2. The Attempted Anglicization of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century: an exemplar of "British History"

Nicholas Canny

Several calls have been made in recent years for a "New British History" which will treat of developments within the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland as but parts of a single process.[1] The exponents of this cause insist that they have more in mind than comparative history, and like all crusaders for a new cause they tend to disregard the writings of previous scholars which clearly meet with their specifications of what this "New British History" should be.[2] Those who come to the subject from a conventional training in English history also display a certain insensitivity towards Scottish

[1] J. G. A. POCOCK, British History: a plea for a new subject, in: Journal of Modern History 47 (1975), pp. 601-628; IDEM, The limits and divisions of British history: in search of the unknown subject, in: American Historical Review 87 (1982), pp. 311-336; J. C. D. CLARK, English history's forgotten context: Scotland, Ireland and Wales, in: Historical Journal (1989), pp. 211-228; H. KEARNEY, The problem of perspective in the history of colonial America, in: K. R. ANDREWS et al. (eds.), The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America, 1480-1650, Liverpool 1978, pp. 290-302; IDEM, The British Isles: a History of Four Nations, Cambridge 1989; S. G. ELLIS, "Not Mere English": the British perspective, in: History Today 28 (Dec. 1988), pp. 41-48.

[2] As far as Ireland is concerned the attempt to present the history of Ireland in a British context dates back at least to W. E. H. Lecky. During the past generation several effective works on Ireland have been presented in a British context as, for example, H. F. KEARNEY, Strafford in Ireland, 1633-41: a Study in Absolutism, Manchester 1959, 2nd rev. edn. Cambridge 1989; D. STEVENSON, Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates: Scottish-Irish Relations in the mid-seventeenth Century, Belfast 1981; T. C. BARNARD, Cromwellian Ireland: English Government and Reform in Ireland, 1649-1660, Oxford 1975; cf. further M. Perceval-Maxwell, Ireland and the monarchy in the early Stuart multiple kingdom, in: Historical Journal 34 (1991), pp. 279-295. I would contend that my own first book, especially where it discussed provincial councils and revolt, contained a decided "British" dimension: N. CANNY, The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: a Pattern Established 1565-1576, Sussex 1976. To my mind, the finest example of "British" History in practice and one that I have never seen referred to by the champions of the new cause is O. MAC DONAGH, The Inspector General: Sir Jeremiah Fitzpatrick and the Politics of Social Reform, 1783-1802, London 1981.

and Irish affairs, and this is especially evident from their employment of the terms *Britain* or *British Isles* to describe the geographic entity that they propose to study even when this area includes Ireland. To me it appears that one real shortcoming of the "New British History", at least where the early modern period is concerned, is that it is political history in the narrow sense which proceeds from the assumption that the course of political events can be explained independently of social and economic considerations. As a consequence of this assumption, historians, such as Conrad Russell, imply that social and economic conditions in the three kingdoms were similar if not identical, and they ignore the fact that developments in one kingdom could have had entirely different consequences in the other two because of the different circumstances which obtained there.[3]

Another and perhaps greater weakness of the "New British History" that has so far been written on the seventeenth century is that it presumes the central importance of those events which have featured prominently in conventional English history, and alludes to developments in Ireland and Scotland only in so far as these assist our understanding of such key episodes as the English Civil War. Two distortions have resulted from this. First, many historians of Scotland and Ireland, presented with the opportunity to have a moment in the sun, have concentrated upon those aspects of their subject that can be seen to have exerted an impact upon these episodes of accepted importance, and they have consequently neglected developments that might be considered of mere local or national significance. And the second distortion has occurred because historians, having been encouraged to explain how events in Scotland and Ireland exerted an influence over the course of English affairs, tend to ignore how developments in England shaped the course of events in Scotland and in Ireland.[4] This second distortion, I would contend, is the more serious of the

[3] C. RUSSELL, The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642, Oxford 1991.

[4] It might be argued that Scotland during the early-modern period was never subjected to the same thrust of Anglicization as Ireland. However, the attempts by those who

two because it is my considered opinion that the influence which England exerted upon Scotland and Ireland was altogether more potent than the influence which operated in the opposite direction. Indeed, I would go so far as to suggest that the attempted Anglicization of Ireland (and also of Scotland) must become the central theme of any subject called British History if this subject, as it has been defined by its advocates, is to have any credibility.

The whole question of the English government employing its resources to achieve the Anglicization of Ireland is one that came forward, almost by accident, during the course of the sixteenth century. For several centuries previous to then the English Crown had abandoned the ambition of the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman monarchs to achieve political domination over Ireland, and had satisfied itself with retaining its interest in that part of the country which remained under the control of the descendants of the Anglo-Norman lords. This area which lay mostly in the east and the south-east of the country was known politically as the Lordship of Ireland. The more stable areas of the Lordship (in the valleys of the rivers Liffey and Boyne in the east of the country, and in the valley of the Nore to the south-east) were inhabited principally by an English-speaking population who followed English legal and tenurial practices, and who owed allegiance to the English Crown through the administration and Parliament that had been established in Dublin. The low-lying fertile terrain in the valleys of these three rivers lent itself to tillage farming, which was supplemented by pastoral agriculture on the uplands. The service-needs of the farming community was met by a series of inland towns which maintained commercial connections with the port towns of Dublin, Waterford and Drogheda where some manufacturing was conducted. All of these factors of language, lineage, occupation, allegiance and human

---

dominated the Scottish Lowlands to extend their influence over the Highlands might be considered in the same light, on which see the old-fashioned D. H. WILLSON, King James VI and I, London 1956, and the more recent J. WORMALD, Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland 1470-1625, London 1981. The assignment by Oliver Cromwell of Roger Boyle, Baron Broghill, to re-organize Scottish affairs might be considered as the most significant attempt to treat the three kingdoms as a single unit under English control.

settlement suggest that society in this more stable area of the Lordship of Ireland was strikingly similar in appearance to English society, and to low-land English society at that. What made it different, however, was that the community in these low-lying areas lived in close proximity to the Gaelic population in the mountainous and boggy parts of the country who constantly threatened them with raiding parties seeking to seize their moveable property and to destroy their crops. This ever-present threat forced the English community in Ireland to expend much of its resources on providing for its own defence. Their predicament was symbolized by the Pale; that series of fortified positions which they were forced to erect in the outlying reaches of the Boyne and Liffey river valleys. A further continuous outlay of resources was associated with maintaining a viable passage-way between the English community in this area and that in the River Nore basin. Again, because of the ever-present military threat, the farming and gentry population in these Anglicized areas were forced increasingly to rely upon their lords to provide for their protection. Such reliance involved them in paying military exactions to their overlords, and as the lords became more militarized, they, in turn, became a threat to the liberties and prosperity of the farming and commercial community. Some lords, in their effort to increase their power and social standing, took to employing Gaelic methods for raising and maintaining armed followers, and this trend, which is referred to by historians as Gaelicization, was decried by the settled English community in Ireland as degeneration.[5]

The use of this term degeneration makes it clear that people in the settled English community in Ireland at the close of the Middle Ages had come to

[5] These themes are outlined in such general accounts as R. FRAME, Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369, Dublin 1981; and A. COSGROVE, Late Medieval Ireland, 1370-1541, Dublin 1951. The phenomenon of Pale society is discussed in more detail in N. CANNY, The formation of the Old English Elite in Ireland (National University of Ireland, O'Donnell Lecture), Dublin 1975; and S. G. ELLIS, The Pale and the Far North (National University of Ireland, O'Donnell Lecture), Galway 1986. An altogether more detailed treatment is presented in a sequence of essays in: F. H. A. AALEN, K. WHELAN (eds.), Dublin. City and Country from Prehistory to Present, Dublin 1992.

