

Scottish Ancestry II

by donald lehman jr
Summer 1997

Table of Contents

OLD AND NEW FAMILY FACTS	1
<i>Family facts from America?</i>	1
<i>Highland Trip Midsummer 1997</i>	2
<i>My first pieces of evidence</i>	3
THE IRISH CELTS: 600 BCE ->600 AD	5
<i>The Royal House of O'Neill from Ireland</i>	5
<i>A High King</i>	7
<i>Celtic Clans</i>	9
<i>Celtic beliefs</i>	10
THE GREAT EARTH MOTHER:7000 BCE ->3500 BCE	12
<i>The beginning</i>	12
<i>Old European civilization</i>	12
<i>Taoism and the Goddess</i>	14
<i>Other Vestiges of the Goddess</i>	15
<i>Summary of Neolithic characteristics</i>	16
KURGAN INVASIONS: 4300->2800 BCE	16
<i>3 waves of destruction</i>	16
<i>Comparisons</i>	19
<i>Banned from the Garden of Eden</i>	20
<i>Weaving it together</i>	21
THE ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE	23
<i>Kurgan vs. Goddess based</i>	23
<i>Modern Manifestations</i>	26
<i>Nature and Sex</i>	27
THE DRUIDS	29
<i>Celtic attitude towards knowledge</i>	29
<i>Why research the Family Heritage or What does it mean?</i>	32
A RETURN TO THE HIGHLANDS OF SCOTLAND	36
THE NORMANS	41
<i>Edward the Confessor 1005-1066</i>	41
<i>Succession</i>	42
<i>Here</i>	44
A TITLE	48
FOOTNOTES	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

Old and New Family facts

Family facts from America?

In our first exploration of our Highland Scottish Ancestry we merely skimmed the surface. Let us go a little bit deeper. But first let us summarize a little of what we learned in the first paper on the chance that you, the Reader, may have forgotten what was said.

Archibald MacLaughlin, the first fact

First because of my extreme imagination, I am going to try and swing from facts as best as I can, but swing I will. Eugene Lehman, my father's brother, Uncle Gene,, Professor of Biology at North Carolina University, from a University publication on Scottish ancestry in North Carolina, discovered that the first known member of the our Lehman family line was Archibald MacLaughlin. This early patriarch owned a hundred slaves and was probably a descendant of a group of Highland Scots who migrated to North Carolina between 1730 and 1750.

A short family history, then to now

His daughter Sarah married Charles Pinkney Jones, a Welsh Methodist minister. Their daughter, Sarah Eugenia, named after the mother, married Harry Burke, a German immigrant. Their daughter Mabel married Algae Lehman, a grandson of Moses B Miller (1819-1902) , the Amish patriarch. His wife, Susannah, bore her 11th and last child, daughter Katherine, when she was 43 years old in 1861. Katherine married John Lehman, whose oldest son was Algae. Algae and Mabel had 4 children, Donald, Eugene, Dorothy, and John. Donald 'Bur', the oldest, married Jeanne Blanchard and had four sons, Donald Jr., David, Robin, and Eric. I, the author, am Donald Jr. I married Laurie Rubin and had two daughters, Serena and Miranda. David, my brother, married Mary Presley and had four children, Rhianna, Brittany, Roger and Noah. Eric, my youngest brother, had one child, Kyra, with Liz Finnegan.

Dedication

This work is especially dedicated to Uncle Gene, whose own interest in the family history has spawned mine. It is for him, my brothers and our children, that this work is intended. It is equally applicable to Aunt Dorothy, my father's sister, and her line and it is hoped that it will read and appreciated by them as well. It is also, of course, intended for any ancestor of ours who might be slightly curious about their illustrious roots. Finally as a history of a people who craved liberty, it is meant for any who might have yearnings to be free of the chains of the Hierarchy.

Primary Cultural Strains

Mabel's father, Harry Burke, died when she was quite young. Hence she was raised primarily by her mother Sarah Eugenia. Sarah was at least partly raised on her grandfather's plantation. Hence the Highland Scottish culture ran thicker through her upbringing than through her blood. Algae Lehman worked on his grandfather, Moses Miller's farm and was much influenced by him. It was said that his father John Lehman, had a drinking problem, which skipped a generation into Bur Lehman, my father. Algae, more influenced by Moses Miller, his Amish grandfather, became a missionary in China. Because of this Papa 'Bur', my father, was born and raised in China through his formative years until the age of 12 years old.

Highland Scot, Swiss Amish, Chinese, American

Because of these factors I would say that the predominant cultural strains which have influenced our upbringing on the Lehman side would be Highland Scots from Mabel Burke, Pennsylvania Amish from Algae Lehman, Chinese culture subliminally from their stay in China, Bur's upbringing, and of course the overlay of American culture that infuses us all. This paper will be almost exclusively devoted to the MacLaughlins of the Highlands of Scotland.

Highland Trip Midsummer 1997

A Trip to the Highlands, our homeland

Uncle Gene mentioned, on a trip to California in the fall of 1995 researching ancestry, that Archibald MacLaughlin was a slave holding Highland Scot whose ancestors had come to North Carolina in the 1700s. This ignited my curiosity. After they left I wrote a paper exploring who the Highland Scots were called Scottish Ancestry. In the winter of 1997, I showed the paper to a Tai Chi partner, Bill Powell, who happens to be a Professor of Chinese religion in the Religious Studies Department of UC Santa Barbara. By chance, some call it coincidence, I call it the Divine Plan, he was going to the Highlands of Scotland at the Summer Solstice. Perhaps I would like to go along, he suggested. With much fear and trembling, false stops and starts, we, my wife Laurie, my youngest daughter Miranda and myself all accompanied my friend Bill to the Highlands of Scotland. This then is what I discovered when I pursued the question, Who were these MacLaughlins of the Highlands of Scotland?.

Scots obsessed with their history

For whatever reason, the Scots are obsessed with their ancestry. Some say it is all they have, others say it is genetic-cultural, it s probably a little of both, From taxi cab drivers to bookstore owners to fellow train passengers, they are all quite aware of certain aspects of their Scottish ancestry. When I would mention that I was going to the

Highlands to explore my ancestry this would initiate an immediate connection. When I would assert that our ancestors had been exiled for fighting for Bonnie Prince Charlie in 1745 it would almost certainly ignite a spirited conversation. Most were happy that we had sided with Prince Charlie. The taxi driver in Glasgow said good for them. As we learned rapidly, for the Scots, the war of '45 was not the end of World War II but was 1745 and the Culloden disaster. Scottish writers didn't even need to mention the century when referring to '45. All readers knew what they were referring to. In Carlisle Castle, on the England-Scottish border, an entire floor is devoted to the Scottish uprising of '45. More later.

