



Rewarding Learning

eGUIDE//History

Historical Investigations and Interpretations

Unit A2 2

Option 2: Ireland 1685–1714

Content	Page
<u>Introduction</u>	2
1. <u>The Catholicising Policies of James II in Ireland 1685–89</u>	3
2. <u>The Catholicising Policies of James II in England 1685–88</u>	6
3. <u>The Conflict in Ireland 1689–91</u>	14
4. <u>The Results of the Conflict in Ireland 1691–1714</u>	18



Introduction

In this option, students explore the impact on Ireland of the brief reign of James II and the resulting conflict between the Jacobites and Williamites. Students explore the Catholicising policies of the Earl of Tyrconnell that transformed the position of Catholics in Ireland between 1685 and 1688. They examine the tension between Protestants and Catholics, settler and native, that came to a head in 1689 in the Siege of Derry and was fought out on the bloody battlefields of the Boyne and Aughrim. The Treaty of Limerick may have concluded the conflict in Ireland but its terms were to be controversially adapted by the penal laws which helped to secure a Protestant ascendancy in Ireland.

This option is assessed in a written examination lasting two hours 30 minutes. Candidates answer three questions. Question 1 and Question 2 are source-based. Question 3 is an extended essay question. Question 1 (a) tests the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context (A02). As well as assessing A02, Question 1(b) also tests the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance (A01). Question 2 is based on two different historical interpretations. Candidates assess how convincing they find two contrasting historical interpretations of a particular issue or event. Question 2 assesses A03, the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted. In Question 3, which tests A01, candidates assess the extent to which they agree with a particular proposition, using relevant evidence to support their answer.

For ease of consultation, the following study is divided into four sections:

1. The Catholicising Policies of James II in Ireland 1685–89
2. The Catholicising Policies of James II in England 1685–88
3. The Conflict in Ireland 1689–91
4. The Results of the Conflict in Ireland 1691–1714



1. The Catholicising Policies of James II in Ireland 1685–89

The closing years of Charles II's reign showed brighter prospects for Catholics. The Duke of York's influence was rising and rumours increased that Catholics would receive commissions in the Irish army.

In 1684, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Duke of Ormonde was warned of impending changes, but Charles died before he could be recalled. On his accession, James II had taken control of the government from Ormonde and given it to the Lord Justices Granard and Boyle, both of whom were Old English. This worried some Protestants but they were not overly alarmed until it was announced that Richard Talbot would be given command of Ormonde's Horse Regiment.

The 2nd Earl of Clarendon was appointed as Lord Lieutenant in August 1685 to regain Protestant confidence. Irish Catholics had hoped for Richard Talbot who, despite not holding that position, dominated the period from 1686 to February 1687. During this time Talbot replaced Protestants with Catholics as officers in the army, and Catholics also appeared in other areas of administration, such as judges, members of corporations and in the Privy Council. Clarendon did not resist as he believed that the Restoration land settlement would protect Protestant and English interests. Tyrconnell made no secret of his wish for change and in 1686 travelled to London to meet the Attorney-General Nagle, who had indicated that some of the Catholic grievances about the land settlement should be addressed.

In 1686 an exodus of merchants to England and soldiers to William began to take place. James ignored the warning signals, pressing on with his apparent Catholic design. By January 1687, Clarendon had been recalled and Tyrconnell was in place as Deputy Lord Lieutenant. The event was noted by the diarist John Evelyn: 'Lord Tyrconnel gon [sic] to succeed the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, to the astonishment of all sober men and to the evident ruin of the Protestants of that Kingdom.'

On Talbot's return to Ireland in February 1687, the army was increased in size, Protestant judges were replaced by Catholics, sheriffs were reappointed and new charters were issued to strengthen Catholic corporations. In Belfast, the new charter gave advantage to Presbyterians in an attempt to gain their support, but Protestant exiles increased in number. Some two-thirds of the rank and file of the Irish army were now Catholic, though the officer class changed more slowly.

By the spring of 1688, proposals for a new land settlement had reached the stage of compromise: Cromwellians would be left with half their holding and former owners would receive half. This was to be proposed at the next Parliament, but was prevented by subsequent events. As we are aware, William arrived in England in November 1688, but there was no constitutional crisis as yet in Ireland. Tyrconnell held Ireland for James, who was regarded as the legitimate King of Ireland. However, control had been lost in some areas, notably in the North where in December 1688 the city gates of Londonderry had been closed against Crown forces. As Irish troops had been sent to England, Tyrconnell was short of men. When Lord Antrim a Roman Catholic whose family had been granted



lands by James I, and a new garrison whose soldiers were mainly Roman Catholic, were sent to relieve the city under the command of Mountjoy, a Protestant, the residents did not know which way to declare. The eventual decision to support William and Protestantism would be felt to the full.