think of themselves as the sole upholders of civil standards in a country which was generally barbaric. The depiction of the Gaelic population as barbarians had been executed most graphically by the Anglo-Norman writer Giraldus Cambrensis who had accompanied King Henry II to Ireland in 1172, and who described his exploits and those of the first Anglo-Norman lords in Ireland in florid detail. For Giraldus, the Anglo-Norman involvement with Ireland was justified on Christian as well as political grounds because, as he portrayed it, life in Gaelic Ireland was incompatible with Christian principles.[6] This axiom was adhered to and further elaborated upon by the descendants of the Anglo-Normans in succeeding centuries, and writers from the English-speaking community in Ireland, even into the sixteenth century, contended that they were not only the sole civil but the sole Christian people in Ireland. By then, however, they had come to accept that the government in England was no longer interested in completing the conquest of Ireland that had been undertaken by the Anglo-Normans, and their calls upon the Crown were for assistance in their effort to preserve them from the dual threat of overthrow by the Gaelic population from without and degeneration from within their own community.[7]

This description makes it clear that all that remained securely in English hands in Ireland at the close of the Middle Ages was an outpost whose very survival as a recognizable English community was seriously in doubt. As such, as we learn from the writings of Steven Ellis, it was not exceptional, and

---

[6] GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, Expugnatio Hibernica: The Conquest of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis, ed. and trans. A. B. SCOTT and F. X. MARTIN, Dublin 1978.

[7] CANNY, Old English elite (above n. 5); C. LENNON, Richard Stanihurst: the Dubliner 1547-1618, Dublin 1981; C. BRADY, Conservative subversives: the community of the Pale and the Dublin administration 1556-1586, in: P. J. CORISH (ed.), Radicals, Rebels and Establishments, Belfast 1985, pp. 11-32; B. BRADSHAW, The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century, Cambridge 1979. Steven Ellis has argued in his publications that the Pale community was far more enduring than was protested in their jeremiads, S. G. ELLIS, Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603, London 1985, esp. pp. 53-107; IDEM, Reform and Revival: English Government in Ireland, 1470-1534, Woodbridge/New York 1986.

he contends that we must study this community, together with the other outposts of English influence in Britain and on the Continent, if we are to have a true understanding of the nature of the English state and society at that time.

If this was the reality of the power of the English state at the close of the fifteenth century, it was to change rapidly as the sixteenth century progressed, and nowhere more decisively than in Ireland. These changes were possible because the Tudor monarchs were altogether more secure on the English throne than their immediate predecessors had been, and were able to engage upon a consolidation of their power in Ireland such as previously would have been unthinkable. The consolidation that King Henry VIII and his advisors had in mind, soon involved the government in an effort to expand the area of English influence in Ireland beyond its traditional boundaries, sometimes by military force, and at other times by persuasive methods backed by force. The advances made into previously Gaelic or Gaelicized areas were taken initially to promote the security of the Anglicized community in Ireland, and the strategy begun in Henry's reign was persisted with during the reigns of his two immediate successors, Edward VI and Mary I. Efforts were made at the same time to procure the allegiance of the loyal community in Ireland to the form of church doctrine favoured by each of these monarchs, but the fact that the forward political thrust persisted regardless of the religion of the monarch makes it clear that it was independent of religious considerations.[8]

While the purpose behind the government's actions was to stabilize the position of the English community in Ireland, each new advance produced an unforseen outcome or complication. This occurred because the monarchs, and the English-born people they appointed in control of Irish affairs, knew little about the country or its society. Ignorance was no bar to initiative however, and when repeated efforts failed to insulate the traditionally loyal areas from Gaelic assault by surrounding them with a chain of fortified garrisons, the officials in Dublin became increasingly fixed upon the view that the only

[8] ELLIS, Tudor Ireland, pp. 85-110, 183-277.

solution to the continuing instability was to establish English government authority everywhere in Ireland.[9]

This statement of purpose was consistent with what the English population in the country had always been seeking. Yet when it was advocated by the officials, it did not elicit any enthusiastic response from the leaders of that community. This coldness or even hostility towards the new aggressive forward policy can be explained by a variety of factors. First, the loyal community resented the fact that most senior positions in the government and also in the church were now being assigned to people born in England rather than, as previously, to candidates from within the English community of Ireland. Another development which alienated the loyal community from crown policy was the increasing reliance of the governors upon the royal army and its officers rather than upon the Irish Council and Parliament. Wages for the crown troops were paid in England, but governors were devising ever more complex strategies to compel the loyal community to meet the principal costs of maintaining the troops once they had arrived in Ireland.[10] There was thus also a fiscal issue which divided the loyal community in Ireland from its government, but the issue which ultimately polarized the two English elements in Ireland was religious in nature.

The government, as we saw, did expect the English community in Ireland to follow its wishes in matters of religion, but its preoccupation with political matters left it with little opportunity to promote a sustained evangelization drive among the English population in the country. This neglect meant that this population, despite the occasional conformity of some of its leaders, remained essentially Catholic at a time when society in England was becoming increasingly Protestant in its commitment. The consequences of this divergence in religious allegiance became more evident from the mid-1560s forward, and already by the late 1570s it was being stated openly by English

[9] R. LOEBER, The Geography and Practice of English Colonisation in Ireland from 1534 to 1609, Athlone 1991; CANNY, Elizabethan Conquest (above n. 2).

[10] BRADY, Conservative subversives (above n. 7).

Protestant officials in Ireland that the presumed loyal population was neither English nor loyal. A distinction was increasingly drawn by the officials between the English-by-birth and the English-by-blood, and they soon moved to cast doubt on the Englishness of the English Irish.[11] Such distinctions were with the purpose of accentuating their point that the only true subjects of the Crown were those who were both committed Protestants and born in England. All others, whatever their professions of loyalty, it was alleged, had degenerated from the civility of their progenitors, and were a threat to the security of the English Crown and its position in Ireland because of their persistent attachment to Catholicism.[12] This argument which was designed by English-born officials and soldiers in Ireland to discredit their principal critics and rivals for patronage, received a sympathetic hearing from senior officials in London. They, like their subordinates in Ireland, had come to equate civility with Englishness, but had also come to identify allegiance to Protestantism as one of the essential conditions of being English and civil. The initial hope of the officials in London was to advance the Englishness of Ireland, in the same way as had been done in England and Wales, through the establishment of provincial Councils that would promote and uphold the authority of the central government in the outlying regions.[13] Such instruments seemed inadequate to the purpose however as tension mounted between England and Spain, and when first the Papacy and then the Spanish monarchy provided moral encouragement and military support to those in Ireland who would challenge the Queen's authority on the grounds that she was a heretic to whom no Catholic subject should owe allegiance. And a further reason for associating Catholicism with disloyalty emerged at this time because many of the more Anglicized families in Ireland began to send their

[11] CANNY, Old English elite (above n. 5); ELLIS, Tudor Ireland (above n. 7), pp. 245-248.

[12] N. CANNY, Identity formation in Ireland: the emergence of the Anglo-Irish, in: N. CANNY, A. PAGDEN (eds.), Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800, Princeton (N.J.) 1987, 159-212, esp. pp. 161-175.

