

"Our growing numbers make us always willing to buy lands from our red brethren, when they are willing to sell. But be assured we never mean to disturb them in their possessions. On the contrary, the lines established between us by mutual consent shall be sacredly preserved, and will protect your lands from all encroachments by our own people or any others. We will give you a copy of the law, made by our great Council, for punishing our people, who may encroach on your lands, or injure you otherwise. Carry it with you to your homes, and preserve it, as the shield which we spread over you, to protect your land, your property and persons" (*To the brothers of the Choctaw nation*, Dec. 17, 1803).

In a letter which he wrote in 1824, fifteen years after he had ceased to be President, Jefferson said that, in a journey from the Rocky Mountains east to the seacoast, an observer could find all of the stages of the progress of man, from the infancy of creation to the present day. One might read this as Jefferson paying tribute to the success of his own Indian policy. By implication, some of the Indians must by now be in the more advanced stages of the progress of man, though not yet in "*the present degree of perfection*", as he had expressed it long ago to George Washington.

Measured on this scale, the Cherokees were undoubtedly the most advanced of all.

### The Progressive Cherokees

The Cherokees, with their Creek neighbours to the south of them, were the largest body of Indians left in the eastern United States. Their lands were in the states of Georgia and Tennessee, also North Carolina. Up to the mid-1790s they had major conflicts with white armies or militias. From then on there

was a lasting peace, maintained principally by the initiative of the progressive element in the Cherokees.

The US Government, of course, wanted peace, in principle. Determined to keep firm control of its Indian policy, it reserved the right to buy Indian lands exclusively to itself, or to the individual states with US representatives present at the transaction. Small interests were to be kept under control, with an eye always on the big picture. The process of white expansion was to be orderly and as far as possible legal.

However, while Jefferson might assure the Choctaws that the law would never let anyone encroach upon them, a truer picture of the reality might be found in the statement by Hugh Henry Brackenridge, Judge of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in a legal textbook published in 1814:

"I do not wish to justify the waging an unnecessary war against the natives... but yet I would justify encroachment on the territory claimed by them, until they are reduced to smaller bounds, and under the necessity of changing their unpolished and ferocious state of life, for fixed habitations and the arts of agriculture."

Persuasion on its own wouldn't do, then: they had to be kept under pressure. The land-hungry frontiersmen would guarantee that much. But persuasion too was employed. The Government employed Agents to the individual tribes, who tended to be experienced, knowledgeable, able, and not very scrupulous men. From the mid-1790s they were urging the advantages of agriculture and white-style living on the Cherokees and Creeks. Their key convert was a young Cherokee warrior who had blooded himself in the recent wars and soon began to rise in the tribal councils. He was afterwards known as Major Ridge.

Ridge first came to attention in the Tribal Council as a humane reformer. The Cherokees had a law that killing, even if it were accidental, had to be avenged by the blood of the perpetrator or one of his kin. Under the reform proposed by Ridge, only those who killed with intent could themselves be killed. Accidental killers would therefore be acquitted and only the actual murderers could be killed, not their relatives. Ridge gained agreement for this at the Tribal Council, with all the Chiefs promising to enforce it. And in due course, when a murderer fled and the victims' relatives announced their intention of killing his brother, Ridge

faced them down by telling them he would himself kill anyone who carried out the threat.

Ridge was one of the first Cherokees who cleared a farm for himself and exchanged his wigwam for a log house with a chimney. "*Forsaking the habits of their race*", he and his equally progressive wife "*set themselves to ploughing and chopping, knitting and weaving and other Christian employments*". In time he would have orchards, corn and cotton plantations, horses, cattle, hogs—and dozens of black slaves to do the work. This was one of the great inducements to Indian chiefs to commit themselves to agriculture: in all respects they might live the comfortable life of the southern planter.