(a) Patriot Parliament

King James II called a Parliament to meet on 7 May; it consisted mainly of Old English and only six Protestants. An Act was passed stating that England could not legislate for Ireland, and, although he agreed in principle, James did not repeal Poyning's Law. Nor would he agree to repeal the Restoration Act of Settlement, fearing the reaction of English public opinion. However, it became clear that he would have to make concessions if he wished to retain Irish loyalty. This Parliament became known as the 'Patriot Parliament'. It removed civil disabilities imposed due to religion. Clergy were to receive the Tithe from their own followers and an Act of Attainder confiscated 270 Protestant estates. The city of London's plantation was cancelled.

A military victory would be needed to ensure that these measures were adhered to, and that was unlikely. The effect of the legislation was to harden English opinion and strengthen the Williamite cause. The Patriot Parliament did not even help the Catholic Church in Ireland: it was not 'established', James merely granted 'Liberty of conscience'. A subsidy worth £20,000 per month was granted for 13 months but the Jacobites still had to use 'brass money' or 'gun money' which led to mass inflation. The money only held 50% of its original value by July 1690. Eventually the Parliament was prorogued on 18 July.



Web Article

The following link connects to the QUB History Department's Irish History Live section where you can access Professor David Hayton's work on the Williamite Wars in Ireland. This was first produced to assist A Level students:

<http://www.qub.ac.uk/sites/irishhistorylive/IrishHistoryResources/Articlesandlecturesbyourteachingstaff/TheWilliamiteWars>



Teaching and Learning Activity

Source analysis and evaluation:

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

Source 1

Extract from a memorandum written by the Earl of Clarendon. Although it is undated, it was probably written early in 1687. Clarendon had served as Lord Lieutenant in Ireland from October 1685 until January 1687.

I have no doubt that truth, including the bare statement of fact, will never be uttered by the Earl of Tyrconnell. You cannot imagine – unless, like me, you have had personal experience of him – how false he is in almost everything he does. What he desires to have done one day, or even claims that he has done, he will positively deny on another day, though witnesses can prove him to be wrong. Sometimes his emotional outbursts and rage, the causes of which are



never obvious, seem to make him forget what he says and does. Whenever his deception is uncovered, it only sends him into an even more violent temper.

Source 2

Extract from a letter from Paul Barillon, the French Ambassador to England, to King Louis XIV, 6 September 1687.

The Earl of Tyrconnell has crossed the sea from Dublin to give an account of his administration to King James. All the most respectable English Catholics look with distaste upon the Lord Deputy, seeing him as an enemy to their race and a disgrace to their religion. However, the King, his master, has shown great satisfaction with the measures he has taken, and has justified what he has done on behalf of the Catholics in Ireland. Tyrconnell places them in key civil and military offices, so that all power will soon be in their hands. There are still many things to be done in Ireland to restore the benefits unjustly taken from the Catholics during previous reigns, but that can only happen in time, and in a meeting of the Irish Parliament.

- 1 (a) **Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of James II's policies in Ireland between 1685 and 1688?
- (b) **Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that James II's appointment of Tyrconnell as Lord Deputy in 1687 was the most important mistake he made in his handling of Irish affairs in the period 1685–1688?



2 The Catholicising Policies of James II in England 1685–88

(a) The support and opposition to James II in England during the first year of his reign

In 1685 James enjoyed a peaceful succession, confirming Charles's success over the Whigs. However, James would strain the loyalty of the Tories by appearing to promote the interests of Catholics. His policies included:

- Suspending or dispensing with the penal laws
- Attacking the Anglican monopoly in worship and education
- Punishing Anglicans through the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes
- Enlarging the standing army
- Appointing Catholics to prominent positions of command
- Interfering with local franchise and borough corporations to fix a prospective Parliament.

On 19 May, James gained support by issuing writs for election of a new Parliament. A Tory majority was assured due to the Quo Warranto policies of Charles II. In fact, there were only 57 known Whigs in a House of 513 MPs. The Anglican clergy preached on Divine Right and the policy of non-resistance; this was in support of authority.

By November 1685 Parliament had warned James that its support was conditional. His refusal to acknowledge this produced renewed fears of a connection between absolutism and Catholicism due to his continued use of the royal prerogative. For example:

- He released Catholics imprisoned for non-attendance at church, or failing to take oaths [supremacy/allegiance] and repaid their fines
- He used the Monmouth Rebellion as an excuse to extend the standing army from 8,500 to 19,700 by the end of 1685
- He purged the judicial bench for the *Godden v Hales* case (1686) to gain the acceptance of prerogative right to dispense with the Test Acts
- He appointed five Catholics to the Privy Council
- He encouraged Catholics to worship openly.

James himself attended worship at the Queen's Chapel and had the doors flung open. This could be interpreted in two ways:

- He would enforce and spread Catholicism
 - The reign would be open and straightforward
- Events indicated the first observation to be more likely.

James's objectives may be summarised as follows:

- Form a base for royal absolutism
- Gain religious toleration



- Free the Crown from a dependence on the Anglican Church
- Provide a counterweight to Anglicans in a legally secure Roman Catholic Church.