[13] CANNY, Elizabethan Conquest (above n. 2), pp. 93-116.

sons to Continental Europe for education as priests in Catholic seminaries that were closely identified with the more extreme political pronouncements of the Counter-Reformation.[14] Queen Elizabeth herself was alarmed by these developments and incensed by all challenges to her authority that were justified on religious grounds. This moved her to approve military intervention in Ireland which escalated to the point where it became the most expensive undertaking of the Tudor state. When doing so, however, she never acknowledged that what she was about was the comprehensive conquest of the country, but her officials in Ireland and her officers in the field believed that the achievement of such a conquest should become their objective.[15]

Those who thought in this way and who worked towards this objective were clearly inspired by such authors as Edmund Spenser and Sir John Davies, who were themselves officials in Ireland and who set down coherently argued statements in favour of the Anglicization of Ireland.[16] Such statements, in so far as they recommended a conquest of the country which would ultimately open the way for the introduction of English legal procedures and land tenure into the previously Gaelic areas of the country, were consistent with traditional medieval policy of the Anglo-Normans. Significantly also they drew heavily upon what Giraldus Cambrensis had had to say about Gaelic society as a justification for their recommendations.

However, these authors departed significantly from Giraldus and those who followed in his tradition in several respects, and it is these differences which made their contributions original. Their first major departure from the medieval writers is that they rejected the supposition that the existing English

[14] H. HAMMERSTEIN, Aspects of the Continental education of Irish students in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, in: T. D. WILLIAMS (ed.), Historical Studies. Papers read before The Irish Conference of Historians, VIII, Dublin 1971, pp. 137-153; N. CANNY, From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland 1534-1660, Dublin 1987, esp. pp. 152-159.

[15] CANNY, Reformation, pp. 108-167.

[16] E. SPENSER, A View of the present state of Ireland, 1596, ed. W. L. RENWICK, Oxford 1970; Sir John DAVIES, A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was Never entirely Subdued, . . . until the Begining of His Majesty's Happy Reign, London 1612.

population in the country should serve as the instruments of reform and Anglicization. This was now utterly rejected because it was argued that the Anglo-Normans had not themselves been a fully civil people at the point of the original conquest, and that their descendants had further degenerated through their association with the Gaelic population. The issue of degeneration which had been of such concern to the Anglicized community was now being turned against themselves and in two respects. Now it was being argued that degeneration from civil standards was inevitable whenever a civil people were placed in close proximity to a barbaric order, and it was being further stated that a civil people who thus degenerated made more formidable enemies than pristine barbarians such as the Gaelic Irish. Following upon this the English-born writers questioned the possibility of recalling those who had lapsed from civil standards or preventing further degeneration through statutory law. Whenever this was done, contended Spenser, English law became a weapon in the hands of those who were inveterate enemies of the Crown, and was used to counter the interests of the Crown. What was required he said (and most of his English contemporaries in Ireland agreed with him) was a conquest of the country which would displace all who held power and influence in Ireland, whether Old English who had become tainted by their associations with barbarism or Gaelic Irish who, it was contended, were Scythian in origin.[17]

This overthrow of the existing political and social order which was recommended by the theorists was with the purpose of erecting a new one which would meet with the highest standards of civility. These standards were clearly to be English ones, and the instruments of promoting them were to be zealous English Protestants who were to be placed in charge of the government of Ireland, and who were to be established as landowners and leaders of their localities in all parts of the country. Aided by the soldiers, who would remain in the country after the conquest had been accomplished, these officials and proprietors would break up and disperse the existing

[17] SPENSER, View, pp. 21-37.

kinship networks in the country, and re-settle the indigenous population on lands which they would hold from themselves. There they would reside in close proximity to the farming and artisan population from England, who were regarded as an essential element of each plantation that was to be established. The role of these settlers was to provide an example to the native population on how the land could be improved, and on how to make best use of the resources of the country. To this extent they were to have an educational as well as an economic function, but the formal educational role was to be left to the schoolmasters in the series of parochial and grammar schools that were to be endowed out of confiscated property and to the Protestant clergy who were to be similarly supported.[18] The only consistent issue in contention between those who advocated such comprehensive schemes of reform was the extent to which use should be made of the Irish language in this educational and evangelization drive. Some, such as Sir William Herbert, suggested that the educators should learn the Irish language and compose suitable instruction manuals and hymns in that language for the schooling of the Irish population. Spenser, on the other hand, contended that the formal educational and evangelization effort would have to wait until the Irish population had become conversant in the English language through their interaction with the settler population.[19] All were agreed, however, that the end purpose was to draw the Irish to a civil condition and to the Protestant faith, and they looked forward with Sir John Davies to the prospect that the next generation of the Irish would "in tongue, and heart and every way else become English so there would be no difference or distinction but the Irish sea betwixt us".[20]

While Davies, when writing this in 1612, was optimistic that this objective was attainable, he was so only because a programme for promoting a large plantation in Ulster had just been put in place. Moreover, he believed, that this

[18] Ibid., pp. 161-163.

[19] Sir William HERBERT, Croftus Sive de Hibernia Liber, ed. and trans. A. KEAVENEY and J. A. MADDEN, Dublin 1922, pp. 105-117.

[20] Sir John DAVIES, Discovery (above n. 16), p. 272.

would serve as a preliminary to further plantations which would result in the gradual, but, none the less, systematic dispossession of Catholic proprietors in the other three provinces. This, he felt certain, was now attainable because of the comprehensive nature of the military victory that had been achieved by the forces of the Crown, over all opponents, in 1603. Furthermore, Davies was satisfied that a massive reallocation of property in Ireland could be given full legal sanction because he proposed to achieve a Protestant majority in the Irish Parliament by reducing the level of representation from the Old English areas while increasing that from the parts of Ireland that had recently been planted. The concern of Davies with legal niceties suggests that he was more moderate than Spenser, but we now know, from the study by Hans Pawlisch of Davies' career in Ireland, that Davies was seeking to employ the Civil and Common Law in the same way that Spenser would have used the weapons of war to achieve the same objective, which was to make society in Ireland a replica of that in England.[21]

The advancement of such a policy, if it had been pursued, would certainly constitute a major theme of any "new British History" that might be written. The subject would have every claim to be described as British because the objective of the reformers was to impose the standards and religion of the dominant kingdom - England - upon one of the lesser ones - Ireland -, and because they, or at least Davies, could countenance the idea of enlisting the support of Scottish Protestants in the fulfilment of this task. The subject would also meet any definition of Britishness because the method of promoting change through plantation in Ireland was quite similar to that favoured by King James VI of Scotland, before he became King also of England and Ireland, for bringing the more remote regions of his Scottish kingdom under the control of his government at Edinburgh. And the strongest claim of the subject to be included within any agenda for British History is because authors such as Spenser and Davies contended that the security of England (and

[21] H. S. PAWLISCH, Sir John Davies and the Conquest of Ireland: A Study in Legal Imperialism, Cambridge 1985.

implicitly that of Scotland also) was reliant upon the implementation of the reform programmes which they elaborated in such detail. Such authors advanced theological and strategic arguments to support this proposition, but their essential argument was that any attempt by a single monarch to sustain religious diversity within a plurality of kingdoms was certain to end in calamity. In so far as there was a high-minded motive behind the composition of reform literature on Ireland it was to draw attention to this anomaly and to advance the case for the Anglicization of Ireland which the various authors believed was the only measure to prevent catastrophy descending upon all three kingdoms.

