

duct of the Earl of Ormond, whose indignant letter to the Lord Treasurer, Burleigh (in reply to the Queen's order to seize O'Neill) is recorded by Carte:—"My lord, I will never use treachery to any man; for it would both touch her Highness's honor and my own credit too much; and whosoever gave the Queen advice thus to write is fitter for such base service than I am. Saving my duty to her Majesty, I would I might have revenge by my sword of any man that thus persuaded the Queen to write to me." Ormond acquainted O'Neill with the perfidy designed against him, and told him that if he did not fly that night he was lost, as the false Deputy was drawing a cordon round Dublin. O'Neill made his escape, and prepared to meet the crisis which now he knew to be at hand. "News soon reached him in the north," as Mr. Mitchel recounts, "that large reinforcements were on their way to the Deputy from England, consisting of veteran troops who had fought in Bretagne and Flanders under Sir John Norriss, the most experienced general in Elizabeth's service; and that garrisons were to be forced upon Ballyshannon and Belleek, commanding the passes into Tyrconnell, between Lough Erne and the sea. The strong fortress of Portmore also, on the southern bank of the Blackwater, was to be strengthened and well manned; thus forming, with Newry and Greencastle, a chain of forts across the island, and a basis for future operations against the north."

(To be continued.)

## MONARCHY OR REPUBLIC

(By WALTER O'BRIEN, in the *Catholic Bulletin*.)

In these days when, on the one hand, we hear the rumbling of tottering thrones, and on the other, silly talk about the "divine right of kings," it may not be either uninteresting or uninformative if we inquire into the origin of kingship; but it will take us pretty far afield.

Turning, then, to the inspired Book, we arrive at the 12th chapter of Genesis, or the year A.M. 2084, before we find mention of the word "king," or rather "prince," which is the same thing. We are told how the Ruler of Egypt in those days—he was one of the many Pharaohs—took a fancy to the wife of another man because she happened to be very beautiful and was wishful to make her his own. However, it must be recorded in his defence that he acted under a misapprehension and that he immediately made reparation when he discovered his mistake. History records that Pharaoh has not been without royal imitators in this matter, but that they have not all been so scrupulous or so punctual in making the "amende honorable" for their little peccadilloes. Someone, I think it is Dickens, has cynically remarked that it is the prerogative of kings to govern everything but their passions.

In the 14th chapter of Genesis we read of the expedition of the four "kings" who made war on five other "kings," all of whose names and kingdoms are recorded, and whose numbers are strongly reminiscent of "Quadruple Alliances," and "Entente Powers" of which we hear something in these later and not less bellicose times. But beyond this, who these "kings" were, whether they ascended their thrones by popular acclamation or by right of primogeniture or, what is more likely, by the power of the "mailed fist," we know not, but this we do know, that it was not by "Right Divine," for kings did not come into being among God's own People for many years subsequently—to be exact, about the year A.M. 2908—and who down to that period lived under a Theocracy, that is, God Himself was their Ruler, governing them through Patriarchs and Judges.

But about the time above stated, a change came over the spirit of their dream. Samuel, the last of the race of the Judges, was growing old, and the reins of office were becoming slack in his enfeebled hands, and he recognised this fact himself, and he resigned. Here I might pause to say how very desirable it would be if modern judges and others holding important and responsible positions would take a leaf out of Samuel's book, instead of clinging to "the fleshpots of Egypt," long after they have lost the mental or the physical vigor necessary for the due performance of their work. Failing this voluntary retirement, the desirable consummation should be accomplished by the gentle pressure of legislation.

Samuel resigned, but in doing so he seems to have been guilty of a little bit of nepotism, a sin which has haunted both Church and State from his days to our own. He appointed his two sons jointly to fill the vacant office, but it did not work well. "His sons walked not in his ways, but they turned aside after lucre and took bribes and perverted judgment."

Upon this the people "struck." They said to Samuel: "Behold, thou art old and thy sons walk not in thy ways; make us a King to judge us, as all Nations have."