Parliament had accepted James's warning not to try to use finance as a lever and it responded by granting him an adequate settlement. It renewed Charles's revenues and gave extra indirect taxes to cover debts and replenish the army and naval stores. Furthermore, on the first day of its session, it voted extra supply to deal with Monmouth who had landed in Dorset.

(b) The Monmouth Rebellion

The Monmouth Rebellion effectively bound King and Parliament together. Monmouth claimed that he was the legitimate heir of Charles II. He blamed James II for:

- The Great Plague
- The Great Fire
- Causing the death of Charles by having him poisoned.

In addition, Monmouth claimed to be the champion of Protestantism. This rebellion was to be a joint effort between some Scots and English. The Duke of Argyll had planned a rebellion in Scotland. The Crown discovered the invasion plans and Argyll's Scottish rebellion was quickly crushed.

Monmouth landed at Lyme in Dorset on 11 June 1685 with 82 men. He was politically incompetent and militarily hesitant. His charisma attracted a badly equipped group of labourers.

The government response:

Three Scottish regiments were brought from the United Provinces

- The Earl of Feversham was appointed commander
- John Churchill was appointed second in command.

Monmouth delivered his 1st Declaration on landing. It was basically Whig in content, stating that government was for the benefit of the nation but that in England a set of restrictions ensured that the rights reserved unto the people tended to render the King honourable and great, and the prerogatives settled on the Prince were in order to grant the subjects protection and safety. In England therefore the implication was that there had been a conspiracy to destroy the Protestant religion and the rights of the nation.

Monmouth's suggested remedies included:

- Annual parliaments
- Removal of the standing army
- Repeal of laws against dissenters
- Restorations of charters removed by Quo Warranto
- Elective sheriffs
- Free juries
- Independent judges.

All these indicate a wish for an extension of democracy and liberty – the only inflammatory note was wanting James to be put on trial for poisoning Charles. Those who



rallied to Monmouth showed the extent of grass-roots support in the West Country; they had no obvious social or political status. Many were small freeholders and urban voters. Nearly all lived at a level of bare self-sufficiency. Therefore by national standards they were generally insignificant, but they had a tradition of independence – their fathers had fought the Royalists in the Civil War. Monmouth was the catalyst necessary to convert defensive West Country Whiggery into an active and aggressive movement.

Monmouth's trail took him to Axminster, through Taunton and Bridgewater towards Bristol, but he turned back. Government forces had gathered at Sedgemoor. The rebels needed a surprise attack if they were to succeed.

Monmouth issued his 2nd Declaration on 20 June. By this he assumed the Crown but a lack of Whig gentry support was shown by the failure of any London radicals to help or cause diversionary risings. On 5 July the rebels attacked and there was a massacre of Monmouth's support. He fled to the New Forest, was found and taken to London, where he was executed on 15 July.

(c) Effects of the Rebellion

James II had enjoyed strong support in Parliament: he was granted soldiers and money, and it saw the defeat of Monmouth as securing the Crown and nation from the fear of Whig rebellion.

The rebels, having threatened traditional law and order, as well as monarchical authority, were met with fierce repression. Rebels were hanged when found. The Chief Justice, Lord Jeffreys, went on a court circuit known as the Bloody Assizes and dealt out severe punishments; for example, Alice Lisle was beheaded because a rebel was found hiding in her shed. She had taken no part in the rebellion.

About 100 people were killed and 400 transported to the West Indies. James II was responsible for this: he made no effort to restrict the excesses of Jeffreys, who was later appointed to the position of Lord Chancellor.

Following the defeat of the Monmouth Rebellion, James II extended the leniency shown by Charles towards Catholics and wanted closer collaboration with Louis XIV. The resulting alienation of Parliament increased that dependency.

Louis XIV did send James a financial gift on his accession, and it has been suggested that this was intended as bait, encouraging James in his pro-Catholic policies, but Louis ignored subsequent requests for financial aid from James.

Had James been more prudent, he would have realised that he could secure his objectives more easily by being patient and moving at a slower pace. His ultimate objectives were not as extreme as his subjects thought, but it was not surprising that they were seen as a possible base for absolutism.

If James was to achieve repeal of the Test Acts of 1673 and 1678, he would be able to appoint officials with unrestricted freedom. His extension of the standing army would prevent rebellion, and any amendment to *Habeas Corpus* could result in indefinite terms of imprisonment.

Had James been able to secure these changes, his position would have been more secure



than Charles II. However, it is important to remember James II did not secure the repeal of the Test Acts, he suspended and dispensed with them but did not gain their repeal.

(d) The growth of opposition to the policies of James II

James did not see the opposition growing; when Halifax opposed him in October 1685, his decision was to sack him. At this time Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, indicating that France and England were moving together, therefore leading to more suspicion and alarm in England.

In the second parliamentary session on 9 November 1685, opposition was again in evidence. James stated that the standing army had been retained as it was needed to deal with rebellion. Then, while accepting that all his officers did not comply with the Test Act, he stated that he was perfectly sure of their loyalty to him. Parliament threatened to withhold finance but found itself adjourned and then prorogued on 20 November. By doing this, James gave up £700,000 but was able to place Catholics in positions of his choosing, regardless of the legality.

