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The Crimean War and Irish Society
Reappraisals in Irish History offers new insights into Irish history, society and culture from 1750. Recognising the many methodologies that make up historical research, the series presents innovative and interdisciplinary work that is conceptual and interpretative, and expands and challenges the common understandings of the Irish past. It showcases new and exciting scholarship on subjects such as the history of gender, power, class, the body, landscape, memory and social and cultural change. It also reflects the diversity of Irish historical writing, since it includes titles that are empirically sophisticated together with conceptually driven synoptic studies.
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Crimea, Sevastopol and Simferopol: these were words which I had rarely heard, never mind read, before the year 2008, when I began reading for my master's dissertation. While my exposure to them, and other people, places and events associated with them, expanded during my research for that degree, conducted at University College Dublin, and during my subsequent doctorate conducted at Queen’s University Belfast, my popular exposure to the region remained all but non-existent. For six years I researched the Crimean War and Ireland’s involvement in it, initially and specifically through the efforts of Catholic priests and nuns in their capacity as chaplains and nurses with the British Army in the Black Sea theatre and the Crimea. Later, this included Irish society’s broader political, economic and social responses to that conflict, its issues and events. Then, in early 2014, Ukraine was gripped by large public protests, which in turn led to the ousting of President Viktor Yanukovych, the subversive military incursion by Russia into the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, the declaration of independence by the Crimean parliament and the region’s absorption into the Russian Federation. All of which occurred in the space of only several months. During that period one could not turn on a television or radio, read a newspaper or digital news stream, or even sit on public transport without reading or hearing Crimea being mentioned. For the first time really since the 1850s the Crimea became a prominent part of popular parlance in Ireland, Europe and indeed much of the world. During the aforementioned six years of research I felt myself to have been the only person (at least in Ireland) talking about that region, the particular conflict which had occurred there between 1854 and 1856 and Ireland’s reaction to it. Everywhere I went during those years I was more often met with the odd reference to Balaclava, the charge of the Light Brigade and Florence Nightingale, but very little beyond that. Without my stimulation the word Crimea or anything related to it was rarely ever uttered with earshot of me. That all changed in 2014. It is the re-entrance of the Crimea into Irish, and indeed global, popular parlance which made the completion of my dissertation in the year that unrest
truly erupted in Ukraine and Crimea perhaps most appropriate, although lamentably so. Yet the similarities of events in 2014 – exactly 160 years since the British and French Empires jointly declared war upon the Russian Empire – are too striking to ignore. The issue of ethno-national identity, so much at the centre of the 2014 ‘Crimean crisis’ or ‘Ukrainian crisis’ (at the time of publication still ongoing), is something to which people on the island of Ireland can relate. It is also a factor which prevails throughout this book, in the context of Ireland and its relationship with the British Empire in the nineteenth century.

Given the events in Crimea and Ukraine, but also those in Ireland – the centenary of the Great War – the timing of this book’s publication is most appropriate. The multitude of events and the sheer scale of interest in and acceptance of Ireland’s and the Irish people’s role in that conflict, which the centenary stimulated, has opened the door to studies of previous and similar wars. The Crimean War is one such conflict. For so many decades after independence, the Great War and the history of the Irishman in the British military essentially became the country’s (i.e., the Republic of Ireland’s) dirty little secret. It was largely buried and rarely discussed. Even in the case of my own family, my great-grandfather’s service in the army during the Great War was excused out of a necessity to feed his family, but such a motivation may well have been erroneous. He, like so many other Irishmen at that time, may well have been motivated by a sense of duty, patriotism, comradeship, adventure or even the belief that the war was just and necessary and that he needed to do his part. However acceptable those latter motivations, and any of the multitudes of others, were in the decade after independence, their acceptability steadily dissipated as the decades rolled on. It is only now that the Great War has been all but fully repatriated. This is most evident by the attendance of members of the Irish government at remembrance ceremonies in Northern Ireland and London since 2013. Yet the war between 1914 and 1919 was not the first conflict in which Ireland was involved as part of the United Kingdom or as part of the British Empire. One cannot forget the Irish contribution to the wars with France between 1793 and 1815, the war against the Boers between 1899 and 1902 and the scores of colonial and brief international conflicts throughout the long nineteenth century. To that list of conflicts must of course be added the Crimean War between 1854 and 1856, a conflict with which so many comparisons and contrasts with the Great War can be made.