But Ridge never forgot there was a distinctive Cherokee community. He remained Indian enough to stay in touch with that community always. Though he sent his children to be educated by the Moravian missionaries, he himself continued attending Indian ceremonies and did not become Christian. Nor did he learn English. In the tribe he collaborated with progressive allies of all sorts: one was a quiet, reflective fellow with a good knowledge of English literature, the Moravians' first convert in the region; another was a rowdy, violent, but basically honest drunk.

Ridge was firmly opposed to an idea that the agents kept insinuating and cultivating among the chiefs: that the Cherokees should sell their lands and go off west beyond the Mississippi. He intervened effectively against such proposals in the Tribal Council. During Jefferson's Presidency a rift developed between the progressive Upper Cherokees, who were committed to agriculture, and the Lower Cherokees, under the influence of Chiefs who favoured selling the land and moving west. Jefferson, of course, tried to exploit this division, but within a few years it was healed and only a small group of the Lower Cherokees went west to Arkansas.

### Progress versus the Prophets

The years 1811-2 brought the most severe test yet for the Indian party of progress. Events were drifting towards war between the United States and Great Britain, and the British of course hoped to incite the Indians to wage war in support of them. Late in 1811 the Shawnee chief Tecumseh came south to

speaking at the Creeks' Council. When Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that "*men of genius do rise up among the Indian nations, who foresee the final fate that awaits the savage population and who seek to reunite all the tribes in common hatred against the Europeans*", in all probability he had Tecumseh in mind.

Ridge was the Cherokee ambassador to the Creeks, and he was present when Tecumseh spoke. Arguing against the proposal by Sioux delegates that the Indians should make war immediately, Tecumseh said that peace must be kept for now. To counter the whites it was necessary to build a great alliance like their United States: a confederation of Indian nations. In the meantime, individual nations should prepare themselves spiritually. They should get rid of everything they had taken from the whites and return to Indian tradition.

It was reported that the head chief of the Creeks, a committed progressive, told Tecumseh this reactionary policy was unthinkable, and Tecumseh allegedly said he would go home immediately and stamp his foot, and all the Creeks' houses would shake. And shortly afterwards something occurred, which had never been known in living memory: an earthquake!—Be that as it may, Thomas Jefferson was in for a surprise. Writing to John Adams in June 1811, he had said that the Cherokees and Creeks were "*far advanced in civilisation*", with some other Indian nations advancing in the same line, and "*on those who have made any progress, English seductions will have no effect*".

In fact, the prophets who called for a return to Indian traditions gained wide support among the Creeks. Their words are reported, it seems, only by their enemies. But an allegedly old prophecy published in the Cherokee newspaper in 1832 contains what must have been key arguments of theirs. The white American "*will settle around you—he will encroach upon your lands, and then ask you to sell them to him. When you give him a part of your country, he will not be satisfied, but ask for more. In process of time he will ask you to become like him... He will tell you that your mode of life is not as good as his—whereupon you will be induced to make great roads through the nation, by which he can have free access to you. He will learn you to cultivate the earth. He will even teach you his language and learn you to read and write... But these are but means*

*to destroy you, and to eject you from your habitations. HE WILL POINT YOU TO THE WEST, but you will find no resting place there, for (he) will drive you from one place to another until you get to the western waters.*"

That prophet, whoever he was, had seen through Jeffersonianism! Such thoughts, expressed with a fiery spirit and a call to resist, got a hearing among the Creeks, and the war party found a talented leader. During the Summer of 1813 the rebel warriors burned some of the progressive Creek towns and destroyed the marks of 'civilisation'. Soon they were in full-scale war with the white Americans. And needless to say the British, who were currently at war with the United States, encouraged the enemies of their enemies.

By December of that year Jefferson was despairing of the cause of Progress among the Indians and thinking again of extermination or removal.