All speculation

If the Readers remember the first paper on our Scottish Ancestry, they will remember that all we really knew about Archibald MacLaughlin was that his family came from the Highlands of Scotland between 1730 and 1750 and that he owned 100 slaves in North Carolina. We didn't really know anything factual about the MacLaughlins of Scotland. We suspected because of the number of slaves that he must have been a noble. We also suspected that the family had been exiled for their part in the Scottish uprising of 1745. Why else would have they left? It seemed sure enough that I asserted it boldly. I also suspected that we had both Pictish and Scottish genes. My brother Robin and my father Bur are both smaller with dark complexion, with fiery temper and combative. David and Eric, my other brothers, are both taller, fairer, and of mild complexions. Myself, I am between, probably more Scottish because I have no temper although I do have a problem with pride. However all of this was merely speculation. Hence in traveling to the Highlands of Scotland I was looking for confirmation (or deconfirmation) of my theories.

My first pieces of evidence

Upon going to the Glasgow visitor's centre, one is inundated with Scottish History. The bookstores are filled with it, leading my daughter Miranda to say that she didn't like the Scottish bookstores because all they had was history. The tourist spots and malls are also saturated with it.

Scottish History is Clan History

Possibly I should mention that Scottish History is Clan History and the Clans came from the Highlands. There are key chains, postcards, computer programs, bookmarks, shot glasses, pens, and even coasters with the clan tartan, insignia, or crest on it. There are also clothing shops specializing in making clothes out of your clan tartan. Buy your

own kilt made from your clan tartan. It's only £300, i.e. 300 British pounds, approximately \$525.

Tartans

By the way, what is a tartan anyhow? The tartan is the plaid pattern specifically associated with an individual clan. In a book titled Scottish Clans and Tartans in the Glasgow Visitor Center, there are 150 clans and tartans listed. This book probably contains most but not all of the clans, but certainly all the bigger clans. Thus while any knowledge of your ancestry is better than none, being connected to a clan is better than just any name. You've got your own tartan, crest, castle, location, and most importantly your own history. As mentioned the Scots are obsessed with their ancestry and so keep a fairly accurate record of the history of each clan. Thus discover your clan connection and you have an instant history, which has already been fairly well explored. As a for instance of the reverse, my wife Laurie has Scottish ancestry in the Lowlands which didn't have any immediately available history.

The Highlander Clans have been isolated

Why the differentiation? As Uncle Gene said, "Speciation doesn't occur unless there is some amount of isolation." In the lowlands of Scotland and through England the geographical barriers to interbreeding are much smaller, also to invasion. Hence from the Lowlands of Scotland down to the bottom of the British Isles there have been many invasions by many different cultures, each spreading their gene pools in the places they conquered. However in the Highlands, because of their glacial geology, they have effectively resisted invasion and also kept their gene pool purer. This same geographical isolation has created clans who each live in their own glacial valley, each with their own clannish history. Because of this uniqueness, it must have also been all the harder to leave.

Although I didn't know it at the time, I was hoping that we belonged to a clan. As daughter Miranda said, "Somehow it seems so romantic to belong to a Clan."

The Clan MacLachlan

Anyway Miranda plops this book in my hand called Scottish Clans and Tartans. "See if we are in it, Dad." With trepidation I looked through the book. After a few false misses because of spelling, I joyously found the clan MacLachlan. It wasn't the same spelling, but Shakespeare himself spelled his name 17 different ways. In later research I found the clan name spelled four different ways, including MacLoughlin and MacLochlen, (This last spelling led my wife Laurie to speculate that the original Lochlens might have had something to do with tending or guarding a Loch. A loch is a long narrow lake in Scotland, carved by a glacier.)

Clan History the same everywhere, with variations

I read many different histories of the MacLachlans. It was everywhere. Each included different but similar information. None contradicted the others. It seems that there must be multiplicity of sources from which these short histories are drawn rather than just one main source. They all concurred that the MacLachlans fought for every Scottish rebellion against the English. They sided with Robert Bruce in the early 1300s in throwing off the English oppression and attended the first meeting of the Scottish Parliament in 1308. They also fought in the uprisings of 1688, 1715, and finally and tragically, 1745. More later.

The Irish Celts: 600 BCE ->600 AD

The Royal House of O'Neill from Ireland

Before examining these more *recent* events, let us go a little further back in time. All the histories linked the MacLachlans with the O'Neill's of Ireland. One history reads, "*The Clan is of ancient Celtic descent from the Royal House of O'Neill.*" Another reads

"This is one of the clans which descends according to tradition, fortified by a Gaelic manuscript of 1450, from the oldest traceable family in Europe. The line of Lachlan passed, according to this tradition, through the historical O'Neill kings from Niall of the Nine Hostages, who was High King of Ireland in 400."¹

The Celts, Iron Age Britain

Who were these Celts? And who was this Celtic O'Neill named Niall of the Nine Hostages, who was High King of Ireland in 400 AD?

In about 600 BC two divisions of Celts with their iron weapons came over and established themselves as the ruling class of England, Wales and Ireland. The Brythons established themselves as the rulers of England and Wales, while the Goidels established themselves as rulers of Ireland.

Just as the Normans established themselves as overlords of the indigenous population almost two millennium later, so did the Celts establish themselves as overlords of the indigenous population when they came over. They did not come en masse to supplant the local population, instead the warriors with their iron weaponry came to rule the locals.²

Picts

Who were the locals, the indigenous population?

"To the Celts of Gaul, and through them to the Greeks, the ancient inhabitants of Britain and Ireland appear to have been known by the common name of 'Pretani'." This was later

corrupted by the Romans into Brittani, or Brittania or Britons. “‘Pretani’, represented in early Irish by ‘Cruithin,’ was the name of the people who in later times are known as Picti, Picts. Hence it may be inferred that during the Bronze Age the Picts were the chief people of Ireland as well as of Britain, and this inference is amply confirmed by ancient Irish tradition.”³

Those darn Picts. They are everywhere. Remember from the first paper that it was they who retreated into the Highlands to avoid conquest by the Lowlanders, the Sassenach⁴. Where did they come from? More on the Picts later.