In writing this book I have incurred many debts, not all of which can be acknowledged here. Particular appreciation must be expressed to the supervisors of my doctoral dissertation, whence this publication is derived: Professors Peter Gray and Keith Jeffery. Their interest and confidence did
not waver through the four years of intensive work, and their constructive criticism, guidance and encouragement helped me to develop and improve my research. I would also like to thank the staff at the Queen’s University of Belfast for providing me with essential skills and services which allowed both me and my work to develop. The staffs of many libraries and repositories were inexorably helpful and generous with both their time and assistance. These include the Dublin City Archives; Dublin Diocesan Archives; Lambeth Palace Library; London School of Economics Archives; National Archives of Ireland; National Library of Ireland; Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland, Belfast; Public Record Office of Northern Ireland; Representative Church Body Library, Dublin; Trinity College Dublin; Union Theological College Library, Belfast and many others.

While the outbreak of conflict in the region associated with this historical study and the continuation of international tensions related to the same at the time of publication may afford this book a certain amount of relevance in the short term, and this may continue for some years owing to the popular culture and impact of the regional conflict, its relevance is broader and more long-lasting. It is hoped that this book will have a long-term appeal to audiences, both public and academic, Irish and not, owing to its central theme and analysis of Irish identity during the original Crimean conflict within the broader post-famine/mid-Victorian period. Through the much appreciated efforts of the aforementioned people and institutions and as a result of the conclusions reached in this work, people’s understandings may be developed and expanded, not only in their appreciation of Ireland's history within the British Empire and the fluctuating nature of Irish history as a whole, especially in the long nineteenth century, but also in their comprehension and appreciation of the complexities and developments of Irish identity during the most recent centuries.
Introduction

The year 2014 marked the 160th anniversary of the beginning of the Crimean War, 1854–6. It was during that anniversary year that the names of Crimea, Sevastopol, Simferopol and the Black Sea re-entered the lexicon of Ireland, and so did the terms ‘Russian aggression’, ‘territorial violation’ and ‘weak neighbour’. Coincidentally, those same places and terms, and the sheer extent to which they perpetuated within Irish and even world media as well as popular parlance, had not been seen nor heard since 1854. It was in that year that the British and French Empires committed themselves to war in the wider Black Sea region and beyond against the Russian Empire. The latter had demonstrated clear aggression, initially diplomatic and later military, against its perceived-to-be-weak neighbour and long-term adversary in the region, the Ottoman Empire, or Turkey. As part of that aggression Russia invaded the latter’s vassal principalities in the north-western Balkans, namely Wallachia and Moldavia (part of modern-day Romania), collectively known as the Danubian Principalities. Russia had previously taken Crimea from the Ottomans in 1783. That invasion, as Orlando Figes has shown, came after and was followed by Russian hopes and efforts to stoke ethno-national and ethno-religious feelings in the border regions of the Ottoman Empire. The invasion of 1853, coupled with a variety of other factors, served to turn what could have been another regional Russo-Ottoman war into the first general European war since the fall of Napoleon Bonaparte in 1815. The western powers feared the Ottoman Empire’s weakness and perceived a quick and imminent defeat at the hands of the Russians. This was because by that time the phrase coined by the Russian Tsar Nicholas I for the Ottoman Empire in the preceding decade – ‘the sick man of Europe’ – had gained popular currency and acceptance. With

