

Church & State

# **An Irish History Magazine**

*And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World*

---

## **England !**

### **Ukraine/Russia Orthodox Church Dispute**

### **Some Enlightenment About WW1**

### **Northern Ireland Conundrums**

### **Religious Disputation: James 1, Richard Baxter *et al***

## Editorial

### England!

England conceived a separate destiny for itself give hundred years ago. It conceived that destiny in terms of religion. Its new religion was devised by the State, making use of borrowings from Germany and Switzerland, and was established by a combination of force, fraud and persuasion. It took root in society and became a nationalist religion in the fullest sense. In the mid-16th century it undertook to reduce life to religion, discarding the trappings of the monarchical State and placing itself under the Presidency of God.

Its arrangement to be governed directly by God—Cromwellianism—did not work out. But during those ten years of totalitarian Protestantism England declared itself to be the agent of Providence in this world. Cromwell's Secretary of State declared that it was England's divine mission "*to teach the nations how to live*" (John Milton). In furtherance of this mission it set about conquering the nations in order to teach them. Ireland was the first country to be subjugated by the new fanaticism.

Theocracy broke down in 1659. Monarchy was nominally restored in 1660. It did its best to curb the public expression of fundamentalist Protestant zealotry—until it was overthrown by aristocracy supported by a fanaticist revival in 1688.

The "*Constitutional Government*" established during the generation after 1688 consisted of rule by an aristocratic Parliament, in the name of a powerless monarch, which got its power from a Puritan populace which it protected from itself. Puritanism was given its head in what was inaptly called "*civil society*" but was prevented from endangering itself by repeating the extremes of the 1650s.

Under this combination England spent the next two centuries attempting to conquer the world, and coming very close to it.

It failed. Perhaps it was destined to fail because the nature of human existence is such that the world is unconquerable. But it failed prematurely because, urged on by the Anglicising Irish Home Rule movement under John Redmond's leadership, it launched an unprovoked war on Germany in 1914, in the posture of moralistic attitudinising that comes so naturally to it, expecting the Germany would be crushed in a few months, only to be rescued from defeat four years later by the United States.

After that pretty well everything that it did in world affairs turned against it. It ended up in the 1970s subordinating itself to the European structure that it had despised as an attempt to revive the Holy Roman Empire. It assumed it could subvert the EU from within. Finding that the EU developed despite it, it now seems to be on the brink of leaving it in order to try to rediscover the separate destiny which it squandered hubristically in 1914.

England wrenched itself apart from European civilisation by means of two great acts of cultural destruction—the Iconoclasm conducted in the mid-16th century by Henry

VIII's minister Thomas Cromwell, and in the mid-17th century by Oliver Cromwell. It deprived itself of its traditional culture in the pursuit of separate and unique power. When in the 18th century the new ruling class wanted culture for its country house, it had to import it from Europe. And live culture for the theatre, when it was un-banned, was got from Ireland where the refusal of religious reform preserved a European dimension of life.

Christianity collapsed in England through being carried to extremes which it could not bear. The collapse happened quite suddenly at the end of the great Victorian Revival that followed the 1832 Electoral Reform. But the culture produced out of the zeal of Protestant fundamentalism remains at the heart of English culture—even though it is subjected to obscene and blasphemous ridicule every night in television comedy.

England is not ashamed of itself. Ireland is.

The Irish middle class is ashamed of the fact that their ancestors were so bigoted that they resisted English Protestantism at considerable cost to themselves, and that, under pressure of the Famine brought about by English Protestant Utilitarianism, they gathered themselves together under a stricter form of Roman Catholicism than they had ever tolerated before.

This magazine was founded over forty years ago, when Catholic Ireland was content with itself. Its object was not to undermine the Roman Church but to establish awareness of a secular sphere. A series of articles was published, *The Rise Of Papal Power In Ireland*, which demonstrated that direct control by Rome over the Church in Ireland was of very recent origin. It was far from being the case that it had deep roots going back to St. Patrick.

The relationship with Rome—with Europe—went through many changes over the centuries, and the development of Irish culture was bound up with those changes. Our aim was to preserve elements of that culture that were in danger of being lost, beginning with the great dispute amongst Catholics in the early 19th century over the appointment of Bishops, the Veto Controversy.

The founding Editors were Tom Bates, a Dublin Protestant, and Paul O'Mahony, a Limerick lapsed Catholic. A budding intellectual of the Cork middle class, Brian Girvin was then appointed Editor. In the course of a year he failed to produce a single issue, giving no explanation of the reason why. Another Editor was appointed and the magazine has been produced regularly ever since. Brian went on to become a kind of anti-historical Professor of Anti-Irishness in a British University. He was clearly more in tune with the potential of the budding Irish academic world than we were.

England developed in a medium of fundamentalist Protestantism, woven into its national culture. It looks back on itself with satisfaction and looks forward with anticipation to being itself again. Ireland developed a strong sense of nationality in a medium of the much broader culture of Roman Catholicism, which does not lend itself easily to fundamentalism.

Due to a change of opinion induced by England a generation ago, it now wishes to destroy what it had made of itself. What it became in effect as a region of the EU as a fellow-traveller of England was regional British. But it turns out after all that it is only *ersatz* British and cannot participate in the spirit of Brexit. It is a lost soul.

✱

## Dave Alvey

Part Two

### The Industrial Schools: *flaws in the liberal narrative*

That mainstream Irish liberalism is a flawed ideology can be seen in the way it seeks to airbrush Fianna Fail achievements from history. This is evident in the way the story of the Industrial Schools is told. In the 1960s various Fianna Fail Ministers collaborated to expose the system of institutional child detention run by religious orders of the Catholic Church, and their efforts led to the closure of the main Industrial Schools in the 1970s. You get a distorted sense of this from the acclaimed book on the subject published in 1999—*Suffer The Little Children* by Mary Raftery and Eoin O'Sullivan—a radical journalistic analysis written from a liberal perspective.

(Mary Raftery died of ovarian cancer in 2012. With the title, *Do They Think We're Eejits*, a selection of her columns for the *Irish Times*, written between 2003 and 2009, was published in book form by that paper in 2013. Eoin O'Sullivan was a lecturer in Social Policy when *Suffer the Little Children* was published and is now Professor of Social Policy at Trinity College Dublin.)

In a previous article I referred to a timeline on the Industrial Schools published on the Internet by Paddy Doyle, a survivor of the system. I wrote that the timeline distorted the historical record by making a reference to Charles Haughey that made it appear as though he was complicit in protecting the system, when he had in fact initiated the first official investigation of it in 1962. On re-reading *Suffer the Little Children* I discovered that it was the source of Paddy Doyle's assertion regarding Haughey; his timeline reference was taken directly from the book. It is therefore necessary to take a closer look at Raftery and O'Sullivan's treatment of the subject.

In retrospect it is at least plausible to adjudge that as Minister for Health Charles Haughey erred in failing to initiate a public inquiry into Children's Homes following the murder of a child by a child care worker from Madonna House, Dublin in 1978. Raftery and O'Sullivan describe the incident as follows:

"In 1978, a child care worker had kidnapped a boy who had been resident at the home and drowned him in the bath of an Edinburgh hotel. In response to calls for a public inquiry at the time into practices employed in children's homes, Minister for Health Charles Haughey said that such an inquiry would serve no useful purpose" (p. 386).

It later transpired that the management of Madonna House, under the Sisters of Charity was marked by "*incompetence and pervasive dysfunction*". The House catered for 50 children and was funded by the State. It was considered to be a major improvement on the Industrial School model in that it was "*a family orientated centre*".

A paedophile, Frank Griffin, was employed as a maintenance man in 1984, six years after the murder. His activities were reported by members of the staff but the Manager, Sr. Anna Purcell, failed to take appropriate action. Griffin was eventually arrested and sentenced to four years imprisonment for sexually abusing children resident there during the 1980s and early 1990s.

To page 4

## Contents

England!	Page
Editorial	2
<b>Liberalism, Fianna Fail And The Industrial Schools</b>	
Dave Alvey (Part 2)	3
<b>Bethany Home and the Church of Ireland</b>	
Derek Leinster, Matthew Fitzell (Report)	6
<b>The Dispute About The Orthodox Church In Ukraine.</b>	
Peter Brooke	7
<b>Some Enlightenment About World War One!</b>	
Martin Tyrrell (Review of Eamon Dyas' <i>Blockading The Germans!</i> )	9
<b>Vox Pat:</b> Window On The Past; High Learning! Vital Statistics! Mentors? Archbishop Croke; Papal Offence? BRACE Yourself; Witless? US Life Expectancy—Britain Up The Spout? Vatican Ambassador; Breast is Best! Academic Acuity! Joseph Conrad Again! "Catholic influence grows among other EU nations"; Window On The Past; High Learning! Vital Statistics! Mentors?	
Pat Maloney	12, 30
<b>Northern Ireland: Political Conundrums</b>	
Brendan Clifford	14
(Review of <i>Say Nothing: A True Story Of Murder And Mayhem In Northern Ireland</i> , by Patrick Rodden Keefe; <i>Forgetful Remembrance: Social Forgetting and Vernacular Historiography of a Rebellion in Ulster</i> , by Guy Beiner.	
<b>Reliquiae Baxterianae</b>	
Stephen Richards (Part 2)	21
<b>Biography Of Daniel O'Connell</b>	
Jules Gondon (trans. Cathy Winch)	
Final instalment	26
<b>Suffer The Little Children!</b>	
Malachi Lawless	29
<b>Representation In The New US Congress</b>	
Report	29
Peter Brooke's <i>Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin And The Russian Question</i> and John Minahane's <i>Spanish Colonial Debate</i> will resume in the next issue	

### Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney

ISSN: 0332-3625

All Correspondence should be sent to:

**P. Maloney,**  
26 Church Avenue, Roman Street, 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 to be sent to address above. Items can also be ordered from

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

In retrospect it is easy to blame the responsible Minister for failing to inquire into the new child care institutions after a child care worker kidnapped and murdered a child in his care, but Haughey probably considered the tragedy to have been an isolated incident. He can hardly be blamed for failing to foresee the future. However, Raftery and O'Sullivan are within their rights as documentary investigators in informing their readers that Minister Haughey decided not to entertain requests that a public inquiry be held and that it subsequently transpired that an inquiry into the new Children's Homes would have been the better decision.

Where a bias against Haughey on the part of the authors of *Suffer the Little Children* becomes evident is in their description of the *Inter-Departmental Committee on Crime Prevention and Treatment of Offenders* which was set up in 1962. Raftery and O'Sullivan make a number of detailed references to this Committee without mentioning that it was Haughey who was its instigator. This is a significant omission.

The Inter-Departmental Committee was the second official investigation into the Industrial Schools (the first was that of the Cussen Committee in the late thirties) and it marked the beginning of a process that led to the closure of the Schools. The formation of the Committee arose from a political decision by Haughey in his capacity as Minister for Justice in a Government headed by Sean Lemass; it is disingenuous to represent it as a routine development initiated by officials. Here is how the Committee is described in the book:

"During 1962, the Department of Education had been involved in a more general Inter-Departmental Committee on Crime Prevention and Treatment of Offenders. This had been established in September under the chairmanship of Peter Berry, Secretary of the Department of Justice. As part of its remit, it explained the treatment of young offenders, and consequently it turned its attention to the industrial and reformatory schools.

Despite meeting on several occasions, this Committee never published a report, and most of its recommendations on the schools were never acted on. Some of these were identical to those of the Kennedy Report, seven years later. However, the deliberations of the Inter-Departmental Committee were strangely never referred to by the Kennedy Report" (p. 358).

Raftery and O'Sullivan then provide a bulleted list of the Committee's main recommendations, the most important of which refer to needs for visiting committees, more frequent inspections, the appointment of matrons/nurses, and regulations to ensure proper bedding and clothing for the inmates. They recount how the Committee interviewed the Chaplain of Artane Industrial School, Fr. Henry Moore, who had been appointed by Archbishop John Charles McQuaid to give him an honest account of the School; his report had been scathing.

Moore gave the same report to the Committee. This represented an indictment of the Department of Education as well as of the Artane School and by way of response three officials of that Department duly visited Artane, producing a report that rejected the criticisms.

This is all described in a chapter entitled, *The First Cracks*, in which the work of Haughey's Inter-Departmental Committee is treated as one among "a handful of voices" critical of the Industrial Schools in the early sixties. But this is a misrepresentation. A more realistic appraisal has been provided by Dr. Fiachra Byrne from the School of History at University College Dublin. An Address he gave to the 2017 Parnell Summer School was reported as follows:

"He said the first significant changes to State thinking on the needs of delinquent children and adults included contributions from psychologists and an interdepartmental committee set up by Haughey when he was minister for justice in 1962" (IT, 16 August 2017).

The Inter-Departmental Committee rattled the cage of those elements in the Department of Education inclined to be defensive of the Industrial Schools. Its recommendations put one part of the State machine on notice that the malpractice perpetrated in the Schools was no longer beneath the political radar. The question at issue represented a particularly difficult challenge for the political system, and the social power that the Catholic Church could call on meant that the defenders of the Industrial Schools could easily repulse the initiative that Haughey had inconspicuously launched. But a start had been made.

In *Suffer the Little Children* Raftery and O'Sullivan are prejudiced against Haughey but they also seem to have very little knowledge of the uneasy relationship that existed between Fianna

Fail and the Church, especially in the years after the party's formation. At that time the party viewed itself as the *excommunicated party* and a pride in that label survived down the decades; Lemass once stated in an interview that a belt of a crozier always helped a candidate being selected by the party.

After the Inter-Departmental Committee other oppositional forces began to close in on the Industrial Schools, as the authors show (356-364). In 1963 the Catholic Bishop of Cork, Dr. Cornelius Lucey, pronounced against the inadequacy of institutional child care. Between 1964 and 1969, though for economic rather than moral reasons, the religious orders closed fourteen Industrial Schools (for most of the first half of the twentieth century there were 52 Schools usually accommodating approximately 6,000 children at any one time).

As the messages of the Second Vatican Council began to hit home a mindset change was occurring in Irish Catholicism which augured the end of the institutional care model, if such a description is not too charitable. A 1964 file from the Department of Education archive states that "*thinking both here and abroad is against long-term detention in institutions*" showing that the sea change in attitude was occurring even in that quarter. By 1966 different branches of the media, in a small way, were beginning to take a critical view of the Schools.

Yet the important agents of change continued to be Government Ministers. As Minister for Education, Donogh O'Malley launched the Kennedy Committee of Inquiry into the Industrial Schools in October 1967. Its Report was published in 1970 after the Committee, headed by District Court Justice Eileen Kennedy, had visited all of the Schools, received 56 submissions, sought information from 45 organisations and consulted 113 publications.

According to Raftery and O'Sullivan, O'Malley's initiative "*resulted in the effective dismantling of the system* [of Industrial Schools] (p. 364), and its Report provided "*one of the most damning indictments of the operation of any State system ever produced in this country*" (p. 378). O'Malley died in a car accident in March 1968. He was replaced as Minister by Brian Lenihan who ensured that the Kennedy Committee had the secretarial resources it needed to overcome obstructions

placed in its way by pro-Church civil servants. It would be wrong, however, to see Lenihan merely as an able inheritor of O'Malley's initiative. As Minister for Justice in 1966, Lenihan wrote to O'Malley pointing out the desirability of establishing visiting committees for the Industrial Schools and recommending that a "vigorous approach" be taken in dealings with the religious Managers of the Schools (p. 365).

The political story behind the Kennedy Committee is that a well known trio of Fianna Fail politicians—Charles Haughey, Brian Lenihan and Donogh O'Malley—with the support at different times of two Taoisigh—Sean Lemass and Jack Lynch—collaborated to break the stranglehold that the Catholic Church had over the Irish State.

In introducing free secondary education and dismantling the Industrial Schools this Fianna Fail grouping achieved a measure of success but every inch of ground needed to be fought for. The Catholic lobby quickly regrouped and, when Fianna Fail was turned out of Office by a Fine Gael-Labour Coalition in 1973, the period of reform was brought to an abrupt end.

A staunch upholder of Catholic Church interests, Richard Burke of Fine Gael, was appointed as Minister for Education and new structures within the Department designed to facilitate educational planning on a national scale were systematically disassembled; the balance of power in the Department and throughout the State machine swung back to the defenders of Church power.

In the final chapter of *Suffer the Little Children*, Raftery and O'Sullivan chronicle how the new era heralded by the Kennedy Report failed to live up to expectations. They state:

"The stark reality is that while the rhetoric associated with child care had changed, the closed and secretive practices which had allowed so much past abuse to occur were still very much in place" (p. 382).

During the 1980s and 1990s child care under the authority of the State continued to be controlled by the Catholic religious orders, even though the Industrial Schools had closed. Physical and sexual abuse of children was rife in the new institutions and religious Managers, fearful of exposing the Church to scandal, were unable to deal with it. The authors make no reference to the effects of the political change caused by the

electoral victory of a pro-Catholic Church Fine Gael/Labour Government.

The three television programmes that made up the documentary, *States of Fear*, on which *Suffer the Little Children* was based, performed a job that needed doing. They were broadcast over three weeks in May 1999 and provoked a massive public debate. It was sensible, given that the impact of TV programmes tends to be relatively short, to produce a book based on the programmes. *Suffer the Little Children* is in many ways worthy of its critically important subject. It is a book that deserves to be on the bookshelves of readers who care about Irish national development. But it has deep flaws and one of its flaws defines much that is wrong with contemporary Irish liberalism.

The first flaw pertains to its treatment of Charles Haughey, as I have shown. Since the subject matter of their investigative work was the exposure of a long-term official cover up, it behoved the authors to be scrupulously objective themselves. Airbrushing Haughey out of the story when he instigated a pivotal investigation, and then highlighting his role when he refused to authorise an inquiry regarding Madonna House, amounts to deliberate distortion arising from what must be assumed to be political bias.

In the same vein an element of pettiness is evident when, in describing politicians who raised concerns about the Schools over the years, the political affiliations are mentioned of Fine Gael representatives like Deputy Kenniffick, a member of Cork City Executive of Fine Gael (p. 132), and Stephen Barrett, another Cork TD (p. 218), while those of Fianna Fail representatives like Cork Mayor and Senator, Gus Healy (p. 132) and Dublin TD Sean Brady (190), are not.

(It is not my intention to portray Fianna Fail as faultless and Fine Gael as exclusively defensive of the Church. As Minister for Justice in the forties, Gerry Boland of Fianna Fail was a rabid supporter of the Industrial Schools, while the manner in which the Fine Gael TD, Declan Costello, recommended to Donogh O'Malley that he use the experience of a courageous priest, Fr. Ken McCabe, in laying the ground for the investigation into the Schools shows that party allegiance was not an automatic indicator of politicians' views on the issue. See page 368. I am simply arguing

that there is a particular onus on the authors of a work on the Industrial Schools to tell the story objectively without the distraction of political bias, whether petty or otherwise.)

It is difficult to know why Raftery and O'Sullivan are weak in describing the political aspect of the Industrial Schools saga. It may be because Eoin O'Sullivan's area of academic expertise, Social Policy, is a discipline in which the role of politics is down-played. Missing from their analysis is any understanding of the political risks taken by Haughey, Lenihan and O'Malley when, with the backing of their party and party Leaders, they moved against Church power.