This suggestion or demand did not meet with Samuel's approval. He was angry, but he prayed to God for guidance, and God replied: "Hearken to the voice of the people in all that they say to thee; they have not rejected thee, but Me, that I should not reign over them." Then He goes on to add: "But testify and foretell to them the rights (i.e., the powers) of the King that shall reign over them." These "rights" would appear to be briefly these: that he would make slaves of their children, that he would take possession of their lands and pass them over to his servants, that he would demand tithes to make him arms and chariots; in a word, that he would crush them and tyrannise over them. Lastly, Samuel, by command of God, prophesied that a day would come when they would cry out against this tyranny, but that God would turn a deaf ear to them because they demanded a king. Notwithstanding this solemn warning, they persisted in their request for a king, and they got him. History records that the experiment did not prove very successful.

Such is the story of the foundation of Monarchy, given almost *verbatim* from the Holy Book; and reading it, we are tempted to quote the trite saying that "history repeats itself." We are told of the restlessness of the people under a form of government which was by no means cruel or oppressive, but was on the contrary undeniably good and paternal, even admitting the excesses of Samuel's sons. We are confronted with nepotism or favoritism; with bribery and corruption. We are even brought face to face with militarism and the crushing taxation which it always brings in its train; and at length, overborne by the strong similitude of it all, we ask ourselves, is the writer speaking of his own century or of ours, for, surely, his words fit the twentieth century like a glove.

We have often been told that war, whether international or internecine, is barbaric, that it is the outcome of a lower standard of morality among the peoples, but that as civilisation and education, culture and refinement advanced, the untamed instincts of man would be brought under better control, that the sword would be turned into a ploughshare and that might would yield to right. This pleasant dream did, indeed, seem to have been almost realised. We had Hague Conventions sitting in solemn conclave, adjusting national claims and smoothing international difficulties. We had even built a superb Peace Palace, where our delegates might pursue their pacific avocation with dignity and ease, so essential for such a work, and all pointed to the fact that the halcyon period had really arrived, when, suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, the blow of an assassin's hand, like the striking of a match in a gas-charged room, awakened men from their dream and blew the Hague Convention and its Peace Palace into eternity, turned Europe, nay, Asia, Africa, and America as well, into one huge camp armed to the teeth, and proved to the day-dreamers that man is ever man, the same in the twentieth century as in the first, that his boasted civilisation is a fraud, a thin veneering, that as, "if you scratch a Russian you find a Tartar," so, also, if you scratch a man you find a savage, especially when he has given himself over to the spirit of materialism and ignored God. All this was strongly emphasised by the barbarous methods, the "frightfulness," adopted in this modern war, which horrified us because it took us by surprise; we had never heard or read of such things, they were the product of modern science, of which we had grown so proud. The Allies, or "Entente Powers," as they are called, cried out, "Behold the 'Hun'!" Yes, it was the "Hun," but not because he is a "Hun," but because he is a man. As far as I can see, "the upper dog" is always cruel, his worst passions are let loose by the smell of blood and run riot; he loses possession of himself, does many things he is only semi-conscious of, and many more he is afterwards thoroughly ashamed of. If you turn over the pages of history I venture to think you will find it has been ever thus, that the "Hun" (whether he be of German or other nationality) has always so acted, gouging out eyes, cutting off ears and noses, and committing other unnameable barbarities and cruelties. Need we do more than recall the French Revolution to prove up to the hilt that at such times men become actually insane and that, reason being dethroned, they are no better than beasts or birds of prey? It is in this way, I think, we may best explain, though not palliate, the persecutions, cruelties, burnings, hangings, and quarterings, etc., whether of Catholics or Protestants, which took place in days gone by in this kingdom and on the Continent, and which now cause our hair to stand on end and our cheeks to burn with shame to think that such crimes could have been perpetrated in the sacred name of religion; but as Lord Macaulay says, "men are found to wade knee-deep in blood in defence of a religion which they desecrate every day of their lives," or, to quote a higher authority, "They will put you out of the synagogues, yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think he doth a service to God."