an Ottoman defeat it was believed (especially in London) that the resulting Russian dominance of Constantinople, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles would lead to a Russian naval presence in the Mediterranean. This could pose a threat to western European power and trade, especially Britain’s link to India. It must also be mentioned that the then new Emperor of France, Napoleon III, was eager to re-establish France’s international prestige and actively sought conflict with Russia for that purpose; drawing Britain in as a somewhat reluctant ally. Napoleon III’s initial justification for confronting Nicholas I came in 1853, just one year after the former’s assumption of power through a coup d’état in Paris; it centred on a local dispute in Bethlehem between Catholic and Orthodox clergy and access to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

Today the Crimean War is represented within the histories of Europe (at least in ones written in Britain) as a major event, and indeed a turning-point, which saw the breaking of the Congress System, the outbreak of the first ‘general’ European war since 1815, the embarrassment of Britain, the reconstitution of French prestige, and the opening of a door to Russian modernisation as well as to Italian and German unification. Politically, militarily, and socially, the war with Russia, between 1854 and 1856, is also held up as a distinct period of British history. This has perpetuated a broad corpus of historical books and studies stretching back over 150 years. The war also retains a strong presence in British popular culture, with Florence Nightingale and the charge of the Light Brigade being central to British ideology, and names like Lord Raglan adorning pubs. However, even though Veronica Bamfield has noted that the Crimean War once formed a definitive episode in the history studied by British schoolchildren there is now little mention of the event in the public education system and very limited popular understanding of the event as a whole. Therefore, this study may also serve to stimulate increased interest in the education and research of the war in Britain as well as Ireland. Yet in Ireland, a country which, at the time of the war, was constitutionally a part of the same state as Great Britain – the United Kingdom – as well as part of the same empire, the event does


not hold a comparative position of prominence. The reason for the war’s absence from Ireland’s nineteenth-century and modern historiographies is not certain. It can be speculated that the rise of popular nationalism soon after its occurrence, the political events of the latter decades of the century, and the emergence of an overtly (and often emphatically) nationalist historiography between the 1850s and 1930, may have been the primary reasons. Some historians have argued a similar case for the comparative absence of the Great War, at least up until the early 2000s. The Indian Mutiny or even the subsequent wars of reunification in Italy, which followed so soon after the Russian conflict, may have also played a part in diminishing its distinctiveness. This was certainly something that the contemporary Art Journal believed, with respect to the former conflict in 1857. Additionally, the Catholic Church’s (or at least elements of it) turn against supporting military service in the British Army in the 1860s may also have played a role.

Similar to the Great War of 1914 to 1919, the Crimean conflict touched every part of Irish society – politics, religion, popular culture and the economy, albeit on a much smaller scale. Thus, it fits within the sphere of the social history of the military in Ireland, which has too often suffered a neglect due to the popular emphasis on combat. This book seeks to add a new chapter to that broad sphere of Irish history and to Ireland’s Crimean War historiography specifically. It does this by complimenting, but also substantially expanding and building upon, principally the work of Brian Griffin and David Murphy and to a lesser degree Maria Luddy in the preceding decade and a half, and that of Evelyn Bolster in the 1960s. It seeks to explore the social, political and even economic factors that influenced not simply the Irish Crimean soldiers but also Irish society more broadly during that European (and even global) conflict. What can be seen from an analysis of the most recent historical works is that an interest in the social

7 Art Journal, 45 (Sept. 1858), p. 171.
and cultural histories of war, especially the Great War, has developed in Ireland. This book also hopes to compliment them too by illustrating another occasion when Irish people (or a large proportion of them), regardless of class, creed or political affiliation, supported, fought in, engaged with or took a substantial interest in, and even criticised and opposed, a major European conflict, more often as citizens of the United Kingdom and British Empire. It is the aim of this book to show how Irish society responded to the Crimean War, how this compares to the responses of the wider United Kingdom (and at times the British Empire, and even France), and where those responses fit into Ireland’s post-famine/mid-Victorian and even wider nineteenth-century history, as well as its relationship with the United Kingdom and the British Empire. This will be done through the analysis of parliamentary and nationalist politics, popular and religious responses, the military in Ireland and the economy. This work attempts to present a balanced picture of nineteenth-century Ireland during a major and influential European event, showing as much as possible the various responses of the Protestant and Catholic, Liberal and Conservative, nationalist, non-nationalist and imperialist sides of Irish society.12