"The interested and unprincipled policy of England has defeated all our labors for the salvation of these unfortunate people. They have seduced the greater part of the tribes within our neighborhood, to take up the hatchet against us, and the cruel massacres they have committed on the women and children of our frontiers taken by surprise, will oblige us now to pursue them to extermination, or drive them to new seats beyond our reach... The confirmed brutalization, if not the extermination of this race in our America, is therefore to form an additional chapter in the English history of the same colored man in Asia, and of the brethren of their own color in Ireland, and wherever else Anglo-mercantile cupidity can find a two-penny interest in deluging the earth with human blood."

But the Cherokees hadn't been seduced. Admittedly, even Ridge had some doubts in his mind after the earthquake. But when a Cherokee prophet began preaching a return to the old Indian ways, Ridge confronted him, saying that this would lead to a disastrous war against the United States. On that occasion he was lucky to escape with his life. However, when the prophet made the mistake of naming a particular day when all who opposed him would be struck down dead, and it didn't happen, Ridge recovered the initiative. The Cherokee Council decided in favour of neutrality in the case of conflict; Ridge told them he would raise volunteer levies to support the United

States. His recruiting made such a stir among the young warriors that the chiefs reversed their decision and committed the Cherokees officially to supporting the white armies.

### Woe to the Victors!

The Creeks were defeated in a half-year campaign (September 1813-April 1814), led by General Andrew Jackson. They fought bravely and skilfully, but ultimately there was too much firepower on the other side. In this brutal campaign the Cherokees distinguished themselves, and none more so than Ridge. He began with only the rank of First Lieutenant, despite his exertions as a recruiter. (It was the fate of the man who didn't know English!) But he made such a mark in the actual fighting that he ended up with the rank of Major.

The Cherokees then saw what thanks they were going to get. First of all, the white Tennessee volunteers went home from the campaign through Cherokee country. They robbed and pillaged as they went, taking animals, corn, fences, even clothes from the local Indians. "*The Cherokees found their homes and families had suffered more at the hands of their white allies than from their enemies, the Creeks*", Thurman Wilkins says. But when they complained about this treatment and sought compensation, General Jackson doggedly opposed them, saying their allegations were "*one complete tissue of groundless falsehood*".

More important, Jackson was determined that the war would be followed by an enormous land-grab, and he didn't wish to distinguish Indian friends from Indian enemies. He imposed punitive terms on the entire Creek nation. Land must be surrendered amounting to 23 million acres: about three-fifths of the present-day state of Alabama and one-fifth of Georgia! The progressive Creeks who had fought alongside the Cherokees under his command protested that this was unjust, but he was implacable and they succumbed. "*What Jackson had done had the touch of genius. He had ended the war by signing a peace treaty with his Indian allies*", as a biographer puts it.

Furthermore, there had been ambiguity about where Creek territory ended and Cherokee land began. Jackson made his calculation so that about two million acres of land which the Cherokees claimed as theirs was marked for

confiscation. The Cherokees protested to the federal government, and the government agreed that they should retain this land. But the response from Jackson and from the southern states was so forceful that the official decision was undermined. The Cherokee chiefs were ground down and disorientated by the relentless Jackson and eventually agreed to the sale of two thirds of the disputed area.

But even that wasn't all. Jackson demanded another cession of land as a quid pro quo for the lands in Arkansas which a small group of Cherokees had agreed to remove themselves to. This was duly settled in conferences which Major Ridge "*boycotted*", according to Wilkins—which is to say, he had run out of resources. All that could be done was to let Jackson push through his settlement and then take up the cause of Cherokee development once again.

The Cherokees, therefore, had served as loyal allies of the United States in a successful war (and unlike many of Jackson's white troops, they had served uncomplainingly), only to be treated in the aftermath like a defeated enemy. Worse still, Jackson had renewed the demand that the Cherokees should sell their lands entirely and remove themselves west of the Mississippi. On this occasion he was unable to achieve that objective, but it was a marker for the future.