Anglicans were faced with an incompatibility:

- Unconditional passive obedience to the authority of the Crown, or
- Preservation of the place of the Established Church.

London clergy opposed Catholic policies, and publications were regularly produced against popery. They ignored James's 'Directions to Preachers', issued in March 1686, which led to action by the Court of Ecclesiastical Causes. First the Court suspended Bishop Compton, who had voted against the exclusion of James from the succession, for not taking action against Anglican clergy who appeared to oppose the King. James had managed to convert the Tories into a 'country' opposition party, but they would never lose their suspicions.

The King continued to extend the army in England and Ireland. He held training camps on Hounslow Heath in 1685, 1686 and 1687; at times, there were 16,000 troops on the outskirts of London, which was intimidating.

James held a test case to test the legality of his actions: *Godden v Hales*. Hales was Governor of Dover and was found guilty of breaking the Test Act at Rochester Court. He appealed to the King's Bench. Its decision was 11:1 that the King had the right to use the power of dispensation. James then added insult to those offended by the decision by appointing Hales to the post of Lord Lieutenant of the Tower of London in 1687.

James II now had no bar to ignoring Acts of Parliament and could rely on the support of his judges. He was free to practise and expand his arbitrary government and pursue any ideas to spread Catholicism.

His main supporter was Sunderland, appointed President of the Council in December 1685. Sunderland wanted to replace Rochester as Treasurer. Rochester was the main representative of Anglican power and, as James did not need to placate Anglicans because Parliament was not in session, Sunderland could increase his position by encouraging James and undermining Rochester.

Following the removal of Bishop Compton, James continued his attack on the educational bastions of Anglicanism by turning his attention to Oxford and Cambridge. These colleges



trained the future leaders and James wanted to influence their teachings and beliefs.

The Vice Chancellor of Cambridge refused to accept a Benedictine monk as a student. The response of the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes was to remove the Vice Chancellor. In April 1687, Magdalen College Oxford refused to accept the King's nominee as President. James made its election void and ordered the appointment of Parker, Bishop of Oxford. Again the Masters refused this, even when James met with them personally. James's response was to form a Royal Commission to remove the Masters and appointed his choice, Parker. When Parker died in 1688, James replaced him with Bonaventura Gifford, a papal emissary. The universities were the champions of the Stuart cause and for James to attempt to intimidate them was to turn supporters into enemies.

Due to these actions James II needed support. He turned to the Dissenters, including Quakers, who, together with Catholics, might have been able to mount direct opposition to Anglicans. In an attempt to achieve this, James issued his First Declaration of Indulgence in April 1687. It granted full liberty of worship to Dissenters and Catholics; he also promised to maintain the Anglican Church, and wanted Parliament to approve these actions.



Teaching and Learning Activity

Create a list of points which you think demonstrate James's alienation of Anglican support. Then compile a response to the suggestion that James was solely responsible for the response of the Anglican political faction.

The approval of Parliament for the Declaration of Indulgence was highly unlikely and it was dissolved in July 1687. James began preparations to ensure that the next Parliament would be favourable to his plans.

Between November 1687 and March 1688, corporations were purged through the continuation of the policy of Quo Warranto. All JPs, deputy lieutenants and other potential office holders were asked three questions. It was made clear that a negative response would result in loss of office, while favourable replies would result in promotion or appointments replacing those who had been purged from office:

- If elected to the next Parliament, would they be willing to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts?
- If not intending to stand for election, would they pledge their support to candidates who were prepared to undertake the above points?
- Would they promise to live in peace and charity with those of a different religion, i.e. accept and practise toleration?

Sweeping purges of 'refusers' led to the installation of many Catholics and Dissenters, some of whom were chosen to stand as MPs in the forthcoming election.

Meanwhile, it became known in September 1687 that the Queen was probably pregnant. This could have major implications for the succession as at this time Mary, James's eldest daughter, was heir and married to William, Prince of Orange, seen by many as the protector of Protestantism in Europe.

In April 1688, James issued his Second Declaration of Indulgence. It contained the same



message as before but added that Parliament would meet by November. Also further purges had occurred; between July and September 1688, 31 new charters had been issued, and parliamentary writs were issued on 18 September.

On 7 May, an Order of Council was issued stating that bishops should ensure that the Declaration to be sent and distributed through several dioceses; and that it was to be read on two successive Sundays. Opposition increased, James had used his prerogative to overrule the Test Act and was now using the Anglican clergy to enforce his views.

On 12 May a meeting was held at Lambeth Palace and a protest was issued from the clergy on 18 May.



© Peterspiro/Stock/Thinkstockphotos

Lambeth Palace

The bishops presented this to the King, stating their belief that the Declaration of Indulgence was illegal and the Crown did not have the power to dispense with the law and grant freedom of worship to Dissenters and Catholics. They referred to the attempt by Charles II to do the same in 1672, which was opposed by the then Parliament, and stated they would not have the Declaration read from the pulpits. Their protest was presented on the grounds of the misuse of the prerogative power of Dispensation, not religious opposition.