Rulers of Europe

Where did these Celts come from? The Celts were rulers of Central Europe before the Romans, all the way to the borders of Greece up into Russia and down to the shores of France. The Celts soundly defeated both the Macedonians of Greece and the Etruscans of Italy. When Caesar was defeating the Gauls of France, he was defeating the last of formerly great Celtic Empire.

Celts physically

The Celts historically were geographically and physically between the Nordic and Mediterranean type. In modern Europe they refer to Celts as those who speak Gaelic and as being of small stature with dark complexion. The original word referred “to folk of great stature, with fair hair, and blue or gray eyes”⁵ I would suggest that the original Celts were of the aggressive ruling class, while the small, dark peoples were the indigenous population who were the farmers and workers. When the later invaders, i.e. Romans, Angles, Saxons, Vikings and Normans, came to Britain, the tall and fair peoples, the Celtic rulers, probably intermarried with the new ruling classes, as they were similar racially, and thus remained part of the ruling classes. The smaller, dark indigenous population, while picking up the Celtic language, remained racially different, and were relegated to slave, servant, peasant, worker, proletariat class, through modern times. Thus the trend we are identifying is a two tiered society, those that rule and those that follow. The ruling class in Europe in all the historical times and much of the prehistoric times came from certain racial groups that were Nordic, Celtic, or Mediterranean. The working class has come from the disenfranchised of the ruling class and from the small, dark indigenous populations.

The *tuath* or state

The Celts arrived in Ireland and brought with them the social structure from the Iron Age La Tene culture that dominated Europe at the time. They quickly became rulers of the Bronze Age Picts who inhabited Ireland at the time. By about the 4th century BC, they had organized the country into small states, *tuath*. At the nucleus of

the *tuath* was a meeting place where the freemen would come to discuss business. The head of these assemblies was called king. This common assembly, *oinach*, of freemen was balanced by a senate, *aireacht*, made up of the friends of the king, *celi*, who gathered in the king's house to make decisions for the *tuath*. These kings acted as judge and also led the community in war. In turn these kings owed allegiance to a High King. The early Celts divided Ireland into five kingdoms, the "Five Fifths".

The Celts had three classes of citizenry. First there were the freemen, property holders, certain professions, and skilled craftsmen. Second were the unfreemen who owed a debt or obligation to one of the freemen. Third were the slaves, probably made up of conquered people, the indigenous population, the Picts.

A High King

Niall of the Nine Hostages

Of the five kingdoms, the Connaught fought the Ulster kings for supremacy. The Connaught eventually achieved the upper hand. "[The Connaught-Tara dynasty] reached the height of its power under Niall of the Nine Hostages at the beginning of the 5th century. ... [He and his kindred] now ruled all the northern half of Ireland except the eastern strip The chief kings of this kindred, *Dal Cuinn*, were recognized as kings of Ireland until 1002."⁶

Because of the relatively primitive weaponry and the small groupings of people, these High Kings ruled the country more in name than in practice. Each of the smaller kings had a lot of local autonomy. The role of the High King was to focalize a sense of national identity and defense in the case of outside attack rather than as absolute ruler, which developed much later. Some of the *tuaths* supplied tribute to the High King, many didn't. The groupings can be said to exist voluntarily for mutual defense rather than as a strictly hierarchical structure. The power of the High King was more dependent upon his personal magnetism than it did upon the political structure.

It is somewhat reminiscent of the role of the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in the Middle Ages, whose power was dependent upon local princes and Electors rather than upon the political structure. It also reflects upon the United States before the Civil War when participation in the central government by the states was voluntary rather than mandatory. The original thirteen states, while providing a collective army to defeat Great Britain in the war for independence, all voted independently to join the Union of states. North Carolina, you might remember from the first paper, didn't vote to join until a Bill of Rights was added.

The Scottish kidnap St. Patrick

The Iron Age Celtic warriors of Ireland, having consolidated their power and seeing the power of the Romans waning in England began raiding Britain from about the middle of 3rd century. The Romans called these raiders, Scotti, a Celtic word meaning raiders. "Niall of the Nine Hostages, ... is identified with 'the Scot' who 'mobilized all Ireland' against Roman Britain. In his reign, St. Patrick was carried to Ireland as a captive and with him in the same raid, 'so many thousands of men'. At the head of a later expedition, Niall was killed at sea by a Leinster prince."⁷

St. Patrick

There is of course much controversy surrounding St. Patrick's conversion of Ireland to Christianity. The Irish tend to turn a process into an event. The Christian haters tend to turn any conversion into a military invasion with the subsequent suppression of women. While many times the military did accompany the religious structure, St. Patrick was kidnapped by Niall, our relative. St. Patrick fought against enslavement of Christians by the Irish and as such he fought against the Celtic class structure. Within two centuries of St. Patrick the class system no longer existed in Irish law. "The earlier racial distinctions between conquerors and conquered, between Pict and Celt, survive only in antiquarian tradition, and all become known by the common name Goidel (Gaels) or Fir Erenn (Men of Ireland)."⁸

Dalraida

At first the Irish merely raided Britain, but soon they stayed and colonized. To illustrate the ephemeral quality of the Irish political system, after Niall's death Ireland broke into 7 kingdoms, three of these in the North. One of these northern Kingdoms, Eastern Ulster was further broken down into three equal kingdoms, interestingly, one of Pictish rule. One of these kingdoms, Dalraida, being very close to Britain, established a colony there on the east of Scotland and ruled it from Ireland.