The logic of the position adopted by those English officials who advocated the promotion of the Anglicization of Ireland through a process of colonization was, for the most part, ignored by senior officials of the London administration, and was officially endorsed only at moments of political crisis. This, as I have previously argued, was because officials in London could never bring themselves to give a high priority to Irish affairs other than when the collapse of authority there threatened the security of England itself.[22] Because of the short-sightedness of these senior officials many historians have also come to believe that resort to colonization was exceptional in England's dealings with Ireland during the seventeenth century. Such historians, with Hiram Morgan as the most recent recruit to their ranks, seem to think that simply because a continuing process of colonization for Ireland was not endorsed by the London government, this policy was abandoned. In support of their claim for its abandonment, they point to the establishment of English-style legal institutions and procedures throughout Ireland from the beginning of the seventeenth-century forward, and to the extension of parliamentary representation in Ireland to include all elements of the population. Here, in this similarity of institutions and procedures, they claim, is the reason why the two jurisdictions of England and Ireland should be considered part of the same British polity. Furthermore, these historians seem convinced that the Irish

[22] CANNY, Reformation (above n. 14), pp. 108-187.

Catholic élite who endured into the seventeenth century, were so conscious of the benefits to themselves of English constitutional procedures that they became discontented, and even resorted to revolt, whenever their rights and liberties as subjects of the Crown were threatened or infringed upon. According to this definition British History is constitutional history, and Ireland's place within a British polity is justified by the involvement of the population there with English-style constitutional procedures.[23]

Those historians who are attached to this view have been especially attracted to the politics of the Old English in Ireland during the first half of the seventeenth century, and to the confrontation that developed between them and Thomas Wentworth who served as governor in Ireland 1633-1641. The Old English, according to this interpretation of events, were strict constitutionalists while Wentworth represented the absolutist trend in English monarchical government, which threatened the liberties of subjects in England no less than in Ireland. What Wentworth was about in Ireland, it is said, was a preliminary to what he would have had the king attempt in England, and, on this basis, developments in Ireland are invoked as a major contributory factor to the heightening of tensions between the supporters of King and Parliament in England itself.[24]

The work of those historians who perceive the years that Wentworth spent in Ireland as an interruption upon a prolonged period of constitutional rule has been disturbed somewhat by the recent work of Hans Pawlisch.[25] This demonstrates how English legal forms and procedures could be used to promote what was in effect a policy of exploitation aimed at the dispossession of all Catholic proprietors in Ireland. If we accept what Pawlisch has to say about the service of Sir John Davies and his master Sir Arthur Chichester in Ireland then we are forced to conclude that normal constitutional relations

[23] H. MORGAN, Mid-Atlantic Blues, in: The Irish Review 11 (1991-1992), pp. 50-55.

[24] A. CLARKE, The Old English in Ireland, 1625-1642, London 1966; KEARNEY, Strafford in Ireland (above n. 2).

[25] PAWLISCH, Davies and the Conquest (above n. 21).

between the English monarch and his Irish Catholic subjects were developed only during the years 1622-1629, when the deputyship was held by Henry Cary, Viscount Falkland. Even then it emerges that the concessions and assurances to the Irish Catholic élite that were conceded first by King James I and later by King Charles I were wrung from them, first because they wished to improve their own relations with Catholic monarchs on the Continent, and second because the government was fearful that Irish Catholics would engage in disturbances at a time when England was at war with Spain. These promises made by the monarchs to their Catholic subjects were, however, stridently resisted by all Protestant interests in Ireland, including most members of the administration, and were regarded with suspicion by many members of the English political nation. This suggests that it was factors of expediency rather than any change of heart which explains why Irish Catholics were able to participate more openly in the constitutional process during the late 1620s and why they could look forward to being treated as equals with any other of the king's subjects. While the expectations of Irish Catholics were thus raised it was never accepted by the King's Protestant subjects in any of the three kingdoms that Catholics should be treated equally with Protestants, and a great number of Protestants believed fervently that the very existence of Catholic landowners constituted a threat to the security of the state.[26]

When account is taken of this reality it appears that any measures taken by Wentworth to counter the promises made by the monarchy to Irish Catholics would have been welcomed by Protestants in the three kingdoms. Wentworth's offence in the eyes of Protestants was not that of curtailing the liberties of Catholics, but in his moving at the same time to reduce the power and influence of Protestant landowners in Ireland. And his greatest offence of all was in organizing an army in Ireland, which included Catholic officers and men, to assist the king in his effort to bring his recalcitrant subjects in Scotland to heel. It was only at this point that Protestants of the three

[26] CLARKE, Old English (above n. 24), pp. 28-59.

kingdoms began to express sympathy for the way in which Irish Catholics had been treated by him, but then only for the purely cynical purpose of broadening the spread of opposition to Wentworth so that he could be more easily destroyed.[27]

These developments, which have been studied in detail by a succession of historians, only came to the fore however towards the end of Wentworth's service in Ireland, and they served to draw him away from an agenda that he had set himself almost from the moment that he had taken up office in the country. During these years Wentworth had been working assiduously to re-fashion Irish society in a manner that would have pleased the theorists who, long before then, had advocated the Anglicization of Ireland through a process of colonization. These endeavours of Wentworth have however escaped the attention of historians and for two reasons: first because they have become obsessed with discerning the causes of the English Civil War and the Irish contribution to that disturbance, and second because Wentworth proceeded with such stealth that even his senior officials in government (and the King) did not know the objectives to which he was working. While Wentworth was careful to conceal his purpose when he spoke and acted on the public stage, he could be very explicit about his objectives when corresponding with his confidants in England such as Archbishop Laud and Secretary Coke. A close study of Wentworth's papers also reveals what might have inspired him to strive after the particular set of objectives he set before himself. One point that emerges clearly from his private correspondence is that he saw himself as a reforming governor with a specific reform agenda to fulfill in a relatively short space of time. How long he gave himself to implement his programme is not clear, but he did insist on several occasions that he intended to return to England after his work in Ireland was accomplished. As early as 1633, in the course of advising Laud on why young rather than elderly clergymen

[27] N. CANNY, The Upstart Earl: the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, First Earl of Cork, Cambridge 1982, pp. 1-40; IDEM, Reformation (above n. 14), pp. 188-206.

should be encouraged to take up positions in the church in Ireland, he pointed out that settled clergymen "of parts" would be "loath to come to bury themselves here in Ireland in their old age" whereas young, vigorous men, aged between 35 and 45, would willingly "bestow part of their travail and watches upon us . . . if in the hope to be then called back". In this respect, wrote Wentworth, "I judge the clergy by the laity for this is, in my own walk, my own desire". There could be no clearer statement that Wentworth saw himself (if we might use the phrase of Ciaran Brady) as a "programmatic governor" and the programme which he set before himself was that of assisting the clergy in their effort to achieve "the reformation of this church". This objective, as Wentworth himself stated, was a "vast . . . work", but he was confident that it was attainable "in good time" with the assistance of God, the king and Archbishop Laud.[28]

By the reformation of the church, as we shall see, Wentworth meant the conversion of all elements of the population, Catholic as well as Protestant, to the form of Protestant worship that was favoured by the king and Archbishop Laud. Before he could proceed with this ultimate objective, Wentworth had to ensure that the church was adequately endowed to provide livings for the Protestant clergy that he wished to have appointed, and that sufficient controls were in place to ensure that these clergy would observe the theological and liturgical rulings that were decreed by the king. On the question of endowment Wentworth discovered that an enormous amount of land that should have rightfully belonged to the church had fallen into the control and use of landed proprietors, Protestant as well as Catholic. To remedy this situation Wentworth, operating through an executive tribunal, had these landowners called to account and diverted of this property.[29]

---

[28] Wentworth to Laud, 9 Sept. 1633 (SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 8, f. 17). On programmatic governors see C. BRADY, Court, castle and country: the framework of government in Tudor Ireland, in: C. BRADY, R. GILLESPIE (eds.), Natives and Newcomers: the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641, Dublin 1986, pp. 22-49.

[29] KEARNEY, Strafford (above n. 2), esp. pp. 69-84.