(e) The trial of the seven bishops

James II faced an important constitutional issue: the seven bishops who refused to read the Declaration were the mouthpiece of the nation. James could either abandon indulgence or suppress the bishops. He chose the latter.

On 8 June 1688 the seven bishops were committed to the Tower. This marked a turning point in attitudes towards James:

- Whigs aligned with Anglicans
- Dissenting clerics visited the bishops in the Tower
- Whig lawyers defended them
- The trial was held on 29 June
- The not guilty verdict was announced on 30 June, sparking a great national celebration.

Then news was broken that would change Anglican attitudes towards James II and his policies: James had had a son on 10 June. The child had survived and so the heir to James II was male and Catholic, not the Protestant Mary.



(f) The Glorious Revolution

On the same day as the not guilty verdict was issued, an invitation was sent to William, Prince of Orange, asking him to come to England. The signatories included Bishop Compton, Lord Devonshire, Lord Shrewsbury, Danby, Lumley, Edward Russell and Henry Sidney. A draft of William's manifesto was drawn up by Danby and sent to the Prince. It was designed to appeal to Anglicans and Tories.

James was aware of the growing discontent and he began to make concessions. During September and October he:

- Removed the suspension on Bishop Compton
- Removed the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes
- Restored Charters
- Cancelled Charters issued from 1679
- Returned the Fellows of Magdalen College
- Dismissed Sunderland.

The Anglican and Tory view was that of passive obedience, qualified by legality, therefore obedience was only due in 'lawful things' and 'within God's will'. They were still hoping for things to return to the pre-1685 position, but William's landing called a halt to this. Some Tories saw William's action as active resistance and therefore opposed it; splits developed in the Tory ranks – even those who welcomed him did not intend that he become king.

William had amassed 200 transport vessels and 50 men of war and light craft. His first attempt to sail failed but he had better weather on 1 November. He sailed to Torquay, landing 15,000 troops on 5 November; this was a significant date to his supporters, recalling the Gunpowder Plot in 1605.

The landing faced no opposition. William headed towards London but needed prominent citizens to come out in support of his arrival. Support was hesitant, especially in the West Country where memories of the Bloody Assizes were fresh.

Gradually people did declare for William. They included Cornbury, heir to Clarendon, Devonshire, Delamare and Danby. William proceeded to Exeter, where he stayed for two weeks. James left London and moved towards William, heading to Salisbury. But on 24 November, James decided to leave Salisbury and return to London. This was seen as a retreat and encouraged the idea that James knew that he was beaten. James's nephew, the Duke of Grafton, and John Churchill now defected, and on arrival in London on 26 November, James learned that his daughter Anne had left with Lady Churchill. James himself finally left London for France on 22 December. The throne was vacant, and preparations, including the meeting of a new Parliament (or Convention), were made for William to succeed.



Teaching and Learning Activity

Source analysis and evaluation:

Read the sources and answer the questions which follow:

**Source 1**

Extract from a speech by Viscount Mordaunt in the House of Lords, November 1685. He is speaking during the debate in response to James II's request for increased finance for the army.

Let us not, like the House of Commons, merely speak of jealousy and mistrust. The actions of the King require a more resolute response. What we now see is perfectly clear. A standing army is in place which includes some officers who cannot be allowed to serve without overthrowing the laws. To keep up a standing army when there is neither civil nor foreign war is to establish that arbitrary government which Englishmen so detest.

Source 2

Extract from William of Orange's declaration of 30 September 1688 in response to the invitation from a committee of peers to take the throne of England.

The evil counsellors of James II have interfered with the privileges, and withdrawn the charters of most of those towns that have a right to be represented in Parliament. They have placed new magistrates in those towns, many of them Popish. They have likewise dealt with all military positions in the same manner. Although the laws have not only excluded Papists from all such employment and have, in particular, stipulated that they should be disarmed, James II's counsellors have, in contempt of those laws, not only armed the Papists, but have likewise raised them up to the greatest military positions, Irish as well as English. By these means, they have made themselves masters both of the affairs of the Church, of the government of the nation, and of the course of justice, thereby to enslave the nation.

- 1 (a) **Use Source 1 and Source 2 and your knowledge of this period.** Which of the sources would an historian value most as evidence in a study of the causes of the Glorious Revolution? [15]
- (b) **Use Source 1 and Source 2 and other evidence you have studied.** How far do the sources support the view that religion was the most important factor in James II's loss of his throne?

Web Video

Watch the episode of Robert Kee's *Ireland: A Television History*, which covers the 1607–91 period:

http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=ireland+a+television+history



3. The Conflict in Ireland 1689–91

(a) The Siege of Derry

By January some nobles managed to inform William of the events in Ireland. Tyrconnell hoped that the Protestants in Derry would surrender but when this failed to happen, Tyrconnell's nephew, Hamilton, was sent to Ulster with a force of men. On 14 March the Break of Dromore occurred, driving the Protestants towards Londonderry and Enniskillen for shelter. Others left for England carrying tales to rival those of 1641.