Ui Neill = O'Neill rule Ireland and Scotland

The descendants of Niall, called Ui Neill, became kings of Dalraida in Scotland as well as kings of Ireland. Remember that the Celtic kings were the heads of assemblies of small states, acting as judge and war leader. In 575 AD the High King Aed called an assembly to, among other things, regulate the relations between Irish Dalraida and Scottish Dalraida. Thus the descendants of Niall, the Ui Neill, i.e. O'Neill, were the Kings of early Scotland. "In the 5th century, the kings of Dalraida, a small kingdom in the northeastern angle of Ulster, extended their power over the Irish settlers in Argyll [in modern day Scotland] and the neighboring islands, their descendants ultimately, in the 9th century, becoming kings of Scotland."⁹

Celtic Clans

How O'Neill becomes MacLachlan

Hence we see that Niall was huge in Irish Celtic history, fathering children whose descendants ruled both Ireland and Scotland. If our clan members were descendants of Niall, why do we have the name MacLachlan? One history says, "Gilpatrick was the father of Lachlan Mór after whom the clan takes its name, although it descends in the male line from the royal house of O'Neill."¹⁰ The MacLachlans descended directly from the house of O'Neill but named their Clan in the 1200s after Lachlan Mór, the original Lachlan. Mac or Mc is Gaelic for 'son of'. Hence MacLachlan means sons of Lachlan. We don't know what he did but they named quite a few things after him in addition to the Clan. There is Lachlan Bay, Lachlan Water, the village of Stralachlan, the barony of Strathlachlan, and of course Lachlan Castle, in which Marjorie MacLachlan of MacLachlan, the 24th Chieftain from the original Lachlan still lives today.

The Irish extended family or *fine*

Before assigning too much importance to our link with Niall, let us look at what the Irish Celts considered family. "Normally each freeman was a member of a *fine* or joint family, consisting of descendants of the same great-grandfather — in other words extending to 2nd cousins."¹¹ We are not talking about nuclear family or even extended family in the modern sense. We are talking about a tribal family or Clan. Sometimes this family linkage would even extend to fourth cousins. To not minimize the connection, there are only four clans of the over hundred major clans, which are descended from Niall, i.e. the Lamonts, the MacNeills, the MacSweens, and the MacLachlans.¹²

Loch Fyne

As a brief aside, the Lachlan barony was situated around Loch Fyne. Fyne is fine, which is joint family or Clan. Hence by extension it is the family or Clan Loch.

The Celts have only farmer armies

Another point about the Celtic social structure was that while the Celtic *tuath* were to supply an army in case of an attack, the *tuath* had no warrior class.

"The Roman military organization seems to have led to the formation of the *fiana*, permanent bodies of professional soldiers, peculiar in Ireland to this period. In the earlier heroic tradition there is no military organization. Later, the Irish law does not recognize the military profession, and no permanently formed Irish military forces are seen until ... the 13th century."¹³

It is said that the early Brits fought the mighty Romans to a standstill, but that at harvest time they had to go tend their crops or they would starve over winter. It was

then that the professional Roman army showed its military advantage. They were supplied food by farmers all over their kingdom. They fought for a living. They didn't need to farm. The advantages of specialization.

Celtic beliefs

Incomplete oral tradition

Now what did these pre-Christian Celts believe in? Because Christianity superimposed itself upon the Celtic culture, the native Celtic religion hasn't existed for nearly 1500 years or more. Because they had no written language even though they understood Greek, we must rely on their oral tradition. Furthermore all of their stories that still exist were translated and written down by Catholic Christians. Much of what was written down was destroyed through neglect by the English, and/or burned by the Christian Presbyterians. Hence what we have left is incomplete. Additionally most of what we have left are stories. Hence we can only glean from these stories hints into the Celtic belief structure.

Celtic mythology

There are Celtic tales from Wales written down in the 1400s which represent a patrilineal succession and seem to be of a much later date. Then there were many tales from Ireland which were written down about 700 AD which represent a matrilineal succession and seem to reflect a much earlier time. There are several copies and are probably from the Irish Early Iron Age, about 700 years before. As a result of the distortion of repetition, there is much confusion associated with the tales. However this is all we have. And because we are descended from Celtic Ireland, it is these tales that we will examine.

There were two types of tales. The first were voyaging or 'rowing about' stories. These were heroic tales where the "pagan heroes are adventuring in quest of lands beyond the sunset." This was related to the Celtic belief that there was a "happy other world beyond the Western Ocean."

The cycle of Cú Chulainn

The second type of stories were connected to the cycle of Cú Chulainn. Although there is much controversy, Cú Chulainn seems to be a god/man. He might have been a real man whose adventures assumed legendary proportions. The cycle of stories contains much intermixing between the gods and mortal men.

In the cycle of stories, much reference is made to the Tuath a Dé Danann. Again there is controversy about who is referred to. Some older analysts thought they referred to a pantheon of gods. Modern analysts consider them to be Cú Chulainn's relatives.

This makes sense in that *tuath*, as seen above, is Gaelic for state. This is an Irish state which is primarily made up of *fine* or family. In some ways the *tuath* could be referring to a clan. Encyclopedia Britannica translates Tuath a Dé Danann, as a 'branch' of the Goddess Dana or Danu. In this context the *tuath* is considered a branch of the larger state.

The Branch of the Goddess Dana and her consort Lucifer

There are about 30 different names by which Dana is referred to, including Badb, Caileach and Macha.

“Dana is clearly the great earth mother or the female principle. She is the Celtic Artemis of classical writers, with the fruitful earth and all animal creation under her control. She is goddess of life and death and is a great slaughterer of men. Her consort Dagda is a rustic Hercules, representing the male principle at a time when descent was matrilineal and the organization of the tribe matriarchal.”¹⁴

Hmmm. Now we seem to be getting somewhere. A matriarchal society? That sounds interesting.

“The Great mother’s magic horse, with one leg up and being impaled upon a chariot pole, suggests links with Scythians to the north of the Black Sea, while many of her characteristics are so like those of the Hindu goddess Kali that, ... it seems probable that these Irish stories belong to a religion which spread from unknown source both westward and to the southeast perhaps 3,000 years ago.”¹⁵

Ohh! The horse sounds like a modern merry-go-round. So this religion extended or spread from India to the British Isles about 3000 years ago, before the ascendancy of Celts, the Jews, the Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists or Moslems. Because it spread so far it must have been fairly influential in its day.

“The Caileach, the great mother, is found in western Scotland as well as in Ireland. She was known as Dana, or Black Annis, in the Midlands and Yorkshire, as Magog, or Macha, from Land’s End to East Anglia. In Italy with her consort Lucifer, Dana, or Tana, taught her people magic, just as in Ireland and Scotland, her people, the Dé Danann, were famous as magicians. Magog is also known far to the east beyond the Carpathians.”¹⁶

Now we’ve got a good bite to chew on. We’ve got a great mother Goddess with a strong male consort. This combination spreads from the British Isles in the west, to Italy in the south, to the Carpathians in the east. A large area. Additionally the strong male consort is called Lucifer in Italy. The plot thickens. I thought Lucifer was the devil. Here he is protecting Mother Earth, the Goddess Dana. Furthermore they are teaching their

people magic. Also the Dé Danann of Celtic Ireland and Scotland were also considered magicians. Hmm, before getting any deeper let us look at what was going in Britain before the Celts arrived.