As the century which largely created, or led to the creation of, the Ireland of today, the nineteenth century is perhaps the most studied of all centuries in Irish history. Works on the period as a whole have been written and rewritten extensively throughout the past century, and especially in the last fifty years following the emergence of the ‘liberal’ historians, the ‘revisionists’ and then the ‘counter-revisionists’.13 Yet up until the 1990s few surveys, if any, made any reference to the Crimean War; too often Irish history seamlessly moved from the famine, the 1848 rebellion or the death of Daniel O’Connell to the emergence of the Home Rule movement, Charles Stewart Parnell or the land war. In fact, the entire decade of the 1850s, or at least up until 1858 and the foundation of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, was too often totally omitted. This contrasted, and still contrasts, very heavily with British history. Since its occurrence, the Crimean War has been consistently held up as an important and noteworthy period in Britain, politically, culturally, militarily and economically. More recently, it has also been held up for its religious factors by Orlando Figes. The conflict has been the subject of a number of substantial British works since the 1960s, but, beyond a few fleeting references, it has not been included in any study of Irish nineteenth-century politics covering the mid-Victorian period to date.14

On the whole Brian Griffin’s and David Murphy’s works on Ireland and

13 Ibid., pp. 3–4.
14 J.H. Whyte, The Independent Irish Party, 1850–9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
the Crimean War have addressed many elements of the conflict’s impact upon life in Ireland between 1854 and 1856, and even thereafter, and the ways in which Irish people responded to the same. However, in Murphy’s case the pre-eminence of the soldier and sailor and their experiences while on campaign substantially limited both the breadth and the depth of social analysis. Only fleeting references could be made to the political, economic and social impacts of the war, although this is perfectly understandable for what was essentially a military history. That being said, attention was given to Ireland’s war correspondents, elements of wartime coverage by the Irish press, the events in 1856 and features of the post-war memorialisation. A detailed analysis was also conducted on a solitary ballad collection. Griffin’s work on the other hand, while also referring to a limited number of songs, did have a broad scope, which included, among many other things, military aspects. The former were his references to the Patriotic Fund and the various religious denominations’ support for it, the activities of the Earl of Carlisle, the commercial activities of Irish merchants and the popular interest in and celebrations of the war and its events. Yet being an essay, his study was prevented from engaging in deep analysis. The same might not be said of his chapter on Irish identity in Bertrand Taithe and Tim Thornton’s *War: Identities in Conflict, 1300–2000*.15 The limited nature of the former in no way negates that extremely beneficial contribution that it made in substantially broadening not only people’s understanding of Irish society’s relationship with the Crimean War but also the knowledge of available sources relative to the same.

Although Murphy’s and Griffin’s works respectively include brief references to the debates in parliament in March 1854 and highlight the presence of sitting, former and Irish-born MPs and peers in the Crimea during the war, this limited perspective fails to illustrate how Irish MPs and peers reacted to the war.16 It remains to be shown how those politicians responded to the war’s issues and events and whether those responses were distinctly Irish or corresponded to those of the wider United Kingdom’s representatives, what the contributing factors may have been for them and where they fit in the wider period of political instability in the United Kingdom between 1846 and 1859. In contrast, the extra-parliamentary politics of Irish nationalists during the war has attracted more attention. With the exception of R.V. Comerford and David Sim, who have respectively