The war which followed was a major crisis in Irish history. Catholics had the prospect of establishing their predominance, they supported the legitimate claimant to the throne – in their eyes – and they controlled the army and administration and were backed by France, the most powerful state in Europe.

William had two fronts: Europe and Ireland. For Protestants there was the chance to reverse the Catholic revival which had followed James's accession. They saw William as King of Ireland and were sure that he would not abandon the English stake in the country, which would prevent the island being used as a base by James II. King James II arrived in Ireland on 12 March 1689 and travelled north, arriving outside Londonderry by 18 April.

In December 1688, Tyrconnell had ordered a Catholic regiment (Lord Antrim's Redshanks) to take over the garrison of Derry, replacing Mountjoy's regiment which had been sent to Dublin. Protestant fears of a repetition of the 1641 massacres appeared to be confirmed by a hoax letter, discovered in a street in Comber, Co. Down. On 7 December 1688, when the first companies of Redshanks had crossed the Foyle by ferry, a group of young apprentices took matters into their own hands by closing the gates of the city. By April 1689, only Londonderry and Enniskillen had yet to fall to the Jacobites. On 18 April, James II arrived at the city, apparently unaware that terms for surrender had already been discussed. Suspecting betrayal, the defenders opened fire, killing one of the King's party. The 105-day siege had begun, but the besieging army had a shortage of artillery which would be needed for a full-scale assault on the city walls. The basic Jacobite strategy was to blockade the city until the defenders were forced to surrender. However, there were a number of encounters between the opposing forces during the siege. At the start of June, a wooden boom had been constructed across the Foyle to prevent ships arriving to relieve the city. Eventually, on 28 July 1689, the boom was broken by a naval assault and the Siege was raised. The first major engagement in the Williamite Wars had ended in a defeat for the Jacobite cause, one from which it never recovered. Apart from anything else, the successful defence of Londonderry was an inspiration for the subsequent Williamite campaign that would be waged successfully in the battles of the Boyne and Aughrim. A Jacobite victory at Derry might well have resulted in a different outcome to the Williamite Wars in Ireland. At the very least, the time scale of the war would have been dramatically different. The fall of Derry would almost certainly have meant the fall of Enniskillen and would have made a landing by William III in the north extremely problematical.

**Web Article**

Read an account of the Siege of Derry – which puts the event in its European context – on the h2g2 website:

http://h2g2.com/approved_entry/A45561134

**Web Video**

Watch a detailed BBC documentary about the Siege of Derry on YouTube:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fYXPmYS9hPA>

(b) Aftermath of the Siege

A fortnight after the relief of Derry on 12 August 1689, the Duke of Schomberg, aged 74 and a veteran of the 30 Years' War, arrived in Ireland with 10,000 men. Schomberg, a Huguenot, had fled France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685.

He met some opposition in Carrick but the defences fell on 20 August. He marched south and waited for supplies near Dundalk. As James II moved north, Schomberg declined to engage him and withdrew to Lisburn. The Jacobites regarded this as a moral victory but James was unable to capitalise on the perceived weakness due to financial constraints. William III decided that he had to come to Ireland if anything was to be achieved, but resented that this involved neglecting Europe. He landed at Carrickfergus on 14 June.

Tyrconnell managed to exchange 7,000 Irish troops for French soldiers, which arrived at Kinsale, Cork, in March 1690. They were commanded by Lauzan. French policy, however, was to avoid committing French troops if possible, so they acted in a mainly defensive role.

(c) The Battle of the Boyne

By 16 June, James had moved north and decided to make his defence at Drogheda, on the River Boyne. William followed and made camp to the north of the river. Battle commenced on 1 July 1690 (Old calendar).

James was pessimistic and had sent the bulk of his artillery to Dublin, but William had to cross the river. A direct assault was ordered and bombardment began at 10.00 am. The Dutch Blue Guard forced a passage through the river, followed by English, Danes, Brandenburgers, Huguenots and Ulster Protestants (a total Williamite force of 36,000). The Jacobites, 25,000 strong, broke ranks and fled. Lauzan had kept a reserve force to guard the retreat to Dublin and, although James lost the Battle, he still had an army. The Williamites had gained a small military victory but a strong psychological victory.

This battle did not end the conflict in Ireland but had huge significance in European terms for the Nine Years' War. William was seen as having defeated the French. It also ensured Protestant success. James had lost Ireland east of the Shannon and left the country on 4 July. Tyrconnell was placed in command.



Web Article

For a detailed account of the Battle of the Boyne, visit the History Net website:

<http://www.historynet.com/battle-of-the-boyne-king-william-iiis-victory-in-ireland.htm>



Web Video

Watch the episode on the Boyne of the BBC's *War Walks* series with historian Richard Holmes:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BonPJjakc4s>

(d) Aftermath of the Boyne

Tyrconnell and the French were prepared to make peace after the Boyne, but Patrick Sarsfield, grandson of Rory O'More who had been involved in the 1641 rising, persuaded Tyrconnell to rally all forces at Limerick.