The Great Earth Mother:7000 BCE ->3500 BCE

The beginning

The Stone Age hunter-gathers

Where better to start than at the beginning. In my first paper *Scottish Ancestry* we looked at the known beginnings of life in the British Isles. After the last Ice Age, some 10,000 years ago small groups of hunter gatherers merely walked across a marshy land bridge between Dover, England and Calais, France. These first European migrations probably came from the culture centered around Lascaux, France. This was the Stone Age in England.

About 6000 BC this land bridge was swept away isolating the Brits.¹⁷ Many times island communities grow smaller life forms, both flora and fauna, than continental communities. Maybe. Maybe not. But the indigenous Brits evolving by themselves for some 8000 years after the last Ice Age, were smaller and of darker complexion than the Celts, Romans, Angles, Saxons, Scandinavians and Normans who all came much later. This early race was a part of the underclass of British society for the last few thousand years. All of the aforementioned cultures were racially distinct from the indigenous population and thus denied them positions of leadership.

The Neolithic farmers and traders

About 3500 BC the agricultural revolution reached Britain from Europe by way of rafts. This agricultural revolution had to do with the domestication of animals and the sowing of crops. Farming had already gone on for nearly 3000 years in Europe. The agricultural revolution was late arriving in Britain. Let us take a brief look at happenings on the continent during these three millennium.

Old European civilization

Greater Europe

First let us identify the group that we are speaking of. Marija Gimbutas, a University of California archaeologist in her landmark book, *Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe*, 1974 has identified a "Civilization of Old Europe." It existed between 7000 BCE and 3500 BCE, based upon hundreds of finds from excavations centering around southeastern Europe. In a more general scale, we can use the term "for all of Europe before the Indo-European invasions, including the megalithic cultures of Western Europe (Ireland,

Malta, Sardinia, and parts of Great Britain, Scandinavia, France Spain & Italy) from the 5th to the 3rd millennium BCE.”¹⁸

Agricultural Stability brings prosperity

“During two millennia of agricultural stability their material welfare had been persistently improved by the increasingly efficient exploitation of the fertile river valleys” says Gimbutas. Says Eisler: “Between circa 7000 and 3500 BCE these early Europeans developed a complex social organization involving craft specialization. They created complex religious and governmental institutions.”

Peaceful, building in beautiful spots

“One of the most remarkable and thought-provoking features of Old European society revealed by the archaeological spade is its essentially *peaceful* character.” Says Gimbutas, “Old Europeans never tried to live in inconvenient places such as high steep hills, as did the Indo-Europeans who built hill forts in inaccessible places and frequently surrounded their hill sites with cyclopean stone walls. ... Old European locations were chosen for their beautiful setting, good water and soil and availability of animal pastures ... nor for their defensive value. The characteristic absence of heavy fortifications and of thrusting weapons speaks for the peaceful character of these art-loving peoples.”¹⁹ In some of these Neolithic sites there are no signs of damage from warfare for over 1500 years.

Unstratified society

Furthermore according to the grave sites neither male nor females were granted dominance, although most signs point to a matrilineal succession. “In sum here, as in Catal Huyuk, the evidence indicates a generally unstratified and basically equalitarian society with no marked distinctions based on either class or sex.” It seems from examining over 30,000 figurines found from both Paleolithic and Neolithic sites that the “feminine figures and symbols occupied the central place.”²⁰

I’m sorry to quote so extensively from these sources, but the information is so startling that I don’t want to misinterpret it. Let me summarize. There existed an Old European civilization which was agriculturally based around the big river valleys. This civilization was a peaceful culture based upon crafts not upon weaponry and was focused upon the female body.

Taoism and the Goddess

A modern example of female body worship

As a modern example of the focus on the female body, we can look to Chinese Taoism. Here the pregnant woman is the idealized state because of its incredible creativity. While the Buddhists of China focus upon the Death rituals, the Taoists focus upon the rituals of life. The Buddhists focus upon detachment from life's pains. The Taoists focus upon energy flow. Much of the imagery of Taoist is based upon the 9 month pregnancy example of the woman. For the Tai Chi people, the ultimate energy is the yin energy, the female energy. One of the postulates of Tai Chi is that the yin, feminine, soft energy, if it is soft enough, can always overcome the yang, masculine, hard energy. The Yin-Yang theorists are the main branch of Taoism, while the T'ai Chi people belong to the main branch of the Yin-Yang theorists.²¹ Hence in this modern example of the worship of the state of the pregnant woman, it is not the worship of the woman as much as it is the worship of her state.

Cultivation

Additionally the Taoists speak regularly of cultivation, an agricultural symbol. We Taoists cultivate our breathing, cultivate our chi, vital energy, and don't want to cultivate our desires. The main modern branch of Taoism talks about the dual cultivation of body and mind. They talk about the old Taoism only cultivating the body while the old Buddhists only cultivated the mind. Zen and modern Taoism cultivate the body and mind. Cultivation is a very soft symbol. It implies cycles, tending, watering, and waiting. With cultivation one waits patiently for things to happen. One does not force it. Additionally cultivation implies another force. In other words, one cultivates a field and watches it grow. One does not pull it up forcefully. Also there is the implicit agricultural passivity. No farmer thinks that he is fully responsible for his crops. He realizes that he is fully dependent upon the seasonal cycles of the Earth itself. While he tends, watering, weeding, and pruning his crops or flowers, it is always they that grow. Hence the idea of cultivation of mind, breath, or chi, means to tend them, pay attention to them, don't forget them, and watch them grow. One does not make one's destiny, instead one watches it unfold. Under the cultivation metaphor one is not the master of one's destiny. Instead one is in charge of what one wants to cultivate. If one cultivates desires one reaps weeds falling victim to Fate. While if one cultivates the chi, one will manifest their Destiny, producing the Great Fruit, according to the mythology of Taoism.