Also missing is any reference to the successful counter attack against them that reached fruition in the seventies. It is possible that the political back-story is absent because the authors wished to disparage the political system of independent Ireland. I know that one of the prime movers in crusading journalism in Ireland, Vincent Browne, was firmly of the opinion that achieving independence was a mistake and his viewpoint may have been shared by other radical journalists like Mary Raftery. I know about Browne's viewpoint because I engaged in a public correspondence with him on the point in *Village* magazine in the early 2000s.

Raftery and O'Sullivan deserve credit for attempting to place the Industrial Schools in a historical perspective. They devote a few early chapters to explaining how the system came into being under British rule in the nineteenth century. Their account is not as bad as some readers might expect—it recognises the massive re-organisation of Church institutions accompanied by rigid orthodoxy that occurred under the leadership of Cardinal Paul Cullen—but the topic is too large to be dealt with in their journalistic approach. It is perhaps a topic for another day.

In contemporary Irish politics the issue of the Magdalene laundries is being used as a battering ram to discredit the national tradition. It is as though the ideological ground needs to be cleared of past remnants so that new ideologies like Liberalism and Feminism can become dominant; it's as though a radical break with the past needs to be engineered to make way for a new dispensation.

But the architects of this new dispensation have no understanding of the

importance of historical continuity. Their project entails a diminishing of culture. The new ideologies—cosmopolitanism, individualistic liberalism and feminism of the US variety—are superficial and divisive; they fitted well with the scheme of globalised capitalism that came a cropper in 2008. They are not socially or locally rooted in the manner of Irish nationalism.

The authors of *Suffer the Little Children* followed the same liberal agenda as is currently being played out over the Magdalene laundries. In exposing the horrors of the Industrial Schools, it was not their intention to enhance Irish national development. On the contrary they misrepresent the response of the Irish political system in the sixties and seventies and depict independence from Britain in a negative light. As they describe it, Irish national politics is not something to be taken seriously.

Alternatively the political approach envisioned in the Proclamation—overcoming social problems through self government with a European dimension—provides a more credible way forward. The excess of power wielded by the Catholic Church had a disfiguring effect on the State and tainted the achievements of the national movement, but that is not a reason for renouncing the entire nationalist tradition.

There are hard lessons to be learned from the experience of the Industrial Schools—for the world of politics and for the Church—and many of the insights provided by Raftery and O'Sullivan are helpful in that regard—but it would be wrong to use those experiences and failures as a pretext for ditching the rich historical legacy of the national tradition in favour of whatever it is that the liberal/feminist lobby has mapped out for our future.

Protestant church leader to stand up for his flock in this matter for over 20 years. I hope others speak out as he does while they contemplate a child born in a stable 2,000 years ago.

**DEREK LEINSTER,**  
Chairman,  
Bethany Survivors Campaign,

Janet Maxwell of the Church of Ireland Synod Services states that the Church of Ireland neither owned nor managed the Bethany Home.

The Church of Ireland, while not directly owning or managing the Bethany Home, was clearly involved in setting up and running it, but at arm's length—very conveniently as it has turned out!

The then Church of Ireland Archbishop of Dublin opened the Bethany Home for "fallen women" in 1922 and the dean of Christ Church Cathedral presided at the first management committee meeting.

It incorporated the Dublin Midnight Mission and Female Refuge, and the Dublin Prison Gate Mission, both Church of Ireland-affiliated organisations.

Several Church of Ireland clergymen, some of whom were superintendents or members of the Irish Church Mission to the Roman Catholics, now known as the Irish Church Mission (ICM), sat on its management committee.

The ICM reports to the Church of Ireland synod and its superintendent is appointed by the archbishop of Dublin.

The then Church of Ireland archbishop of Dublin in 1945 recommended the Bethany Home, "an evangelical institution for unmarried women and their children", as a suitable place for "Protestant girls on remand".

Many of the women sent there were referred by Church of Ireland clergy.

Church of Ireland clergyman Rev Kevin Dalton, who as a child spent time at Bethany along with his mother, described it as "A Church of Ireland home for unmarried girls".

The Bethany Home records are held by the Church of Ireland.

Surely the Church of Ireland cannot persist in refusing to take responsibility for this appalling scandal?

Such a strategy could be construed as a cynical ploy to wait until all the survivors have died, in a misguided effort to shore up the Church of Ireland's reputation and avoid monetary compensation.

**MALCOLM FITZELL,**

## Report

Two letters which appeared in the *Irish Times*

### Bethany Home and the Church of Ireland

With great sadness, I see that Janet Maxwell, on behalf of the Church of Ireland, "corrects" Canon Ronnie Clarke's recent brave letter, criticising the Church of Ireland for its historical role with regard to the Bethany Home, its victims and its survivors (Letters, December 20th, 21st).

The Church of Ireland says, in effect, nothing to do with us.

When I met Janet Maxwell 18 years ago she told me she had no idea what went on in the Bethany Home. I had to bring her up to speed. She was not aware that: the archbishop of Dublin opened this home for what he termed "fallen" women in 1922; that money was donated in his name; that the dean of Christchurch said that Bethany continued the work of a Church of Ireland charity which deflected women from "evil ways"; that Church of Ireland clergy continually sat on the management committee; and that many other clergy sent unmarried mothers to the home.

In 1939 a member of the Church of Ireland who inspected the home on behalf of the State expressed no concern about large numbers of dead, dying and very sick babies. They were, he reported officially, "illegitimate", therefore

"delicate", and more prone to sickness and death. In 1945 the archbishop of Dublin Dr Barton designated Bethany Home as a place suitable for young female offenders. He pointed out to the then-minister for justice that it was already used by the courts to incarcerate Protestant women convicted of petty theft up to and including infanticide. Unsurprisingly, unmarried mothers were termed "inmates".

Though the Church of Ireland donated money, and consigned women and abandoned children to the Bethany Home, its survivors' campaign obtained not one cent from the church. The church was connected to the aims of the Bethany Home while it ran, but is disconnected from it today. It does not want to acknowledge responsibility for the harm the home perpetrated.

Janet Maxwell and the Church of Ireland did provide clergy for an annual memorial service for the past three years. I thank her for that.

Janet Maxwell's public response to Canon Ronnie Clarke says a lot about internal attitudes within the Church of Ireland. I hope that Canon Clarke will not feel disheartened. He is the first

## The Dispute Over The Orthodox Church In Ukraine

A Catholic looking at the present confrontation between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Moscow over the Orthodox Church in Ukraine might well conclude that there is something to be said for a Church covering many different nations with a unified hierarchy culminating in a single unquestioned (at least in principle) head.

### Brief History Of Orthodox Church Administration

The Orthodox Church by contrast claims to be 'conciliar'—that is, its authoritative decisions are arrived at by Councils of the whole Church which issue clear, legally binding '*canons*'. But the only Councils universally recognised as authoritative are the seven (or eight) '*Ecumenical Councils*' held in the first Christian millennium while there was still a more or less coherent Roman Empire with an Emperor based, from the fourth century onwards, in Constantinople.

In principle there were five self-governing—'*autocephalous*'—Churches in the Empire, Churches with their own patriarchs—Old Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, New Rome (Constantinople) and Jerusalem. A Council could be said to represent the whole Church when all the Patriarchs were represented. At the moment of the conversion of Constantine, in the Council of Nicaea (325) there were only three patriarchates—Old Rome, Alexandria and Antioch. Constantinople was made a patriarchate in the second Ecumenical Council (381), immediately assuming a dominant position as centre of the Empire.

Then in 451 the main stream of the Patriarchate of Alexandria split away, forming what we call the 'Coptic' (Egyptian) Church. A new but much smaller and weaker patriarchate in communion with Constantinople was formed. At the same Council, Jerusalem, previously under Antioch, was made a patriarchate.

But in the seventh century Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem all fell, first to the Persians then to the Muslims, and were no longer part of the Empire.

In the ninth century frictions between the papacy (Old Rome—now turning to

the new Germanic Empire forming in the West on the basis of peoples who had never been fully part of the Roman Empire) and New Rome. This resulted in two rival 'Ecumenical Councils', both held in Constantinople. The first (869-70) was recognised in the West, the second (879-80) was recognised in the East.

Thereafter Old Rome managed to organise Germans, Goths, Vikings and some Slavs into its own more or less unified 'Catholic' Church, while New Rome organised mainly Slavs—Bulgarians, Serbs, Russians (Vikings again)—into its own more or less unified 'Orthodox' Church.

### Moscow And Constantinople

The whole area of Orthodoxy however succumbed to Muslim and—in the case of Rus', based initially in Kiev—Mongol ('Tatar') rule. Kievan Rus' then came under Polish Catholic domination while, in the fifteenth century, as Constantinople finally fell to the Ottomans, the Grand Duchy of Muscovy broke free of Mongol rule and began the fraught process of creating the Russian Empire. In the seventeenth/eighteenth century, as the result of a Cossack revolt, it incorporated the eastern part of what is now called 'Ukraine' (based on the Slav word for 'borderlands'), including Kiev, securing more territory to the West of Kiev through the partitions of Poland (between Russia, Austria and Prussia) at the end of the eighteenth century.

So, from the thirteenth to the seventeenth/eighteenth centuries, Kievan Rus' had little or no connection with Muscovite Rus'. The extreme Western part of what is now Ukraine—Galicia—was incorporated in the Austrian Empire through the eighteenth century Polish partitions. It was returned to Polish rule after the Great War and only became part of the Russian Empire/Soviet Union first through the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, then through Stalin's victory over Hitler. This is today, understandably enough, the area where hostility to all things Russian is strongest.

Initially, after Constantinople fell to the Muslims, the Russian Church reorganised itself without reference to the Patriarch of

Constantinople, with the Grand Prince of Muscovy proclaiming himself as 'Tsar' (i.e. Caesar) and therefore as a legitimate continuation of the Roman Imperial system.

It was only in the sixteenth century (1589) that a Patriarch of Moscow was established with the blessing of Constantinople. But it was suppressed by Tsar Peter ('The Great') in 1721 (effectively in 1700 when the last patriarch died and Peter declined to replace him) and replaced by a Synod of Bishops controlled initially by the Tsar but eventually by a 'procurator', a lay government official appointed by the Tsar. The resemblance to the Church of England is not accidental.

The patriarchate created in 1917 after the abdication of the Tsar and immediately before the Bolshevik takeover could quite legitimately be regarded as a new institution agreed by a Council of the Russian Church with only a minimal nod, if that, in the direction of Constantinople, which was itself in a perilous position after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople could be said to have been strengthened administratively by incorporation into the Ottoman Empire since it was now in a single polity incorporating the territories that had been lost to it by the steady advance of the Muslims. And the Ottomans were anxious to have a simplified, unified Christendom in their territories with a clearly designated 'head'. But it was tightly controlled by the Sultanate and widely accused of serving the financial interests of the Greek community in Constantinople more than religion.

In the nineteenth century, as the Christian parts of the Empire, starting with Greece, claimed their independence, they made their own Church arrangements, regarding Constantinople as necessarily a tool of Turkish policy with very little moral authority (the real spiritual authority in the Church was probably the monastic island of Athos). As a result we have a Bulgarian Orthodox Church, a Greek Orthodox Church, a Serbian Orthodox Church, and a Romanian Orthodox Church.

This, together with the Russian Orthodox Church, not to mention the Ukrainian, creates a chaotic situation in non-Orthodox countries, where each of the ethnic Orthodox jurisdictions will have its own Churches responsible to its own hierarchy. They are usually in communion with each other and with both Moscow and Constantinople and follow more or less the same ritual pattern—except for a division over

which calendar to use. Constantinople in 1923 adopted what it calls the 'Reformed Julian calendar'—which happens to coincide with the Western 'Gregorian' calendar with a difference of dates only occurring after 877 years. This was partly done with a view to establishing closer relations with the Anglican Church at a time when the patriarch was looking to England for defence against the resurgent Turkish national movement. The Slavs in general remained faithful to the Julian calendar.

### Relevance To Ukraine

The purpose of this whirlwind tour of Orthodox history has been to show that, in terms of Church organisation, Orthodoxy is a mess so that, in assessing the rights and wrongs of the Ukrainian Church controversy, it is almost absurd to try to evoke any well-established juridical principle. That is what we have been given by our history and any attempt to change it is only likely to lead to further rancour and division.

Constantinople thinks the problem can be resolved by establishing its own primacy as final court of appeal for the whole Orthodox world. The case for this on the basis of continuity from the earliest days of the Roman (Imperial) Church might be relatively strong. But the argument is entirely an intellectual one. The Patriarch, trapped in Istanbul, surrounded by a generally hostile Turkish population and with only a very small parish of his own, is in a weak position. Moscow, which could hardly on the basis of history establish any claim to universal jurisdiction, is nonetheless vastly more powerful in terms of resources and numbers of Orthodox believers scattered through the world.

As things stand (I am writing in December 2018) The Ukrainian Orthodox Church is under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. In 1990, in the last days of the Soviet Union, the then Moscow patriarch, Alexei II, gave a degree of 'independence in self government' to the UOC under its Metropolitan, Filaret. Filaret had been Archbishop of Kiev since 1966 and Metropolitan since 1968. He has been accused of being a KGB agent but that hardly distinguishes him from Alexei or his successor, the current Moscow Patriarch Kyrill. It was a necessary qualification for the job (as payment of large sums of money to the Turkish Sultan was a necessary qualification for the job of Patriarch of Constantinople under the Ottomans).

In 1991 Ukraine declared its independence from the Soviet Union and a

'*sobor*' (council) of the UOC declared the independence of the Ukrainian Church, with Filaret at its head, from Moscow. Moscow declared the new 'Kyiv patriarchate' to be schismatic and organised a separate loyalist synod in May 1992. This remained generally recognised as the Ukrainian Orthodox Church by the rest of the Orthodox world, including Constantinople, and it holds most of the important Church properties in Ukraine.

But Constantinople is now in the process of recognising the Kyiv patriarchate (or to be more precise a new Church formed on 15th December 2018 from three elements—the Kyiv patriarchate, an older and much smaller Ukrainian autocephalous Church and, perhaps, some elements from the Moscow Church) as the legitimate Ukrainian Orthodox Church, thus implicitly reducing the existing Ukrainian Orthodox Church to the status of Russian Orthodox Church in the Ukraine. The necessary '*tomos*' is due to be given on the 6th January—Christmas Eve in the Julian calendar.

### The Claims Of Constantinople

In doing this, Constantinople is asserting in the first case its right to do it. Constantinople claims to be the spiritual head of the world's three hundred million Orthodox Christians and thus to have sovereignty over Moscow. In particular it claims to have jurisdiction over all Orthodox Christians living outside the territory of their own hierarchs. Hence people in the Orthodox diaspora dissatisfied with their own hierarchs can turn to Constantinople. This has occurred recently in the Russian Orthodox Church in England when Bishop Basil of Sergievo, seen by many as the successor to the much loved Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, turned to Constantinople, feeling ill treated by Moscow. He and his supporters joined up with the 'Paris exarchate' which had separated from the Communist-dominated Moscow and been received by Constantinople in 1931.

In the case of Bishop Basil and of the Paris exarchate, Constantinople's right to do this has not been very vigorously contested since in Western Europe both Moscow and Constantinople are operating outside 'their own' territory. Basil might equally have chosen to join the Serb or Bulgarian Churches—except that they might not have accepted him because he was breaking the oath of allegiance he had sworn to Moscow. Only Constantinople would claim the right to override this.

The Ukrainian issue is much more serious since Ukraine is traditionally an Orthodox country and Moscow claims that it is part of its own historical jurisdiction. Moscow also claims to be the legitimate successor of the original Kievan Church established with the baptism of Rus' in the eleventh century (so does the Kyiv patriarchate but here Moscow's claim to historic continuity, while perhaps not very strong, is nonetheless stronger than its rival's).

One can immediately see why the issue is so important in the eyes of Ukrainian separatists. Each side of course claims that the other is playing politics. The issue is so serious that Moscow has broken communion with Constantinople, thus potentially creating a world-wide split in the (rather attractive) loose web of Orthodox sacramental unity.

In Ukraine itself we can expect to see a concerted drive on the part of the newly-formed Church, backed by the Government, to seize the properties currently in the hands of clergy loyal to Moscow—especially perhaps the older properties in existence prior to Ukraine coming under the Moscow jurisdiction. There is unlikely to be much of the discretion showed by the Irish Catholic Church in allowing the Anglican Church of Ireland to hang on to pre-Reformation properties in Ireland.

### The Case Of Estonia

The drive towards establishing an autocephalous Ukrainian Church independent of Moscow is of course backed by the US, and Bartholomew (the Constantinople Patriarch) has his own agenda. But I, as an Orthodox Christian sympathetic to Moscow, find it difficult to argue that what the Ukrainian separatists are doing in relation to Moscow is very different from what separatist Greeks, Serbs and Romanians did in the nineteenth century in relation to Constantinople.

A similar problem had already arisen in Estonia where again Constantinople supported a nationalist breakaway from Moscow. That finished with an uneasy truce between two Estonian Orthodox Churches. The Estonian Apostolic Orthodox Church (EAOC—already placed under Constantinople in 1923 when Estonia was an independent country) has some 20,000 believers in 59 parishes, while the Estonian Orthodox Church—Moscow Patriarchate (EOCMP) has some 150,000-200,000 believers, largely ethnic Russians, in 30 parishes. Those figures come from the '*International Religious Freedom Report*'



issued in 2003 by the US State Department, which takes an interest in such things. The Report is interesting on the subject of property relations, perhaps explaining the discrepancy by which the Moscow Church with so many more believers has so many fewer parishes:

"By the end of the reporting period, most Church properties, including those being used by the EOCMP, have been under the legal control of the EAO. Once the EOCMP registered and acquired the legal capacity of a juridical person, it then obtained the right to initiate court proceedings to gain de jure control over the properties that it has used on a de facto basis with the permission of the EAO. On October 4, 2002, the Government and the two Churches concluded a protocol of intentions according to which the EAO would transfer a part of its property presently used by the EOCMP to the state. The state in turn will lease it to the EOCMP for 50 years. Aleksander Nevski Cathedral is owned by the city of Tallinn and rented out to its Russian Orthodox congregation on a several decade lease basis."

We can assume from this that prior to independence all these Church properties were owned by the Estonian Orthodox Church—Moscow Patriarchate (EOCMP) and that after independence they were all taken by the Estonian Apostolic Orthodox Church (EAO), which had been a Church in exile during the Communist period).

### Likely Consequences

Estonia of course is a predominately Lutheran, not Orthodox, country. Perhaps some sort of accommodation between two 'Ukrainian Orthodox Churches' will be achieved, but at present it seems unlikely. And it is certain that the present drive to suppress the Russian cultural heritage in Ukraine will do little to bring the pro-Russian Eastern areas of Luhansk and Donetsk back into the fold. One assumes they will hang on to their present ambiguous status until (as in the case of Georgia and Abkhazia/South Ossetia) a determined effort by the Ukrainians to seize them by force gives Moscow the justification for a decisive intervention.

