Saturday direct to the Bishop and making a statement in the Press on Monday to the effect that he had asked the Bishop for an explanation and hoped the public would reserve judgment in the meantime. Such a course would have deprived many people of a great deal of prominence, but would have prevented the storm which has since arisen, and would certainly have been more in accordance with the responsible position the Mayor holds, to say nothing of ordinary fair-play.

Now, gentlemen, having heard the evidence, I ask you to dismiss from your minds as far as possible the aspersions cast upon the Bishop by the Press and by various public bodies, and to judge him only on what you have heard in this Court. Not only have the witnesses for the Crown been severely shaken in cross-examination, but several of them have admitted that the Bishop, when dealing with the Easter Rising and subsequent events, stated that he was reading from a list, and even they must have satisfied you that when his Lordship spoke about the 155 men and women, including three priests, who, during and since 1916, had died for Ireland, he was not referring only to those who were killed in the Rising, and that he referred to the "Black-and-Tans" alone as murderers. Coming to the speech itself, as set out in the indictment, it is common ground that it can be read in little more than three minutes, though it took from twenty to twenty-five minutes in delivery. There are a great many omitted passages which would doubtless have had an explanatory and qualifying effect on what has been reported. Even as it stands, however, the speech unexplained by evidence cannot reasonably be said to bear the damaging inferences which the Crown seeks to draw therefrom. Taking the first paragraph on which the Crown relies, his Lordship early in the speech referred to the numbers of Irish people who had been driven from their homes because their foreign masters did not want the land peopled by Irish men and women, but preferred to make it a cattle ranch for the snobs of the Empire. Here the reference was to a state of things which has long passed away, when the landlords who depopulated the country were literally masters of the people, and as they were in the vast majority of cases absentees, the Bishop aptly described them, and was certainly entitled to refer to them, as foreign masters. Here the Bishop was alluding to an indisputable historical fact—a deplorable fact—but one which belongs to the past. You will remember, however, gentlemen, that he was speaking to an Irish audience on a subject on which the Irish heart feels deeply. It may be difficult for you who are not Irish to understand that feeling. Shakspere says,

> He jests at scars,
> That never felt a wound

I trust, however, Mr. Foreman and gentlemen, you possess sufficient of the dramatic instinct to put yourselves in our place—for I am proud to be of Irish extraction myself—and not only to make allowances, but to feel some sympathy for the sentiment of deep indignation with which they recall the evictions which drove such immense numbers of Irish people from their country, and which accounts in no small measure for the abiding affection which many of their descendants still cherish for the land of their ancestors who suffered such cruel and inexcusable wrongs. Rather less than twenty years ago the Nonconformists in England were engaged in a passive resistance movement, and suffered imprisonment rather than pay taxes for the maintenance of schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. Speaking from his place in the House of Lords in that connection, Lord Rosebery said that, although he could not enter into the feelings of the people who objected to Church schools, that was because he was not a Nonconformist, and he confessed that when he saw people prepared to go to such lengths for conscience' sake, he was bound to say that no civilised Government should subject their conscience to such a strain, and thus he was obliged to respect feelings he did not really share. So, gentlemen, I invite you to regard this particular paragraph in the Bishop's speech, and though you may disagree with some of the words employed, you will readily conclude that they disclose no seditious intent whatever.

My learned friend, the Crown Prosecutor, invites you to take seriously the paragraph in which the Bishop states that Ireland has not got all that she asked for, nor all that her sons died for, but that she had secured an instalment of her freedom and was determined to have the whole. The Bishop has told you that he had here in mind the partition of Ireland and the ultimate inclusion of Ulster, for which the Free State Treaty provides. The vast majority of the people of Ireland share the feeling, and it is absurd to suggest that the view expressed by his Lordship is anything other than that to which any citizen is entitled. The commendation of Mr. de Valera as the man who had carried Ireland thus far, and who would see that the rulers of Ireland were "not duped by England," is also well within the limit of free speech, and is a view which he was entitled to express, though the passage would certainly have been less liable to misinterpretation—more especially as there are critics in this country eager to misinterpret—had the Bishop made it plain that he referred to the Government, not to the people of England. His Irish audience understood what he meant, —indeed, they have too many historical reasons for doing so—and I would remind you that in the last edition of the *Nineteenth Century and After*, Dr. Addison, until recently a colleague of Mr. Lloyd George, denounces him as a prevaricator and an expert in duplicity. I submit to you with confidence that his Lordship or any other citizen is entitled equally with Dr. Addison to question the sincerity of Mr. Lloyd George, and my learned friend can hardly be serious when he invites you to believe that this passage of the indictment is indicative in the slightest degree of seditious intent on the part of the Bishop.