An unbroken link with the Goddess

Furthermore I will state that I believe Taoism represents one of the unbroken links with the Neolithic Goddess religion that preceded the Hierarchical God systems. These patriarchal religions include all the religions of the Bible, i.e. Christianity, Moslem, and Judaism, which dominate the Western world. Interestingly it also includes Buddhism and Yoga, which dominate the East. They renounce this earthly existence for the spiritual world. Additionally the latest trend in Hinduism in its asceticism is also patriarchal.

Taoism has no historical beginning as do almost all of the major world religions. Judaism, Christianity, Buddhism, Confucianism and Moslem have a historical personage who started their religion. Although Buddhists and Christian scholars alike have created Lao Tzu as the founder of Taoism in the 6th century BC, this is far from accurate and only a reflection of their world view. See my paper on the history of Taoism based upon Schipper.

Other Vestiges of the Goddess

Kuan Yin, Boddhisatva of Compassion

Let it be pointed out however that the Goddess is far from dead. Kuan yin, the Boddhisatva of Compassion, is major in Buddhism. She snuck into the Buddhist pantheon after they realized the essentially nihilistic aspect of the detachment of Buddhism. In her name social interaction and involvement occurs. She is part of the Big Boat, Mahayana Buddhism, which is to carry everyone across the Great River. Her entry into the mythology of Buddhism was simultaneous with the idea that we are part of an interconnected web. Hence follows the idea that there is no such thing as individual salvation. It has to be collective. Kuan yin in her compassion is the Goddess. Kuan yin in her compassion grants hard love, not the easy way out. See my essay on the Monkey for more details.

Mary, The Mother of God

In Christianity, Mary, the Mother of God, plays the role of the Goddess. Many if not most Catholics pray to her first before God. Her gentle and compassionate nature make her an ideal saint to turn to. God is a little too high up on the hierarchy to be easily approachable by the common person, hence he or she looks to Mary as the intermediary between God and themselves. After all she is God's mother and so must have some influence over him. Some have even suggested that the image of Madonna and Child converted more pagans, especially women, than did the image of Jesus suffering on the cross or of Jehovah leading troops into battle. Many of the converts to Christianity came from war god cults. They were not converting from the Goddess to Christianity. The

Goddess had already been crushed. In the Mother Mary one saw a breath of fresh air that might eventually herald the return to the Goddess.

Summary of Neolithic characteristics

Back to the topic. In many ways Europe between about 7000 BCE and 3500 BCE was a high time for the human race. It was the Neolithic or New Stone Age. It had to do with the cultivation of the land, in addition to hunting it. Nature was tamed. Trade had begun. The Neolithic was when weaving and pottery were developed. It was when humans moved out of natural enclosures, caves and the like and began building homes. Humans built in beautiful places, not safe ones, because war was not a threat.²²

Why they left

About the time that this peaceful, craft oriented civilization was ending on the continent, it was just beginning on the British Isles. The question is why? Why was the European civilization ending? Why would these Neolithic people risk their lives to cross the English Channel if life was paradise on the European side of the Channel? What happened to this high time of human existence when humans concentrated on crafts rather than weaponry, this time when humans built in beautiful rather than safe spots because they were unafraid of attack, this time when men and women were granted equal status?

Kurgan Invasions: 4300->2800 BCE

3 waves of destruction

Gimbutas

According to Gimbutas, this peaceful Neolithic state in Europe ended with the Kurgan invasions from the Northeast. There were three waves, #1 4300-4200 BCE, #2 3400-3200 BCE, and #3 3000-2800 BCE. Basically the invasions were based upon a jump in weaponry. Although the Neolithic farmers and traders worked in metals they didn't turn them into weapons. They were a sedentary agricultural culture. The Kurgan invaders were nomadic cultures who worshipped weaponry and power.

The Chalice and the Blade

Riane Eisler in her book *The Chalice and the Blade* goes into great detail concerning this period. She points out that the refined imagery of the Neolithic culture was non-hierarchical and sexual, while the unrefined imagery of the Kurgan invaders was hierarchical and violent. The Chalice in her title suggests this Neolithic culture, while the Blade suggests the Kurgan invaders.

It is an easy scenario to recreate. The Neolithic peoples were living in a state of relative harmony, cultivating the arts and crafts. The trade was encouraging prosperity. However because of the lack of aggression in their lives they had not cultivated Ward off or defense. Nomadic groups who had used up their natural resources and/or were perhaps going through a physical drought, saw these soft peoples with all their prosperity. The nomadic groups were living on the periphery as always in rough terrain. They had already honed their battle skills in combat with each others.

They had begun worshipping war gods of high places which became the vengeful sky god. It was an easy jump to a rationalized philosophy of might makes right. Let us take what we need. We are strong and hard. They are soft and weak. They can't resist us. The God or gods have made us strong in order to take what we need from those that can't defend themselves.

On the Verge of Invasion: A Kurgan Conversation

One can easily imagine a prehistoric conversation between the pastoralists.

"Og! Look at that land down there. It is lush and green. Look at our land it is dry and brown. Let us seize it for our tribe."

"But Cleg. It is inhabited by people already. We can't just go take it from them."

"Why not?"

"It's just not right. We should cooperate with them and find out how they have become so prosperous. Maybe we could become prosperous using the same techniques."

"Silly Og. They have to work hard to make a living. Do you think farming is easy?"

"Well, no."

"And we are strong and they are weak."

"Right."

"God made us this way for a reason."

"What's that?"

"We take from them what we need. It is God's will."

"God's will?"

"He wouldn't have made us strong and them weak if he hadn't meant for us to take from them."

"They believe in different gods."

"Our God must be stronger because we are stronger."

An exchange between a Kurgan and a Nature worshipper

Nature worshipper: "Let's have a discussion about the relative strengths and weaknesses of our relative value systems."

The Kurgan warrior raises his club: "Do you want to die or would you rather submit to my culture?"

Nature: "What kind of a discussion is this? This culture of violence only leads to more violence."

Kurgan: "Submit or die? That is the only question, worth discussing."

Nature: "This is not very civilized. Our Goddess promises creativity and happiness. What does your God promise?"

Kurgan: "He promises land and power."

Nature: "How immature. How limiting. Have you never felt the thrill of creation? It far surpasses the thrill of domination."

Kurgan: "Why create when we can take what we need. Besides what do you know about the thrill of domination? The only thing you've dominated is your clay."

Nature: "The subtlety of the interplay of artist and materials is so incredible. It creates such a feeling of well being in the artist and the world around. In your philosophy of domination, all you're thinking about is yourself."

