

White v. Gill: Tipperary Famine Clearances Revisited in 1863

Denis G. Marnane

Introduction

On 31 January 1863 the *Tipperary Advocate* published a brief letter from 'Agricola', a correspondent in Fethard who indicated that this was the first of several letters about 'how the farmers are persecuted beyond endurance', especially in the townland of Colman (Colman Cramptmore, 970.5 acres with a valuation of £763.85 in the civil parish of Colman). The absentee landlord of Colman, his sole holding in the county, was the Rev Richard Hobson whose family acquired the property through a late eighteenth-century marriage. Hobson was attacked as a 'rack-renting parson' but the primary target was the agent 'the notorious Jack White of Cashel, commonly called Shawn Mullougha'. No details were given but Peter E. Gill the editor and publisher of the newspaper, in a note made clear that he would gladly print the facts and added: 'We are a long time hearing of the notorious White and we are glad to have a fling at him'.

The next volley was fired a week later by 'A Looker-on', writing from Colman who excoriated White, claiming that he was better known locally as 'Shawn na Crisha', because of his propensity to swear 'on the five bleeding wounds of Christ crucified'. Yes, White gave leases but demanded bribes and was never more happy than when evicting tenants, something he practiced on 'a certain townland convenient to Cashel'. The writer appealed to Hobson (living in county Antrim) to dismiss White as other landlords had done.¹ A few weeks later, another letter appeared, this time from 'G' who reported that White that week had one of the Hobson tenants evicted and that further enquiries would be made about the details. Readers were reminded of the 'thousands' of acres that White 'cleared out from Cashel to Killoughill', a region known as 'Shawn Mullougha's Prairie' and that in a landscape of demolished houses, where there once were people, now grazed shorthorns and dexter sheep. This letter was given the provocative heading: 'Shawn Mullougha - Exterminating the Papists'.²

Another letter from 'G' appeared in early April giving details about Colman, including a letter of 1857 from Hobson to his tenants in which on raising rents, he promised to reduce them should times again be bad. Readers were again reminded of what happened on the Smith-Barry estate near Cashel, especially the townlands of Ballinree and Gortmakellis, when just after the Famine, White was the agent. Hobson would be sorry when his honest tenants were scattered and gone because of White's 'depopulating propensity'.³ Two weeks later 'A Frightened Farmer' launched a sustained and suspiciously articulate piece of invective against White, calling him (among other things) the 'great Pashaw of the Crowbar Brigade'.⁴ While Peter Gill the editor of the *Tipperary Advocate* was undoubtedly well informed about the Hobson estate, there was a justified assumption that the connection went deeper and that Gill himself wrote these letters.⁵

Living in Cashel and professing different politics, White was not a subscriber to the Nenagh-based and radical *Tipperary Advocate*. Once his attention was drawn to what appeared to be a sustained campaign, attacking not only his profession but his character, he had little choice but to respond. In June 1863, White initiated an action for libel against Gill, claiming damages of £2000. White's case centred on the letters published in the issues of 31 January and 7 February.

Gill's response was defiant, very much seeing himself as the tenant's champion at a time when other nationalist newspapers pitched their attacks on landlords in timorous terms: 'some one must espouse the cause of the people and strive to save them from utter extermination'. A meeting was held in Dublin to organise the 'Tipperary Advocate Defence Fund' and a committee of Dublin-based Tipperary men was put together under the chairmanship of Denis Egan.

In part this was a response to the fact that the case would be heard in Dublin and in an effort to broaden the appeal for funds. The resolutions passed indicate how the issues were seen: at a time of economic depression: farmers were the only hope of prosperity; the maintenance of a free press was vital and tenants had to be supported. Both sides assembled expensive legal teams and it became clear from the start that far more than White's relations with the Hobson tenants would come under scrutiny. White's role with respect to other estates would be examined to provide justification for Gill's charge that White was an 'exterminator', only too willing to take advantage of the Famine.⁶ Gill's legal team was not restrained in its charges against White's management of the Boherlahan Smith-Barry estate in particular, claiming that 158 houses were demolished and 3,000 acres depopulated, two-thirds of which White farmed himself.⁷ There was some legal argument about estates other than that of the Rev Mr Hobson being brought into the case but this was allowed because it was recognised that at issue was John White's good name. Consequently, the trial ranged over all aspects of White's career in estate management.⁸ In early July a local Defence Fund was set up based in Nenagh under the chairmanship of J.D. O'Ryan, the message being that this was a fight about Tenant Right much more than the fate of just one man.⁹

Who were these two men, Peter Gill and John White, who faced each other on Monday 26 October 1863 when the case finally began in the Court of Exchequer in Dublin? Gill, known in some circles as 'The General' and who died in 1892 was a member of one of the best known Nenagh families. T.P. Gill nationalist MP and first secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction was a nephew, as was John Augustus O'Shea a famous war correspondent. Peter Gill began publishing the *Tipperary Advocate* in 1857 and used it to promote a popular if maverick agenda. In 1863, in response to an economic downturn, Gill was clear that landlords would make tenants bear the brunt, unless his newspaper could galvanise nationalist opinion. As one of his obituary notices declared, Gill was original in both manner and matter. Three times he put himself forward as a parliamentary candidate, not that Westminster was at the centre of his political thinking. When he started his newspaper in 1857, one hostile Nenagh resident was clear that it would be 'the organ of the Young Ireland party'.¹⁰

The parliamentarian and journalist William O'Brien describes Gill as 'one of the oddest figures in the Tipperary of those days' and acknowledged that while he was a good platform speaker, politically he was not taken very seriously.¹¹ Peter Gill took himself very seriously and lived up to the mission statement he wrote in an 1860 editorial: 'We consider it a part of our mission to afford the poor or the injured man an opportunity of speaking for himself and of pleading his own cause at the bar of public opinion'.¹² Gill had a tendency to push matters beyond the point at which sensible men would have pulled back. In 1861, he had experience of another libel case, one involving John Lanigan MP for Cashel. The jury found for Gill but awarded him a farthing damages, which left the painful matter of costs.¹³ Gill can hardly have expected John White to ignore the intensity or scope of the attack on him. However, while Gill may have welcomed the court case as an opportunity to direct national attention on the plight of tenants, the fact that the case was heard in Dublin cannot have pleased him. When figures from the 1861 census became available, his response was intense, seeing population loss as a result of

deliberate landlord strategy. For Gill, the Tipperary landscape had become a place of 'skeleton walls (standing) like gaunt spectres'.¹⁴