Unless both sides recognise the legitimacy of the other's position, we are facing the horrid prospect of something resembling the inter-Orthodox War that broke out between Greeks and Slavs in Macedonia during its struggle for independence from the Ottomans.



## Martin Tyrrell

Book Review

**Eamon Dyas : *Blockading the Germans*: the evolution of Britain's strategy during the First World War with an overview of 19th century maritime law, Belfast HBistorical and Educational Society, 2018.**

### Some Enlightenment About WW1

On 7th May 1915, off the Old Head of Kinsale, the *Lusitania*, a British liner travelling from New York to Liverpool, was torpedoed without warning by a German submarine. Some 1,200 of the ship's crew and passengers were killed. The sinking, which soon became a staple of Allied propaganda, is one of the best remembered events of the First World War; remembered to this day when so much else of the war has been forgotten. Following the *Lusitania* attack, German submarines sank several other liners (often without warning) not to mention a great many cargo ships. Thousands of civilians—passengers and merchant seamen—died.

Looked at on its own and out of context, the sinking of the *Lusitania* seems a wanton, mindless action. And by any diplomatic reckoning, it was a colossal blunder that helped nudge American public opinion in the Allies' favour—there were around 130 Americans among the dead. Only when the context is restored does the sinking and, by extension, the wider German submarine campaign, become explicable. This meticulously researched book by Eamon Dyas, the first instalment of a three-volume history of the First World War blockade, restores that absent context in all its detail.

The story of the *Lusitania* is widely known. But the blockade is largely forgotten, barely warranting a mention during the recent centenary commemorations. Two early accounts of it were suppressed on publication as was the impressive official history by A.C. Bell (it was kept 'under lock and key' until 1961). And yet the under-reported blockade contributed significantly to the eventual Allied victory and might well have been decisive. Moreover, but for the blockade, there would have been no submarine campaign, and, consequently, no *Lusitania* sinking.

Reading Dyas, you soon appreciate that 'blockade' does not quite capture what the Allies achieved in the First World War, which was to cut Germany almost completely off from essential

imports such as food, animal feed and fertiliser. Blockading—like the closely related tactic of commerce raiding—was nothing new. Past blockades had involved a kind of naval version of the siege, a close cordon of warships barring access to an enemy port or coastline. Now, the warships were positioned well back from Germany, patrolling the North Sea and stopping and searching ships bound for any part of continental Europe, seizing contraband which was soon generously defined to cover almost anything.

The ensuing lack of imported food greatly reduced overall food supplies; shortages of fodder and fertiliser reduced the efficiency of German agriculture and, in time, its ability to make good the growing shortfall. The result was significant civilian hardship that had reached near famine conditions by the time of the Armistice in November 1918. Post-Armistice, the blockade was intensified for a couple of months before some leniency was eventually shown. But it was not fully lifted until the German delegation signed at Versailles the following July. By then it had led to several hundred thousand civilian deaths.

The First World War came at the end of many decades of international effort to regulate war, including naval war, and the economic aspects of naval warfare such as blockading and commerce raiding. This is the maritime law of Dyas' sub-title. If these initiatives had been taken seriously, it would have been impossible to mount a blockade of the type that was actually put in place from 1914 onwards. The various pre-war agreements afforded neutral states significant freedom to trade in time of war. Consequently, even if Germany had been blockaded and its merchant fleet harassed into port, the country could have met its needs, for innocent goods at least, via the ships and ports of its neutral neighbours.

But if pre-war international law had been taken seriously, that would have been remarkable. As Dyas shows, the lesson of the half century that preceded

the outbreak of war in 1914 was that international agreements on the conduct of war were meaningless, invoked selectively and expediently if invoked at all. That had been the case in the American Civil War, the Boer War and the Russo-Japanese War, so no surprise that it was the case in 1914.

Admiral 'Jacky' Fisher, the standout British naval officer of his generation is illustrative. In public, Fisher was in full agreement with the relevant international law. Privately, however, he viewed the entire procedure of civilising war—the conferences, the declarations, and so on—as farcical. "*It's quite silly not to make war damnable to the whole mass of your enemy's population...*", he once commented (p177) and "*every treaty is a scrap of paper*" (p158). Nor was Fisher a maverick. "The prevailing sentiment in the Admiralty", Dyas comments, "*had always been that anything agreed in times of peace was secondary to the pursuit of an object in times of war*" (p146).

Dyas describes how most of the pre-war agreements were swiftly unpicked in the interests of the blockade once the war was underway. The distinction between military and non-military goods was increasingly blurred, for example, until more or less any goods bound for Germany could be seized. At the same time, Germany's neutral neighbours were, in effect, co-opted into delivering the blockade. The quantities they could import were carefully restricted to ensure that what was imported was consumed at home, not exported on to Germany and neutrals were even prevented from selling their own domestic surpluses to Germany.

The degree to which the European neutrals assisted in the delivery of the blockade not only compromised their neutrality but sat awkwardly with the Allies' claims to be fighting in defence of the rights of small, neutral states. American historian Marion Siney later speculated that the main reason A.C. Bell's official history was suppressed was that it went into detail regarding how the neutrals were made compliant in the blockade.

The other reason I think that the blockade has been so significantly downplayed is the number of civilian deaths it is estimated to have caused. There was no particular issue with this at the time. Bell cites without problem the official German estimate of 763,000 and commends the statistical analysis that went into it. But subsequent comment-

ators have dismissed the idea that many (or possibly *any*) people died on account of the blockade.

Something I've noticed since I started reading up on the blockade is that, while the story of the blockade itself has received relatively little in the way of mainstream coverage, there has been considerable mainstream dismissal of it. It is as if the blockade is some hoary old chestnut, so familiar it can be refuted without summary or elucidation. Niall Ferguson, say, in his 1998 *The Pity of War*, tells us about the blockade only so as to tell us that it is largely a myth—no one starved, he says; no-one died; no-one surrendered on account of it.

In the same vein there is the frequently made claim, which Dyas notes, that the Germans themselves compounded the impact of the blockade through inefficiency and ineptitude. Even allowing for the blockade, this argument runs, the Germans had enough food to go around. It was not the Allies' fault that they chose to allocate more to the army than to the civilian population. Had they stood the army down, there would have been no serious shortages. James Wycliffe Headlam, one of a number of academics who, during the war, were enlisted as official propagandists, was particularly eloquent in putting this argument, which Dyas neatly summarises: "*As long as the Germans have the option of surrendering they have the option of not starving*" (432).

The theory that Germany could choose surrender over starvation was, of course, tested in 1918 when Germany did, more or less, surrender. Its armed forces were stood down and significant materiel decommissioned. The result was an intensification of the blockade, not a let-up.

The submarine campaign was Germany's main response to the blockade, a tit for tat attempt at deterring merchant ships from supplying the United Kingdom. All evidence suggests that it was improvised once the war was underway, not planned in the pre-war years. Submarines were a novelty in 1914. There were small numbers of them in all of the world's major navies but no consensus as to what they might be used for. (Some thought they had no use.) Germany had about two dozen ocean-going submarines at the start of the war; it would have needed perhaps ten times that number to affect British imports. The only obvious advantage Germany's submarines had, initially, was that they were less at risk from attack than surface

warships. In the event, they proved reasonably effective, particularly as commerce raiders.

Until the Germans began using submarines as commerce raiders, established wartime practice—the rules of engagement or 'visit and search'—was that merchant ships, whether neutral or belligerent, deferred to any warships that stopped them. So long as they deferred, merchant ships were treated as civilian vessels, and those aboard as civilians, not combatants. In general, they were not sunk without warning, and if they were taken as 'prize', the safety of the crew was assured.

At the start, German submarines behaved conventionally when acting against merchant ships. They surfaced to apprehend their target, searched it and, if it was carrying contraband, sank it but only after those aboard had been put into lifeboats. Aside from two or three no-warning attacks on 30th January 1915, that was how German submarines operated until the Spring of 1915.

But the British had a problem with German submarines, which they decided were *de facto* pirates—pirates whether they were attacking warships, or merchant ships or, in the case of the *Deutschland*, which Dyas here relates, was simply freighting non-military goods across the Atlantic.

Since German submarines were pirates, the Admiralty required that all British merchant ships should in future treat them like pirates. When apprehended by a German submarine, merchant ships were to retaliate if possible, by ramming the submarine, or by using their deck gun if they had one (many soon did).

In addition, decoy ships, called '*Q Ships*', were introduced. These looked like merchant ships but were covertly armed and crewed by Royal Navy sailors. Their role was to lure German submarines into an attack to which they would then retaliate with force, taking no prisoners. By the end of the war there were several hundred Q-ships in service. Dyas states that they accounted for around 6% of all German submarine losses.

The effect of these measures was to deter German submarine commanders from surfacing and instead incentivise them to abandon convention, stay underwater and attack without warning.

The piracy or otherwise of submarines was not the issue. For the British, the problem with German submarines, military or merchant, was

that they could evade surface warships and potentially undermine the blockade.

There was certainly no generalised opposition to submarines. The Royal Navy began the war with a bigger submarine fleet than Germany and, for several years, a British submarine campaign was waged in the Baltic. It was waged because Germany's trade with Scandinavia, especially Sweden, was less affected by the blockade than its other international trade, and it had some success until the Russian Revolution deprived the submarine fleet of bases. Like the blockade itself, it is a little-known aspect of the war. But it was commemorated at the time by Rudyard Kipling in his poem *The Trade*. (It is an uncharacteristically oblique work. In a poem about submarines sinking merchant ships, Kipling does not once mention submarines, or merchant ships, or the sinking of same. The 'trade' was the nickname of the Royal Navy's submarine service—'trade' as in tradesmen, and tradesmen as distinct from professionals. The submarine service was noted for its lax discipline, casual attitude to rank and uniform, and, ironically, for hoisting the Jolly Roger rather than the red ensign any time it came into port.)

I get the impression that the German and other merchant ships that were sunk in the Baltic were sunk conventionally and that the merchant ships themselves did not retaliate—no rammings, no use of deck guns, no decoys. If they had retaliated, I'm pretty sure it would be well-known.

After the war, the new German republic was prohibited from maintaining a submarine fleet and required to put a few wartime submarine commanders on trial for alleged war crimes. But there was no general international ban on submarines and Germany's surviving *U-Boote* were shared among the navies of the victor powers. Whatever wickedness there was to submarining was a peculiarly German wickedness.

Several times during the war, the Germans indicated that they would trade their wicked submarine campaign in return for civilian food imports being exempted from the blockade. Always, the Allies rejected these proposals, a big hint that they saw no strategic equivalence between submarine commerce raiding and the blocking of German civilian food imports. Submarines, even when they attacked without warning, damaged Britain less than blockading food imports damaged Germany. As a

result, attempts to bargain submarines for food got nowhere.

And efforts to get the belligerents round the table to talk actual peace likewise failed. Restoring the *status quo ex ante* was not an option. The Allies were on a crusade, the goal of which, as Lloyd George said, was to see "*the Prussian military despotism...broken beyond repair*", the better to prevent "*civilisation again being menaced...*" (595).

This was not a war being waged in pursuit of a compromise peace. So why was it being waged? What was it for?

"The First World War would not have happened", Dyas writes, "if it were not for British scheming it to happen and planning it to happen. In the absence of such plotting, what was in fact a local conflict in the Balkans would have been done and dusted within a matter of weeks. It was Britain's determination that elevated the local conflict to the realm of a world war and it was through Britain's sustaining such a war beyond the point at which a reasonable peace could have been achieved that ensured it became as devastating to Europe as it did" (367).

By way of evidence, he argues that German behaviour in the months leading up to war did not suggest a Government planning to initiate hostilities. Germany did not mobilise its fleet in the immediate pre-war period and there were few German commerce raiders at sea when the war began. As late as June 1914, the German Government hosted the Royal Navy at the official opening of the Kiel Canal. To this I would add that, on the eve of the war, more than a third of Germany's peacetime imports came from its soon to be enemies and that these included significant food imports.

Nor was the First World War a given. As Dyas shows, throughout the early 1900s, there were developments that might have worked against the outbreak of war, had they been allowed to continue. Critical in this respect were the various attempts at Franco-German rapprochement. The image of France as a state dominated by dreams of *revanche* is one that Dyas here counters. In France, some at least were keen to develop a mutually beneficial working relationship with Germany. In Morocco, for instance, cool-headed Franco-German diplomacy twice prevented war.

An emerging compromise seemed possible, Dyas argues that Germany, by the 1900s, was less keen on colonialism than on commerce—leave the colonies to France so long as Germany could

invest in them. In Britain, too, there was more public appetite for social reform than war. Only gradually did more the hawkish factions prevail—Asquith, Grey and the Committee for Imperial Defence in Britain; *revanchist* elements in the civil service and the army in France. And to what long-term good?

I've mentioned already Niall Ferguson's *The Pity of War*, now more than twenty years old. In it, he sets out an interesting counterfactual. Imagine there'd been no First World War. Or imagine Britain had stood aside from it. The worst that might have happened is that Germany would have won. And, having won, it would have set about making some kind of European Union—continental Europe taken in hand by Germany, modernised and stabilised, with a single currency and so forth. How bad would that have been? Britain, having kept out of the war, could have steered clear of the German peace as well. Instead, the German-dominated union happened anyway, and Britain, having depleted itself in two World Wars, was in the end required to join it. And that, an unhappy Ferguson concludes, is why the First World War was a pity.

Dyas is particularly strong in his coverage of the American position in the first years of the war, another story we don't hear that often. The United States might, he argues, have championed neutral rights and, thereby, countered the blockade. In practice, however, the Americans were more interested in their own particular interests than in the high principles of international law, their commercial interests, especially. While many American businesses suffered on account of the blockade, American exports of munitions to the Allies picked up considerably. In addition, with the Allies, Britain especially, buying from the Americans on credit, the United States, a debtor nation in 1914, had become a significant and growing creditor just two years later. Allied indebtedness gave the United States and its citizens a growing stake in an Allied victory so that that country's eventual intervention in the war was on its own terms and in its own interests.

This is a book that brings back into public view aspects of the war that have been for too long under-explored. It is a work that compels us, as readers, to reflect and re-appraise. A late and welcome entry to the industry of First World War publishing of the past four years, one that stands out markedly.



V  
O  
X

Archbishop Croke  
Papal Offence?  
BRACE Yourself  
Witless?  
US Life Expectancy—  
Britain Up The Spout?  
Vatican Ambassador  
Breast is Best!  
Academic Acuity!  
Joseph Conrad Again!

"Catholic influence grows among other EU nations"

P  
A  
T

the Judiciary and the Banks, RTE is one institution that needs a 'revolutionary', sorry, radical overhaul!

\*\*\*\*\*

**Witless?**

The late Lord Stopford, when Vice-Chancellor of Manchester University, was once asked by the Secretary of the local Rotary Club if he would nominate one of his Professors to give an after-luncheon talk. Stopford agreed to do so, but asked for suggestions about a preferred topic, as this would help him in making a selection.

The secretary stated that the subject was unimportant, provided the speaker was witty. The V.C. replied that he had no wits amongst his professors, but that he could easily supply two half-wits (*Professor George A. Mitchell, OBE, TD*).

\*\*\*\*\*

**US Life Expectancy—**

The suicide rate in the US is at its highest point in at least 50 years, leading to a decline in life expectancy, new research has found.

There were more than 47,000 suicides last year, up from a little under 45,000 the year before, according to US Government records.

Drug overdose deaths also continued to climb, surpassing 70,000 last year, in the midst of the deadliest drug overdose epidemic in US history.

Overall, there were more than 2.8 million US deaths in 2017, or nearly 70,000 more than the previous year, which was the most deaths in a single year since the Government began counting more than a century ago, the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) said.

The increase partly reflects the nation's growing and ageing population but it's deaths in younger age groups—particularly middle-aged people—that have had the largest impact on calculations of life expectancy, experts said.

For decades, US life expectancy has been increasing, rising a few months nearly every year. Now it's trending the other way: it fell in 2015, stayed level in 2016, and declined again last year, the CDC said. (*Irish Independent*, 30.11.2018)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Britain Up The Spout?**

Months after appointing its first Minister for Loneliness, Britain named a Minister for Suicide Prevention as part of a new push to tackle mental health issues.

**Archbishop Croke:**

"summoned to Rome in 1883. Pope Leo XIII has been the recipient of a stream of propaganda against Croke from the English envoy, but when he tries to admonish the Archbishop, the Archbishop gives as good as he gets:

"Well, Holy Father, all I need say in that connection is this: If Garibaldi had the same amount of support from the priests and people of Italy behind him that I have had in the stand I have taken against Irish landlordism and English injustice in Ireland, it no longer surprises me to find your Holiness a prisoner in the Vatican'..." (Mark Tierney, *Croke of Cashel, The Life of Archbishop Thomas William Croke 1832-1902*, Dublin, 1976, p.5)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Papal Offence?**

Former President Ms. Mary McAleese says she was seriously offended by the pontiff, Pope John Paul II, purposely ignoring her when they were first introduced ahead of their much publicised meeting during her presidency.

"Instead of greeting Ms. McAleese, the Pope reached across to her husband Martin and said: 'Would you not prefer to be the President of Ireland instead of your wife?'..." (*Irish Ind.*, 13.10.2018)

In the book, *Madam Politician—The Women at the Table of Irish Political Power* by RTÉ Political Correspondent Martina Fitzgerald, Ms McAleese says "nobody else thought it was funny", and her husband was "mortified" by the Pope's comment.

"He knew by my face that I didn't think it was funny. I did say to him, 'you would never have done that to a male president'," she adds.

The Pope said he did not have fluent English and the comment was intended to be a joke. He added: "I heard you had a great sense of humour."

After the 1999 meeting in the Vatican, the then serving President described the Pope as "intellectually, ferociously agile".

Ms Fitzgerald interviewed Ms. McAleese, her predecessor Mary Robinson and every female TD who served at Cabinet for a book that charts the journey of women in Irish politics.

**BRACE Yourself**

The book also documents or [alleges] how former Taoiseach Charlie Haughey pulled the bra strap of ex-Fine Gael Minister for Education Gemma Hussey during a Dáil debate on rape.

Mr Haughey approached Ms. Hussey from behind while she was observing the debate on a Private Members Bill she had sponsored.

He pulled at her bra strap and gestured her to sit down.

"I was sitting there observing a debate when I felt a chuck on my bra strap at the back. I got a shock and leapt to my feet", Ms Hussey says in the book.

Mr. Haughey told Ms. Hussey he would "look after" her Bill and said he had an "excellent minister" working on the legislation.

"I was dumbfounded. I was just amazed.

"I was kind of rendered speechless really" (*Irish Independent*, 13.10.18)

Imagine Charlie was the Pope?

"Rendered Speechless", Ladies, you want to follow Archbishop Croke's example in his meeting with Pope Leo XIII.

Mind you, Mary McAleese isn't always so reticent (See *McAleese v. Clifford, A Belfast Magazine, No. 30, 2007*).

As for Martina Fitzgerald?

"Martina Fitzgerald received a significant payout from RTÉ and was asked to sign a non-disclosure agreement after agreeing to part ways with the broadcaster... Last night, a friend of Ms Fitzgerald said she was 'thrilled' with the deal struck with the broadcaster" (*Irish Independent*, 22.12.2018).