The Jacobites aimed to hold Athlone and Limerick until the French sent help. Williamite forces laid siege but had overestimated the earlier victory at the Boyne and demanded unconditional surrender, which had only increased Jacobite determination.

Sarsfield had intercepted some Williamite guns and eventually the Williamites ran out of ammunition and the first siege of Limerick was lifted. William returned to England and left the Dutch commander Ginkel in charge.

Meanwhile, Marlborough had landed at Cork, taking it, followed by Kinsale. These were the only towns the Jacobites had held east of the Shannon. Tyrconnell had also left Ireland, leaving the young Duke of Berwick in charge of Jacobite resistance.

Tyrconnell returned in January 1691, followed in May by St Ruth, a French general. The Williamites attacked Athlone, taking it on 30 June, and St Ruth returned to Aughrim, 16 miles south-west of Athlone to prepare for battle.

(e) The Battle of Aughrim

The Jacobite position in the summer of 1691 was a defensive one, having retreated behind the River Shannon, from where they hoped to receive military aid from Louis XIV of France via the port towns and eventually be in a position to re-take the rest of Ireland. Ginkel, the Williamites' Dutch general, had breached this line of defence by crossing the Shannon at Athlone. The Marquis de St Ruth, the French Jacobite general, moved too slowly to save Athlone. Ginkel marched through Ballinasloe, on the main road towards Limerick and Galway, before he found his way blocked by St Ruth's army at Aughrim on 12 July 1691. Both armies were about 20,000 men strong. The turning point in the battle itself was the death of St Ruth, decapitated by a cannon ball. At this point, the Jacobite position collapsed very quickly. Their horsemen, demoralised by the death of their commander, fled the battlefield, leaving the left flank open for the Williamites to funnel more troops into and envelope the Jacobite line. The Jacobites on the right, seeing the situation was



hopeless, also began to melt away, although Sarsfield did try to organise a rearguard action. This left the Jacobite infantry on Killcommadan Hill completely exposed and surrounded. They were slaughtered by the Williamite cavalry as they tried to get away, many of them having thrown away their weapons in order to run faster.

Estimates of the two armies' losses vary. It is generally agreed that about 7,000 men were killed in the battle. Some recent studies put the Williamite dead as high as 3,000, but they are more generally given as between 1,000 and 2,000, with 4,000 Jacobites killed. Many of the Jacobite dead were officers, who were very difficult to replace. On top of that, another 4,000 Jacobites either deserted or were taken prisoner. What was more, they had lost the better part of their equipment and supplies. The city of Galway surrendered without a fight after the battle, on advantageous terms, and the Jacobites' main army surrendered shortly afterward at Limerick after a short siege.



4. The Results of the Conflict in Ireland 1691–1714

(a) The Treaty of Limerick 3 October 1691

Sarsfield protected the retreat towards Limerick, and Ginkel began the second siege of Limerick. Sarsfield led the defence but, when an English ship was spotted in the Shannon estuary, he realised that French help was not forthcoming and he negotiated terms on 23 September 23. The lessons of the Siege of Derry had been learned: it was unlikely the French could or would send relief. Ginkel had been given full plenipotentiary powers by William.

(i) Terms of the Treaty

MILITARY

- All who wished could go to France
- Prisoners would be released.

CIVIL

- No confiscation of estates
- Liberty of worship
- Freedom of career
- Permission to hold civil and military appointments.

These articles agreed that Roman Catholics could have freedom of religion as consistent with laws in Ireland under Charles II. A pardon and property rights were guaranteed to those in Limerick and others in any Irish garrison giving an oath of allegiance to William. They could carry on trades and professions as in the time of Charles II.

The Treaty had three objectives:

- Toleration to an extent for Roman Catholics
- Security of life and tenure for Jacobites
- Security of life and tenure for civilians.

The Treaty of Limerick freed William for the continental war but the articles depended on cooperation. William tried, but the Irish Parliament did not ratify the treaty until 1699, and then ignored aspects of it. It embarked on a series of Penal Laws prior to 1696, confiscating 270 estates, leaving 7% of the land in Catholic hands. This effectively established the Protestant Ascendancy.

Both sides criticised the treaty. Williamites said that the terms were too favourable, while the Jacobites believed that they could have agreed better terms. There was no assurance for the freedom of Catholicism. There was no provision for orphans or prisoners of war. However, the Penal Laws effectively broke the treaty.



Web Articles

The following links will take you to accounts of the detail of the Treaty as presented by Ginkel, historians and the Wild Geese society:

<http://www.libraryireland.com/JoyceHistory/Treaty.php>

<http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/E703001-010/index.html>

<http://indigo.ie/~wildgees/treaty.htm>

(b) The Penal Laws

William's attitude at Limerick was seen as alarming by Protestants, due to its conciliatory nature. They felt that it was necessary to rule with a Protestant minority or establish direct control from England. The latter would prove costly and difficult; William made his intentions clear by the end of 1690 when he had appointed Lord Justices and a Privy Council – a continuation of traditional government.