The first point to be made about Gill's protagonist John White is that he was not John Davis White, proprietor and editor of the *Cashel Gazette*, author of *Sixty Years in Cashel*, ballad collector and the subject of a number of articles in this Journal. Both men were members of the same family of White but when John Davis compiled a history of the family, this line was excluded at their request. John White who died in May 1882 at the age of eighty, resided and had an office in John Street Cashel, from where he conducted a mix of financial and administrative responsibilities.¹⁵ There is a scene in *Knocknagow* in which a local land agent is discussed: 'He has several agencies, too, and a damn bad agent he is. There is not a lease on any of the properties he is over. He pretends 'tis the landlords refuse to give leases; but 'tis well known 'tis himself puts 'em up to it'.¹⁶ These fictional characters could have been discussing John White. Evidence from the 1863 libel case, revealed the extent to which White acted on his own initiative and sometimes to his personal advantage, while claiming that he was merely an instrument. According to the Rev Mr Hobson: 'I never authorised harsh proceedings; if Mr White acted harshly he kept it a secret from me'. Among the matters kept from Hobson was White's practice of forcing under-the-counter payments from tenants anxious to obtain leases.¹⁷ As Larry Clancy and Phil Morris agree in *Knocknagow*: 'Security is the only thing'.¹⁸

The truth of this is clear from the evidence heard in the course of *White v. Gill*. On a number of estates during the late 1840s and 1850s, White was seen as the primary threat to tenant security. 'A good agent was a man who improved the agricultural practice and value of an estate, who was self-effacing enough to channel all public credit to his employer, and who cultivated the expected reciprocation of respect between the landlord and the community'.¹⁹ This was the ideal. The 1863 case of *White v. Gill* gives a view of the reality. Before looking in detail at this trial, an examination of the economic climate will help set the scene.

Economic Background

In his report for 1864, Sir H.J. Brownrigg, inspector general of constabulary, noted with respect to South Tipperary that the economy was better than for some years past but that many farmers were by no means prosperous, not having recovered from the negative impact of the previous three or four years.²⁰ Peter E. Gill was acutely aware of the pressures on tenant farmers during the early '60s and the libel case of 1863 was a consequence of his reaction – or in the case of John White and the kind of language used against him, over-reaction perhaps. As a journalist, Gill was used to presenting complex, abstract issues in personal terms, always telling stories his readers could understand and to this end John White was cast as villain.

Through the 1850s, '60s and into the '70s, Ireland experienced a measure of agricultural prosperity.²¹ The one exception was the agricultural depression of the early 1860s.²² There was a major drought in the spring and summer of 1859. This was followed by the wettest consecutive three years in the nineteenth century (with the exception of 1846-8). As an official report graphically described the situation for 1861 when rain fell on 182 days: 'A quantity of rain sufficient to cover the whole surface of the country to a depth of two feet three inches fell during the period'.²³ The 1861 report from the Board of Public Works noted the crop damage inflicted by bad weather and during early 1862, there was an unusual number of applications from landlords for drainage loans, partly as a means of giving employment.²⁴ The spring and summer of 1863 were again very dry, followed by a wet autumn but a mild winter.²⁵ One result of this sequence of bad weather was an outbreak of various animal diseases. For example, a mixture of

swine fever and a shortage of potatoes reduced pig numbers in South Tipperary by 18% between 1859 and 1864. Other diseases directly related to the wet weather were foot rot and liver fluke. In South Tipperary, the most affected livestock were cows whose numbers declined by over 18% between 1859 and 1864.²⁶

In February 1863, a resident magistrate (R.M.) in his report to Dublin Castle referred to the great distress in Tipperary and to the fact that there was no getting of rents from the small farmers on the Tipperary side of the Suir: 'When the March rents will come, I know not'. Also, trade was stagnant and he went on to explain that 'the farmers have eaten up everything and the meal men who have supplied them can get no money from them'.²⁷ In Tipperary town for example, in February 1862 the poor staged a public demonstration and threatened violence if they obtained no relief. A committee representative of the local landed interest, including the agent to the Smith-Barry estate, was put together and money raised to help some five hundred destitute families.²⁸

Some landlords responded to the depression by reducing rents, something Gill was quick to praise in his newspaper.²⁹ Others however pushed for payment, irrespective of the economic circumstances. One of the estates to feature in *White v. Gill* was the Cashel or Boherlahan Smith-Barry estate. (The larger part of this property in the county centred in and around Tipperary town.) In 1859 the rental of this estate was £2410. By 1864, it was £2792.³⁰ Statistics on evictions in South Tipperary during 1859-64 indicate that the recession was a setback and not a crisis. Looked at from a distance (which is exactly what Gill was not doing), it can be seen that the difficulties experienced by the agricultural community 1859-64 in no way compare to the disaster visited on the region during the immediate aftermath of the Famine. This was why Gill was determined that once the case went to trial, far more than White's conduct as agent for the Hobson estate would be examined.

In the period 1849-53, Tipperary suffered more than any other county, having nineteen times as many evictions as Fermanagh, the least affected county.³¹ Gill's attitude towards White in 1863 is best understood by knowing that what he was reacting against was much less the events of the early '60s and much more what had happened in the county a little more than a decade earlier. Also, something that undoubtedly weighed heavily with Gill, was the remarkable silence and darkness that surrounded these Famine clearances in Tipperary. There was virtually no contemporary media coverage or indeed official recognition or reaction.³² John White, by reacting to Peter Gill's provocation in 1863, ensured that light was cast on what may be argued was the most important but least highlighted episode in the history of the county in the nineteenth century.

Figures gathered by the constabulary from 1849 with respect to evictions are accepted as reliable. Earlier statistics are more problematic.³³ Once a landlord or agent decided to eject tenants, he had to work through quite a complicated legal process involving a choice of several superior courts, the Queen's Bench, the Exchequer and the Common Pleas, each of which had different regulations. All interested parties had to be served with notice of the intended action which led to a deluge of legal documentation in order to close a potential loophole. Process serving could be a dangerous occupation. If action was being taken against a tenant for arrears, he was served with notice of rent and costs due. If a landlord simply wanted rid of a tenant, he was given six months notice to quit, followed by a process for over-holding. In either circumstance, the tenant was to appear in court but only in the latter case was the tenant entirely at the mercy of the landlord. If the issue was rent arrears, the tenant could save himself by paying arrears and costs.³⁴ Sometimes ejection was more notional than actual in that after

ejection, tenants were readmitted as caretakers. This is reflected in the Table below.