Like takin' Candy off a baby! After

Prime Minister Theresa May has announced the appointment of the Health Minister Jackie Doyle, Price to the new role. She will lead Government efforts to cut the number of suicides and overcome the stigma that prevents people with mental health problems from seeking help.

While suicide rates have dropped in recent years, about 4,500 people take their own lives each year in England. It remains the leading cause of death for men under age 45, according to government research.

Beachy Head, [East Sussex, England, close to Eastbourne] the UK's highest chalk sea cliff, is often associated with suicide. The Beachy Head Chaplaincy Team, which conducts regular day and evening patrols of the area in attempts to locate and stop potential jumpers, has responded to more than 5,500 incidents since 2004. (*Daily Telegraph*, London, 10.12.2018)

There was more than one suicide a day in Ireland on average last year, according to figures released by the Central Statistics Office. The CSO has released its Vital Statistics Yearly Summary for 2017, which has revealed that there were 392 recorded suicides last year, down slightly from the 399 recorded in 2016.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Vatican Ambassador

Ireland's new ambassador to the Vatican is already working in Rome and will formally present his credentials to Pope Francis next month.

Ambassador-Designate Derek Hannon succeeds Emma Madigan as Irish Ambassador to the Holy See. Ms Madigan, who was appointed to the role in 2014, is widely acknowledged as having played a key role in smoothing diplomatic relations between Ireland and the Vatican after a period in which then Tánaiste Eamon Gilmore closed the Irish Embassy to the Holy See, ostensibly on grounds of expense.

It was announced this June, 2018, that Ms Madigan would return to Ireland to take up a post in the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and on September 6th she presented her Letters of Recall to the Pope.

According to the department, Mr. Hannon "has taken up duty at the Embassy to the Holy See and is due to formally present his credentials to His Holiness next month" (*Irish Catholic*, 11.10.2018).

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Breast is Best!

A Limerick priest has joined an initiative supporting breastfeeding in public, creating what he says is the country's "first official breast-feeding-friendly church".

Fr. Seamus Enright, rector of the Redemptorist 'Fathers' at Mount St Alphonsus Church, announced that it has signed up to 'We're Breast-feeding Friendly Limerick', an initiative run by Limerick City and County Council and Healthy Ireland. It aims to normalise breast-feeding in public and improve the health of breast-feeding mothers and their babies.

"It's the most normal activity in the world. There are wonderful, Early Renaissance paintings of Mary breast-feeding Jesus... it was obviously how Jesus was born and brought up. So, if Mary breast-fed Jesus, it just shows how ordinary and normal his life was, and it just shows how ordinary and normal a part of life [breast-feeding] is."

Thirty-eight premises, including coffee shops, menswear stores, and sports clubs, have signed up since the initiative was launched last month. Those who sign up must fulfil certain criteria (*Irish Examiner*, 18.10.2018).

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Academic Acuity!

The professor mislaid his umbrella and went from shop to shop looking for it. When he finally traced it, he was most grateful.

'You are the only honest shopkeeper in Dublin,' he told the proprietor. 'All the others denied having it.'

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Joseph Conrad Again!

Conrad (1857-1924) was born in the Ukraine, and was 38 years old when he wrote his first book: "Almayer's Folly". Baptised a Catholic but stopped practising his faith before he began to write. He is buried in Canterbury City Cemetery, Kent, England. The present writer is unaware if he was buried according to Catholic rites, i.e. did Conrad die a Catholic? (*C&S*, No. 128, Second Quarter, 2017)

"Though he was born Roman Catholic, Conrad acknowledged no religion and wrote of the supernatural only as superstition. He knew nature first-hand, having been a merchant seaman for 20 years—thus he was no nature mystic, and detested what he perceived to be sentimentalism in Herman Melville (with whom, to his disgust, he was repeatedly compared).

His masters were Flaubert, Turgenev and Henry James; his intention as an artist was, as he states in the celebrated preface to "The Nigger of the 'Narcissus'", to appeal to the reader's temperament—"to make you hear, to make you feel... to make you see". Yet he was a passionate moralist, a philosophical writer whose primary subject is the

individual and his relationship to the human community" (*Joseph Conrad: A Biography*. By Jeffrey Meyers. Illustrated. 428 pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$27.50. (Review by Joyce Carol Oates, 14.10.1991. *The New York Times Archives*, Page 007015).

\*\*\*\*\*

#### "Catholic influence grows among other EU nations"

"It was splendid to see the revised Missa Cantata broadcast from Ashbourne Church courtesy of Eurovision to the faithful practising the predominant religion in the European Union.

Catholics represent 45.3pc of Europeans as against the next nearest, the Protestant religion of 11pc.

The Catholic figure does not include the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church which has between 240 and 260 million members.

It is not surprising, since a large part of Europe is the remnants of the Habsburg Empire ruled by Empress Maria Theresa and her successors.

The Missa Cantata in its original Tridentine form was celebrated as the last Mass in most Cathedral churches in Ireland up to the 1960s.

In 1960 Pope John XXIII's code of rubrics distinguished the Missa Cantata from a high Mass and a low Mass.

Since then a sung Mass with choir and without additional priests, it is called a Missa Cantata.

Our politicians of all hues see our recent social legislation including Christmas Eve announcements that abortion will be available to girls under 15 in special circumstances without parental involvement as a mark of progression or coming of age as a country.

I would doubt that these 'progressions' will be viewed with acclamation in European countries, especially by the increasing number of European political parties that are appearing across Europe with Catholic leaders.

Angela Merkel's successor Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer is regarded as socially conservative.

She is an active Catholic and has served on the Central Committee of German Catholics.

In Bavaria, the largely Catholic state has issued a decree that Christian crosses are to be placed at the entrances to all its public buildings. The premier Markus Söder said it should be seen as 'a clear avowal of our Bavarian identity and Christian values'. The Bavarian CSU party kept Ms Merkel's party in power during her tenure.

We may have far to go to convince our incoming cousins in Europe that we are still the same country that sent our brightest and best 1,000 years ago to bring Catholicism to Europe." **Hugh Duffy**, Co. Galway. (Ir. Indep., 27 Dec 2018)

\*\*\*\*\*

## Brendan Clifford

Review of—

*Say Nothing: A True Story Of Murder And Mayhem In Northern Ireland*, by Patrick Rodden Keefe

*Forgetful Remembrance: Social Forgetting and Vernacular Historiography of a Rebellion in Ulster*, by Guy Beiner.

### Northern Ireland: Political Conundrums

Is it a matter of vital urgency to know whether Gerry Adams was or was not a member of the Provisional IRA in some sense? What depends on knowing it—apart from Adams's freedom from prison and the careers of one or two journalists?

What is not disputable—and is not disputed—is that Adams was a directing influence on the military campaign of the IRA, that he gave it an immediate purpose short of the ending of Partition, and that he brought an end to the military campaign with the achievement of that purpose, which enabled his Army to stand down in good order and apply itself politically in the new order of things that it brought about.

That was what Michael Collins failed to do. Collins, in making his settlement, broke the military instrument that had obliged the Empire to negotiate a settlement. He destroyed the IRA. He made war on it on Whitehall instructions, in a campaign that is absurdly called a *Civil War*. The Army with which Collins destroyed the IRA in 1922-3 was financed and armed by the Empire.

The beginning of the Northern War was nobody's business in particular. It was the unintended achievement of Everyman. It began without an Army, but acquired an Army after it had begun. It happened because the Government of the state farmed out the governing of the Six Counties region of the state to the Protestant community, and after two generations the Catholic community would tolerate that travesty of democratic government no longer.

The franchised regime, conducted by the Protestant community, was rejected by the Catholic community, which was a minority of two-fifths. The Whitehall Government of the state briefly considered bringing the Six Counties within the democracy of the state. The Dublin Government of the Irish state, which asserted a right of sovereignty over the Six Counties of the British state, insisted that the Six Counties must not be brought within the democracy of the British state.

Whitehall therefore continued the franchise system after it had broken down.

Under these circumstances of virtual anarchy, a war situation came about during the Fall, Winter and Spring of 1969-70. An Army materialised out of the situation. It declared war in the Summer of 1970.

The formal aim of the War, the political unification of Ireland, was unachievable. A secondary aim, more in keeping with the circumstances out of which war had developed, was introduced mid-way through the war. I first noticed it in the early 1980s: A settlement was made on that secondary issue in 1998.

The War was a product of circumstances to which all had contributed in one way and another. The settlement was brought about by the political ability, combined with the military authority, exercised by the Adams group in Sinn Fein/IRA.

It was only natural that Whitehall should hope and expect to fragment the IRA in the course of engaging it in a settlement, as it did in 1921-2. It failed. The IRA remained intact.

A few who had been active in the War did not agree to the ending of it on the basis that the political framework of Northern Ireland should be restructured in the interest of the community in whose interest, and with whose actual support, the War had been fought. They held that the only basis of settlement should be the establishment of an all-Ireland state.

But there was no substantial support in the 26 Counties for a war to unify the South with the North. It is even doubtful if there was substantial support in the South for unification without war. The Constitution of the state asserted 32 County sovereignty but there was no political will behind it. Continuation of the Northern War, therefore, after the grievance of the Northern Ireland Catholic community had been met, could only have led to Republican disintegration.

Republican dissent from the Northern

settlement was marginal. It did not disturb the course of events. But it was given an amplified public voice in the hope of damaging the Republican leadership that had fought the War and thus prevent it from becoming the major political party of the Catholic community in the working out of the restructured Northern Ireland entity that it had brought about.

A new book has been published about the Boston College aspect of this affair: *Say Nothing: A True Story Of Murder And Mayhem In Northern Ireland*, by Patrick Rodden Keefe, an Irish American. The publisher is HarperCollins.

It has an epigraph: "*All wars are fought twice, the first time on the battlefield, the second time in memory. Viet Thank Nguyen.*"

It begins by describing the Treasure Room in the John Burns Library of Boston College. It is—

"a secure space, exactly climate controlled and supplied with a state-of-the-art fire suppressant system. The room is monitored by surveillance cameras and can be accessed only by entering a code on an electronic pad and turning a specific key. The key must be signed out. Only a select handful of people can do so."

Then one day in 2013 two detectives from Belfast turned up, asked for a series of secret files, and were given them. Those files contained confessions, by IRA opponents of the 1998 Agreement, of what they had done in the War. They had not been intended to be confessions to the police. They were supposedly statements for the historical record, whose very existence would remain unknown until the events they referred to no longer had any bearing on current affairs. But, as things turned out, they were were confessions of criminal activity on which the Serious Crime Squad could act. And the circumstances left no doubt that they were voluntary confessions.

They seem, furthermore, to have been 'Guilty' pleas, in that they declare that what was achieved did not warrant what was done to achieve it. People had killed and had got themselves killed for nothing. Their lives had been dedicated to the War for a generation, and now the War had been called off without its nominal object being achieved, and that meant it had not justified itself as a war.

And, if it wasn't a war, what was it? A disturbance of the peace by murder?



War is not an activity carried on within the law. It is a lawless activity. To the extent that there is a pretence of a law governing war, it is laid down by the victor in order to justify himself and to brand his defeated enemy as a criminal. The nuclear destruction of two undefended Japanese cities by the main giver of law to the world in the era of the United Nations was not prosecuted as a war-crime, and was never acknowledged to have been in any way improper. It follows from this that war remains an activity outside the law, and that any attempt to apply the notions of law to it can only be the propaganda of a hostile party.

The parties to the Northern Ireland War were the IRA, acting for the Catholic minority, and the British State, which had excluded the Six counties from the democratic political life of the state and imposed a subordinate sectarian system on them. The war ended when Whitehall concluded that it could not win, and when the IRA concluded that it could not win either and agreed to settle for the moment for a basic restructuring of the Six County system.

That settlement was experienced as a victory by the Catholic community by and large. It ended the pretence that Northern Ireland was a kind of democracy, to be governed by a party representing the majority, and it made provision for the separate representation in government of the two communities.

The object of the new arrangement was not to unite the two communities but to give expression to their ineradicable division.

The fact of ineradicable division was known to everyone. Actual life was conducted on the basis of it. But it was denied ideologically by the nationalist movement, and by the Constitution of the Irish state. And one of the reasons why purely idealist Republicans rejected the 1998 deal was that it made practical political arrangements for the separate representation of the two communities in the politics of devolved government.

The resentment of some purely idealist Republicans, who were committed to the realisation of their unrealisable ideal, when the War was called off in order to give effect to a Six County settlement which recognised the social reality of the communal division as a national, not merely religious, division, was taken in hand by the organisers of the Boston College confessions and directed towards the political destruction of Gerry Adams.

Adams was arrested, questioned by the police for four days, and released. On his release he directed attention towards Paul Bew.

What is Paul Bew? He is now a minor figure in the Whitehall Establishment and his life in the real world of Northern Ireland is over. But what was he then?

This is what Keefe tells us about him:

"Paul Bew was enjoying a stint as visiting scholar at Boston College. Bew, who was normally based at Queen's University, was a professor of Irish history. He had also served as an adviser to David Trimble, the leader of the Ulster Unionist Party, who had played a major role in the Good Friday negotiations and was now serving as first minister for Northern Ireland. Boston College had a dignified legacy as a bastion of scholarship on Irish history and literature. In the Spring of 2000, the college administration was looking for a way to mark the end of the three-decade conflict in Northern Ireland, and Bew mentioned to Bob O'Neill, the head of the John Burns Library, that the college might consider some way of documenting the Troubles. Perhaps, Bew suggested, the college could gather some sort of testimony from people who had participated in the Troubles, in order to create a historical record of the conflict. 'This will be for graduate students a generation from now', Bew said. O'Neill liked the idea. But the new project would need a director. Bew proposed a longtime Belfast journalist named Ed Maloney.

Moloney was a bold choice, a sharp-minded, sharp-elbowed chronicler of the Troubles. He had been a student at Queen's during the 1960s and witnessed, first hand, the emergence of the civil rights movement and the dawn of the Troubles. He took part in demonstrations himself and got to know Dolours Price, Eamonn McCann, Bernadette Devlin and other radicals of the day. As a newspaperman Moloney covered the conflict with painstaking attention, breaking important stories... Physically he was unprepossessing... But he was known for his fearlessness and his unwillingness to back down from a fight. His disability had endowed him with a lifelong sympathy for the underdog. Once, in 1999 the government used a court order to try to force Moloney to turn over his interview notes from a meeting with a loyalist paramilitary. He refused, risking prison. Then he took the government to court and won..." (p254).

He had been friendly with Adams,

but—

"the relationship soured. Moloney had grown convinced that Adams was deliberately misleading the rank and file of the IRA. He suspected that Adams had privately resolved early on to give up the army's weapons in the interests of the peace process but that he and the people around him had kept the closely guarded secret from the rest of the organisation. Moloney had begun work on a new book, *A Secret History Of The IRA*... But as he broke stories that conflicted with the Sinn Fein party line, he encountered hostility. Martin McGuinness nicknamed him Ed 'Baloney'. One night, someone slashed his tyres. In 2001, Moloney left Belfast and moved to the Bronx..."

"Moloney took Bew's general notion of documenting the Troubles and proposed something more specific. Boston College should conduct an oral history, in which combatants from the front lines would speak candidly about their experiences..."

Anthony McIntyre, who had taken part in the war as an IRA Volunteer, but on release from prison in the early 1990s had done a degree course at Queens with Bew as his mentor, and had enrolled for a PhD, was taken on as interviewer of Republicans who were will to be interviewed.

"The Belfast Project... seemed to address the obvious shortcoming in the Good Friday Agreement. In their effort to bring about peace, the negotiators had focussed on the future rather than the past. The accord provided for the release of paramilitary prisoners, many of whom had committed atrocious acts of violence. But there was no provision for the creation of any sort of truth-and-reconciliation mechanism that might allow the people of Northern Ireland to address the sometimes murky and often painful history of what had befallen their country over the previous three decades. After apartheid ended in South Africa, there had been such a process, in which people came forward and told their stories. The explicit understanding... was that there was an exchange: if you told the truth, then you would receive legal immunity..."

"Part of the reason that such a process may have been feasible was that in the aftermath of apartheid, there was an obvious winner. The Troubles, by contrast, concluded in a stalemate. The Good Friday Agreement envisaged a 'power sharing' arrangement. But there was a sense in which neither side had really emerged triumphant..." (p258).

But the inconclusive ending of the

Northern Ireland War is a small part of the difference with the South African situation.

In South Africa the Anglo-Dutch colony made a deal with the native population which conceded the vote to the natives in return for a guarantee that white property would be safe, and an arrangement was made between the two sides for resolving feelings about the past. What were the two sides in Northern Ireland? Keefe does not happen to mention what they were, but the matter is essential.

The war was not fought between the IRA and whatever it is that David Trimble represented. Trimble was present at the signing of the Agreement, but his only part in the making of the Agreement was to allow himself to be bullied by Tony Blair, than at the peak of his influence, into signing it—or at least not refusing to sign it and letting it be thought that he had signed.

There is no valid comparison, in terms of constitutional substance, between the IRA and the UVF/UDA, and still less between Sinn Fein and the fragments of the old Ulster Unionist Party—or "*the Northern Ireland state*" according to Lord Bew. There had never, in constitutional fact, been a Northern Ireland State, and in 1998 there was not even the semblance of one.

The Irish State was present at the signing of the Agreement, and signed as if it had actually been a party to the war. And then it revoked, by referendum, its sovereignty claim over the Six Counties. But it did not in any way acknowledge that what was being ended by the Agreement was a war, or that its sovereignty claim had had anything to do with that war, or that the IRA was anything more than a bunch of criminals. There were no releases from Southern prisons.

The other party to the war was the actual State in Northern Ireland—the British State. And the British State made it clear at the start that it was not going to engage in any truth-and-reconciliation nonsense. All of that was a matter for the locals in the Six Counties. The notion was fostered that the 'Troubles' consisted of an incomprehensible local conflict between Catholics and Protestants in which the British State acted as mediator.

The British State was a kind of benevolent outsider in Northern Ireland, while at the same time Northern Ireland was an integral part of the British state. The Northern Ireland *State* of Lord Bew's

devising both did and did not exist—it was dialectical, you see!

There was no Truth-and-Reconciliation function for the Belfast Project of Boston College, set in motion by Lord Bew and directed by Ed Moloney, the former friend of Gerry Adams. What it amounted to was a finger-pointing exercise at Adams as a monster.

Keefe's account of Lord Bew omits an essential detail: he was a member of the Official IRA. He was openly a member of Official Sinn Fein, whose purpose seemed to be to brand Provisional Republicanism as a sectarian murder gang. That he was also in the Official IRA was revealed in the *London Review of Books*. It was asserted in the *London Review* that he was a member of the Official IRA and the assertion was not contradicted. And the *London Review* is not a fringe publication that somebody in Bew's position might treat as being of no consequence.

No details were given of Bew's military career in the *London Review*, or anywhere else as far as I know. But the fact of membership indicates a consuming hatred of the Provisional IRA, which was the actual IRA that fought the War.