Kurgan: "It's only about me. And domination feels good to me."

nature: "Have you no compassion?"

Kurgan: "Compassion is a sign of weakness."

Nature: "You'll never experience a sense of Oneness with the Universe without this sense of unity of all things."

Kurgan: "Enough of these fancy words. Submit or die!"

Nature: "But our Goddess promises happiness while yours only promises power which creates so much unhappiness."

Kurgan: "Power makes me happy. All these words make me unhappy. Be my slave and create for me or join your ancestors in the grave. My god is more powerful than yours and I'll prove it with my club."

Nature: "But our Goddess brings ecstasy and encourages cooperation."

Kurgan: "Bah. Cooperation means that I'll have to do something useful. I'd rather take what I want. Submit or die."

Nature: "But the Goddess will give you real happiness."

The Kurgan brings his club down upon the Nature worshippers head.

Kurgan: “There that proved my God is more powerful. If her goddess had been more powerful then she would not have let me kill her. Thank you God for giving me the power to vanquish my enemies. You are great.”

Thinking to himself: “But after that initial blood rush of excitement, the thrill of taking life, the god-like power of life and death, even feeling like a god, I somehow feel empty, drained. Hmmm. What did she say before I crushed her skull. The Goddess promises happiness through creativity.”

“By god, these words and thoughts are giving me a headache. I will have to go kill someone else. That always makes me feel better and proves that my God is the most powerful. Happiness and creativity. Bah! Feminine concepts. All of us Kurgans know that only power brings happiness. We are the Chosen race. We dominate everyone and take what we want. God has promised it to us. Our Book says so.”

Comparisons

Comparison of Old European Culture vs. Kurgan culture

For easy comparison Gimbutas compares the Old European culture with the Kurgan culture in the following diagram.

	<i>Old European Culture</i>	<i>Kurgan Culture</i>
<i>Economy</i>	Agricultural (no horse), sedentary	Pastoral (with the horse)
<i>Habitat</i>	Large aggregates villages and townships no hill forts	Small villages with semi- subterranean houses chieftains ruling from the hill fort
<i>Social Structure</i>	Egalitarian Matrilineal	Patriarchal, patrilocal
<i>Ideology</i> ²³	Peaceful, art-loving woman creatress	Warlike man creator

Early nomads religiously tolerant

For these early nomads the issue was not whose God was the true God, as much as whose God was the most powerful God. He whose God was most powerful ruled and those with weaker gods were enslaved. The subjugated cultures could still worship their own gods. Hence in Scandinavia a tripartite deity system was created. The warriors had their set of war gods while the crafts people and peasants had their own

set of Gods. It institutionalized the separation between the dominator culture and the subjugated culture. In the Middle East the Greek and Roman pantheon of gods just included the old agricultural gods at a lower rung on the Hierarchy, but did not exclude them.

Even the early Hebrews were somewhat tolerant of the races that they subjugated for Jehovah. David married Bath-Sheba the Hittite, after sending her husband into the thick of battle to be killed. Wise King Solomon, Bath-Sheba's son, greatest king of the Jews, "loved many strange women, together with the daughter of the Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Sidonians, and Hittites; ... Solomon cleaved unto these in love. ... For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods."²⁴ The Old Testament wasn't denying the existence of other gods as much as it was saying that Jehovah wanted a monogamous relationship. Hence in these early battles between the agricultural Earth worshippers and the nomadic Sky worshippers, the issue was only whose God was stronger, not whose god was more real.

Intolerance comes later

Intolerance came much later with the rise of the priestly class and their connection to the dominating class. The more subjects the more power. The multiplicity of gods only defused the moneys and directions of the lower classes. Besides it was always the priests and priestesses of the Old Goddess cults which were stirring up so much trouble in the masses. It was when Christianity linked up with Emperor Constantine of Rome that it became so intolerant. The Commandment which says that Jehovah is a jealous god and wants his followers to worship no other god but him, is only a statement of monogamy. It is not fundamentally a statement of intolerance. The Jewish people have always manifested monogamy towards their God rather than religious intolerance towards their neighbors. There are many cases in Jewish history of cultural intolerance and violence when two cultures are competing for the same economic niches and extreme violence comes into play. But these are only economic battles in the guise of religion.

Banned from the Garden of Eden

The decline of civilization

With the coming of the Kurgan invasions began the decline of the agricultural Neolithic culture. Indeed in many objective ways these barbarian invasions from the steppes of the north set the development of civilization so far back, that it was some

2000 years before it reached a roughly equivalent state. Eisler summarizes James Mellaart's book, *The Neolithic of the Middle East*, pp. 275-280:

“By the fifth millennium BCE, or about seven thousand years ago, we begin to find evidence of what Mellaart calls a pattern of disruption of the old Neolithic cultures in the Near East.” Archaeological remains indicate warfare, natural catastrophes and sometimes both, causing large-scale destruction and dislocation. In many areas the old painted pottery traditions disappear. Bit by devastating bit, A period of cultural regression and stagnation sets in. Finally during this time of mounting chaos the development of civilization comes to a standstill. As Mellaart writes, it will be another two thousand year before the civilizations of Sumer and Egypt emerge.”²⁵

Reflected biblically

Interestingly in the Biblical story of Adam and Eve, this devastation is reflected. First they live in the Garden of Eden in a state of relative harmony with Nature and each other. The Garden of Eden in the Bible is not only symbolic but physical as well. It is identified with four rivers running from it. The Tigris and Euphrates are specifically named. The Mesopotamian valley is the area referred to and this is where the Old European Civilization flourished for so many years before Judaism existed.

This idyllic state is supposedly ruined because of Eve's temptation and Adam's weakness. They are both banned from this Garden of Eden by God and barred by an angel with flaming swords from returning to this original state of innocence.

Weaving it together

A Historical Summary of Neolithic Europe

To tie us up with the European migrations to Britain in about 3500 BCE, let us summarize these Neolithic developments in Europe. From roughly 7000 to 4500 BCE the Old European culture developed agriculture, domesticated animals, began and refined pottery and weaving, built temples and began collecting in larger population groups. Between 4500 and 4000 BCE the first Kurgan invasions occurred, beginning the disintegration and decline of these Neolithic cultures. Between 4000 and 3500 BCE the quality of the pottery begins to decline, the tiny figurines begin to disappear altogether. While no weaponry was illustrated in Neolithic art, now crude weaponry achieves prominence in the artistic remains. Between 3500 BCE and 3000 BCE the 2nd Kurgan invasions occurred. This further Kurganized the Neolithic societies. This is when the agricultural Neolithic civilizations sailed over to the British Isles on small rafts.