Evictions in County Tipperary, 1849-53.³⁵

YEAR	EVICTIONS		RE-ADMITTED		ACTUAL EVICTIONS		HOUSES	
	Families	Persons	Families	Persons	Families	Persons	Number Evicted from	Number Levelled
1849	2753	15,743	436	2375	2317	13,368	2732	1067
1850	2817	15,387	650	4212	2167	11,175	2706	846
1851	1505	8360	475	2812	1030	5548	1397	321
1852	1037	5551	360	2176	677	3375	958	266
1853	467	2400	128	663	339	1737	445	98

These are extraordinary figures: over 6,500 families evicted during this five-year period and 3,000 houses or more to the point, homes, levelled. By 1853, the situation was beginning to moderate. The contrast with 1863 is instructive, though that year, because of the recession, showed the highest figures for the late 1850s and '60s.

1863	127	623	42	198	85	425	127	3
------	-----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	-----	---

In 1849, evictions within the county affected the north riding much more severely, 1487 families as against 830 in the south. This was also the situation the following year but in 1851, '52 and '53, while overall figures were much reduced, the impact was more severe in the south riding.³⁶ Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this traumatic dislocation is the extent to which it has been ignored. From the point of view of landlords it allowed a brutal rationalisation of their estates, a rationalisation that benefited some tenants at the expense of people who were in the workhouse, in America or dead.

White v. Gill arose over the Hobson estate, the townland of Colman. Ironically, clearance was not an issue on that estate.

Population change on the Hobson Estate, 1841-61.³⁷

Year	Population	Houses
1841	254	34
1851	214	28
1861	172	25

However, Peter Gill made sure that a great deal of attention during the trial centred on the Smith-Barry estate, where clearance was a huge issue. An analysis of population loss 1841-1851 in a variety of south Tipperary estates showed the Smith-Barry property (6,222 acres) top of the league with a reduction in population of 44%.³⁸ This owed everything to what happened on the Cashel or Boherlahan part of the estate, comprising about 3,5000 acres.

Change on the Smith-Barry Boherlahan Estate 1841-51.³⁹

TOWNLAND	NUMBER OF HOUSES		NUMBER OF PERSONS	
	1841	1851	1841	1851
<i>BALLYSHEEHAN CIVIL PARISH</i>				
Ballinree	70	8	417	47
Ballysheehan	15	8	103	44
Glascloyne	1	1	11	13
Marshalstown	3	2	27	13
<i>ST PATRICKSROCK CIVIL PARISH</i>				
Ballinree	15	12	110	73
Clonmore	4	2	23	9
Garryard	4	1	29	6
Gortmakellis	14	8	95	43
Monadreela	10	2	68	12
Thurlesbeg	56	20	380	166
Windmill	20	8	118	42

Whatever way these figures were looked at, the fact remained that in 1841 there were 212 houses on this estate. A decade later there were only seventy-two. The question addressed during the libel trial, was the fate of the families living in the missing 140 houses. For the historian there is virtually no paper trail between John White and what happened on this estate, most particularly in Ballinree, as people were beginning to hope that the potato crop was again flourishing. White's name occurs in an official source from 1849 but then only in connection with six evictions in Thurlesbeg and one in Ballysheehan.⁴⁰ As Peter Gill recognised, the silence surrounding what happened in Ballinree and other townlands would be shattered over a decade later, before the Lord Chief Baron in Court of Exchequer in Dublin.

White v. Gill

The case opened on Monday 26 October 1863 with a recitation of the two letters held to be libellous, published in the *Tipperary Advocate* of 31 January and 7 February. Key questions included the Irish language names applied to White, his administration of various estates especially that of Smith-Barry and the charge that he corruptly received money from tenants granted leases. Incidentally, White's barrister had also been against Gill in the earlier libel case involving John Lanigan MP.⁴¹ Given that there had been a spate of well-publicised agrarian murders in the region, the first point made in White's defence was calculated to appeal to a respectable Dublin jury, namely that such press coverage was bound to make him a target. Carrying much less weight was the technical point that with respect to the Smith-Barry property, White was not agent but sub-agent.

During this period the entire Smith-Barry estate spread across several counties was managed by William Maunsell Reeves (1788-1857), barrister and land agent, who from offices in Dublin managed a large number of estates. Between 1841-52, John White, who had worked as a land agent since 1830, was delegated local responsibility for the Cashel or Boherlahan part of this estate.

Two opposing expert witnesses testified with respect to the Irish language terms applied to White in the libels. One of these experts was employed as a scripture reader by the Irish Church Mission Society, the other was a native-speaker from Clare. They differed a little in their interpretations but the substance of the names applied to White was 'John of the Curses' and 'John of the Cross', both names referring to the popular charge that White imprecated tenants who displeased him and that a favourite oath was to call on the bleeding wounds of Christ. White absolutely denied this and as a respectable member of the Church of Ireland, it was obviously a charge he reacted to very strongly.

When White's counsel concluded his opening statement, White left the court, prompting Gill's counsel Richard Dowse to make clear his client's desire for a personal confrontation with White. The intention was to confront White with the details of his management, especially with regard to the Smith-Barry estate in Boherlahan where he orchestrated 'a systematic series of evictions'. The court heard a list of tenants who were evicted and their townlands (not given in the press reports); that 158 houses were razed to the ground; that 'hundreds' of people were evicted so that nearly 3,000 acres were cleared 'and that these evictions were carried out in a cruel and oppressive manner'. After a reference to a specific tenant on the Hobson estate, a widow whom it was claimed White had put into gaol, Gill's counsel sought to broaden the context of the case so that it was seen as a trial between Anglo-Saxon and Celt. While allowing that 'in some respects the Saxon may be superior to the Celt', Dowse gave a sustained but not especially historical defence of the Celtic character, making the argument that unless there was reform, the United Kingdom would lose both the goodwill of the Celts and their fighting spirit.⁴² This speech received 'loud applause'.