The Official IRA fought its own war, in a medium of ideological fantasy, for a couple of years, and committed a couple of notable atrocities before declaring a ceasefire and becoming an Establishment media presence in the propaganda campaign against the Provos. Their actions must be described as atrocities because they were not directed towards any coherent political purpose, and were not conducted on behalf of any identifiable social body, and were abandoned as futile. The best known of those actions is the Aldershot Bombing of 1972, in which 5 cleaners, a gardener and a priest were killed but no military.

The main publicity organ of the Official IRA was the biggest selling Irish newspaper, the *Sunday Independent*, whose Editor, Anne Harris, many years later, took time off from denouncing the Provos to write and publish an article defending the Aldershot Bombing.

The interweaving of the Official IRA/Sinn Fein with the publicity apparatus of the Southern state is one of the unreported phenomena of the Northern Ireland War—with an ongoing residue in media commentary. The media does not expose itself.

The established Establishment in

Dublin lost its bearings when war took off in earnest in the North in 1970-71. I know this because I took part in debates about the North with Front-Benchers of Fine Gael and the Irish Labour Party in those years.

I argued that the Protestant community in the North was misunderstood in its Unionist politics by the Nationalist political culture. I held that its Unionism was not an out-of-place expression of religious bigotry in politics, but was the expression of a national development which the Ulster Plantation, and the ancillary migrations, had undergone in the course of three centuries, and that it would resist Irish Nationalist pressure as a nationality.

But the political culture of the Irish state was deeply committed to an understanding of Ulster Unionism as a form of obsolescent Reformationist bigotry, that had been manipulated by the Tories for English party purposes, and that would soon give way if some hard pressure was applied to it. The Provisional IRA would apply the hard pressure, and should be given its chance. Ulster Unionism would crumble under pressure, particularly if a breach could be developed between it and its Tory inspirers. And then I would see how wrong I was. Meanwhile certain diplomatic conventions had to be observed officially.

That genuinely did seem to be the way the Northern situation was understood by public figures in all parties in the Republic, and by virtually all media personnel too. And it was given pretty frank expression by Tim Pat Coogan, Fine Gael Editor of the *Fianna Fail* daily newspaper, the *Irish Press*, which is no longer with us.

The Tory link was put to the test in 1972 when the Tory Party, under IRA pressure, abolished the Stormont system. The result was the emergence of William Craig's vigorous Vanguard movement, and the appearance of the organised Protestant working class on the streets of Belfast in military formation, wearing Balaclavas. (That working class has since disappeared, with the shutdown of much of Belfast's engineering industry.)

It was clear that the Dublin Establishment had misconceived the Northern situation fundamentally. Things were not as it asserted them to be, but it was incapable of reconsidering what it had asserted in the light of what was proving to be the case. The fundamental misconception of the North was fundamental



to the political culture of the Southern state. It must not be tampered with. The Ulster Unionists were part of the Irish nation that had been led astray by the Tories. If they continued to be hostile to their nation after a breach had been made in their relationship with the Tories, the reason must be that the leading element in the nation had antagonised them with policies that affronted their religious sensibilities. Too much emphasis had been placed on Catholicism in the history of the nation and the way of repairing the damage was by Oecumenistic blurring of the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism and a comprehensive re-writing of history in order to blur the 'misunderstanding' that had unfortunately arisen between Ireland and England.

The fixed idea was that some inessential influence, some external influence, had been brought to bear on the Irish nation and had divided it superficially, but that a common band of nationality persisted beneath the division and that it would assert itself and restore the sense of national unity when the divisive influences of Rome and Canterbury were countered. It seemed to me that that was a delusion that could only be held by somebody who had never actually looked at Protestant Ulster, and who had no sense of the difference between Ulster Protestantism and Southern Ascendancy Protestantism, and who had no curiosity about what made Protestant Ulster tick.

Official nationalist Ireland set about re-educating itself—re-historicising itself—undermining itself—in search of the common substratum of national unity whose existence was implied logically by the way the strong appearance of things was dismissed as superficial. But it did not seem to me that those engaged in that exercise believed that the thing which was logically implied by their reasoning really existed.

The Official IRA flourished in that flickering Enlightenment Twilight once it gave up its ludicrous war.

It was re-making itself as Marxist in the late 1960s with a view to entering reformist politics, and had expelled many who held to the view that the purpose of an Army was to fight, when the fighting broke out in the North. The only part it played in the events of August 1969 was a marginally provocative one. A new Army was formed out of the disrupted populace during the Winter of 1968-9 and was given leadership by the element expelled from the IRA. The

Marxist Army Council condemned the new IRA as sectarian because it acted within the realities of the *status quo* and gave effect to the determination of the Catholic community that it would no longer be ruled by the Protestant community.

The Official IRA said that the War it chose to fight was a National Liberation War against Imperialism—which had nothing to do with Protestants and Catholics but was part of the international class war. But Northern Ireland was entirely a place of Catholics and Protestants. That is what Whitehall and Westminster determined it should be when it imposed a devolved system of government on the Six Counties and excluded it from the party-politics of the democracy of the state.

So the transcendental war of National Liberation, launched by the Official IRA on behalf of a nation that did not actually exist, was fought in disconnection from what did exist, and what it amounted to was a handful of atrocities. But, when that war was given up by the Officials, with their visceral hatred of the Provisional IRA which had displaced them, many of them were well placed to become a major presence in the Dublin Establishment. Their convoluted Marxism-Leninism gave them a clear and simple fantasy view of the Northern situation, uncomplicated by acquaintance with empirical fact.

(The ideologist of the movement, Eoghan Harris, explained that Truth had no necessary connection with empirical fact, and was better off without it. This put one in mind of the distinction made by Russian dissidents in the 1930s between the two Russian words for truth: *pravda* was the higher truth of belief inculcated by the regime, and *istina* was the truth of factual detail of what existed empirically.)

I was denounced as an Imperialist/Orange stooge in the early 1970s by Eoghan Harris, because I proposed that Protestant Ulster should be treated as a distinct national development in Ireland, rather than as a defector from Irish nationality. Twenty years later I was a primitive 'Catholic-nationalist' in his view, because I saw no need to denigrate the Irish national development—over which he was a watchdog in 1970 but which had later gone sour in his head.

Irish nationalist denial of authentic national difference in the North turned on itself and began to destroy itself in many more heads than Harris's. and so

it was not surprising when David Trimble, a fundamentalist Unionist, had Official IRA advisers in 1998, urging him to obstruct implementation of the Agreement that Prime Minister Blair had bullied him into going along with.

Prominent among his advisers were Harris, Paul Bew—then a mere Professor—and Professor Henry Patterson. I had known both Patterson and Bew in the early 1970s. Patterson, who was East Belfast working class, flourished on the sociological side of academia. He had a remarkable ability to write in the rigorous Althusserian Marxist mode of sociology. I thought it was as remarkable as Weber's ability to produce music in Schoenberg's twelve-note system. But, though he was immersed in the system, he demonstrated the hollowness of Althusserian pretensions to transcend experience by developing as a Unionist fundamentalist. And he demonstrated how little religious belief had to do with it by being, as an Althusserian Marxist-Leninist, a comprehensively atheistic man of science.

Bew was a kind of Ascendancy Protestant. He explained his family circumstances to me but I have forgotten them, except that some ancestor knew Canon Sheehan. He could engage in conversation in normal language but his writing had to be shaped to Althusserian formulas, which did not come as naturally to him as to Patterson.

Both joined Official Sinn Fein soon after they parted company with Athol St., where they had never been formal members. Athol St. was the only political centre in Belfast where Protestants and Catholics mixed freely, without having to be on front-parlour behaviour. The common ground was the accepted fact of national difference about which nothing could be done, and which any settlement would have to accommodate rather than overcome.

Discussions were conducted matter-of-factly, about well-known matters of fact, instead of in a special language, academic or crypto-Marxist, designed to conceal those vulgar inescapable realities, in order to produce the illusion of a higher form of thought which lay beyond them but would somehow master them.

Meaningful discussion could not be carried on between these incompatible languages. Bew and Patterson were ill at ease in discussions conducted in the language of the street. After an initial

infatuation with Athol Street, in the trauma suffered by Unionist intellectuals in the existential crisis of 1969-70, they gravitated away from it towards regions where the language of sociology—of the pseudo-science of society—was the common language. And there they met Official Republicanism, which in its political futility had become sociological. And sociology was also the language in which academic careers were to be made under the patronage regime instituted by Whitehall after it took academia in hand. (The Ulster Unionist Party, as far as I could see, had no patronage regime for the shaping of intellectual life.)

Marxism-Leninism, in the esoteric form of Althusserianism, was all the rage in British academia in the early 1970s. And Official Republicanism, in its escape from the 'sectarian' vulgarity of actual life in the North, and in justification of the absurd war it fought for a couple of years, became Althusserian. I recall its exhibitionist gunman, Des O'Hagan, writing enthusiastically about the new magic which "*dissolved the primacy of the generic subject*". So I was not surprised when Bew turned up in Official Sinn Fein. But I was surprised when the *London Review* revealed he had joined the Official IRA. However, the details of his military career have not come to light. Is *transparency* not required on this matter on the part of the British peer (who heads the parliamentary Ethics watchdog) who has been so concerned to pin a military career on Gerry Adams?

There is much that is interesting in Keefe's book, but surely he is negligent in not probing Lord Bew's political background and motives in the way that he probes others. And likewise with Moloney.

Clearly Adams was not an outside commentator on Republican affairs whose advice was taken. He was a Republican insider with authority. But there are conventions governing these things and I do not see why they should not be applied in the case of Sinn Fein/IRA. Whitehall/Westminster subjected the Six Counties to systematically sectarian government for two generations and then found itself with a war on its hands. In the course of this war an attempt was made to assassinate the political leader on the British side. And a British attempt was made to assassinate what Whitehall regarded as the political

leader on the Republican side.

Margaret Thatcher undoubtedly had authoritative influence on British military affairs, as Adams had on Republican military affairs, but Thatcher was not a member of the British Army. And British State conduct with relation to the Six Counties brought about a situation in which the Republican movement, Sinn Fein/IRA, acquired something like the status of an actual State in the Northern Catholic community, making good to that extent the constitutional pretensions of the 2nd Dail as preserved by the anti-Treaty movement.

I do not pretend to know anything about the internal affairs of Sinn Fein/IRA. I have shunned, rather than sought, inside information, preferring to see what was happening and describe it. I saw happening around me in 1969-70 a new Republicanism forming out of a population that had been disrupted by a wild assault on it by the state. A year earlier those new Republicans had been sophisticated New Leftists, scorning the IRA, and imagining that a new world had been created out of student rebellion.

They were given a constitutional and military structure by Rory O'Brady and others who had been expelled from what was becoming the 'Officials'. That structure was the structure of State on which Collins had made war in 1922. It maintained the distinctions proper to a State. Sinn Fein was not a group of sympathisers but an integral part of the structure. There was therefore nothing paradoxical about somebody, who clearly exercised authoritative influence on the IRA, denying that he was a member of it.

It was rumoured, naturally enough, that Adams was a British agent. From a certain point of view he was one, whether he knew it or not. He had ended the War without ending Partition, and by doing so he had devalued the War and reduced it to a murder campaign. And there he was, swanning around in a good suit, mixing with important people, acting innocent, denying that he was ever in the IRA. It was too much for Brendan Hughes and others, who had suffered for the cause but were now reduced to living marginal lives.

Why were they marginalised? Because they wanted the War to be continued to the bitter end as a war against Partition—to an end that would certainly be bitter. Adams cheated them of principled defeat by making an interim settlement which ended the subjection

of the Catholic community to the Protestant community acting as the local agency of the State.

The 1998 Agreement greatly enhanced the position of the Catholic community in the conflict of communities which was the only practically possible form of political activity under the arrangement made by Westminster for the Six County region of the State in 1921. The possibility of ending Partition was greatly increased by this new arrangement if the Catholic community retained its autonomous cohesion and was not drawn into British politics—of which there was no possibility since the British parties continued to boycott the Six Counties.

But this apparently meant nothing to Hughes. And when Lord Bew and Ed Moloney gave him the opportunity to spill the beans about Adams, he seized it.

I never tried to get behind the appearance of things and try to puzzle out who was an agent of the State acting through subterfuge and who was not. But I took it that Bew became a British agent in the mid-1970s—which was, I suppose, the time when he joined the Official IRA.

In 1970 or 71 he took up the idea of Two Nations from Athol St. and edited, with the future Professor Patterson, a little magazine called *The two Nations*, which was produced for them by Athol St. A few issues appeared. Then they came to Athol St. and asked for the idea to be "*nuanced*". I refused to have anything to do with *nuancing* it. The crude reality of it became more pronounced every week. But it was left to them to *nuance* it if they could.

The Two Nations was a mere statement of social fact. It was not a policy. Our first policy was for Dublin to recognise that the Ulster Plantation had over three centuries developed a national life of its own and on that basis open up the possibility of communication with it. When that was absolutely rejected by Taoiseach Lynch, and by all parties in the Dail, we proposed that the undemocratic mode of government of the Six Counties within the British state should be made the issue. This mode of government aggravated relations between the two communities in the North. A first step towards a remedy would be the inclusion of the Six Counties within the party politics of the state. There was no possible common ground in Northern Ireland politics between the communal parties of Ulster Unionism and Nationalism, but there could be common ground if the Tory and Socialist parties of the

state ended their boycott of the region. Dublin rejected this no less than the Two Nations. And so did Lord Bew and Professor Patterson. If they had not rejected it, they would not now be a Lord and a Professor.

They came up with the notion that Northern Ireland was itself a State, not an undemocratically-governed region of the British state. And, as a State, it had its own party system: Populists and Anti-Populists. This was dressed up in the weird language of New Leftist sociological Marxism-Leninism and published as a book. It was nonsense. But it was useful nonsense to the State and it brought rewards.

Patterson, East Belfast working class, was immersed in the communalist culture of Northern Ireland Britishness, and he was progressing within it by sheer brain-power. But Bew was a sort of a detached fragment of what once had been a would-be ruling class. He had once been able to converse in relatively normal language about the over-all realities of existence in Northern Ireland. He might have become a historian—but he warded off the danger. It seemed to me that he knew what he was doing, but that it was a matter of *noblesse oblige* with him. He had an inherited duty to the State and therefore History was very much secondary to the well-being of the State with him, and he would not as a historian subvert the project for which the State had concocted Northern Ireland. The State needed fake history and he supplied it.

Another big book about the North has been published recently. *Forgetful Remembrance: Social Forgetting and Vernacular Historiography of a Rebellion in Ulster* by Guy Beiner. It is 709 pages long and is published by Oxford University Press. It has to do with such phenomena as "*pre memory*" (the memory of events that have not happened) and "*pre-forgetting*" (the forgetting of events that have not been remembered). The industrious author has collected many interesting marginal details about the United Irishmen, but unfortunately the event to which these details are marginal does not appear in the book at all. It is the absent centre to which a great mound of marginal detail is attached. And the reason why the central event is absent is not unconnected with the way that the absence in Northern Ireland of the democratic political system of the state is dealt with by professional academic historians whose income is

drawn from the States concerned.

The mythology of nationalist Ireland says that the United Irishmen were Presbyterian Irish nationalists. It is deduced from this supposed fact that there must be something still of Irish nationalism in the make-up of Presbyterian Ulster even though in politics they have been led astray by Tory-inspired bigotry.

I reprinted a great deal of material from the United Irish movement about 40 years ago. Unionist Ulster was not interested in it, which did not surprise me. But neither was nationalist Ireland interested in it.

The United Irish movement as founded on the false ground of the Kingdom of Ireland—the Kingdom of the Protestant colony of 1691. It was a reform movement in Protestant Ulster in support of the measures advocated by Henry Grattan for the purpose of giving national substance to the Protestant Parliament, which achieved legislative independence in 1782, by gradually admitting the Irish to it. And what it was critical of was aristocracy, not monarchy. This was made abundantly clear by resolutions adopted at Parish Meetings in Antrim, Down, etc.

The aristocracy that ran the Parliament not only refused reform but criminalised the advocacy of reform. This provoked the Presbyterians to organise a conspiracy. Conspiracy implies revolution.

The Parliament stood firm against the threat of revolution, and at the same time set about terrorising the Catholics. If the French had landed in force in 1796, an Irish state on French lines would possibly have been formed. But "*Wind and Weather*" intervened and the various elements in Ireland were left to work things out through interaction with each other. The Ulster Protestants, cornered into revolutionary organisation by an intransigent aristocracy, and seeing the Catholic population stirred up by the Orange terrorism of the aristocracy, did not have the will to carry through the revolution that they had been cornered into organising for.

The revolution went off at half-cock, or a quarter-cock. The aristocracy looked to the British Army to suppress it, but, while engaged in the work of suppressing it, the British Government introduced the *Union Bill* to abolish the "*Kingdom of Ireland*" and its Parliament and bring Ireland within the English Constitution.

The Orange movement, which was then a military movement of the ruling aristocracy, protested that the London Government had adopted the programme of the United Irish movement. And many United Irish leaders in the North agreed that this was the case and supported the Union—this is the great secret about their apparent *volte face*!

The Orange Order threatened to use force in support of the Irish Parliament but was faced down by Whitehall. There was for a few years after the Union a Protestant Ascendancy Repeal movement in Dublin, and it seemed to me that it must have fed into Emmet's Rebellion. But there was little or nothing of that kind in Belfast.

A.T.Q. Stewart, a cultured Unionist of the kind that disdained the populace, and that therefore could not see what was under its nose (it no longer exists) wrote about the *Transformation Problem*—that problem that could never be solved because it is a false problem—about how the nationalism of Protestant Ulster in the 1790s was transformed into something entirely different in the course of the following generation. (And this appears in Beiner's book.)

What was aggravating the Ulster Presbyterians in the 1790s was not the Union. Union had been asked for earlier and refused. When the Union was enacted in 1801, the Presbyterians settled down within it. A few, like William Drennan in Dublin, verged on something like Irish nationalism. But when Drennan returned to Belfast four years after the Union, and published the *Belfast Magazine* Belfast had settled down within the Union.

Ulster Unionism after 1886 is different in kind from what it was before. It is today an organised movement excluded from British political life, whose purpose is to prevent the Six Counties being excluded from the state. Between 1801 and 1885 there was no Unionist Party: only participation in politics through membership of the parties by which the state was governed.

The 1798 Rebellion was not simply forgotten in Protestant Ulster when I was probing the matter in the 1970s. It was remembered as a kind of false start towards something that was achieved in altered circumstances, which had no relevance for the present day.

For nationalists the misconception of it was usable as a debating point. But if any nationalists probed that period in

search of the common nationalist sub-structure between Ulster Unionists and Irish nationalists they must quickly have found that it was not there and lost interest.

William Drennan's sister, Martha M'Tier, supported the admission of Catholics to the Constitution, of course, but when she noticed the behaviour of the Catholics around the Chapel that was opened in Belfast, it struck her that they were not quite a broken people, and she *feared* that they would take back possession of the country.

The first major ideological step towards re-possession was taken with the publication in Dublin of the *Irish Magazine* by Walter Cox, who had been a United Irishman, in 1807-15. It is barely mentioned by Beiner.