By October 1692 it was obvious how much control Irish Protestants would be able to exercise. An Act of the English Parliament of 1691 stated that Members of the Irish Parliament had to declare against much of the Roman Catholic doctrine and, once they had gained control, the Parliament would demand more sanctions against this section of the population. A system of Penal Laws developed over 10 years and covered many areas:

- Catholic Irish had no vote
- If a Catholic landlord/farmer died, his land would be divided equally among all his sons. Thus, as the years passed, the farms became smaller and Catholics became very poor
- No Catholic was to hold a lease for more than 31 years except on bogland (normally a lease was for 99 years). This led to insecurity, as a farmer did not know if he could re-rent when his lease expired. He would be less willing to invest in improving the land
- A Catholic worker was not allowed any apprentices, preventing expansion or training for the youth
- A Catholic was not allowed a horse valued at more than £5
- Catholics could not have their own schools
- Catholics could not send their sons abroad to be educated
- There were to be no Catholic bishops in Ireland. A £50 reward was offered for revealing any. Only two remained by 1702
- Catholic priests were not to appear in public wearing clerical robes. Reward for disclosure was £20
- Catholic services were banned
- Catholics could not be lawyers or doctors
- Catholics could not enter the civil service or sit on town corporations.

By 1703, the Irish Parliament wanted to strengthen this legislation and prepared a bill to prevent the further growth of 'popery'. The English added a clause imposing a sacramental test on all office holders. This therefore excluded non-Church of Ireland Protestants, in other words Dissenters (e.g. Presbyterians, Baptists). Royal Assent was granted in March 1704 by Queen Anne, putting in place a legacy of both Catholic and Dissenter opposition to the new Anglican Ascendancy.



The success of William in Ireland only led to insecurity. The arrival of Queen Anne led to more targeted actions against Roman Catholics. The Acts against popery in 1704 and 1709 included the division of lands on death and the registration of clergy.

It seemed to some that Catholic Ireland had lost its leadership; the Catholic landowning class was small and continued to decline during this period. In 1688, Catholics held 22% of the land but by 1703 this had declined to 14%. Due to ongoing events in Europe it was unlikely they would receive help from abroad.

The landowners were now Anglican and were concerned about the actions of the Presbyterian Church which they saw as undermining the authority of the Crown and Anglicanism. Presbyterian interests developed in commerce and politics rather than land ownership, and their numbers increased during the 1690s. Anglicans felt threatened and relationships between the two were poor. There were attempts to get a Toleration Bill through Parliament which failed in 1692 and 1695. However the English government did resist the attempts to enforce laws against Dissenters in Ireland.



Web Video

Watch the first 12 minutes of episode 3 of Robert Kee's *Ireland: A Television History* for an overview of the Penal period and what Kee call the emergence of 'two nations':

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qLROIKH2SoU>

(c) The emergence of the Ascendancy and Protestant nationalism

As Anne's reign developed, Irish division reflected that in England with a Whig–Tory division in Parliament. The Irish Tories could not be judged Jacobites, and the difference between the two seemed to centre on attitudes towards Catholics. Irish Tories did not support the strict enforcement of penal legislation, while Whigs hoped to extend the persecution.

Until 1707 the Tories seemed to have control and passed the Test Act of 1704, but events in England would lead to change. The Tory Lord Lieutenant, Ormonde, was dismissed in 1707 and was replaced by the Whig, Wharton. He opened up posts to Whigs but did not repeal the Test Act. In 1710 the Whigs fell from power in England and in Ireland the two groups concentrated on attacking each other. As Queen Anne's health declined, there was some fear that Ireland could pose a problem, but on her death there was no Jacobite response. The Tory party began its decline after this time.

Irish politics – and Irish life in general – was dominated by the Anglican landowning class, what came to be known as the Ascendancy. Yet at the same time, we see the first stirrings of what we might term colonial nationalism – or Protestant nationalism – among elements of the same class, best represented by the prototype 'Patriots', William Molyneux and Jonathan Swift. Colonial nationalism in Ireland might have developed in a very different manner – or perhaps not developed at all – had England responded to an approach from the Irish Parliament to consider an Anglo-Irish Union in the wake of the Anglo-Scottish Union of 1707. It was perhaps an idea ahead of its time, but it would return before the century ended.



Web Articles

Here is a link to an Ulster Historical Foundation article on Molyneux's constitutional philosophy:

<https://www.ancestryireland.com/history-of-the-irish-parliament/background-to-18th-century-ireland/constitutional-theory/>

The following link will take you to an article giving an in-depth view of Swift's position, 'A Modest Proposal in the Context of Swift's Irish Tracts: A Relevance-Theoretic Study', by Maria-Angeles Ruiz Moneva , published 2010:

<http://www.cambridgescholars.com/download/sample/57792>