The first witness was Jeremiah Guiry, a Hobson tenant with seventy-seven acres whose first statement was that his family had been tenants for nearly a century, he being the fourth generation, thus staking a claim that had the support of custom and feeling but not of the law. Oliver MacDonagh termed this 'the communal vision' in an influential study of what he saw as the dual understanding of 'property' each arising from war, defeat and confiscation but only one having the support of the legal apparatus of the state; the other based on tradition, memory and resentment.⁴³ White, agent to the Hobson estate since 1851, on the evidence of this witness, sought to change one of the most usual procedures, that of the 'hanging gale' whereby a tenant paid the rent due in March on 20 November and the September portion on 21 April. A demand for a full year's rent was especially hard during the depression of the early 1860s. Guiry told the court of various meetings with White in his Cashel office, during which he was threatened, assaulted and sworn at. With money borrowed from his brother, Guiry paid his year's rent, only to have White offer to accept a half year's rent, his point having been made about tenants obeying estate rules.⁴⁴ When towards the end of the trial White took the witness stand, he denied all of the charges that put him in a bad light and presented himself as doing no more than interpreting rigorously the rules of the estate.⁴⁵

The next witness was Michael Mockler, another Hobson tenant, holding about thirty acres who explained that when White was appointed in 1851, Famine-related arrears were wiped off and that following a valuation, rents were reduced. However in 1857, rents were restored to their

original level. White's counsel emphasised that this wiping of arrears was a condition of White taking the agency. Mockler corroborated much of what Guiry had told the court, including White's extreme reaction when several tenants, led by Guiry called on White in Cashel to plead their case. 'Poverty and tyranny are well known (in Colman) since Mr White came' was the essence of his message. One of the charges against White was that he sought bribes from tenants who wanted leases and Mockler appears to have offered him £10, money well spent if a lease was given on favourable terms. According to White this was refused. There was no disputing that rents had been reduced between 1851 and 1857; in Mockler's case by around 20%. In part, bad feeling on the Hobson estate was a result of rents (not unreasonably) being raised in 1857 when agriculture was improving but being maintained during the early 1860s when agriculture was depressed. According to witnesses a constant refrain by White was that tenants were better off than they admitted.⁴⁶

Holding one of the largest farms on the estate of Colman, Michael Waters with over eighty acres told a story that must have been typical of farmers in his situation. Some of his land he held under lease but when White offered a lease for all of it, Waters refused because he considered the rent too high. He categorised 1854-57 as 'good years' and managed to save £200 but he gave £150 as a dowry when one of his four daughters married in 1861 and added that he had nothing to give the others. He told the court he had no money in the bank and would have to sell stock to pay the rent. This tenant seems to exemplify what has been characterised as a crisis in rising expectations and perhaps explains the volume of complaints against White, orchestrated by Gill at a time of economic uncertainty. Having a taste of even limited prosperity, the prospect of losing it was the more unbearable.⁴⁷ At the time of giving his evidence, Waters owed a year's rent and £8 arrears. His hope that prices would improve was his explanation for this delay in paying his rent. Waters also told the court about meetings between Gill and his Colman witnesses; the point being made by White's counsel that the case was a conspiracy against their client.⁴⁸

Five other Colman tenants gave evidence; a common thread being White's 'expectation of something for himself' when giving leases, £1 being the figure in some cases.⁴⁹ A number of witnesses described White saying to them that as Hobson was an old man, they had no security, especially in the case of small-holders, unless they had leases. It can hardly have been in the interests of the estate to give leases to tenants holding handfuls of acres. On the one hand there was the story told by William Slattery, present when Hobson introduced his new agent (White) in 1851, the landlord allegedly saying: 'These are old families in the townland and shall never be disturbed'. But on the other hand there was evidence that in 1862 Slattery was evicted in spite of the tenant's claim that he would have given 'quiet possession'. Another more substantial tenant, a widow holding around seventy acres, explained how in 1851 White pressured her to surrender her farm and when she refused an inducement of being paid a year's rent, about £60, she told the court how White contrived to make her life difficult, for example distraining her cattle for a debt of £6.20. When the circumstances of how White had her arrested in Cashel came up, White's counsel had the matter deemed inadmissible. Not surprisingly, when this incident was put to Hobson, he admitted it was a 'harsh transaction' but was entirely White's doing. Any money this tenant put together during the mid-'50s appears to have been used to finance the emigration of several of her children.⁵⁰

When, later in the trial, White gave evidence, the jury was faced with substantial concordance between Hobson tenants as to their treatment and White's absolute denial, leaving jurors to conclude collusion and conspiracy between tenants or White's perjury.

As discussed above, there was nothing dramatic about the decline in the number of

households on the Hobson estate 1841-61. Also, when White took over management of the property, six of the holdings were between seventy-six and 100 acres and three were between fifty-one and seventy-five acres, accounting for over 70% of the townland. Another five holdings were between twenty-six and fifty acres, accounting for another 17% of the estate so that 87% of Colman was already structured in viable holdings.⁵¹ From the trial evidence it is difficult not to conclude that White's management style was arbitrary, motivated by a determination to benefit the landlord (and himself) from the increasing prosperity of the 1850s. His unwillingness to acknowledge the economic downturn of the early 1860s provoked some of the tenants and prompted the response of their champion Peter E. Gill, leading to the case in the Four Courts.

The Smith-Barry Boherlahan Estate

Ryan the first Smith-Barry tenant to testify cannot have impressed the jury. Holding over sixty acres, he made clear he had no difficulty personally with White and while certain about the disappearance of people from his townland of Ballinree (Ballysheehan), admitted 'I have seen Mr White in that townland but I was not present when any houses were levelled; I saw houses down on the estate'. White was agent (more correctly sub-agent) from 1841 to 1852 and in 1850, 82% of Ballinree was in the landlord's hands.⁵² One of the charges made against White was that he kept much of this land in his own hands, something Ryan rather incredibly declared he knew nothing about.

Because White managed this estate during the Famine, his record was a vital part of Gill's defence and the next witness Edmond Long was very hostile to White. In common with many estates in the early nineteenth-century, the 3,500 acres property was let to a handful of middlemen who allowed the proliferation of holdings that were plots rather than farms.⁵³ When these middlemen leases expired or as happened during the Famine, lessees defaulted and on ejection, land reverted to the estate, the estate had to deal with large numbers of families, many with no land, clinging to a precarious existence. For example in Ballinree (Ballysheehan) in July 1845, there were twenty-four occupiers with a few acres or none, all of whom except two had disappeared by August 1850. Many better-off occupiers had also disappeared. In 1841 there were seventy occupied houses in the town land. By 1845 there were fifty-eight and by 1850 there were five. By then most of these former homes were demolished. In 1850 there were six vacant houses still standing in Ballinree, sad monuments to the work of John White.⁵⁴

Edmond Long, described as 'a poor broken-down looking man', was such an under-tenant and was evicted in 1848 from a 'small plot of ground' for which he paid £28 p.a. and on which was a mill, from which he claimed he often made £1 to £1.50 a day. White's version of the eviction was straightforward: an engineer's report prompted by Reeves, stated that the mill stream prevented drainage of adjacent marshy land and that in the eviction the mill machinery was not smashed.⁵⁵ Long's version was lurid. About a month earlier, White had visited him and on inquiring how long he was in possession, was told: 'My generation are upwards of one hundred years here'. This sent White into a paroxysm of cursing that he would be rid of Long. A little later when coming from mass, one of White's men met Long and said that the sheriff was coming three days later. Long and his family were ejected and the mill demolished. When offered refuge locally, White threatened this good Samaritan. 'I am now a very poor man', Long told the court, 'all my children went over to America and I don't know but they are killed. I was obliged to look for outdoor relief from the Cashel Union and get it'. In this version of events White was characterised as relentless in his determination to destroy Long, making sure that an appeal to Smith-Barry for money to allow him take his family to America failed. When cross-

examined about what houses he saw being levelled, Long admitted that he had not actually seen any 'but I heard tell of that (thirty four or thirty five houses levelled), I saw the people coming into Cashel to live'.