Then once these first steps had been taken to improve the endowment of the church, Wentworth could give thought to the recruitment of clergy in England to serve in the various Irish dioceses. Some of these were to be appointed to positions that had previously lain vacant because of the inadequacy of the livings attached to the parishes. More, however, were to take the places of serving Protestant clergy who were to be dismissed from their positions either because of scandalous behaviour or because they were not of sound doctrine. To facilitate these removals Wentworth commissioned an investigation into the condition of the various Irish diocese. Those investigations which were of principal concern to him were the Ulster dioceses where he discovered that, not only many of the clergy, but the church-wardens and "preaching scoolmasters" were "desperate non conformists" from Scotland.[30] Such people, who favoured Calvinist doctrine and a Presbyterian mode of church organization, were as offensive to Wentworth in Ireland as they were to Laud in England, and he complained to Laud, in words that would have been familiar to the Archbishop, of how troubled he was "to see all government, order and decency in this our church trodden down to dirt and nothing appearing but a half face of something like an Annanias".[31] The aesthetic offence was compounded with a political one when the leaders of this Calvinist group began to identify with the Covenanters who stood against the king's effort to impose an Anglican form of Protestant worship upon Scotland. Wentworth sought to forestall the spread of such defiance into Ireland by obliging Scottish settlers in Ulster to take an oath that they would not make common cause with the Scottish Covenanters. This measure, which earned Wentworth the enduring hatred of godly Protestants in the three kingdoms, was consistent with his endeavour to promote a revision in the official doctrine of the Church of Ireland. The existing formulation of doctrine did not satisfy Wentworth because it made too many concessions to Calvinism, and

[30] Henry, Bishop of Down, to Wentworth, 18 Oct. 1638, SCL, Strafford Papers, vol. 20, b, no. 134.

[31] Wentworth to Laud, 28 Aug. 1633, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 8, f. 13.

he proceeded to bring Irish church doctrine into line with those recently recommended by Archbishop Laud for the church in England.[32]

This effort by Wentworth to consolidate the position of the Protestant church and to establish it on sound doctrinal basis was seen by his contemporaries, and by most historians since then, as no more than extending to Ireland the kind of Arminian church settlement that was being imposed by Laud and King Charles upon England and Scotland. It was certainly that, but the consolidation of the position of the church in Ireland was considered by Wentworth as the essential pre-requisite to his moving to win, or force, the compliance of the Catholic population in Ireland with the Church established by law. While this preliminary work was underway, Wentworth saw little point in disturbing or harassing Catholics, and he saw considerable merit in conceding a *de facto* right of worship to Catholics so that they would never suspect his greater purpose. While thus concealing his hand from public view, Wentworth made clear his detestation of Catholicism to his correspondents in England while in Ireland he moved gradually but systematically to undermine the position of Catholic landowners who were the bulwark of the Catholic clergy. Because of the stealth with which he moved, neither Catholics nor Protestants recognized the full sweep of what he intended, nor for that matter have historians who have studied Wentworth's career in Ireland.

On those occasions when Wentworth revealed his true feelings about Catholicism he did so in a virulent fashion. The claim being made by the Old English for favourable treatment, out of consideration for their long record of loyalty to the Crown, made no impression upon Wentworth. "They set forth," he said, "how they and their ancestors have at all times been faithful subjects, and yet in a manner the whole country hath been within memory in actual rebellion".[33] And, as he looked to the future, he expected no better. Writing in 1636, Wentworth warned that until the Old English were "brought to a

[32] A. FORD, The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641, Frankfurt a.M. 1985, pp. 243-276.

[33] Wentworth to Coke, n. d., SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 9, f. 177.

conformity in religion, the Crown of England may not in wisdom repose any confidence in them". In that same letter he inferred that the political endeavours of the Old English were acting as an obstacle to the efforts being made to being "the natives . . . into the paths of civility", with the result that these natives might still "be accounted animals, mean betwixt rationals and brutes, than men". The way in which the Old English were impeding the civilizing process was by providing protection and patronage for friars and Jesuits. It was Wentworth's ultimate intention to have such clergy expelled from the country, and while, in 1636, he did not consider it opportune to remove them he gave an assurance that when the time was right he would "take all speed and courage in the execution".[34]

The reason why Wentworth wished, in 1636, to delay his proposed onslaught against the Catholic clergy was because he was then pushing ahead with a plantation in the province of Connacht and County Clare. The vast bulk of the land in this area west of the river Shannon was in the possession of Catholics, most of whom could not produce titles which were good in law for the estates which they occupied. Spokesmen for Protestant interest in Ireland had repeatedly called upon the government to remove these proprietors and to establish a plantation along the lines of what had been implemented in the provinces of Munster and Ulster. However, the lobbying of Irish Catholics during that critical juncture of the mid-1620s had earned the proprietors in Connacht a reprieve from plantation under the terms of the Graces conceded to them in 1628 by King Charles I. In return for a series of substantial payments to the king, the landowners were assured that they would be granted full legal title to their properties under an act to be processed through the Irish Parliament. The promised Parliament was never convened and the act never passed, and when Wentworth did assemble the first of his Irish Parliaments in 1634, he made it clear that he intended both to disregard the promises made by the king and to proceed with a plantation. When doing so he was warned

[34] Wentworth to Coke, 6 July 1636, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 9, f. 53.

that his "severity may disaffect that people and dispose them to call the Irish regiments forth of Flanders to their assistance".[35]

This reminder of the dangers associated with his work may have further convinced Wentworth that he should refrain from taking action against Catholic priests until he had first brought their patrons under firm government control. This, as he saw it, could best be done through plantation, and the kind of plantation which he visualized for Connacht was similar to that which had been implemented in North County Wexford during the 1610s. Under such a scheme the occupants who did not have good title to their estates would forfeit everything to the Crown but would receive back the equivalent of three quarters of their property with a secure title. This, however, would be on the tenure of knight service which would provide a regular income to the Crown, and would make it possible for the government to require the grantees and their heirs to take the oath of supremacy. If applied rigidly this would ensure that all native proprietors in Connacht would be forced to conform in religion. Even more important for Wentworth was the fact that one quarter of the land in Connacht would become available to English-born Protestant proprietors who would become the basis for government support in the province. When this final element was in place Wentworth was satisfied that he would have a scheme which would advance "the service of the Crown, the increase of religion and the future peace and safety of the kingdom".[36]

What Wentworth meant by the service of the Crown was obviously the enhancement to the revenue and patronage of the Crown that would follow from the plantation, and he advised specifically that the king should apply "the benefit of those plantations to the Crown" and not leave "them open as a prey

[35] Wentworth to King Charles, 10 Sept. 1636, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 3, f. 262.

[36] A New History of Ireland, vol. III, Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691, eds. T. W. MOODY et al., Oxford 1976, pp. 219-222; Wentworth to Coke, 7 Apr. 1635, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 9, f. 6.

to every pretender".[37] The increase in religion would follow because, as he described County Galway which was to be included within the scheme, "the people there" were "in a manner wholly popish and Irish, not a Protestant and Englishman of note in the whole county [and] extremely addicted in their affections to Spain".[38] Plantation would thus be beneficial to true religion because it would both weaken those who were "unsound and rotten at the heart" and provide the government with the opportunity to "line them thoroughly with English and Protestants".[39] The enhancement to the security of the realm that would derive from plantation was implicit in Wentworth's condemnation of the Catholicism of the Irish in Connacht. However, besides being "the likeliest and most open [area] to an invasion", Connacht was also a region where the subjects were greatly dependent on their lords. Such dependency would obviously be shattered by the plantation scheme which Wentworth envisaged, because the socially dominant group in the province would now be the freshly-established English Protestant proprietors. Their influence would also bring an end to "the power which the popish clergy have with the people there".[40]

These arguments advanced by Wentworth to justify a plantation in Connacht suggest that his policies were being shaped by the theorists who had argued how Ireland could best be Anglicized. Like the theorists Wentworth believed that with the policy of plantation "lay a principal means of the security and flourishing of this kingdom in religion, peace, civility and trades". Civil improvement would accrue because the Irish, as well as being papist, (or

[37] Wentworth to Windebanke, 27 Nov. 1637, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, f. 22.