But the story of Cherokee progress had not ended. In the years that followed the nation committed itself still more thoroughly to "*industrious occupation and a government of regular law*," to quote Jefferson. Just a few years after their disastrous victory in war, a chief named Sequoyah invented a script for the Cherokee language. Jeffersonian philanthropists welcomed this less than warmly, since it was their conviction that the Indians must give up their own languages and adopt English. With Sequoyah's script, however, it was a short step to having a newspaper, published partly in Cherokee and partly in English. Fairly soon most of the Cherokees were literate in their own language.

Further details of the story must be left to a future article.

### Notes on Sources:

"the end proposed should be...": Benjamin Madley, 'Reexamining the American Genocide Debate: Meaning,

Historiography and New Methods', *American Historical Review* February 2015, p. 109; "It is said, they are averse...": This and subsequent quotes in this section from Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (Richmond, Va. 1853).

"I believe the Indian...": Henry Wiencek, *Master of the Mountain: Thomas Jefferson and His Slaves* (New York 2012), p. 53; "endowed with the faculties...": Noble E. Cunningham Jr., *In Pursuit of Reason: The Life of Thomas Jefferson* (Baton Rouge 1987), p. 276; "To deny that it could...": Morag Barbara Arneil, '*All the World Was America*': *John Locke and the American Indian* (Ph.D Thesis, Univ. of London 1992), p. 378; "Are you prepared to lay...": *ibid.*, p. 367-8; "leading them thus to agriculture...": *ibid.*, pp. 366-7; "If the Indian were transformed...": Bernard Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indians* (Univ. of Carolina Press 1973), p. 4.

"with great pleasure see...": Arneil, *op. cit.*, p. 366; "Compared with you...": Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. Merrill D. Peterson (New York 1984), pp. 559-60; "You will mix with us...": Wiencek, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-3; "Jeffersonian opinion almost universally...": Sheehan, *op. cit.*, p. 174; "In order to provide...": Arneil, p. 366; "Our growing numbers...": Jefferson, *Writings*, *op. cit.*, p. 558; Jefferson's letter in 1824: Sheehan, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-6.

"Forsaking the habits...": Cited Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy* (Norman, Oklahoma 1988), p. 33; "men of genius do rise...": Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ch. 10; "far advanced in civilisation...": Jefferson, *Writings*, *op. cit.*, p.p. 1263-4; "will settle around you...": Wilkins, *op. cit.*, p. 10; "The interested and unprincipled...": Jefferson, letter to Alexander von Humboldt, December 6, 1813; "the Cherokees found their homes...": Wilkins, *op. cit.*, p. 80; "one complete tissue...": *ibid.*, p. 85; "What Jackson had done...": Robert V. Remini, *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York 1988), p. 85; "industrious occupation...": Arneil, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

Further revelations about the ideology of Progress can be found in the current issue of  
IRISH FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
(June 2017)  
in  
Pat Walsh's  
*Balfour And Eugenics*  
Further details can be obtained from  
[athol-st@atholbooks.org](mailto:athol-st@atholbooks.org)

## Martin Mansergh

### Letter to Editor

You publish in your Second Quarter edition a pretty derogatory and one-sided account of the Reformation. Its main achievement in later German eyes was the impetus that it gave to intellectual freedom. If the freedom to think for oneself began with the Bible, it certainly did not finish with it. The article goes on to describe English Protestantism not just in origin as "a made-up religion in the service of the State", but as one that "remained so", and "Government Protestantism was not a religion at all". By extension, that comment presumably has to include the Church of Ireland, at least prior to disestablishment in 1870, and *de facto* in Northern Ireland since 1920. There are good reasons why people would refrain from describing any mainstream faith practised today as "a made-up religion". Most religion has been state-backed throughout history till relatively recently, not just English Protestantism.

One purpose of the article, 'Carlstadt and Luther, Bishop Berkeley and the Irish', by Brendan Clifford, seems to be to fit George Berkeley, Irish-born and -educated and Bishop of Cloyne for 18 years, into an ideological strait-jacket, where he can be written off as "an English gentleman". One would barely guess from the article that Berkeley is one of the better known philosophers of the past still studied in Ireland and far outside it.