Another witness told a very personal story, admitting that he now held the land of the man in question. The house was 'thrown-down', the man and his wife seeking shelter in a cabin on another estate. Within a few weeks the man died and when the witness returned from the funeral, the wife was dead. According to the evidence of Patrick Grant, one day he saw nine houses being levelled, both White and the sheriff in attendance. Talking about the townland of Gortmakellis, this witness did not take refuge in generalisations but gave a list of tenants 'all gone' and explained that 'the Englishman has the land now' (Timothy Booth?) and that where once were people, now were cattle. Making this witness particularly effective was the fact that he worked for White. 'I sowed clover for Mr White in a great part of Ballinree. I sowed it where houses had been, on the very places where the foundations had been.' Grant was certain that 'hundreds' of acres were taken by White, one of the charges made by Gill. 'I don't recollect any man who left the estate of his own accord.'

Gill's counsel went through a list of tenants on various townlands asking witnesses about their present status. Philip Connell was familiar with Thurlesbeg and Gortmakellis and 'most of his answers were to the effect that such a person "is not there now and his house is knocked" '. Connell held forty-five acres in Ballinree. In some cases Connell was unsure whether the person had 'left' or been 'evicted' but in most cases they were evicted. Like the previous witness, Connell told the court about his dealings with White, the emphasis being on the arbitrary and abusive nature of the agent's attitude. For example, Connell's brother was evicted from Thurlesbeg and 'was obliged to go to Australia'. Unlike the previous witness, Connell claimed that he remembered the sheriff and police coming 'to pull down the houses' in Ballinree. His language is of interest. His reference to the removal of 'old families' suggests a belief that such tenants had rights other than what the law, British law, recognised. Looking back from the perspective of 1863 at these events, Connell was mindful of the fact that displaced tenants had been replaced by a handful of 'strangers', substantial leaseholders such as John Hopkinson who held nearly 600 acres, Thomas Brindley with nearly 400 acres and Timothy Booth with around 150 acres.⁵⁶

None of the witnesses was precise as to when exactly evictions took place. According to *Griffith's Valuation* (1850), Philip Connell had two sub-tenants, though by that date one was gone, the house 'vacant'. With reference to one of these, Connell was served with notice to get rid of him and Connell told the court that the man had 'to lie in the side of a ditch for a week before he could get lodgings, for no one on the Smith-Barry estate dared to let him in'. Connell was cross-examined by White's counsel in an attempt to establish that Connell was complicit in these evictions. Connell explained about White overtaking him on the road one day saying: ' "Connell you have a bad house" . I jumped round frightened thinking he wanted my house and said: "Is it my house?" "No", said he, "your tenant's house" '. This story continued with reference to White swearing 'by the five wounds of Christ' and Connell refusing to comply until served with a notice to quit.

The witness admitted that he was given the vacant scraps of land but emphasised that he paid nothing for this land. 'I was terrified seeing the whole country gone and the houses all down.' The final flourish by White's counsel was the question to Connell: 'Are you not as great a land-shark as Mr White?' To which Connell replied: 'God forbid. I could not be compared to him; he could not be matched in Ireland.'

Two other witnesses gave evidence about this estate. Nicholas Wall who was then a Bianconi tenant explained how he had handed over his Smith-Barry holding to his son-in-law on his marriage to his daughter but that White had evicted him, simply because he wanted the land. Wall's attempt to appeal to the agent Reeves only served to annoy White who, according to the witness, had the new tenant 'decreed' for the hanging gale and arrested. A key point in this evidence was the contrast between the Smith-Barry and Bianconi estates. The son-in-law then went to the Bianconi property where 'Mr Bianconi built a comfortable house for him'. Unlike in England, this was not the usual practice in Ireland. This witness appears to have confirmed the charge that White held portions of the estate in his own hands, though no details were provided. Michael Hanly who held 105 acres in Ballinree (St Patricksrock) told the court about his father, who died in 1855, and who held his farm from the Lockwood middle interest, until Lockwood was ejected (after 1850). The fact that Hanly still held his farm allowed that he had no real grievance against White and admitted this. He did explain that when his father had to deal directly with White, he was pressured into paying what Lockwood owed the estate, an example of an agent pushing his advantage at a time when a tenant was especially vulnerable.⁵⁷

When John White gave evidence about his management of the Smith-Barry estate, he could hardly deny that large numbers of tenants 'disappeared' during his tenure but his argument was that tenants opted to go. He named six Ballinree tenants, all originally holding from middlemen, who because of the 'exhaustion' of their land and the burden of poor rates, could not pay their rents and as David Kennedy (probably Denis Kennedy holding about forty-four acres) explained to White, even if he got the land rent free, he could 'no longer support himself'. In some instances, according to White, the estate had slated tenant's houses but tenants left anyway. This evidence was less impressive when in response to a query from the judge, White admitted that he had no records, having destroyed them when he gave up its management in 1852. 'I did not think I should ever want them.' White continued his litany of tenants willingly abandoning their holdings. Regarding some of them, White's story was that he did what he could to get them to stay. 'Might I remark that when I found the tenantry leaving ... I sent down a man specially to know whether I could do anything to enable them to retain their holdings'. White admitted responsibility for evicting just one tenant, Tom Cullen (who held twenty-eight acres).

At this point some of the jurors declared that the case might be shortened. Clearly they were fed up with the seemingly endless names of tenants from obscure townlands in a part of the country with which they were not familiar. One of the jurors was of the opinion that it did not matter whether 'one or five hundred' tenants had been evicted, it was not the responsibility of the agent but of the landlord. Another juror disagreed with this and the judge made it clear that the nature of the evictions and White's complicity were at the heart of the case. This intervention indicates something made explicit when they gave their verdict; jurors were not influenced by the evidence but had their minds made up on the basis of their predispositions on the matter of landlord-tenant relations.