[38] Wentworth and Council to Coke, 9 July 1639, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, f. 249.

[39] Wentworth to King Charles, 10 Sept. 1636, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 3, f. 262.

[40] Considerations if King Charles declared war on Austria, n. d., SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 3, f. 283; Wentworth and Council to Coke, n. d., ibid., Letter Book 11a, f. 249.

perhaps because of it) were addicted to "idleness and want of manufacture".[41] The settlement of English in their midst would obviously provide an immediate remedy for this social deficiency, but Wentworth also apparently accepted the notion that the Irish would be reformed by the example of the civil living of the settlers once plantation had taken place. And, in a passage reminiscent of the most blatant special pleadings of the theorists, Wentworth explained how the loss of one quarter of their lands would be to the long-term material benefit of the Connacht landowners because:[42] "These three parts remaining will after this settlement be better and more valuable to them than the former four parts . . . as well in regard of the benefit they shall have by the plantation as of the security and settlement they shall gain in their estates."

Almost as if to show that such arguments about the civil benefits that would derive from plantation were not mere rhetoric, Wentworth went into considerable detail in describing his own efforts to establish a plantation in O'Byrnes country in County Wicklow at the same time that the larger plantation in the west of Ireland was being negotiated. His intention was to make his own endeavours in Wicklow "an example for those of the other plantation now on foot", and "a perfect work . . . for posterity". Earlier efforts by the English at building in Wicklow, such as the construction of Cary's Fort, were to be superceded by his own fort and lodge at Cosha, and those English who had already settled in Wicklow were to be compelled to invest in similar buildings.[43] Then, on the more specifically material side, Wentworth commissioned detailed "directions for Establishing a Plantation in Ireland". This document, sixty pages in length, outlines projects for the processing of timber and the erection of an ironworks at Arklow. To this purpose skilled workers were to be recruited from England, and the document

[41] Wentworth and Council to Coke, n. d., SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, f. 249.

[42] Report of Wentworth and the Connacht Commissioners, 30 Nov. 1637, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, ff. 30-31.

[43] Wentworth to Coke, 29 Aug. 1636, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, f. 125.

showed how "men of mystery" such as bellow-makers, founders, furnace men, and hammer men could be attracted to Ireland for half the wages they could command in England because they would be assigned farms of land on Wentworth's estate in Wicklow. Their efforts would, in time, leave ground open to arable farming, after trees and roots had been removed, and the document explained that masons and millers would then be required to facilitate the establishment of a permanent civil society.[44]

While thus providing a practical insight into what he himself believed could be achieved through plantation, Wentworth also alluded to what had already been accomplished in Ireland. In passing through the planted lands in Munster, between Clonmel and Limerick, Wentworth described it as "a country upon my faith . . . as well husbanded, built, and peopled as you are in England". The "industrious and well-conditioned" appearance was, he contended, due directly to plantation and he warned that "unless by this means we be able to invite the English, flatter not yourselves with the hope of any lasting good from this kingdom".[45] Wentworth had similar favourable comments to make about Ulster, despite his reservations about the religious leanings of the Scots. Writing in 1639, he expressed concern that there were "one hundred thousand at least of the Scottish nation" settled in Ireland, but he still believed that they could be made useful if "a good hand" was held over them to prevent them from joining the Covenanters.[46] Because of their potential, Scots were considered by Wentworth to be better subjects than Irish Catholics. However, his favourable impressions on the plantation in Ulster were formed because many of the grantees had been English, and he was concerned that none of the English grantees should be deprived of their estates simply because they had not fulfilled their plantation conditions. In this respect he moved to halt a

[44] Directions for establishing a plantation in Ireland, n. d., SCL, Strafford Papers, vol. 34.

[45] Wentworth to Lord Viscount Conway, 21 Aug. 1637, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 10a, f. 44; Wentworth to Laud, 16 Aug. 1637, ibid., Letter Book 7, ff. 40-41.

[46] Wentworth to Vane, 14 May 1639, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 10b, ff. 76-77.

possible re-plantation in the one county in Ulster that had been planted by the London merchant companies. To do so, he asserted, would have been altogether out of keeping with the "crime" they had committed and would take no account of the more important consideration that they had "settled themselves there *bona fides* upon valuable considerations, and by their charge and industry exceedingly improved those lands above what they were at their entry". Any move to dispossess the Londoners, he said, would discourage "all other planters through the whole realm" and would "so dishearten the English from bestowing themselves on this side as will be to the prejudice of the Crown many thousands in the future plantations".[47]

On this occasion Wentworth significantly referred to his plantation plans in the plural, and the contrasts which he developed between those areas which had been planted and those which remained in Catholic possession was designed to strengthen his case for a comprehensive plantation of all property remaining in Catholic possession. Even as the juries were proving crown title to lands in Connacht and Clare, Wentworth was secretly setting the wheels in motion for a plantation of the Lordship of Ormond in counties Tipperary and Kilkenny. And as the Connacht jurors clinched the case for the Crown by proving that the province could be claimed as the "ancient inheritance of the Crown" Wentworth concluded that the Old English lawyers "within the Pale" who had contested the crown title would "begin now to find his Majesty hath the same title to a great part of Meath which he hath to Connacht, and that many other pieces amongst them also are upon older, fair and just claims subject to plantation".[48] The private investigations which Wentworth set afoot showed that where crown title to Connacht could be proven by tracing ownership backwards to the original conquest of the province by the de Burgos, crown title to much of Munster could similarly be proven by tracing

[47] Wentworth to Cottington, 8 Dec. 1638, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 10b, ff. 22-24; Wentworth to Laud, 3 Nov. 1638, ibid., Letter Book 7, f. 134.

[48] Report of Wentworth and the Connacht commissioners, 30 Nov. 1637, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, ff. 30-31; Wentworth to [Coke?], 9 Nov. 1635, ibid., Letter Book 9, f. 103.

lineages backwards to the Norman conquest of Robert FitzStephen. Thus, in his opinion, most of the lands of Munster that had not been included within the Elizabethan plantation in that province and that still remained in Catholic possession were now liable to confiscation. Similarly for the province of Ulster, Wentworth was able to justify the seizure of Upper and Lower Iveagh in County Monaghan by making reference to the Irish parliamentary act of 11th Elizabeth which had declared the entire Lordship of Tyrone confiscate the Crown. And more generally Wentworth's agents compiled a "book" of minor holdings in Catholic possession in various parts of the country which could now be seized either because previous owners had once committed treason or because the lands had been ecclesiastical property.[49]

It is only when these various references are pieced together that we come to appreciate that what Wentworth referred to as "the great work of Plantations" was not the plantation of Connacht alone but the re-settlement of almost all land in Ireland that remained in Catholic possession. He did not divulge his full scheme publicly because plantations were "not to be gone about but in time of peace" and a general scheme was likely to arouse unrest. Even what he was attempting in Connacht was, he acknowledged, the cause of "discontentments and grumblings", and we also know from Wentworth that he realized that what he hoped to implement in Ireland was a revolutionary scheme such as would not have been contemplated for England. Writing to Sir Henry Vane and alerting him to disturbances which might result from the plantation in Connacht, he asked him to imagine the effect that a similar "operation", which would deprive every landowner of "a full fourth of all his lands . . . would have with your people in England".[50]

Besides his fear of the tumult that would result from an announcement of a general plantation, there were also practical reasons why Wentworth proceeded

[49] SCL, Strafford Papers, vols. 124/125, nos. 280, 281, 284, 295; ibid., vols. 24/25, no. 275.