In the 1820s the Presbyterians supported Catholic Emancipation, but they rejected Repeal of the Union, when it was raised by O'Connell immediately after Emancipation. The Rev. Henry Montgomery, opponent of the notoriously Conservative Rev. Henry Cooke, was undoubtedly a radical, but he was no less Unionist than Cooke, and it was his Open Letter to O'Connell in 1831 that announced the parting of the ways between the popular movements of the two communities.

The War of 1970-1998 was between one of these communities and the British State. But if the State had withdrawn from the Six Counties—as it pretended it was thinking of doing in the early seventies—there would have been a war between the two communities, and the Labour Secretary of State, Merlyn Rees, urged the Unionists to begin preparing for such a war (a matter dealt with in *Against Ulster Nationalism*).

Books are now being published which suggest that the Northern Ireland system was conceded by Westminster to the Ulster Unionists in 1921. In fact, it was imposed on them. When it was first proposed, the Unionist leader opposed it. But the Unionists were persuaded by Whitehall to agree to it in the Imperial interest as it helped with the handling of Sinn Fein in the rest of the country.

The Northern Ireland system did basic damage to the Unionist community by excluding it from the political life of its state.

The Nationalist community had no political place within that state. It remained cohesive, with its mind on

another state. It had access to the social welfare amenities of the British state without being distracted by the political conflicts by which these amenities were brought about. It increased as a proportion of the whole, even during "*the fifty years of Unionist misrule*", and then it developed in quality as well as quantity during the 28 years of war. One could say that it *progressed* through the process of communal attrition, which was, and remains, the only possible politics in the Northern Ireland system.

The 'Troubles', whether regarded as war or as organised crime, would not have been possible if Britain had not imposed undemocratic government on the Six Counties when retaining them in its state.

Keefe says not a word about what made such an astonishing thing as war possible in a region of the pioneer liberal democracy of the world. The fundamentally guilty party is absent from his story.

His heart goes out to Jan McConville, and to Brendan Hughes in his lonely flat in Divis Tower, who in his voluntary confession says that McConville persisted in being an informer even after being caught in the act and warned. But who pulled the trigger? By a process of deduction he points the finger at Marion Price.

Adams was tried on a charge of IRA membership but found Not Guilty. He was arrested on foot of the opening of Lord Bew's confidential tapes and after four days released without charge—and pointed the finger at Lord Bew. But Keefe finds his denial of IRA membership absurd. Though elsewhere in the book he says that amongst the soldiers Adams was not regarded as a soldier (p237).

But he does say that the secret of the Boston Tapes was blown by their guardian, Ed Moloney, who could not resist writing a book in the knowledge of them, to the surprise of the College authorities who had acted in good faith (p324).

Wars arise from conflicts of interest and they used to be ended by negotiations, with incidents in the war covered by acts of *oblivion*. All of that changed in 1914 and 1918. Britain denied in 1914 that it made war out of national interest, and in 1918 it refused end the war by negotiation. It was a matter of Good versus Evil, and Evil has no rights and must be punished.

That set a pattern. But the British State could not see its way to winning the war that had arisen within its own jurisdiction, in its undemocratically-

governed region, so it negotiated an ending. But it did not provide for *oblivion*. It left things to be fought over in retrospect as if it had been a feud—a procedure recommended by one of Blair's lieutenants, Alistair Campbell, I think. And, denial of the fact of war and support of continuation of it as feud was supported by the Irish State, the SDLP, and the Ulster Unionist Party.

There is a section in Beiner's book called *The Chimera Of Oblivion*. But "*man is a political animal*", and therefore oblivion is possible. And Beiner seems to concede this with a reference to post-1945 Germany. But in the Six Counties it required an acknowledgement by the State of the fact of undemocratic government, and that this fact had consequences.

About thirty years ago I got into conversation with Peter Hitchins (not knowing who he was). He agreed that the Six Counties had been subjected to undemocratic government through the Northern Ireland system, but he denied that undemocratic government had consequences—or perhaps that the consequences it was having were valid consequences. This is a chasm in English intellect.

\* **The Origin Of Irish Catholic-Nationalism**, Selections From Walter Cox's *Irish Magazine: 1807-1815*. Edited by Brendan Clifford. 136pp. Illus. £14, £11.50

\* **Henry Montgomery's Letter To Daniel O'Connell** (1831, pamphlet). €6, £5

\* **Bolg an Tsolair/ Gaelic Magazine**, 1795 by Patrick Lynch, Charlotte Brooke and Others. *Reprint of United Irish magazine, with substantial profiles of P. Lynch and C. Brooke* by Brendan Clifford & Pat Muldowney. 248 pp. €21, £17.50

\* **William Drennan: Selected Writings**, 3 volumes: *The Irish Volunteers, 1775-1790. The United Irish Years, 1791-1798. The Union And Emmet's Rebellion, 1798-1803*. €10, £7 each.

\* **The Causes Of The Rebellion In Ireland** And Other Writings By Rev. Thomas Ledlie Birch, United Irishman. Selected and Introduced by B. Clifford. Also included in this collection are Birch's *Letters From Saintfield* in the Northern Star; his 1794 *Address To The Synod Of Ulster*; his pamphlet against the new style of anti-political religion being introduced in Presbyterian Ulster, *Physicians Languishing Under Disease*; and a transcript of the official record of his trial by *Court-martial*.

112pp. €10, £8

\* **Against Ulster Nationalism**, A Review of Northern Ireland Politics in the Aftermath of the 1974 UWC General Strike, with Insights into the Development of the Catholic and Protestant Communities, their interaction, and their relation to Britain, in Reply to Tom Nairn and Others by Brendan Clifford.

88pp. €10, £8

## Stephen Richards

Part Two of an examination of Richard Baxter

### Reliquiae Baxterianae

"Elizabeth bequeathed no bed of roses to James I. Discuss." This essay title was the introductory *pons asinorum* leading on to the verdant pastures of "A" Level History studies back in the 1970s. I've thought about it from time to time since. While "bed of roses" might be overstating it—or, as one clever classmate put it, "she did, but the roses had thorns"—the state of affairs in Church and State and foreign affairs might have been reasonably manageable by a successor with a modicum of common sense.

The life and reign of James I (or Jamie Saxt in Scots) provides an object lesson in how small a part raw intelligence plays in successful statecraft. If you're Isaac Newton or Albert Einstein you might get away with exhibiting those tendencies that are loosely described as being "on the spectrum", but not in politics, or indeed in those professions that have a large human component, such as Law, Medicine and the Church.

We can't seem to get away, these days, from self-promoting egotists bragging about their "people skills", but these are things that are best understood in demonstration. We're talking here about the ability to have insight into others' feelings, and to affirm the other person while challenging his or her most deeply-held beliefs—and, even in the middle of the cut and thrust of debate, to avoid lopping our opponent's ears off! It's important to make people feel good about themselves. But James seems to have been one of those people whose vanity was fed by the humiliation of others, a characteristic not unknown on the Bench either.

The efforts of the Elizabethan divines, combined with the reluctance of Elizabeth herself, to wade into divisive waters, had preserved the ecclesiastical equilibrium. Even if Elizabeth wasn't the author of the famous quatrain on the Eucharist ("*Christ was the Word that spake it/He took the bread and brake it/ And what the Word did make it/That I believe and take it*") it summed up her policy, which was 'Don't push it' (with apologies to A.P. McCoy's Grand National-winning steed).

The possibility of a successful Catholic *coup* had receded, the Separatists, viz. the Anabaptists and Brownists, had been forced into exile in Holland, and the remaining quarrels in the Church were differences of emphasis among men who shared over 90 per cent of their theological DNA.

#### Hampton Court Blues

It was in this benign set of conditions that James convened the *Hampton Court Conference* of 1604, in response to the *Millenary Petition* of clergy the previous year. This was going to be a stage on which he would show off his credentials as a Renaissance polymath. The Church would see that it owed its very life to the favour and wisdom of its sovereign. In other words, it was all going to be about him.

Just four of the Puritan clergy were admitted to that gathering, and they were excluded from most of the sessions. They were Laurence Chaderton, the Lancastrian first Master of Emmanuel College Cambridge and friend of Lancelot Andrewes from student days, who lived to the incredible age of 104, dying in 1640; John Reynolds, Master of Corpus Christi College Oxford; John Knewstubs, another Northerner, from Westmorland, who spent most of his life as a parish clergyman in Cockfield, Sussex; and a nonentity called Thomas Sparkes.

These four were placed on a wooden bench, like arraigned prisoners in the dock. When it came their turn to participate, this took the turn of a five-hour grilling and goading from James. As Adam Nicolson writes in his book about the 1611 Bible:

"These were moderate and distinguished men, suggesting moderate changes. But James—and Bancroft [then Bishop of London] who seems to have been in an excitable state at the theatre unfolding around him—was treating them like extreme schismatics from the outer fringes of Anabaptist lunacy" (*Power and Glory*, Harper Perennial, 2003).

Towards the end, one modest but badly-worded suggestion from Reynolds seems to have driven James into a

paroxysm. This was that each Bishop might have a diocesan committee, a Presbytery as Reynolds put it, as an advisory panel. This drew from James the Pavlovian response: "*if you aim at a Scotch Presbytery, it agreeth as well with monarchie as God and the Devil*".

In the end the only thing that came out of the Conference was the project of a new Bible translation, by royal appointment. This was a collaborative enterprise involving Translators from all wings of the Church, but, for all its literary majesty, it lost some of the force of the best of the Geneva Bible editions, and of course came without without the controversial marginal notes. It was as if the Translators were aware of James's shadow looming over them.

#### There's Such Divinity Doth Hedge A King

With his "*no bishop, no king*" philosophy, James had made the fatal linkage between the legitimacy of the episcopal order and that of the Crown itself. As with his view of the judges, the Bishops were to be like lions under the throne. In his not unattractive worldview, shared by many of his European ruling class contemporaries, the prince was the magnanimous despot presiding over the social and ecclesiastical order, accountable only to God himself. He was the fount of honour and preferment, and the recipient of waves of gratitude and obeisance from a contented people.

To be sure, James had seen what the Wars of Religion had done to France, and indeed to Scotland, but above and beyond this there was the Platonic ideal of the State as modified by Christian thinkers. Crackpot "*self-conceited brethren*" (see the Introduction to the King James Version) were to sacrifice their angular scruples and fidgets for the sake of the commonwealth.

This Jacobean model may indeed owe more to the concept of the *basileus* in the Eastern Church, where traditionally the ruler had a quasi-sacral status, validating the established orders, the powers that be, in both Church and State. Anglicised, and Anglicanised, it became known as the *Divine Right of Kings*. As has been pointed out in these pages, this contrasted with the tension between Pope and Emperor which had been characteristic of Western Catholic society for the previous millennium, and which had been the seedbed for scholastic philosophy as the rival claims were debated in the Schools.

James's approach might have been more successful if he, as the Renaissance Prince, had been prepared to sacrifice some of his own fidgets, but in his mystical elevation of the episcopate, James was heightening the danger of that civil disintegration he dreaded, and which came about forty years later. The Crown became too heavily invested in a particular theory of church government as a result of which Crown and Church each became infected with the discontents stirred up by the other.

### **Bishops, Good And Bad**

I'm labouring this point because it goes to the heart of Richard Baxter's persistent argument, against all comers, that it was possible for the country to settle down under a moderate episcopacy, sensitive to local conditions. In his pursuit of this solution he managed to make himself obnoxious to the Cromwellians, to many Presbyterians, and above all to the Caroline divines of the Restoration.

One can easily download his *Treatise of Episcopacy, confuting by Scripture, Reason, and the Church's Testimony that sort of diocesan churches, prelacy and government which casteth out the primitive church-species*, etc. etc. This, an important element in the huge Baxterian corpus, was apparently "meditated" in 1640, composed in 1671 (but "cast by") and finally published in 1680, at the height of the Exclusion Crisis, when, it might be supposed, there weren't many cool heads around to benefit by it.

There's a distinction here, which I would have done well to have understood earlier, between Episcopacy and Prelacy. It's quite possible to be an upholder of episcopal church government while at the same time disowning anything that smacks of prelacy. And as for the question, *what is prelacy?* The answer is, we know it when we see it! The telltale sign is the exercise of unaccountable authority within the diocese, which might involve moving clergy around like chess pieces, and stipulating certain forms of worship in every church. Gaudy vestments, a distaste for the preached Word, and an addiction to Popish liturgical practices might also come into it.

What comes to mind is the *Prescopalianism* (a term coined by J.C. Beckett I believe) which was a feature of the Protestant Churches in the North of Ireland during the 1620s, under the benevolent eye of Archbishop James Ussher, until the coming of Wentworth

in 1633. I would need to check with Crawford Gribben just to what extent Baxter's thought was moulded by the older man, but their views were virtually identical.

The historical argument for some sort of modified episcopacy was that in Early Church times particularly gifted leaders would have emerged in various cities of the Empire, and they would have had a superintending role over smaller churches and less experienced pastors in their area. The *New Testament* examples would of course be Timothy in Ephesus and Titus in Crete. A century or so on and we have Ignatius, Polycarp and so on. The practical argument is that it's very useful to have associations of churches in particular localities who can work in combination as the need arises, whether in terms of mission or poor relief.

### **Highest Common Denominators**

What Baxter was advocating, ironically, is in line with current Anglican practice, as seen in the General Synod, and with the voices of the Reformists in the Catholic Church. The classic anti-Papal thesis of Protestant polemicists has been that up until 1215 (the Lateran Council) the Church of Rome had been accumulating errors like carbuncles, but was still defensible as the true Church. From that time on, with the increasing concentration of power in the hands of the Pope, the errors multiplied irredeemably. The Pope was out of control because conciliar government had failed.

Baxter was a surprising influence on C.S. Lewis whose interests in seventeenth century literature didn't extend to many of the Puritans. Here is Lewis in a 1952 letter to the *Church Times*:

"To a layman it seems obvious that what unites the Evangelical and the Anglo-Catholic against the 'Liberal' or 'Modernist' is that both are thorough-going supernaturalists, who believe in the Creation, the Fall, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Second Coming and the Four Last Things. That unites them not only with one another but with the Christian religion as understood *ubique at ab omnibus*."

While it was outside the immediate scope of his argument, it's clear from many other instances that Lewis included 'traditional' Roman Catholics in the camp, and I believe the Orthodox. In trying to come up with an umbrella term for these allies under the skin, he speculates randomly and then hits on "*Baxter's 'mere Christians'*". The reference for this,

cited by Walter Hooper (Lewis's indefatigable literary executor and a convert to Rome), is from Baxter's *Church History of the Government of Bishops and their Councils* (1680), the section entitled *What History is Credible and What Not*:

"You know not of what Party I am of, nor what to call me. I am sorrier for you in this than for my self; if you know not, I will tell you, I am a Christian, a Mere Christian, of no other Religion; and the Church that I am of is the Christian Church, and hath been visible where ever the Christian Religion and Church hath been visible" (this last remark sounds tautologous).

It hadn't occurred to Lewis that a time was soon coming when the term "*High Church Liberal*" wouldn't be an oxymoron; or indeed, later on, the term "*Evangelical Liberal*". On which last see Brian McLaren, *A Generous Orthodoxy*, which I sadly left on a Greek ferryboat when I was only half way through. It's a dazzling display of shape-shifting.

Consistent with his "*mere Christianity*", Baxter's approach was to treat these matters of liturgy and church government as second order issues, not issues to die in the last ditch about, even though he did end up, metaphorically at least, dying in the last ditch over them. To insist on your own gold standard was to risk dismembering the body of Christ. Let's arrive at a non-objectionable decent reverent form of worship for the national church and then get on with being a Christian nation. Let's not worry overmuch about the shape of the cup as long as it holds the water of life.

The approach is not indifferentist, in some ways quite the opposite. But I do wonder at times if champagne tastes quite the same if drunk from a coffee cup.

### **Second Thoughts**

I've got ahead of myself, as we left Baxter in an anxious state just at the outbreak of the English Civil War. We have to bear in mind that his memories of his thoughts during this period are bound to have been influenced by everything that came after, but he does make a clear distinction between what was going through his head at the time and his more mature reflections, and he writes like an honest man, so I'm prepared to accept much of what he says at face value.

Having done his best to lie low and stay out of trouble for a year or two in

the aftermath of Naseby Baxter, arrived at a different mind:

"Abundance of common troopers [on the Parliament side] and many of the officers I found to be honest, sober orthodox men... But a few proud, self-conceited, hot-headed sectaries had got into the highest places and were Cromwell's chief favourites, and by their very heat and activity bore down the rest, or carried them along with them, and were the soul of the army, though much fewer in number than the rest (being indeed not one to twenty throughout the army)... I perceived that they took the king for a tyrant and an enemy, and really intended absolutely to master him, or to ruin him..."

"Upon this I began to blame both other ministers and myself. I saw that it was the ministers that had lost all by forsaking the army and betaking themselves to an easier and quieter way of life..."

"And I reproached myself also, who had before rejected an invitation from Cromwell. When he lay at Cambridge long before, with that famous troop which he began his army with, his officers purposed to make their troop a gathered church, and they all subscribed an invitation to me to be their pastor and sent it to Coventry. I sent them a denial reproving their attempt, and told them wherein my judgment was against the lawfulness and convenience of their way, and so I heard no more from them. And afterward, meeting Cromwell at Leicester, he expostulated with me for denying them. These very men that then invited me to be their pastor, were the men that afterwards headed much of the army, and some of them were the forwardest in all our changes; which made me wish that I had gone among them, however it had been interpreted; for then all the fire was in the one spark".

Some of Baxter's abiding characteristics are revealed here: his priggish, schoolmasterly manner, and his supreme confidence in his own abilities. Cicero must have been like this too, thinking he could exercise a moderating influence on Pompey and Caesar. The abiding conceit of literary men is to believe they're making the waves whereas often they're just being carried along. But yet there's a certain naïve honesty about Baxter that disarms us.

### **You're In The Army Now**

He ended up attached to the army anyway.

"As soon as I came to the army Oliver Cromwell coldly bid me welcome, and never spake one word to me

more while I was there; nor once all that time vouchsafed me an opportunity to come to the headquarters where the councils and meetings of the officers were, so that most of my design was thereby frustrated. And his secretary gave out that there was a reformer come to the army to undeceive them, and to save Church and State, with some such other jeers; by which I perceived that all that I had said but the night before to the committee was come to Cromwell before me... But Colonel Whalley welcomed me and was the worse thought on for it by the rest of the cabal."

This was in the Summer of 1645, and Baxter had an active time of it, with Whalley's regiment, pursuing Goring and the Royalist remnants down into the West Country, then back towards Oxford and Banbury to put pressure on the King's command headquarters.

Apart from Whalley, who was Cromwell's cousin, Baxter had no friends in high places, and indeed Whalley—

"grew odious among the sectarian commanders at the headquarters for my sake; and he was called a Presbyterian, though neither he nor I were of that judgment in several points."

Whalley was certainly an interesting character. There is no indication that he came over to Baxter's side in any meaningful way. He was just as good at his pretended decency to Baxter as he was later on when he appeared to show great solicitude for the King's comfort while Charles was in army custody, earning the latter's gratitude and some opprobrium from the army ranks.