The case continued and in the words of a press report: '(White) went on at a considerable length ... to give from memory the history of every tenant. In almost every instance he denied that the tenants had been evicted ... (but had) voluntarily surrendered the land owing arrears... far from trying to get them off the land, did all he could to enable them to remain... and that he acted in the kindest and most considerate manner'. Under cross-examination White became jesuitical, rejecting the charge that '158 houses were by your order, and under your directions, razed to the ground?' White's point was that any such actions were under 'instructions from Mr Reeves and I was obliged to follow them'. However he had no recollection about the number of

such actions.⁵⁸ White gave evidence over several days, during which large numbers of now-vanished Ballinree and Thurlesbeg tenants were recalled to memory and in White's version of events, in spite of his best efforts, manifested a perverse determination to flee their holdings. He also more plausibly denied that he personally farmed this land 'between putting out tenants and getting new tenants'. Under the direction of Reeves, he 'superintended as well as (he) could the management of these lands. I had a steward paid by Mr Smith-Barry and I strictly accounted to Mr Reeves for the produce'.

At the conclusion of the trial, the best cases for White and Gill were put by their respective counsels. Speaking for Gill, J.E. Walshe QC highlighted the contemporary context of the case: massive and sustained loss of population (the image of evicted Tipperary tenants 'amidst the swamps of Tennessee') and the deteriorating economy, raising the spectre of Famine's return ('scenes of terror and misery'). White's management of the Smith-Barry property was clearly seen as central to Gill's depiction of White as an exterminator – a number of tenants characterising White as Mr Hyde, but White himself, when he gave his evidence, clearly presenting himself as a beneficent Dr Jekyll. Was the jury to suppose that tenants were engaged in a malicious conspiracy (eighteen witnesses to one)? What was the jury to make of the absence of records, all the more suspicious because of the presentation in court of a few ledgers but with pages torn out? The circumstances of having responsibility for an estate, some 3,000 acres, from which middlemen had been removed, exposing a mass of poor tenants was understood but this did not excuse White's policy of 'extermination'. The idea that such a large number of tenants 'voluntarily' walked away from their homes was risible, as was the claim that Reeves was the real villain, White being no more than his instrument. As the press reported: 'The learned counsel was loudly applauded at the close of his speech'.⁵⁹

Speaking for White, his counsel began with an attack on Gill's motives. In doing so, he unintentionally drew attention to the need for reform in landlord-tenant relations, a matter at the heart of Gill's journalism. On the question of the Irish language names unflatteringly applied to White, dismissing them as a malign invention did not carry conviction. With regard to the substance of the case, the designation of White as 'exterminator', his counsel at first side-stepped the extent and nature of the clearance of Ballinree and Thurlesbeg and concentrated on White's role as no more than someone 'who executed the orders of his principal'. Smith-Barry acting through Reeves 'was obliged to give notice to quit to many but he only evicted in a very few instances'. In any event 'Smith-Barry did no wrong and if he did, [White] was not responsible for it'. Having removed White from primary responsibility, his counsel then back-tracked and addressed the jury as men who understood the negative ramifications of the middleman system and that his client did no more than respond to an unsustainable situation. In any case, this response was limited. 'The number of evictions were very few, that the majority of tenants quietly surrendered their holdings'. Again, hoping to engage the sympathy of the jury, Gill's press coverage was presented as a direct threat to White's life in the context of Tipperary's bloody reputation. 'These papers were read in the forge and upon the roadside... by hundreds of ignorant and misguided peasants and passed from hand to hand and cabin to cabin'.⁶⁰

Other Estates

While John White's ordeal in court was triggered by his management of the Hobson estate and most attention was given to the Smith-Barry estate, other estates with which White had dealings were also brought into the picture. A crucial point of difference between these estates was that White was in charge of the Smith-Barry Boherlahan estate during the Famine.

Nodstown, a townland of nearly 1,000 acres in the civil parish of Ardmayle was the property of The King's Hospital (actually a school in Dublin, called the Blue Coat school – still a school and now in Palmerstown⁶¹). During the early 1850s the local agent was inefficient and on his death in 1857, John White was appointed.⁶² In the context of increased rural prosperity, the governors of The King's Hospital were anxious to increase their income from their Tipperary estate. Opposition to White in this regard was led by one of the tenants, John Devane (holding eighty-two Irish acres) and who appeared in the Four Courts to give evidence against White. He explained that he had paid rent increased from £79 to £129 p.a. after he had been served with an ejectment and paid the costs. His investment in his holding was made possible by money he had made in America and as he told the court: 'After Mr White became agent I was fortunate to get a wife with a fortune'. Devane was the type of prosperous tenant ready to use any measure, short of losing his land, to minimise the estate's portion of increasing prosperity.

Gill's hope that Devane would be seen as a victim of landlord greed was thrown off course when Devane admitted that he had removed cottiers from his holding (nine indicated in *Griffith's Valuation*). This happened years before White's appointment and as Devane explained to the court: 'It was for the benefit of any person who wished to make a living out of the land to get these people out of it'. White could hardly have put the economic argument more powerfully. This admission by Devane caused an uproar in court, not calmed when he added by way of extenuation that 'he had given a sovereign to some who had not their breakfast'.

William Maher, another Nodstown tenant told the court about being on a deputation to the Governors and being told by them that rent increases were their decision, not White's. This was confirmed by the evidence of the Governor's general agent and registrar, who described going to the Tipperary estate and having valued the land, raised the rent by about one-quarter.⁶³ Not surprisingly, when Gill's counsel summed up for his client, Nodstown was not the source of a smoking gun. Another example of even weaker evidence against White was the story told by another witness Richard Norris, who reached back some fifteen years to when he was still going to school and described White telling his (Norris) father that 'the gentlemen of the country were robbed by having such a lot of cabins on their land; that they should get all taken off and make the land yield a proper return to the owners'.⁶⁴

Rathsallagh, a townland of under 400 acres in Tullamain and owned by Daniel Bastable, was managed by White from around 1847 or 1848. Three of its tenants gave evidence, one of whom Kennedy Davin (holding sixty-seven acres) told the court about White discussing the court case with him and reminding the witness of 'all the indulgence he gaye me'. One of Gill's charges against White was that he was open to bribes with respect to leases and Davin told the court about how he and a neighbour got White to remove an objectionable clause from leases being renewed on payment of £18. That neighbour, Thomas Hallanan (holding 107 acres) also gave evidence. White's counsel questioned this witness, not about this matter but asked: 'On your oath, would you not like Mr White to be beaten in this action?' Deviously, counsel pushed this question to mean White being physically assaulted; the witness making clear that such a thing would not bother him.⁶⁵