[50] Wentworth to ?, n. d., SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 9, f. 206; Wentworth to Vane, 30 May 1639, ibid., Letter Book 10b, f. 77.

cautiously. It was, he said, "impossible to do all at once", and he stated further that "we hold it not fit to embrace more having so much already in our hands".[51] Another reason which dictated caution was the intense lobbying of the Catholic party at court to counter the plantation in Connacht. The most persistent of the lobbyists was the Earl of Clanricard (or St. Albans as Wentworth referred to him, using his English title), and Wentworth used all the resources at his command to prevent Clanricard having his estates in Galway declared exempt from the plantation. Wentworth's real objection, as he made clear to such confidants as Sir Henry Vane and Archbishop Laud, was that the exemption of Clanricard's estates would create a precedent that would be followed in subsequent plantations, thereby defeating his principal purpose of undermining the authority of the Catholic proprietors. He was not able to state this objection to the king because this would have revealed that what he had in mind for Ireland was a general confiscation of Catholic estates. Instead he sought to hold the king to his schemes by promising - quite implausibly - that the plantation of Connacht alone would "shortly . . . pay the debts of the Crown of England" while also making the government of Ireland free of charge to the English Exchequer.[52] When, in due course, the king hearkened to Clanricard's appeal and declared his estates exempt from the proposed plantation, Wentworth remonstrated with Treasurer Vane that a gift by the King of £ 100,000 in ready money to Clanricard would have been preferable to the exemption because of the way in which it had prejudiced "the future plantations".[53]

As it transpired none of the plantations, not even that in Connacht, were proceeded with because, at the moment when Wentworth was about to launch his scheme in Connacht, his energies were suddenly diverted to assist the king with his political difficulties in Scotland and England. What is important,

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] Wentworth to Laud, 9 March 1636, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 6, f. 331; Wentworth to Vane, 9 July 1639, ibid., Letter Book 10b, f. 121; Wentworth to Laud, 9 March 1636, ibid., Letter Book 6, f. 328.

[53] Wentworth to Vane, 9 July 1639, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 10b, f. 120.

however, is the evidence that, before this distraction occurred, Wentworth had decided upon a programme of plantation for Ireland that was as extensive if not as comprehensive as that later implemented by Oliver Cromwell. The differences between the two is that Cromwell and his associates aimed to deprive Catholic landowners of all their estates, where Wentworth believed that Catholics could be permitted to retain three quarters of their property provided they were closely superintended and their lives monitored by the English Protestant proprietors, he wished to introduce on the remaining quarter. Wentworth was more lenient because he believed that Catholic landowners who were placed within this reformed social framework would be compelled, over the course of time, to abandon their religion in favour of Protestantism. The purpose behind his scheme is clear from his willingness to exempt the Connacht estates of both Lord Ranelagh and Sir Charles Coote, who were of English planter stock, from the proposed plantation, and also the estates of the Gaelic, but Protestant, Earl of Thomond in County Clare. Not even Thomond was to be exempt from the supervision of English Protestant proprietors however. On the death of the fourth Earl in 1639, Wentworth immediately recommended that his heir should not continue to enjoy government over County Clare because this had made "them in the nature of Count Palatines [and] gave unto them a greater dependency than in reason of state ought to be afforded to any of the natives of this kingdom".[54] It seems to have been his wish that the existing English settlers in Ireland, and certainly the Scots, should also be made subject to the government of these new proprietors. The Scots required such supervision because of their Calvinist leanings, but Wentworth left no doubt that he lacked confidence in all existing

[54] Wentworth to ?, 22 Apr. 1639, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 11a, f. 227. Dr. Mary O'DOWD in discussing the issue of plantation in Connacht believed that Wentworth wished to grant no exemptions, either to Protestant or Catholic proprietors. It is true that he made such statements, especially when dealing with Clanricard's claims, but the weight of evidence in his own correspondence suggests that he did intend to exempt lands already in Protestant ownership from confiscation. M. O'DOWD, Power, Politics and Land: Early Modern Sligo, 1568-1688, Belfast 1991, p. 54.

Protestant planters and officials in Ireland and believed that they had become corrupt and degenerate because of the lack of proper order and discipline in both church and state before his own arrival in Ireland.[55]

All of this indicates that Wentworth believed that his series of plantations would mark a new beginning in the social and religious reform of the country. The religious reform would have become possible because the plantations and the political re-ordering of the country would have reduced the ability of Catholic landowners to provide patronage and protection to Catholic clergy. The weakening of the authority and independence of Catholic proprietors would also have made it impossible for them to oppose the withdrawal of toleration from the Catholic clergy; and we know from Wentworth himself that he did intend to expel priests from the country at the appropriate time. This time would obviously have been after the plantations had been put into effect, and after the Church of Ireland had been given renewed strength with the recovery of whatever property had been lost to it through lay impropriatorship, and with the appointment of more clergymen and the establishment of firm discipline. The persecution of the Catholic clergy was therefore to coincide with an active missionary effort on the part of Protestant ministers and there seemed good reason to expect that this would succeed because the ministers would have direct access to the common people who previously had been shielded from outside influence by their Catholic lords.

The one element of Wentworth's scheme that was not revealed was the identity of the new proprietors who would be so crucial to the scheme's success. There are several hints in Wentworth's correspondence with his confidants that associates of theirs were pressing for grants of Irish land and Wentworth on a few occasions made reference to proprietors who he thought would not be suitable. One of these was the Duke of Lennox whose secretary, one Mr. Webb, was active in Ireland seeking a grant "for the whole plantation of Connacht". Lennox, together with the Earls of Arundel and Nithsdale, were recommended to Wentworth by the king without response, but Wentworth

[55] CANNY, Upstart Earl (above n. 27), pp. 9-19, 155-159.

seemed more enthusiastic about a brother of Lord Chief Justice Finch who was recommended to him by Cottington. Besides these hints, there are indications that Wentworth had intended to take for himself a large section of the Connacht lands.[56] From these various pieces of information it appears that Wentworth would have preferred as proprietors, English over Scots, and Protestants over Catholics, and that he would have wanted all new landowners to be strong supporters of Crown and church. Where these proprietors were to find appropriate settlers for their estates was an issue to which Wentworth had not given much thought but which he obviously believed would be problematic as we can gather from his sneering observation to Archbishop Laud.[57] "Indeed I have sometimes thought those that go to New England and the other plantations in America might better, by order of the state there, be directed hither where we do in very truth want men exceedingly. But then again when I considered how far most of those people are run out of their wits already I was very well content they should run far."

Even where the details were not worked out, it is clear that Wentworth was working to a plan, and the plan seems to have been based on the theories that had been formulated in Ireland both before and immediately after the Elizabethan conquest of the country. While it is possible to point to parallels between this plan and the schemes formulated by the advocates of aggressive Anglicization it is less easy to establish direct influences. It would, for example, be tempting to suggest that his endeavours in Ireland had been inspired by Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596), but Wentworth never referred to the Spenser text in his writings. However, we can be certain that Wentworth was familiar with Spenser's *View* because the first published edition of the text appeared only in 1633 and was dedicated to Wentworth by Sir James Ware who had edited this version. Moreover, the text

[56] Wentworth to Cottington, 4 Nov. 1633, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 3, f. 32; King Charles to Wentworth, 20 Oct. 1633, ibid., Letter Book 3, f. 39; Cottington to Wentworth, 28 June 1635, ibid., Letter Book 3, f. 214; O'DOWD, Power (above n. 54), esp. pp. 115-119.