Clifford with the help of some quotations concentrates exclusively on the negative, frequently patronising, and sometimes offensive attitude of Berkeley to the alleged lack of industry of the people around him. As I stated myself in a lecture to the Irish Association in Dublin on 20 May on the Reformation and its Impact on Ireland, "there were many fine bishops and deans (of the Church of Ireland), Ussher, Bedell, Taylor, Marsh, King, Swift and Berkeley, but they were all representatives of an ecclesiastical system that had no justice about it, without the wholesale adoption of colonial assumptions". Clifford goes on to conclude, having discussed only one side of the case, that the Ireland of today is in no way an evolution of Berkeley's Ireland, and castigates Irish intellectuals for

regarding him as any sort of a forerunner. For good measure, and without any supporting evidence, he even questions Berkeley's belief in the existence of God, though it is in fact essential to his philosophy.

Long before there was much revisionist influence about, Eamon de Valera as Taoiseach gave a quite different and more generous appraisal. On 7 June 1953, marking the bicentenary of Berkeley's death, he stated:

"Just over 200 years ago there lived in Cloyne a wonderfully cultured gentleman, who rose high above the prejudices of his class and loved his country and its people. This great kindly man, who was one of the foremost thinkers of his time, posed several questions about Ireland's economic development to which we in Fianna Fáil, since we first came into office in 1932, have endeavoured to provide the concrete answers".

He then went on to quote several passages from Berkeley's *The Querist* (republished by Dundalgan Press in 1970) in support of greater economic self-sufficiency. Some of the thinking of Thomas Davis, which contributed important elements to the Irish-Ireland ideology on which independent Ireland was initially based, is consciously or not a development of Berkeley's thinking.

*The Querist* is a mainly progressive, even patriotic, tract, asking for example "whether a wise State hath any interest nearer (its) heart than the education of youth", arguing for Roman Catholic admission to university without religious obligations, and querying "whether a scheme for the welfare of the nation should not take in the whole inhabitants? And whether it be not a vain attempt to project the flourishing of our Protestant gentry, exclusive of the bulk of the natives?" Berkeley was not just critical of the poor, because he asked "whether a nation of gentlemen would not be a wretched nation". He was convinced Ireland was a fertile country of great unexploited potential. At various places in the text Berkeley writes as someone identifying himself as belonging to

Ireland (then a separate but subordinate kingdom), whether as a country or a nation.

It is one thing to respect in the present day, as the Constitution now implicitly does on foot of the Good Friday Agreement, the wishes of those Ulster unionists who, though entitled to Irish citizenship, reject or repudiate it on principle (a bit less so in the Brexit context). It is quite another thing to attempt to deny people, whether living, dead or long dead, an Irish identity, in whole or in part, which they willingly profess(ed), on the grounds that their backgrounds or political attitudes exclude them.

The modern Irish State is understandably proud of all those who have played a part in enhancing the country's reputation at home and abroad, regardless of the tradition from which they come, including Bishop Berkeley, in whose memory on the tercentenary of his birth An Post issued a stamp in 1985. Berkeley belongs to more than Ireland and Britain, where he counts as part of a triad of empirical philosophers, Locke, Berkeley and Hume. A famous American university in Berkeley, California, and a college at Yale, of which he was an early benefactor, are named after him, as of course is the copyright library in Trinity College, Dublin.

The Ireland of the future, including a potential united Ireland, needs to be broad-based, and embrace all its traditions, and that has long been generally accepted. In fairness, one must acknowledge that was more difficult to do in the past, when, with the hurts of history still raw, a country under acute social, economic and political pressures was still finding its feet in the first decades of independence, especially after the bulk of the Protestant population concentrated in Northern Ireland had taken six counties out, regardless of the feelings of the nationalist community there. While there are some constants, conceptions of national identity change in every generation, as different strengths and different priorities emerge but narrowing it down serves no good purpose.