But his was one of the first signatures on the King's death warrant, and he was a Cromwellian to the last, who would have continued to support Richard Cromwell if his troops hadn't deserted him. Accordingly at the Restoration he was near the top of the most wanted list. He managed to escape to New England, where the agents of the Crown pursued him for the next fifteen years, from one hiding place to another. He ended up living in a cave in Connecticut with Colonel Robert Goffe, one of the Irish Goffes, dying in 1675 before justice, or vengeance, could catch up with him.

### **Different Drums**

The change of mood that came over the Parliamentary forces in the mid-1640s has been impressionistically conveyed by Walter Scott in the opening pages of *Woodstock*. As the "sectaries" began to gain an influence over the army

out of all proportion to their actual numbers, so, correspondingly, the fortunes of commanders like Fairfax began to wane, as did those of clergy like Baxter.

From about 1648 there was Royalist plotting going on among some of the London Ministers who had been very sympathetic to the Parliamentary cause in the early days of the war. Baxter comments on the 1651 execution of Christopher Love, the Welsh-born Rector of St. Laurence Jewry, who had been a Puritan firebrand but from 1645 had become disaffected, and was convicted of secret correspondence with Henrietta Maria. Here is Baxter's account:

"Mr. Love was tried at a court of justice, where Edm. Prideaux, a member and solicitor for the Commonwealth, did think his place allowed him to plead against the life and blood of the innocent. Mr. Love was condemned and beheaded, dying neither timorously nor proudly in any desperate bravado, but with as great alacrity and fearless quietness and freedom of speech as if he had but gone to bed, and had been as little concerned as the standers-by..."

"This blow sunk deeper towards the root of the New Commonwealth than will easily be believed, and made them grow odious to almost all the religious party in the land except the sectaries... The most of the ministers and good people of the land did look upon the New Commonwealth as tyranny, and were more alienated from them than before.

"The Lord Fairfax now laid down his commission and would have no more of the honour of being Cromwell's instrument or mask, when he saw that he must buy it at so dear a rate. And so Cromwell with applause received a commission and entered upon his place."

Significantly, it was one of the leading Puritan preachers and writers, Thomas Manton, who attended Love on the scaffold. John Owen (1616-1683), Baxter's near-exact contemporary and possibly the most distinguished of all the Puritans, by contrast hitched his wagon to Cromwell's star, from the time he accompanied Cromwell to Ireland to clean house at Trinity College Dublin, to his later appointment as (Independent) Dean of Christ Church Oxford, and Vice-Chancellor of the University. At the Restoration no distinction was made between Manton and Owen who were both cast into outer darkness.

William Gurnall is a Puritan giant



who has been forgotten by the world in general. One of the "Remainer" clergy, Rector of Lavenham in Suffolk, he was a pastoral pastor who did his best to avoid trouble and strife, but he still says this, I suppose in the mid 1670s:

"And have not our dissensions, or rather our rejecting those overtures which God by men of healing spirits have offered for peace, been the cause why mercy has fled so far from us, and we left to groan under those sad miseries that are upon us at this day? And who knows howling? O, who can think what a glorious morning shone upon England in that famous Parliament begun 1640 and not weep and weep again to see our hopes for a glorious reformation, that opened with them, not sugt up in blood and war, contention and confusion!—miseries too like the fire and brimstone that fell from heaven upon those unhappy cities of the plain." (*The Christian in Complete Armour.*)

### I Know Where I'm Going

One has to allow that from time to time popular movements arise, owing nothing to political machinations, but Baxter's quite plausible thesis is that the political ascendancy of the "sectaries" in the army was engineered by Cromwell, as was their subsequent fall.

Raw power casts its own spell. This might also partly explain the Exclusion Crisis thirty years later, when for a time a *coup* seemed on the cards. In our own time it's interesting to note how many Labour politicians succeeded in swallowing their principles when New Labour seemed unstoppable; and how many of these same politicians are now going with the Corbyn flow. If it looks like the way to advancement is to be associated with one or other of the "sects" then so be it.

This explanation tends to put paid to the idea that Cromwell was just blundering about, as depicted by Buchan in his biography, always seeking "clearness", whereas he was engaging in political manoeuvres every bit as clinical as on the battlefield.

Charles had been delivered into the hands of Parliament, who lodged him in Homeby House, Northamptonshire.

"While he was here the army was hatching their conspiracy. And on the sudden one Cornet Joyce, with a party of soldiers, fetched away the king, notwithstanding the parliament's order for his security. And this was done as if it had been against Cromwell's will and without any order or consent of theirs;

but so far was he from losing his head for such a treason that it proved the means of his preferment."

This was when Whalley and the army chiefs buttered up Charles, making him believe that they had his best interests at heart and "would save him from the incivilities of the parliament and Presbyterians".

"When the parliament offered the king propositions for concord (which Vane's faction made as high and unreasonable as they could, that they might come to nothing), the army, forsooth, offered him proposals of their own, which the king liked better; but which of them to treat with he did not know. At last, on the sudden, the judgment of the army changed and they began to cry for justice against the king, and with vile hypocrisy to publish their repentance and cry God mercy for their kindness to the king, and confess that they were under a temptation. But in all this Cromwell and Ireton and the rest of the Council of War appeared not. The instruments of all this work must be the common soldiers."

Baxter goes on to describe how the *Council of Agitators* was elected from the mass of the soldiers:

"They draw up a paper called The Agreement of the People as the model or form of a new Commonwealth. They have their own printer, and publish abundance of wild pamphlets as changeable as the moon. The thing contrived was an heretical democracy. When Cromwell had awhile permitted them thus to play themselves, partly to please them and confirm them to him, and chiefly to use them in his demolishing work, at last he seemeth to be so much for order and government as to blame them for their disorder, presumption and headiness, as if they had done it without his consent... And while the Parliament and the Agitators are contending, a letter is secretly sent to Colonel Whalley to intimate that the Agitators had a design suddenly to surprise and murder the king. Some think that this was sent from a real friend, but most think it was contrived by Cromwell to affright the king out of the land or into some desperate course which might give them advantage against him."

And thus the panicky flight to Wight and Charles's incarceration in Carisbrooke Castle, and while there, as Baxter continues:

"The parliament sent him some propositions to be consented to in order

to his restoration. The king granted many of them and some he granted not. The Scotch commissioners thought the conditions more dishonourable to the king than was consistent with their covenant and duty, and protested against them; for which the parliament blamed them as the hinderers of the desired peace. The chiefest thing which the king stuck at was the abolishing of Episcopacy and alienating theirs and the Dean and Chapter's lands...

"They seem not to have taken the course which should have settled these distracted churches. Instead of disputing against all Episcopacy, they should have changed diocesan prelacy into such an Episcopacy as the conscience of the king might have admitted, and as was agreeable to that which the church had in the two or three first ages."

### Divide And Rule

A suggestion along these lines, according to Baxter, had previously been put forward by Ussher, and while Charles had rejected it at that time, he was now ready to consider it, and—

"as he would not when others would, so others would not when he would. And when our present King Charles II came in we tendered it for union to him, and then he would not. And thus the true moderate healing terms are always rejected by them that stand on the higher ground, though accepted by them that are lower and cannot have what they will."

Next comes *Pride's Purge*. I'm ashamed to say that I'd no clear notion of what was going on at this time, which I would put down only partly to my own lack of curiosity in my schooldays, but rather to the seeming inability of my "A"—Level History teacher to explain what was really going on. Contemporary historians like Baxter may be partial, self-serving at times, but they do make their meaning clear.

What was happening was that Cromwell was making sure that Parliament in a moment of weakness wouldn't be so spineless as to acquiesce in a composition with Charles. Certainly "*peace hath her victories, no less renown'd than war*", but Cromwell's peacetime victories were mainly over the Parliament for whose cause he had gone to war. It was in this context of fear and loathing, divide and rule, that the London ministers saw the light, and Love was executed.

So the Revolution started eating its own children. When in due course the



Cromwell loyalists ceased to be of further use to him then they were despatched too. The *Rump*, that monster of Cromwell's own creation, was denounced by him and disbanded in that famous speech of 20th April 1653, with armed troop at his back. Things had come full circle from Charles's descent into the House of Commons eleven years before. It's always been a matter of some perplexity to me how this speech has resonated approvingly down the centuries. It's a bilious outburst that would make the utterances of Robert Mugabe seem models of lucidity. The successor to the Rump was, according to Baxter aptly named the *Little Parliament*, chosen by the soldiers, two by two, out of the English Counties.

"[Cromwell] can now conjure up at pleasure some terrible apparition, of Agitators, Levellers, or suchlike, who, as they affrighted the king from Hampton Court, shall affright the people to fly to him for refuge; that the hand that wounded them might heal them [Baxter's mocking reference is to Hosea 6:1: "*Come let us return to the Lord. He has torn us to pieces but he will heal us; he has injured us but he will bind up our wounds*"]. For now he exclaimeth against the giddiness of these unruly men, and earnestly pleadeth for order and government."

### It's An Ill Wind

But here we come up against the paradox. This is best set out by Baxter in his own words:

"I did seasonably and moderately by preaching and printing condemn the usurpation, and the deceit which was the means to bring it to pass. I did in open conference declare Cromwell and his adherents to be guilty of treason and rebellion, aggravated by perfidiousness and hypocrisy, to be abhorred by all good and sober men."

So far so honourable. I don't know exactly where Baxter was on the scale that runs from very muted all the way up to out and out recklessly bold. But I suspect he may have pulled his punches somewhat. And in fact he admits as much:

"But yet I did not think it my duty to rave against him in the pulpit, nor to do this so unseasonably and imprudently as might irritate him to mischief."

The reasoning is subtle and fascinating. Whether it's an *ex post facto* rationalisation I will leave others to judge. But I don't think we can accuse Baxter of being a mere trimmer in view

of his honourable conduct at the Restoration, and the long years of disgrace, fear of imprisonment, and indeed actual imprisonment, that he endured in what was then old age:

"And the rather because, as he kept up his approbation of a godly life, in the general, and of all that was good, except that which the interest of his sinful cause engaged him to be against; so I perceived that it was his design to do good in the main, and to promote the Gospel and the interest of godliness more than any had done before him, except in those particulars which his own interest was against. And it was the principal means that henceforward he trusted to for his own establishment, even by doing good, that the people might love him, or at least be willing to have his government for that good, who were against it as it was usurpation. And I made no question at all but that, when the rightful governor was restored [i.e. Charles II], the people that had adhered to him (being so extremely irritated) would cast out multitudes of the ministers, and undo the good which the usurper had done, because he did it, and would bring abundance of calamity upon the land."

This is a remarkable passage, for its analytical depth, its political savvy, and its wisdom. However deplorable the new regime had shown itself to be, and however obnoxious the generalissimo who headed it, the reactive instinct to go for the opposite extreme, to rush into the arms of someone who wasn't Cromwell, had to be guarded against.

### Et In Arcadia

We have to remember too that all politics is local. Baxter was by his own account thinking mostly of the people of Kidderminster, on whose behalf he was holding back from giving Cromwell both barrels. He was left in peace to pursue his labours in his longer second period there, from 1647 to 1660. Very soon after 1660 his Kidderminster pastorate came to a juddering halt, and he was cast out on the roads of the world. He minded this for himself of course, but he minded it more for his flock.

I get the impression that Baxter was one of those characters, to be met with in most ages, who can connect and sympathise with the common man, but can be prickly with those of his own social or intellectual status. In his case his lack of a university education may have had something to do with it as well. But, whatever the explanation, natural or supernatural, something

clicked between Baxter and the townsfolk of Kidderminster. He was a contentious figure in his day, and indeed contention has followed him beyond the grave, but even his detractors conceded that this was his finest hour. And he admits that without Cromwell it wouldn't have been possible:

"For my part, I bless God who gave me, even under an usurper whom I opposed, such liberty and advantage to preach his gospel with success, which I cannot have under a king to whom I have sworn, and performed true subjection and obedience."

Not only was he their minister, but for some years he doubled up as their GP. He doesn't bang on about his golden age as much as might have been expected, but he says this:

"The congregation was usually full, so that we were fain to build five galleries after my coming thither, the church itself being very capacious, and the most commodious and convenient that ever I was in. Our private meeting also were full. On the Lord's-days there was no disorder to be seen in the streets, but you might hear an hundred families singing psalms and repeating sermons as you passed through the streets. In a word, when I came thither first, there was about one family in a street that worshipped God and called on his name, and when I came away there was not passed one family in the side of a street that did not do so, and that did not, by professing godliness, give us hopes of their sincerity."

But Baxter's Arcadia was going to come to an end. I hope to conclude this series by exploring the general failure, and Baxter's failure in particular, to establish a national consensus post-1660, along moderate episcopal lines, what we might call the second great failure of the seventeenth century if Hampton Court was the first. We'll also take a look at Baxter's interesting theological afterlife.

**The Veto Controversy** by *Brendan Clifford*. An account of the fierce dispute among Irish Catholics, between 1808 and 1829, as to whether the appointment of Irish Bishops by the Pope should be subject to a degree of Government influence, as was generally the case elsewhere. Includes **Thomas Moore's Letter To The Roman Catholics Of Dublin (1810)** and extracts from polemical writers on either side: J.B. Clinch, Dr. Dromgoole, Bp. Milner, Denys Scully, Rev. Charles O'Connor etc. 203pp. €18, £15, postfree

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

# Jules Gondon

First English Translation  
by  
**Cathy Winch**  
Part 7

## Biography of Daniel O'Connell (1847)

[This final instalment picks up the story after O'Connell called off the Clontarf Monster Meeting organised for the 8th October 1843. The British authorities banned it the night before. O'Connell was then tried 'for sedition' and sent to jail. It begins with a letter written in 1847 by O'Connell's son Maurice to the electors of Tralee, after his father's death.]

We read in a letter written by Maurice O'Connell, eldest son of the Liberator, recently sent to the electors of Tralee, whose votes he is seeking once more:

"The first commitment I made towards my constituents is to work for the repeal of the thrice accursed union. I have made this commitment freely and I have faithfully kept to it. I commit myself again to work, both within and without Parliament, to achieve the break up of the union.

It is a duty that I owe to you and to Ireland; it is a duty that filial piety imposes on me; for I owe it to my beloved, my illustrious—alas departed—father to work for this objective.

Friends and compatriots! I will say no more. You lament his loss with me, and you will help me, by choosing me again as your representative, to gain for Ireland the dearest object of his thoughts, the highest aim of his ambition, for which he worked, for which he lived, for which he died: the revocation of the union which Ireland abhors!"

In 1845, the Liberator resumed his plans of 1843. As far as the public was concerned, the House of Lords verdict had legitimised the prosecution of the Repeal Association leaders. O'Connell intended to pick up his plan at the point where his trial prevented its execution, but circumstances stopped him from doing so.

The English Cabinet had defused the agitation, thanks to the diversion of the monster trial; now it created a ferment of discord among the Catholics of Ireland. It made permanent the grant to the great Maynooth Seminary; it modified the *Bequests Act* [conditionally permitting legacies to the Church, ed.]; and passed the *College Bill*. O'Connell

fought against the latter two measures. The law on Church Grants, in its original form, was an attack on freedom of conscience and the discipline of the Church; the College Bill established a mixed system of higher education which was a danger to the youth.

Nature also conspired against the plans of the Liberator for the parliamentary emancipation of his country. Famine spread consternation and terror throughout Ireland. The desperate cries for food took precedence over claims for its political rights. O'Connell supported all Sir Robert Peel's commercial reforms and voted the abolition of the *Corn Laws*. If he put pressure on the Cabinet, it was to demand work and bread in the name of Ireland. The return of the Whigs to power gave him hope for his unhappy compatriots, hope which was soon disappointed. The misfortune which struck Ireland was one of those calamities against which the efforts of one man are without effect; even Governments have difficulty alleviating them with the immense resources at their disposal. O'Connell had seen a fraction of the members of the Association secede from him after very violent internal struggles and adopt the attitude of a hostile party. The behaviour of Young Ireland, if the disposition of its members can be judged by the language of its press organ, cannot be blamed too strongly.

The old agitator felt very keenly the attacks and recriminations directed at him. After such immense struggles, such great sacrifices, on the edge of his grave, he felt the sceptre he had held so long slipping from his grasp. A party which had grown because of his stature—which he had made popular and which owed him everything—forcibly dared to attempt to usurp the power it had exercised under his direction. Unfortunately O'Connell had only too often repeated that he knew no one in Ireland better qualified to succeed him than M. Smith O'Brien.

The party whose leader was O'Connell's presumptive heir was impatient to enjoy the succession which was offered. When this idea started

taking hold, Young Ireland meant to take by force what O'Connell had promised as a reward for its patriotism when he was no more.

The courting of Young Ireland was a great mistake, exploited by O'Connell's rivals to satisfy their ambition. The wretched circumstances in Ireland had contributed to their success. They declared their hostility to the Whig Cabinet as soon as it came to power, thus inviting Ireland to mistrust the man who they claimed was going to hand the country over to the Whigs. O'Connell had assured his compatriots to put their faith in those in power, who would surely feed them. Well! We know how cruelly events proved Young Ireland right. O'Connell had against him the overwhelming reality of facts, and his opponents used that cleverly, endeavouring to create doubt in the mind of the people about the sincerity of his patriotism; but could the people doubt its Liberator?

O'Connell regarded the principles of Young Ireland as too dangerous in their religious and political aspects for him to avoid a fight. An internal struggle was inevitable—of the sort which made England ever stronger against unfortunate Erin. On the eve of this painful struggle, one in which he would explain things to the people in his own words, the man who had faced such violent storms, who had triumphed over so many enemies, felt weighed down by age and sorrows. His strength let down his spirit.

It is in the midst of these distressing circumstances that he felt the first symptoms of the illness that took him from his country. The athlete, who had fought so long and hard, for the first time felt his physical strength fail him. He went to Parliament for the opening of the present session, but his weakened voice could not be heard properly; he implored the commiseration of the House and the Government for his dear Ireland—from whom he was to be taken away. Meanwhile, S. O'Brien, young, full of energy and ambition, capable, with an influence already established, was making every effort to fill in the House of Commons the role which O'Connell had played up to then.

From that moment the imagination of the illustrious agitator was strongly affected. His robust constitution diminished visibly. He had to withdraw from work or any serious occupation, and we know that doctors advised him to travel in order that distractions might divert his mind from the misfortunes of his

country. When he started his pilgrimage to Rome, his illness had already made rapid progress.

Travelling through France—in Paris, Nevers, Lyon, Avignon and Marseille—he experienced universal sympathy for his principles and his great accomplishments for his country, especially among Catholics. In Paris, the *Electoral Committee for the Defence of Religious Freedom*, headed by its President the Count de Montalembert, was admitted in his presence to pay homage. We reproduce below the words of the noble Count to the illustrious representative of Ireland:

"Monsieur et illustre ami,

When I had the good fortune to see you for the first time, sixteen years ago, in your house at Derrynane on the edge of the Atlantic, we were on the morrow of the July Revolution, and you were already deeply concerned about the fate of religion in France. I respectfully received your good wishes and your teaching. You showed us already then the aim we should set ourselves and the rule we must follow: to free the Church from the temporal yoke by civic and legal means, and at the same time, to make her cause separate from any political cause.