[57] Wentworth to Laud, 8 June 1638, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 7, f. 104.

was recommended by Ware as superior to all other works, "a few passages excepted", that treated of the reformation of Ireland.[58] While we can consider Spenser's *View* as a possible influence on Wentworth's thinking, we do know that he set about educating himself on how to proceed with the reform of the country from the moment of his appointment. Already in 1633, he remarked that he was "yet in gathering with all possible circumspection my observations whereupon, what and when to advise a reformation".[59] Part of what he had gathered was a document described as *A survey of the Government of Ireland 1 January 1631/2*, which was an historical sketch of England's involvement with Ireland similar to that provided in Davies' *Discovery*.[60] Another item that has survived among Wentworth's papers is one entitled *The Heads of Such Matters as I conceive do conduce for Advancement of the Crown's revenues and the Certainty and Security of the Better subjects of Ireland.* This anonymous text, like the previous one, devoted much space to a historical narrative but employed it to demonstrate the onset of degeneracy first of the Anglo-Norman settlers and more recently of the Elizabethan settlers in Munster. In both instances degeneracy was attributed to "the immoderate greatness" of those who acquired land in Ireland and who consequently enjoyed excessive authority over "the earth tillers". The most recent in this catalogue of neglect were the undertakers in Munster many of whom had acquired holdings far in excess of the recommended 12,000 acres with the result that "some of the heirs of such undertakers are so degenerate as they have renounced their religion and gone to popery".[61] And a third text surviving among Wentworth's papers, *Butt's Discourse on the state of Ireland*, was also consistent in its arguments with the earlier theorists and pointed to three reasons why the kingdom of Ireland remained in a "most deformed,

---

[58] Preface by Sir James WARE to: E. SPENSER , Esq., A View of the State of Ireland. Written Dialogue Wise between Eudoxus and Irenaeus, Dublin 1633.

[59] Wentworth to Carlisle, 7 Oct. 1633, SCL, Strafford Papers, Letter Book 8, ff. 30-31.

[60] A Survey of the Government of Ireland, 1 Jan. 1631/2, SCL, Strafford Papers, vol. 34.

[61] The Heads of all such Matters, SCL, Strafford Papers, vol. 24/25, no. 142.

desolate and miserable estate". These were, first, "the intolerable, malicious instigations of . . . the Roman clergymen", second, "the common envy and hatred of most all this country nobility, gentry and farmers freeholders (of the Roman succession) against all strangers in general, but more especially against them that are not of their society", and third, "the privileges in all or most of the cities or towns corporate in this kingdom" whereby foreign merchants and tradesmen were excluded. The continuation of the *Discourse* which recommended that Ireland be organized on Protestant lines after the example of the United Provinces would certainly not have met with the approval of Wentworth, because of his strong monarchical preference.[62] However, the general diagnosis would have confirmed him in his opinion that the security of the three kingdoms would only be achieved when Ireland had been thoroughly Anglicized through the process of plantation and re-settlement.

Once account is taken of this direction of Wentworth's policy and its inspiration we can conclude that the government in Ireland during the entire period 1603-1642 was firmly set upon a radical course of Anglicization except for the brief interlude during the 1620s when this was abandoned for tactical reasons. This establishes that those English officials who served in Ireland had come to perceive Irish social conditions as essentially different from those which obtained in England, and had come to see their primary function as that of re-shaping Irish society so that it would conform with English standards. These officials had therefore departed totally from the political philosophy that had obtained up to the first half of the sixteenth century when the purpose of government was considered to be the protection of those in Ireland who owed allegiance to the English Crown. It seems clear from Wentworth's correspondence that many senior officials in London were ready to endorse this newly defined function of government, and it appears from the early years of the seventeenth century that even the monarch, in that case King James, recognized the logic of the drastic course being recommended to him by his representatives in Ireland. However, that monarch's primary concern was with

[62] Butt's Discourse on the State of Ireland, SCL, Strafford Papers, vol. 24/25, no. 141.

establishing himself firmly on the throne of England while maintaining his influence in Scotland, and his occasional enthusiasm for innovation in Ireland was dampened by his concern to make progress in areas of government that were more important to him. Queen Elizabeth, who had preceded him on the English throne, was equally reluctant to give a high priority to Irish affairs, although she had steeled herself to see the war against Tyrone through to the bitter end. Financial considerations go a long way to explaining the Queen's general hesitation to give her approval to extreme measures, but she was also held back by her belief that her primary obligation was to uphold the position of those who professed loyalty to her, even when these refused to be included within the religion of the state. King Charles I shared this same conservatism with Queen Elizabeth, and his officials, including even Wentworth, had to work around him when it came to determining a policy for Ireland. As a consequence, the English government had no official policy where Ireland was concerned, and the absence of such a policy was an essential source of weakness for the monarchy. It was such because it left King Charles seeking to uphold a *status quo* in Ireland at a time when this *status quo* was considered anomalous and threatening by his Protestant subjects in all of the three kingdoms. This leads us to the conclusion that the collapse of the British monarchy occurred not because of the policies that it had pursued by Charles, but because he failed to endorse a scheme of government for Ireland that was considered just and reasonable by the vast majority of the more influential subjects in the three kingdoms. Had he taken the advice that was proferred so liberally by the theorists, and had he given a free hand to Wentworth it is likely that he would have encountered armed opposition from the Catholic landowners in Ireland, possibly supported by Irish soldiers returned from service in Continental Europe. Such an operation would have been formidable but not unsuperable because the king, and Wentworth, in opposing it would have enjoyed the fulsome support of Protestants in England, Scotland and Ireland. A war, the ultimate objective of which was the Anglicization of Ireland, would thus also have contributed to the formation of a coherent British monarchy the previous existence of which was no more than putative.

The fact that the King failed to accept the advice that was offered him meant that he was left with the problem of governing three kingdoms, each of which (and especially Ireland) had a society and a polity that was different from the other two. His attempts (and those of his successors including Oliver Cromwell) to grapple with this problem have been the subject of fruitful investigation by historians, but of equal merit is the historical work which seeks to describe and explain the distinctiveness of each of the three kingdoms. Such work is important because, as will be evident from this paper, the policy-makers of successive British monarchs frequently proceeded as if each kingdom was a self-contained entity, and only occasionally treated the three monarchies as a single political jurisdiction. Further work on the particular is also necessary because the social context was distinctive within each of the kingdoms, and also because those who dominated local society within the kingdoms functioned on at least three levels - within the locality; in national politics, and at court - almost as if each level of power and influence was independent of the other. Continued investigation of the separate jurisdictions is also called for so that we can better understand the very different Continental contacts that were maintained by the several communities in each of the three kingdoms. These contacts with the Continent contributed to and helped sustain the diversity of the three kingdoms, and inspired individuals to engage upon undertakings that would have been beyond their ken had they limited their horizons to the kingdoms of the British monarchy. While thus encouraging further investigation of the particular, I should also emphasize that I am not disparaging what has already been written and what, hopefully, will continue to be written within a broader British context. My concern rather is that excessive emphasis on the British dimension to the history of the three kingdoms will result in people forgetting that the best history is that which addresses problems the solution to which must be pursued in complete disregard of any geographic frontiers.