De Valera preferred to maintain bridges between traditions, as exemplified by the appointment of another gentleman Douglas Hyde as first President under the 1938 Constitution, rather than insist on rigorous

demarcation. Still less did he demand excommunication from the nation and from the national story of a selection of figures from the Anglo-Irish tradition, particularly if there was something that could be held against them as anti-national, regardless of whether they saw themselves and were seen as Irish in whole or in part. David Trimble, by all accounts an enthusiastic supporter of the two-nations theory, was only being consequent when he accused this State of being 'monocultural', the other side of the coin, except that the reality was

always different from the theory, and is even more so today. Why would anyone from a Protestant background in Northern Ireland ever willingly be persuaded to join with a State, which, if it followed the thrust of the article, would discount known co-religionist achievers from other parts of the country, like Bishop Berkeley, as not belonging, not valued, and not Irish? To its credit the State doesn't behave like that, and mostly didn't even back in de Valera's day, thanks to his good example.

27.5.2017, Tipperary

## Carryduff

continued

asked him outright if he had smashed it. He denied it of course. He was then asked if he was going to light a fire and choke everybody in the chapel. He said he didn't know it was damaged. We few Carryduff Catholics said nothing for we feared our houses being attacked. All we could do was make the sign of the cross as he looked in our direction in order to mock him.

So with the US Army allowing us to use their chapel and now the Gibraltarians a fact had been established, Catholicism had been re-established in Carryduff and all the daily jeers, jibes of sectarianism and the attacks on our homes wasn't going to drive us out.

Paddy Mallon, a local landowner, rent landlord and owner of the Ivanhoe Inn and Hotel donated an acre of land in 1943 for a Church to be built. The US Army throwing open its chapel to the few Catholics in Carryduff had motivated him.

The foundation stone was laid on the 22nd May, 1945. Local Protestant militants sabotaged the foundations and Mallon demanded a police guard on the site. The RUC reluctantly had to abide by this order as Mallon had influence because of his wealth. Nobody was charged though the RUC would have known who the saboteurs were. Maybe they just told them to stay away in future. The B'Specials, a part-time armed police paramilitary force, were the most likely culprits. They knew every move the RUC made as they shared the same barracks.

On the 30th June, 1946 the Church was dedicated to St. Joseph. It was built of brick with a concrete floor and it had 100 chairs. But it crowded from a hill over Protestant sectarian Carryduff.

Later a larger church was built and opened in 2002, within walking distance, as the Catholic population expanded. Castlereagh Borough Council, possibly reminded of the other Church on the hill, only gave planning permission if it couldn't be seen from the road. So a hollow was bulldozed.

In 2009 St Joseph's was demolished and the

new Church, the Immaculate Heart of Mary, took its place.

Carryduff in Irish: Ceathra Aodha Dhuibh—Black Hugh Quarter or alternatively: The Quarterlands of Black Hugh. (A quarterland is 120 acres.)

Carryduff is now again part of the ancient Parish of Drumbo but of equal standing as the Parish of Drumbo and Carryduff, Carryduff having expanded from those 120 acres of Black Hugh to being now known as Greater Belfast though it still retains its mostly rural setting.

The last Catholic Church in the Parish of Drumbo was in 1600 and all that remains of it is the stump of the round tower in a Presbyterian churchyard in Drumbo Village.

The digging of the reservoir in Carryduff, to serve Belfast, was mostly done by Catholic labour in 1900. Ireland being one under England, the labour also came from other parts of Ireland. Mass was said in a hut there. That was the first Mass said for 300 years in Carryduff, and a hut-type school was set up temporarily for the children of the navvies and called *The Dam School*. Living on-site they would have gone back to where they originally came from once the reservoir was finished.