Conclusion

When John White was cross-examined, especially about Ballinree, his responses were shifty. What he did not know was legion: the number of tenants; how they left their homes; whether they died, went to the workhouse or to America; he was even uncertain about his presence during evictions. As Gill's counsel asked: 'All you know is that they left the land? – Yes'. White

was then asked: 'And none of their ghosts have as yet appeared to you? – "No I am happy to say (laughter)." '66 When counsel for each side concluded summing up, having made the best case for their clients, there was a delay of nearly two weeks before the judge charged the jury who were left to choose between White's self-serving evidence or the testimony of a succession of witnesses, assuming that the jury did not decide that these witnesses had entered into a conspiracy to destroy White but that their evidence was truthful. There is little doubt that the jurors were bored by the relentless local detail and as one of the jurors remarked, their minds were made up more on the basis of prejudice than of evidence. They failed to agree a verdict and made it clear to the judge that this would not change and so they were discharged.⁶⁷ Gill was happy at least with the fairness of the judge's charge to the jury and hoped that the case might influence opinion in England about reforming landlord-tenant relations. However, the matter of his costs was to remain an ongoing problem for Gill.

In Tipperary popular opinion interpreted the result as a victory for Gill. In New Inn, bonfires blazed and an effigy representing White was burned. It was adorned with a hat which was covered with notices-to-quit.⁶⁸ In Cashel the band paraded and the police had to protect White's house.⁶⁹ For Gill personally, matters were less happy. A 'Gill Indemnity Fund' was set up to meet his costs which included not just his legal team but the expense of maintaining his witnesses in Dublin. To keep the case before the public, over the following months Gill's newspaper published a series of 'sketches' about the trial.⁷⁰ Here Gill cleverly was able to revisit selected aspects and personalities of the trial, giving back-stories to arouse interest and sympathy. The emphasis was on the way that White v. Gill transcended the merely local and touched on matters of national importance: the shadow of the Famine, the flight of people from Ireland, the exposure of tenants to arbitrary law and the immediate threat to precarious prosperity.

A meeting in Dublin in January 1864 was attended by A.M. Sullivan and The O'Donoghue MP (Tipperary 1857-65).⁷¹ By June, Gill was expressing his hope that priests and people would bestir themselves', especially in Dublin and John White was again cited as an example of all that was wrong with the land system.⁷² Gill's language showed no restraint, as if he was daring White to have another go at him. Contributing to the fact that for all his efforts Gill was not taken entirely seriously was his extravagant display that his life was a melodrama in which he was the lead player. For several months in 1864 he was seriously ill and then in late September his newspaper proclaimed his survival. An editorial noted that his death would have been a great loss to tenant farmers and how the revelations from White v. Gill immortalised his name, not only in the UK but in the United States and Australia.⁷³

In the decades after the Famine, the occasional voice called attention to Famine clearances. Writing in 1870, Isaac Butt, hardly the most vehement nationalist polemicist, characterised these clearances as 'an act of war, of cruel, ruthless war'.⁷⁴ Around this same period, Frederick Engels, in a preface to a collection of Irish songs, prepared for the daughter of Karl Marx, referred to 'the mass eviction of the Irish from house and home'.⁷⁵ In a book published in 1886, T.P. O'Connor, parliamentarian and journalist devoted a chapter to 'The Great Clearances'.⁷⁶ A modern historian has wondered why 'so few mass clearances became notorious'.⁷⁷ Another sees these clearances as the primary contribution 'to the generation and spread of anti-British hostility in Ireland'.⁷⁸

Is there perhaps a link between the extent of clearances in Tipperary and that county's commitment to revolutionary politics? What of the protagonists John White and Peter E. Gill? White got on with his work. He continued to manage a few estates though the notoriety engendered by the trial can have done him no service professionally. He had to put up with the name-calling: 'Shawn Mullougha' and 'Shawn na Crisha'. Gill paid a higher price. The debts

arising from the case continued to burden him. In the summer of 1865, while fighting the general election (on a predictable platform that nothing was to be gained from the House of Commons), he was arrested for debt, £166 outstanding legal costs. When the results came in for Tipperary, Gill was in Clonmel Gaol. Tipperary's electors demonstrated scant gratitude for his efforts on behalf of tenant farmers. He received just 930 votes. The two victors between them got over five thousand votes. Gill spent three months in prison while efforts were renewed to raise money. On his release on 17 October 1865, he can be forgiven for his attack on tenant farmers, the class he championed and from whom he expected generosity.⁷⁹

Notes

- 1 *Tipperary Advocate*, 7 Feb 1863.
- 2 *T.A.*, 28 Feb 1863.
- 3 *T.A.*, 4 April 1863.
- 4 *T.A.*, 18 April 1863.
- 5 *Clonmel Chronicle*, 11 Nov. 1863. The letter published on 31 Jan is dated 30 Jan, while that published on 7 Feb is dated 6 Feb.
- 6 *T.A.*, 20 June 1863.
- 7 See *T.A.*, 26 Sept 1863: a letter from 'A Cashel PP' and his charge that White had 'swept thousands of God's people away from their native dwellings and rendered desolate the country for miles around the town of Cashel'.
- 8 *F.J.*, 15 June 1863.
- 9 *T.A.*, 4 July 1863.
- 10 M.L. Legg, *Newspapers and Nationalism: the Irish Provincial Press 1850-1892* (Dublin, 1999), p.95.
- 11 N. Murphy, *Walkabout Nenagh* (Nenagh, 1994); *Cashel Sentinel*, 23 July 1892; *Nenagh Guardian*, 23 July 1892; W. O'Brien, *Recollections* (London, 1905), pp. 106-09; J.A. O'Shea, *Roundabout Recollections* (London, 1892), vol.2, pp. 89-92; L. Fogarty, *Father John Kenyon* (Dublin, n.d.), pp. 137-8.
- 12 *T.A.*, 31 March 1860.
- 13 *T.A.*, 9 Feb. 1861.
- 14 *T.A.*, 20 July 1861.
- 15 J.D.White, *History of the Family of White* (Cashel, 1887); *Clonmel Chronicle*, 31 May 1882.
- 16 Chapter 26.
- 17 *C.C.*, 7 Nov 1863.
- 18 Chapter 32.
- 19 E. Richards, The Land Agent in G.E. Mingay (ed.), *The Victorian Countryside* (London, 1981), vol. 2i, p.440.
- 20 Sir H.J. Brownrigg, *Report on the State of Ireland in 1864*, p.46.
- 21 For an optimistic view of agriculture in Tipperary, see the report of the Special Correspondent in the *Times*, 13 Sept 1861.
- 22 The standard discussion is James S. Donnelly, Jr, 'The Irish Agricultural Depression of 1859-64' in *Irish Economic and Social History*, 3 (1976), pp. 33-54.
- 23 *The Agricultural Statistics 1861* [3156], H.C. 1863, 69, p. 18.
- 24 *30th Report from the Board of Public Works, Ireland for 1861* [3008], H.C. 1862, 27, p.8.
- 25 Donnelly, pp. 34-6.
- 26 See *Tipperary Free Press*, 12 Sept 1865.
- 27 G. Goold R.M. to T. Larcom, 1 Feb 1863 (*Larcom papers MS. 7638/56*, N.L.I.)
- 28 *T.F.P.*, 4 Feb 1862.
- 29 For example, *T.A.*, 29 March 1862 regarding the estate of James Scully in Clerihan or 29 Nov 1862 regarding the Watson estate near Clonmel.
- 30 Smith-Barry Tipperary rental, 1858-79 (*Smith-Barry Papers, DCN/1402-77* Cheshire Record Office,