16 Murphy, *Crimean War*, pp. 3–7; Griffin, ‘Crimean War’, pp. 291–2.
analysed much, but not all, of the activity of Irish nationalists in Ireland and the USA during the Russian campaign, the principal question has remained unanswered: why was England’s difficulty in 1854–6 not Ireland’s opportunity (as it might be argued to have been in 1916)? It is also worth asking how the response of the royal representative in Ireland compared with that of the very public, engaging and well-known active of the monarch during the same period.17 Recently, Stefanie Markovits and Ulrich Keller have demonstrated the extent to which people in Britain expressed popular interest in and enthusiasm and support for the war with Russia, and the ways in which this was expressed. Yet, in the Irish context, these interactions have only been touched upon.18 This stands in stark contrast to the substantial focus that has to date been given to history and understanding of Irish people’s relationships with the British Army, the wider United Kingdom and the British Empire, especially in the early twentieth century and principally during the Great War.19

Religious themes have been prominent in the Irish Crimean historiography, in the areas of Roman Catholic army chaplains and especially nursing sisters (Sisters of Mercy), with the works of Bolster and Luddy. While a not insignificant inroad has been previously made, especially by Griffin, into this broader topic in Ireland, again, in Britain far more work has been done. A substantial broadening of focus is necessary.20 The need for

20 For a full list of the articles written about Irish Crimean chaplains and nursing sisters, see Irish History Online. For the British religious angle, see Denis Blomfield-Smith, *Heritage of Help: The Story of the Royal Patriotic Fund* (London: Hale, 1992); Myna Trustram, *Women of the Regiment: Marriage and the Victorian Army* (Cambridge:
a greater interrogation of Irish society’s response to the conflict is made no clearer than by Figes who argues that religion was at the very heart of the Crimean War. Even the military aspect of the conflict, in spite of Murphy’s well-known contribution, with its lengthy analysis of Irish soldiers’, sailors’ and civilians’ experiences in the East, has remained focused on the combat factor. This is been something that has been lamented by Adrian Gregory and Catherine Switzer in the context of the Great War, but it can be as easily applied to this conflict. 21 With the exception of Griffin’s works (and to a lesser extent Murphy’s), and prior to this book, no substantial effort has been made to place the war within its wider social and political contexts of the mid-Victorian period, the British Empire and the broader nineteenth century. The famine ended only a few years before the outbreak of the Crimean War, and the years of the conflict and the wider 1850s form part of what is termed the post-famine period, but with the exception of one – Michael Turner’s After the Famine: Irish Agriculture 1850–1914 – the war has not featured prominently within Irish economic studies. This is in spite of the fact that the Napoleonic Wars and the Great War have both been regularly noted for their influences on the Irish economy, principally through increased agricultural production and exports to Britain, and profits for farmers. The latter war also saw substantial industrial output from Belfast shipyards and linen mills. 22

A large variety of studies do exist on the politics, culture, religion, military and economics of nineteenth-century Ireland, but, unlike in Britain, they contain a substantial lack of analysis of the Crimean War period. In stark contrast, there are works of the conflict conducted in Britain with specific or general focuses on all of these areas, but practically none exists in Ireland. This is in spite of the country’s political, economic and even social interconnectedness with Great Britain and the British Empire in those years. What follows is a story that seeks to rectify that omission. The Crimean War, so much like the Great War, though on a far smaller scale,
was an event which touched all parts of Irish society and elicited responses from the same between the years 1854 and 1856 (and even in the half-decade that followed). It represents a distinct period in Irish post-famine recovery, Ireland’s political representation at Westminster, the relationship of Irish people with the state, both in London and at Dublin Castle (as well as vice versa), and also in the population’s and the churches’ perceptions of and relationship with the monarchy, army, United Kingdom and the empire, as well as their place within the latter. All-in-all, the Crimean War represents a distinct period in the history and development of Irish identity and Ireland’s place with the British Empire, and this is what the succeeding six chapters will show.