In Pender's *Census of Ireland* (1659) reference is made to Caroduff (Carryduff), which had a population of twelve residents, designated as eleven Scottish and English and only one native Irish. In the year 2000 the figure for the population of Carryduff was over the 8,000, of this 55% was Catholic. Seventeen years later it is more near the 10,000 mark. In 1946 there was about 20 Catholics in Carryduff. In the townland of Mealough, within Carryduff, there was only our mixed family of Catholic mother, five Catholic children and my father a Presbyterian. In the Parish of Drumbo, including Carryduff, there were about 100 Catholics.

Carryduff now has the Ceathrú Aodha Dhuibh CLG (Carryduff GAC) with the usual Gaelic games and the teaching of the Irish language..

I'm not here to crow over the changes made in Carryduff though, during my family's life there, it was made hell by sectarianism. Many times we feared for our lives. But not everyone was against us. Two families—the Shaws, farmers (not

related)—welcomed us into their kitchens when we went to buy vegetables. I kept wondering why they weren't like the rest of the Protestant population. There was also the farmer Billy Garret, whom we used sit around his fire with as children, and pump the bellows to make it glow. Yet a quarter of a mile away you would get another farmer saying to my two young sisters off seven and eight: "*I don't sell purdus (potatoes) to Romanists.*"

As we entered the new millennium two local Protestant self-published a type of journal called *Carryduff 2000: A Chronological Record of Events In The Life and Development of Carryduff, Past and Present and Memoirs of the District From Bygone Days*. It was researched and written by George A. Bowsie and Graham Murphy.

Both men are local Protestants and have given the original Irish name places and a list of the Anglicisation of the name Carryduff over the centuries plus giving the Irish meanings to the various townlands within Carryduff. One is a gifted church organist and travels to church meetings in various countries. The other man was in his 90s. I met them back in 2002 when I was invited to give a talk to the Carryduff Historical Society. I found he had an astounding memory for the past and a good grasp of Carryduff's history going into past centuries.

In the talk I went easy on the sectarian issues those years back as the audience was totally Protestant. Most of them came from families that had lived there since the days of the United Irishmen and bore the names of some of those hanged. But it was the descendants of these martyrs who had stoned our house and poisoned the well-water during WW2. Now I was talking to the long-livers and their grown children. The impossible became possible—they were laughing with joy at my description of some of the more bizarre characters that once flourished in Carryduff.

9 May 2017

### Note

#### High Court Action

A report in the *Irish Independent* (26.5.17), entitled *High Court Bid To Stop Nuns Owning Maternity Hospital*. states:

"A High Court challenge has been lodged to prevent the new National Maternity Hospital being built on land owned by the Order of the Sisters of Charity on the campus of St Vincent's Hospital in Dublin...

The legal challenge is... by Dick Spicer (70), co-founder of the Campaign to Separate Church and State, and his son Norman".

Church & State magazine wishes to make clear that it has no connection with this legal action or with Mr. Spicer.

**Macaulay  
Jewish History  
Mr. A. McCabe:  
Figures**

**Macaulay**

The Protestant writer, Macaulay, on the Catholic Church says:—

"Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world : and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all."

"The regular weekend Mass and full-time resident parish priest will soon both be a thing of the past, a Catholic bishop has warned.

Amid the ongoing shortage of priests, the Bishop of Kerry, Ray Browne told his flock that weekend Masses in every parish in the diocese will not be viable "in a short few years" (*Irish Independent*-3.7.2017).

"Soon it will not be possible to have a weekend Mass in every church in the diocese. That day is not far off," he warned. (*ibid.*)

In all, there are 111 Churches in Kerry's 53 Parishes. Most Parishes have two or three Churches, a small number have one Church.

The Diocese of Kerry is not the only parish experiencing this crisis. The neighbouring Diocese of Cork and Ross is also concerned about an ageing and declining cohort of priests.