- Chester.)
- 31 W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords & Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford, 1994), p. 25 and appendix 4.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p 27. See the *Times*, 7 Feb 1849 for a comment on the amount of deserted land in Tipperary.
- 33 T.P. O'Neill, 'Famine Evictions' in C.King (ed.), *Famine, Land and Culture in Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), p. 31 and generally.
- 34 *Ibid.*, pp. 32-8; Vaughan, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-2.
- 35 CSORP 1874/685 (NAI).
- 36 *Return of Evictions etc.*, 185, H.C. 1881, 77.
- 37 *Pobal Ailbe*, pp. 110-11.
- 38 D.G. Marnane, 'Famine', part five in *THJ*, (2000), p. 86.
- 39 See D.G. Marnane, ' "A Valuable Property": The Smith-Barry Cashel Estate' in *Boherlahan-Dualla Historical Journal* (2001-2004 and ongoing).
- 40 *Abstract Returns of all Notices Served upon Relieving Officers etc.* 517, H.C. 1849, 49, 279.
- 41 T.A., 9 Feb 1861. Mr Sergeant Armstrong.
- 42 For a discussion on these race based perspectives see K. Theodore Hoppen, *Ireland since 1800 Conflict and Conformity* (London, 1989), pp. 138-9.
- 43 O. MacDonagh, *States of Mind: a Study of Anglo-Irish Conflict 1780-1980* (London, 1983), pp. 34-51.
- 44 *Clonmel Chronicle*, 28 Oct 1863.
- 45 T.F.P., 3 Nov 1863.
- 46 C.C., 28 Oct 1863; T.F.P., 3 Nov 1863. Describing this period: 'Many farmers experienced an unprecedented flush of good fortune' R. V. Comerford, 'Ireland 1850-70: Post-famine and Mid-Victorian' in W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland*, vol. 5 (Oxford, 1989), p. 381.
- 47 See James S. Donnelly, Jr. *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork* (London, 1975), pp. 219-50.
- 48 C.C., 31 Oct 1863.
- 49 John Brien, James Mockler, Mary Slattery, Thomas Fitzgerald and William Slattery.
- 50 C.C., 31 Oct 1863, 7 Nov 1863.
- 51 *Griffith's Valuation*, Middlethird, p.35.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p.10.
- 53 For these middlemen see *Rental Co Tipperary Estate, Nov 1813* (Reeves papers, MSS 10466-7, NLI)
- 54 *Surveyor's Field book, Ballinree, Middle Third* (My thanks to Tom Ryan, Ballinree); *Griffith's Valuation*, Middlethird, p. 10.
- 55 C.C., 4 Nov 1863; T.A., 31 Oct 1863.
- 56 *Smith-Barry Cashel Estate Rentals* (in possession of the writer).
- 57 C.C., 28 Oct 1863; T.A., 31 Oct 1863.
- 58 C.C., 4 Nov 1863.
- 59 C.C., 11 Nov 1863.
- 60 C.C., 11 Nov 1863.
- 61 See L. Whiteside, *A History of the King's Hospital* (Dublin, 1985, 2nd ed.).
- 62 For a detailed account of this estate based on The King's Hospital archives, see the ongoing series of articles by Paddy O'Dwyer in *Boherlahan-Dualla Historical Journal*, especially (2001) pp. 40-50; (2002) pp. 87-98; (2003) pp. 36-47; (2004) pp. 116-27.
- 63 C.C., 31 Oct., 7 Nov 1863.
- 64 C.C., 31 Oct 1863.
- 65 *Ibid.*
- 66 T.A., 7 Nov 1863.
- 67 T.A., 28 Nov 1863.
- 68 *Limerick Reporter & Tipperary Vindicator*, 27 Nov 1863.
- 69 C.C., 28 Nov 1863.
- 70 T.A., 5, 12, 19 Dec 1863, 2, 9, 23 Jan, 13 Feb 1864.
- 71 T.A., 23 Jan 1864.

- 72 T.A., 18 June 1864.
- 73 T.A., 24 Sept 1864.
- 74 *The Handbook of the Land: Selections from Mr Butt's Tracts on the Land Question* (Dublin, 1870), p.34.
- 75 *Marx Engels Ireland and the Irish Question* (Moscow, 1986), p.369.
- 76 T.P. O'Connor, *The Parnell Movement with a Sketch of Irish Parties from 1843* (London, 1886), chapter four.
- 77 T.P. O'Neill, 'Famine Evictions in C. King' (ed.), *Famine, Land and Culture in Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), p. 56. For an example of Tipperary famine history rewritten, see W. Hayes and A. Cavanaugh, *The Tipperary Gentry*, volume I (Dublin, 2003), p.vi.
- 78 J.S. Donnelly, Jr., 'The Construction of the Memory of the Famine in Ireland and the Irish Diaspora, 1850-1900' in *Eire-Ireland*, 31 (1996), p. 42.
- 79 T.A., 8, 22, 29 July, 5, 19 Aug, 16, 30 Sept, 7, 21 Oct 1865.