I am happy to be able to show you today that your lessons have borne fruit among us. I come to present to you those who first enrolled in France under the banner which you deployed and which is here to stay. All of us are your children, or, rather, your pupils. You are our master, our model and our glorious teacher. That is why we have come to pay you the tender and respectful homage due to the man who, today, has done the most for the dignity and liberty of mankind, and especially for the political education of Catholic populations.

We come to admire in you the man who has accomplished the most beautiful task that man can dream of here below; the man who, without spilling a drop of blood, has won back the nationality of his country and the political rights of eight million Catholics. We come to salute in you the liberator of Ireland, a nation which has always inspired fraternal feelings among the French, and who, thanks to you, will never again fall under the yoke of Protestant fanaticism.

But you are not only the champion of a nation; you are the champion of the whole of Christendom. Your glory is not only Irish, it is Catholic! Wherever Catholics return to practising civil virtues—devoting themselves to winning legitimate rights—that is, under God, the result of your work! Wherever religion is emancipating itself from a

yoke forged by several generations of sophists and legal experts it owes, under God, a debt to you! May this thought fortify you, rejuvenate you despite your infirmity, and console the sufferings of your patriotic heart.

The good wishes of Catholic France, of truly liberal France, will accompany you in your pilgrimage to Rome. Your meeting with Pius IX will be a great moment in the history of our times: when the greatest, the most illustrious Christian in our century kneels before a Pope who takes us back to the best epochs of the Church. If, in this moment of supreme emotion, there is space in your heart for a thought other than for Ireland and Rome, remember us! The homage of love, respect and devotion of the Catholics of France for the head of the Church could not be better placed than on the lips of the Catholic Liberator of Ireland."

Daniel O'Connell replied that sickness and emotion had sealed his lips, but that he regarded this demonstration as the most significant event of his life.

From the moment of feeling the onset of his illness, O'Connell—always known for his strong faith and piety—resigned himself to taking the rest his doctors condemned him to like a good Christian, but he only forgot this world to think of his soul and of his God. By day and by night, during the periods of insomnia brought on by pain, Daniel O'Connell never stopped praying for the salvation and happiness of his dear Ireland. Almost always immersed in grave meditation, he wanted to hear of nothing but his country and the consolations of eternity. Up to his last moment, all his words reflected the confidence and the resignation of a soul ennobled by all that Catholic piety can give of dignity and greatness.

Having received in France the welcome that the eminent services he has rendered to the cause of religion and humanity guaranteed to him everywhere, he left Marseille, believing he felt some improvement in the state of his health. He looked forward to breathing the air of Italy. He had only one ambition, to reach the tomb of the apostles; he prayed he might be granted the happiness of kneeling at the feet of the Father of all the faithful, and receiving the blessing of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. But this last satisfaction was refused him. He surrendered his soul to God on the 15th May when he arrived in Genoa, gratefully receiving all the sacraments of the Church; he demonstrated the keenest piety and the most saintly resignation.

He was fortunate to retain possession of his mind perfectly up to his last moment. Seeing that he would not complete his pilgrimage, he bequeathed his heart to Rome, ordered that his body be transported to Ireland, and asked for prayers to be said that God deign receive his soul in heaven.

We would not dare to criticise the doctors (on many counts so worthy of commendation) who cared for the illustrious patient in France; is medical science, however, always above reproach? Should not the inflexible application of certain principles—principles blindly revered by a large number of practitioners—give rise to certain doubts? In a science as uncertain as medicine, is it really not possible that a system of treatment proclaimed infallible today will be condemned tomorrow?

It has been reported that O'Connell was sceptical about the science which his friends trusted would rebuild his health—and how could it be otherwise? What doctors said was white beyond the Channel, was black on this side. The published reports of the medical men do not indicate that the antecedents of their illustrious patient were taken into consideration satisfactorily. It seems that a purely local and accidental phenomenon was detected, when what should have been observed was a disorder connected to the whole career of this famous man.

O'Connell should not have been treated simply like any other patient, and we wonder if his illness was fully examined in the context of his extraordinary existence. In England the first doctors who were called upon to care for O'Connell thought that his weakened body—exhausted by producing such a huge number of ideas, such prodigious activity—needed to be supported and fortified, not further weakened by blood letting. Given the results of the opposite point of view, who will dare say they were wrong?

With a less blind faith in the principles which are fashionable today in medical science, who knows if the fatal crisis might not have been postponed, perhaps for a long time? In our opinion the results of the autopsy will not justify such a system of treatment, unless it can be demonstrated that inert matter has the faculty of translating faithfully the phenomena of life.

It was inevitable that O'Connell would sooner or later succumb—a victim of the indefatigable ardour he expended in the service of his country. For eighteen months moral suffering—crueller

still—was added to the bodily infliction, which was a consequence of his glorious struggles and his immense labour. In one of those frightful calamities only Providence can understand, he saw his country prey to the horrors of famine, and death gather with a blind fury a young and vigorous generation, the hope of the future. The inefficient measures taken by Government, party divisions, the temporary disablement of the powerful lever of agitation, the anarchistic and anti-religious propaganda of free-thinking patriots: these are the main circumstances which together came to morally wear down the Liberator of Ireland.

O'Connell could not survive so many afflictions! It would be foolhardy to try and exactly attribute the share each of these particular circumstances had in the sufferings to which he succumbed. With his grave not yet closed, at a time when only unity can give Ireland the strength she needs, we will not risk aggravating dissensions that run already too deep. We would lay ourselves open to an accusation—all the more odious because it would be unwarranted—that we were exaggerating the effects on O'Connell's mind of certain attacks.

We leave unsaid so many things that could be added to the glory of the Irish Liberator that we will not bother to inquire if some slight blemishes might be found in a political life so rich in a multitude of events.

All those who met him agree that his private life shone no less brilliantly than his public life. He was the proud recipient of the Civil List which Ireland granted her king, and his liberal generosity endeared him to his unfortunate compatriots. Daniel O'Connell was irreproachable in his private relationships, always fulfilling faithfully the duties of friendship, beloved of all who knew him, esteemed by all the persons who did not have an interest in hating him; his kind manner disarmed ill-will, and the prejudices of those who approached him had dissipated when they came away. He knew how to be polite without ceremony, proud with the haughty, tender and kind with the humble. His private virtues are not indifferent to his country, because they contributed to serving her interests.

The Liberator of Ireland leaves four sons, Morgan, Maurice, John and Daniel. The last three are members of the British Parliament.

It is undeniable that Ireland does not owe to O'Connell alone her emancipation from servitude and her awakening to

liberty; but, as M. de Beaumont said:

"If O'Connell did not create emancipated Catholic Ireland, who else could represent her as well as he did? If he was not alone in creating the great movement which transformed her so deeply, who could deny that he made that movement prodigiously faster and stronger?"

If he has not himself forged the instruments of liberty that Ireland now owns, who else would have known how to use them as well as he did? Who could have made such a deep and thorough study of the needs of Ireland, understood them so acutely and put such great faculties at their service?

O'Connell was taken away from his friends and his country, but not everything died with him. His spirit will live in the Irish people, who will be for posterity as so many living pages of his history. His name will be the password of liberty and his grave the meeting place of the sons of Ireland!

## Appendix

The news of the death of O'Connell produced a profound impression in the whole of Europe. In Rome, where he was expected, all hearts were deeply saddened. The people of Rome were preparing to erect a triumphal arch to the defender of religious liberty, and his entry in the holy city would have been a veritable ovation. These marks of sympathy and veneration turned into preparations of a different nature. The admiration of the Romans manifested itself through the ardour of the prayers offered for the repose of his soul.

The sad news, reaching Ireland on 25th May, produced the most profound emotion. Crowds assembled in front of Conciliation Hall to gather the few details available. A note was promptly posted on the door:

"Alas! Alas! O'Connell is no more. The Association will meet tomorrow to compose an address to the people of Ireland on the occasion of this dreadful national calamity."

The Dublin Municipal Council adjourned itself for three weeks as a mark of respect for the memory of the great citizen of Ireland.

All the bells of Catholic churches and chapels sounded the death knell. The archbishop of Dublin ordered that every Mass for the next three days be offered for the salvation of his soul.

As the news spread in the provinces, prayers were ordered in every diocese.

The Bishops, in their letters of condolence to the sons and the family of the Liberator, assured John O'Connell of all their sympathy, and encouraged him to take over the leadership of the popular movement. The clergy and the municipalities in eloquent Addresses declared their fidelity to the principles of the Repeal Association and their devotion to O'Connell's son, who in these last years had seconded the patriotic endeavours of his father.

The municipal councils of provincial towns imitated the example of Dublin; they adjourned all business deliberations, and most ordered that, as a mark of mourning and by wish of the inhabitants, the shops of their town remain closed for three days. Young Ireland associated itself to the general mourning; despite the recent differences, it wanted to pay homage—in the words of Mr. S. O'Brien—to the memory of a citizen who rendered such eminent services to his country. The Irish Confederation (this is the name of the Young Ireland Association) invited all its members to wear a sign of mourning.

The Repeal Association addressed the following Proclamation to the Irish people. This document ends by recommending them to remain faithful to the principles of peace, order and legality constantly preached by the liberator.

"Fellow countrymen—O'Connell is no more!! The animating Spirit of Ireland has passed away. The Light of the Nations is extinguished.

Weep and wail, and let your grief be without limit, oh children of Ireland, for the cup of your affliction is full, and the extent of your suffering without measure. The Pride of your hearts has been stricken down—the Bright One of Erin is removed—the Liberator of our country has departed.

With a season of sorrow it has pleased the Almighty to afflict us to the uttermost. Pestilence and famine blight our people—and, in a foreign country, far away from his own loved native land, low lies the veteran Champion of Ireland's liberties.

Oh! Well may we mourn him, for the whole human race deplore his loss, and the gloom of our bereavement afflicts the world.

Fellow-countrymen, how shall we best prove that we loved him whilst living, or mourn for him when dead? By reverencing his principles—by obeying his dictates—by pursuing the same noble objects in the peaceful steps he trod.

In one sense—in the true sense—O'Connell is not dead: Men like him can never die. All that was mortal has

passed away, but the immortal part remains. His spirit, fellow-countrymen, abides with you. His moral teachings are spread for ever through you, and through the universe. No time can extinguish the lessons of his wisdom.

For ourselves, associated as we were here, by him, our purpose is determined—to stand by his principles, and to abide by them alone. This is our fixed and unalterable resolve.

Throughout the wide world a mighty void is felt. Who shall fill it up? What nation, what people, has not lost a benefactor. Our country has lost its guide and leader. Oh! Let that country still be directed by his wisdom, and be marshalled beneath his standard.

His paths were the paths of peace. He walked in the ways of the law and order. Remember, still remember, the motto of his association—the moral of his wisdom and experience—

'The man who commits a crime gives strength to the enemy.'

By his long and faithful services—by the noble example of his life—by the glory of his immortal name—we beseech, we implore you, fellow-countrymen, swerve not from the principles, desert not the objects, nor abandon the doctrines of O'Connell." [Retrieved from the *Freeman's Journal* 27 May 1847, CW.]

The Repeal Association invited Mr John O'Connell, son of the Liberator, to take the place left empty by his illustrious father as President of the Association. This offer has been accepted.

The youngest O'Connell son, who accompanied him in his journey and softened the sufferings of his dying father with all the attentions inspired by filial love, went to Rome to deliver the precious token of his father's devotion to the Holy See. The Dundalk representative heard from the mouth of Pius IX words which must have acted as a balm on his suffering, when the Father of all the faithful pressed him to his heart and said: "*Since the pleasure of seeing and embracing the hero of Catholicity was not reserved for me, let me have the consolation of embracing his son.*"

It is on the order of His Holiness that a solemn service was celebrated on 28th June in the Church, Saint Andrea della Valle, and that the Reverend Father Ventura, foremost orator of Rome, pronounced the funeral oration of O'Connell before the immense important audience thronging this Church. All Catholic nations seemed to be represented at this ceremony to show their gratitude for all that O'Connell has done for the cause of their liberty.



## Malachi Lawless

Letter

### Suffer the little children . . .

On 17th December the *Irish Independent on line* carried a report that Primary and Secondary schoolchildren in the Republic were to be taught about LGBTQ+ issues under radical new plans, creating a Brave (or confusing?) New World World in Irish schools for children ...as the State implements it's social engineering agenda cheered on by the EU. However, that report disappeared from the *Independent* site very quickly.

As for the print edition of the *Independent*: Surprise, surprise.... No article on LGBT classes in Irish schools . I've checked on LGBT.IE and nothing there either .

The said article in the *Independent online* talked about extensive LGBT classes in first and second level schools and how these will be prioritised, full steam ahead, as part of Irish sexuality education to 8 year olds upwards .

What struck me immediately was ....teacher education in LGBT sexuality ....and how any programme like this could only be done best by LGBT teachers ( so to speak) ....

Already at second level that very approach is being adopted, I do believe (in Newpark Comprehensive, Blackrock, Dublin) where the normal (oops, can't use that word anymore) class teacher and any other straight person ( parent) is excluded from the LGBT class .

To my mind that is nothing else but a straight ( argh!) case of ideological brainwashing under the guise of a National educational curriculum designed to normalise LGBT lifestyle and marginalize a straight (argh, argh...!) lifestyle under the false flag of EQUALITY.

The matter is discussed in this U-tube video of Gemma O Doherty: <https://youtu.be/wq2XQLMoQGQ>

## Report

### Representation In New US Congress

Congress as a whole is overwhelmingly Christian—even more so than the country. Seventy-one percent of Americans identify as Christian, compared to 88 percent of Congress. Both Protestants and Catholics are overrepresented on Capitol Hill.

Over 6 percent of the new Congress is Jewish, with 34 Jews among the total of 535 lawmakers in the US House of Representatives and Senate.

Jews make up 2 percent of the US population, so Congress as a whole is more than thrice as Jewish as the country in general, according to a new study by the Pew Research Center on religion in the new Congress.

The number is even larger in the Senate, where eight of the 100 members are Jewish. That's 8 percent, for the math-challenged.

This Congress has four more Jews than its predecessor, which had 30

Jewish members. But it's far from the most Jewish Congress ever. That was the 1993 Congress, which boasted 51 Jews—nearly 10 percent of the total.

All of the Jews in the Senate are Democrats, as are all but two in the House. The Republican exceptions are Reps. Lee Zeldin and David Kustoff, from New York and Tennessee, respectively. They are the only non-Christian Republicans in the Congress, according to Pew.

The most underrepresented group is unaffiliated Americans. Twenty-three percent of Americans don't identify with a religion, but that's true of just a sole member of Congress—new Arizona Senator Kyrsten Sinema.

Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus and Unitarians are also represented in Congress.

\*

VOX

Window On The Past  
High Learning!  
Vital Statistics!  
Mentors?

PAT

**Window On The Past**

"Since we met here last Sunday, some people in Kerry have been betrayed into an act of madness which we may safely say is without a parallel in the annals of lunacy", Bishop David Moriarty (1814-77) told his congregation at Killarney on the Sunday following the Fenian Rising. [5.3.1867]

"I should have thought that, considering the spacious accommodation afforded by our lunatic system, and the facility afforded by our board of governors, that there were few dangerous lunatics yet at large in this county. But I am sorry to say I was mistaken. It would seem that some dozens of that class left the town of Cahirciveen on Wednesday evening with the avowed object of making war on the Queen of England and of upsetting the British Empire."

Having dwelt at very great length on his sense of shame that this should happen in his diocese and that his friend Lord Castleross should have thought it necessary to send his children to safety in England, Bishop Moriarty finished with that remarkable statement which would be remembered long after he had gone to his reward on 1st October 1877:

"If we must condemn the foolish youths you have joined in this conspiracy, how much must we not execrate the conduct, of those designing villains who have been entrapping innocent youth, and organising this work of crime. Oh God's heaviest curse. His withering, blasting, blighting curse is on them... When we look down into the fathomless depth of this infamy of the heads of the Fenian conspiracy, we must acknowledge that eternity is not long enough, nor hell hot enough to punish such miscreants" (S.J.L., *The Irish Press*, 1.10.1993)

David Moriarty—

"...is acclaimed the great bishop of Kerry in the nineteenth century and one

of the greatest in the long line of succession in that see. Between twenty and thirty churches, St. Brendan's College and many religious houses and schools came into being during the episcopate." (Bishops of Ireland 1870-1987, Bernard J. Canning, *Donegal Democrat*, 1987)

"His title to greatness does not rest on his views on Irish Nationalism and the national issues of his day. He simply did not want separation of Ireland from Britain. This and other political views did not always run in accord with current national sentiments as reflected in his outburst in St. Mary's Cathedral, Killarney, after the Fenian rising in Kerry in 1867. In the incident he was reported to have said: *Hell was not hot enough and eternity not long enough to punish the Fenians.*

"Although given to strong language it is now conceded that the evidence that he actually used these words is slim and based on hearsay but nevertheless they are still linked with his name. But it is admitted that Moriarty's incursions into politics were not always happy. In January, 1855, Cullen [Archbishop of Dublin] had found it necessary to warn him against Young Irelandism. Yet, nobody ever dreamt of thinking or saying he was not an Irishman to the heart's core." (*ibid.*)

In *Men of the Time* for 1872 is the following entry for Moriarty:

"Bishop Moriarty has published numerous pastoral letters and sermons some of which attracted in a remarkable degree the attention of the public. He has uniformly discountenanced all treasonable movements in Ireland, vigorously denounced the Fenian Brotherhood and more recently (January, 1872) has opposed the Home Rule party."

Mgr. Patrick J. Corish in *A History of the Irish Catholics* sic. [Catholicism] said:

"The capable Bishop of Kerry opposed repeal on political grounds. He was acutely aware of the dangers of a situation where in his own striking phase 'the people knew no patriotism except hatred for their rulers', but he was convinced that the best hope for justice and prosperity in Ireland lay in a fair working of existing institutions..." (*A History of Irish Catholicism*, Vol. 5, II & III, 4., Dublin, Ireland : Gill, 1967-1972.)

If Mgr. Corish believes that he'll believe anything!

\*\*\*\*\*

**High Learning!**

. . . Then there was the student at Trinity College who was most indignant when he failed in history. Half the questions, he told everyone, were about things that happened before he was born.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Vital Statistics!**

Almost three-quarters of babies born are to first and second-time mothers according to new figures released by the Central Statistics Office (30.11.2018).

The average age of a first-time mother was just over 31, while the average age for all new mothers was just under 33. This age was lower at 30.5 for mothers outside of marriage.

The data collated for the second quarter of 2018 also found there was a natural increase in the population of 7,827.

However, the number of deaths—7,592—increased 3.8pc compared to a birth rate increase of 1.3pc compared to the same period in 2017.

Of the 5,407 marriages registered for this period, 181 were same-sex marriages, six more than last year.

But it was significantly fewer than the 290 in the second quarter of 2016—the first year same-sex marriage was legal in Ireland.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mentors?**

"It has always been very curious to me how Irish sentiment sticks in this half-way house—how it continues to apparently hate the English and at the same time continues to imitate them." (Address by Douglas Hyde in Leinster Hall, Dublin, 25.11.1892, '*On the necessity for de-Anglicising the Irish People*').

\*\*\*\*\*