The Cathedral of Saint Mary and Saint Anne in Cork, is the seat of the Bishop of Cork and Ross, and the Mother Church of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Cork and Ross. It is located in the heart of the city, yet conducts just one single Mass on a Sunday morning. There was a time, not long ago, when four or five Masses were said on the Sabbath.

A Church in the heartland of the city's Northside, a predominately working-class area, finds that the dues and offerings can barely pay the church's electricity bill.

Following the closure of St. Vincent's Church, Sunday's Well on 30th June 2016, fears were expressed that if its sale went on the open market, the Crescent could replace the Cross.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Jewish History**

"The Jews closely resembled spoiled children. The objects of God's unceasing care and the constant recipients of His special favours, they showed their willfulness and disobedience at every step in their career. By many striking miracles He led them out of the bondage of Egypt, fed them in the desert with manna from heaven, gave them 'a land flowing with milk and honey', fought their battles for them, and made their enemies fly from before their face. Yet they more than once murmured and rebelled against Moses. They set up a golden calf for worship at the foot of Mount Sinai, at the very time when Moses was speaking with God in their behalf and receiving from Him the tables of the Law. Weary of the judges whom God had sent them, they clamoured for a king, 'to be like unto other nations'. Always restless and never satisfied, they passed from sin to sin until they consummated their ingratitude by closing their eyes to the Light and crucifying the Messiah. Jerusalem was soon after destroyed, the temple demolished, and the Jewish people sent as wanderers over the face of the earth, because they were 'a stiffnecked people'."

(*Handbook of Essentials in History and Literature*, Ancient and Modern for the use of Junior Pupils. By the Rev. D. Gallery, SJ. Third Edition. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, O'Connell Street. 1886)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. A. McCabe:**

"...I believe that if ever there is a naval war, Ireland and Irish seas are going to be the cockpits of the world. Therefore, I say that this subject of territorial waters is of the very deepest interest..." (*The Wit and Humour of Dail Eireann*, Padraic O'Farrell, Mercier Press, 1986).

\*\*\*\*\*

**Figures**

A total of 1,147 same-sex marriages have taken place in Ireland since the marriage-equality legislation came into effect in November 2015.

The Central Statistics Office (C.S.O.) has released its marriage and civil partnership data for 2016, which was the first full 12-month period for which same-sex marriage statistics are available.

In 2016, there were 1,056 same-sex marriages, with 606 male and 450 female couples.

Same-sex marriages accounted for 4.7% of all marriages in Ireland in 2016.

The average age of couples in same-sex marriages was 40.7 years.

Same-sex marriages accounted for almost 5% of all marriages in 2016. There were 91 same-sex marriages in 2015 and 1,056 in 2016.

While numbers attending Mass may be dwindling, the number of people opting for religious ceremonies and services remains high.

In 2016, religious ceremonies accounted for 64.8% of all marriages.

There were 12,140 (53.7%) Catholic marriage ceremonies, 372 (1.6%) Church of Ireland ceremonies, The Spiritualist Union of Ireland performed 1,038 (4.6p%) ceremonies and 1,104 (4.9%) couples opted for other religious ceremonies.

The most popular form of ceremony for same-sex couples was civil, which accounted for 80.5%, or 850, last year.

A further 97 couple (9.2%) opted for humanist ceremonies and the Spiritual Union of Ireland performed ceremonies for 73 same-sex couples.

Almost half of all same-sex marriage ceremonies took place in Dublin City, with 481 couples tying the knot here.

The next most popular locations were Cork City and Co Wicklow, with both places having 57 same-sex marriages take place there in 2016.

While 88% of opposite-sex marriages were first-time unions when it came to same-sex marriages, only 56% of them were first-time marriages.

This is because many same-sex couples had previously been in civil partnerships.

Of the 2,112 individual partners, 1,195 were single prior to their marriage, 840 were previously in civil partnerships, 64 were divorcees, and four were widowed.

\*\*\*\*\*