Now gentlemen, I invite you to bear with me while I refer to that portion of the Press report which has given rise to the strongest denunciation. I concede at once that the indictment would be fully justified if the Bishop really spoke as the Press reports him. Assuredly, however, he has abundantly satisfied you—and his own evidence has been fully corroborated by some witnesses for the prosecution—that he did not apply the word, "murdered" in connection with those who were killed in action in the Rising of 1916, and that he used the term only in connection with the "Black-and-Tans," during 1920-21. Here let me state that we cannot recede from our contention that the men and women included in that category were in fact murdered. Speaking from his place in the House of Lords, the Archbishop of Canterbury referred to the work of the "Black-and-Tans" as the devil's work. Mr. Asquith from his place in the House of Commons has charged them with murder, and Mr. Churchill and other Cabinet Ministers have admitted as much. Such being the fact we invite you to agree that the Bishop was entitled to state that the victims of these men were murdered. We confidently invite you to agree, moreover, that he did not refer to those killed in action or to those who died of hunger strike as having been murdered. I am satisfied that in this connection you are abundantly satisfied with his Lordship's evidence, and though you may think that the unhappy fact had better not have been referred to, you will, nevertheless, agree that in speaking of it to an Irish audience, he disclosed no seditious intent and was acting within the exercise of the right of free speech which every citizen possesses. The Crown Prosecutor, however, will nevertheless direct your attention to the reference made to "that glorious Easter," which the Bishop admits using parenthetically, and in that connection I would ask you to bear with me while I direct your attention to a few historical facts in connection with which this reference should be considered. It has been well said by an English publicist that, though the rising occured in Ireland, it was not an Irish rising. In other words, those connected with it were a small number of young men—Sir Philip Gibbs has described them as "dreamers and patriots"—in the city of Dublin. Brave and courageous though they were, I concede that the British Government was bound to employ force to subdue them, and I freely admit it would be unjust to brand all the soldiers who opposed them as murderers. Let me remind you, gentlemen, that the littoral of history is strewn with the wreck of such enterprises. History is replete with the records of acts admittedly illegal, but, nevertheless accounted glorious by posterity. Condemned by their contemporaries, such men soon pass into the martyrology of a nation, and in process of time they become almost deified. Let me give you some instances.

One of the greatest men in English history is John Milton. Certainly he wrote the greatest poem in the language. May I remind you, however, that Milton spent one-third of his life in propagating republican principles, in denouncing monarchy as impious, that he wrote a pamphlet justifying the beheading of Charles? I invite my friend, the Crown Prosecutor, to read the controversy between Salmasius, the Dutch scholar, who regarded Charles as a martyr, and John Milton, who justified his execution on the ground that the people had the right to put a tyrant to death. My friend knows that the execution of Charles was an illegal act, and that Milton risked his liberty and life defending it. To-day, however, the memory of Milton is none the less cherished as that of a great and patriotic Englishman. Again, gentlemen, may I recall the rebellion headed by the Duke of Monmouth in 1685. Monmouth failed, he was taken prisoner, a fugitive, and after vainly seeking mercy from an unnatural uncle, James II, he met the doom of a traitor. We have it on the authority of Macaulay, however, that even in his own day (200 years after Monmouth's death) in that part of England where brave peasants and miners died in Monmouth's cause, the memory of the man is held in reverence by the people, and that English mothers tell their children the story of Monmouth's death. But, gentlemen, I will bring you closer to our own day. You have heard the story of the American Civil War, and doubtless the story of John Brown. John Brown was a visionary and an enthusiast, whose hatred of slavery as an institution amounted to fanaticism, at least so his enemies said. With a handful of men he proclaimed a holy war against slavery. His men were routed, defeated, and slain, and he himself hanged as a traitor amid infuriated enthusiasm. Very soon, however, the public feeling changed; the nation engaged in a death grapple over slavery, and the story of John Brown's deeds and death, in verse, became a veritable battle hymn of freedom during the war:—

> He captured Harper's Ferry, with his nineteen men so few,
> And he frightened old Virginny till she trembled through and through.
> They hung him for a traitor, themselves a traitorous crew,
> But his soul goes marching on.