Back to why did they come over

Now we can more easily answer the question that begun this section. Why did these early Neolithic Europeans come over to the British Isles by raft if they were leading such an idyllic life? It is easy to see that the idyllic life of the Old European culture had passed with the Kurgan invasions. I would suggest that these early Europeans came to the British Isles for the same reason that many other groups migrated to the British Isles in later years. Probably they risked their lives on small rafts to escape violent persecution and slavery and to preserve their peaceful culture. (Ironically the more aggressive Celtic, Angles and Saxons also might have come over to Britain to escape more aggressive cultures.)

Inevitability of Kurgan invasions

In some ways it is easy to bemoan the loss of innocence in the human race. It is nice to look back upon a time men and women were treated equally. It is nice to think of societies based upon arts and crafts rather than warfare. It is nice to think of humans as sexual creatures rather than violent creatures. It is nice to think of a culture which is based upon cooperation rather than upon competition. It is nice to think of tribal support and nurturing rather than the individual fighting to make it by himself. While it is nice to think of all these things and how it could have been, I'm afraid that the disintegration of this early Neolithic culture was somewhat inevitable. Competition for natural resources always brings out the worst in humans. When there is a huge earth with very few humans, it is easy to get along. When the earth becomes smaller because of more humans competing for the better spots, warfare is inevitable. With warfare comes the glorification of the warrior with his weaponry. With the glorification of the warrior comes a theology which supports warfare and a technology which focuses upon waging a more effective war. Ah well. Such is life.

The Kurganization of Culture

In these prehistoric times and later, there was a Kurganization of culture. Those cultures that were conquered and enslaved became Kurgan. The beliefs of the underclass however where they were allowed to coexist became Kurganized. Where the focus prior to this time was upon this life. After the Kurgan invasions the focus shifted to the afterlife where things would become good again. Justice would reign again. The meek shall inherit the earth. Good would be rewarded; bad would be punished in the afterlife. This was a rationalization for the terrible injustices that were witnessed during these times and later.

For those Neolithic cultures that escaped domination and enslavement, their political and religious structure was forever changed. While the artist- craftsman had

been granted a huge status in the pre-Kurgan societies, now leadership was shifted to a military ruler who might defend the culture from attack. Suddenly man's stock has risen substantially. For the Neolithic craft-oriented society, sex was a non-issue or the fertile woman was worshipped to inspire creativity. In the war or defense oriented society post Kurgan invasion the male sex rose to dominance as a military protector.

We saw that in response to Rome, Ireland created a standing army, although it was not a part of their original culture. The rise of a professional army in response to external aggression is a case of the Kurganization of a culture. The rise of larger political units to combine in the case of attack is also a type of Kurganization.

There is a tendency among us pagans to glorify Celtic culture, while among Christians there is a tendency to feel the Celtic society uncivilized. The reality is that the Celts were a Kurganized society. Although they granted a greater participation in their society, this participation was only extended to family members. They still dealt in slaves. Their society was hierarchical with high kings, lords and the like. They were a warlike culture who had dominated Europe in their time, conquering both the Etruscans and the Macedonians. Their time having passed in Europe, they moved on to conquer the British Isles. While they adopted much of the local indigenous culture, to their credit, they still maintained their role as conquerors. Hence although the Celtic mythology reflects the ancient earth goddess mythology, the society was far from the egalitarian nature of the earlier Goddess based societies.

Our modern culture is also Kurganized with its glorification of violence and warfare. This is nothing new. The only thing new is that with the reemergence of the earth worshipping mentality that there is an objection to this mindless worship of military power.

The role of knowledge

Kurgan vs. Goddess based

Weaving of strands

Before moving on let us weave some strands of our story together. These Celtic stories were written down about 700 AD by Catholics but reflect a culture 700 years earlier. But the roots of the mythology of these stories is linked with a mega culture that spread east and west from Europe perhaps even a thousand years earlier. This culture was Goddess based.

Lucifer, bearer of light

'In Italy with her consort Lucifer, Dana, or Tana, taught her people magic, just as in Ireland and Scotland, her people, the Dé Danann, were famous as magicians.' Let us use these

examples to discover a little more about the difference between the preceding Goddess culture and the patriarchal cultures that followed. Hmmm let's see. Dana and her consort Lucifer were gods that spread magic to the people. Lucifer, is Latin for 'bearer of light'. Lux, light, and fero, to bear or carry, are the root words. These ancient gods are actually sharing knowledge. Magic is knowledge. Lucifer bears the light of knowledge to illuminate. Enlightenment. The Light clears away the dark and shows the Path

Knowledge is power for the patriarchy

The sharing of knowledge with the people by the gods of these ancient religions stands in direct opposition to the attitude towards knowledge of the patriarchal religions. In the patriarchal religions because power is the quest and knowledge is power, knowledge is guarded and kept secret in order to increase personal power. Typically the high priests of the patriarchal religions reserve the knowledge for themselves to share with the masses at their discretion. In the Catholic Church a strict hierarchy is set up whereby the Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, then Priests are closest to God in that order. Hence when the Pope issues a Papal Bull he is speaking for God, allowing the rest of the mortals to know what God thinks. Traditionally in most Christian religions the priest interprets the Bible for the congregation.

Knowledge to be shared in the Goddess community

In the preceding Goddess culture the emphasis is on cooperation rather than competition, hence knowledge is immediately shared. Disseminating knowledge is good because it furthers the ability to cooperate. Knowledge itself is good. This is in direct opposition to the later Christian idea that only faith and belief are important. Basically for the patriarchal systems, knowledge is bad because it leads to the breakdown of the hierarchy. The people discover that things have not always been this way and demand greater freedom and equality.

Conscious Repression of Knowledge

The first point about knowledge in hierarchical systems is that it is retained rather than shared. The second point which has been dealt with extensively in my paper, *Evolution of the Gods..* is that the acquisition of knowledge is actively suppressed and discouraged. The Kurgan power structure with their patriarchal gods consciously persecuted any knowledge of the old ways. Knowledge in any age leads to a cultural relativism. Knowledge in these ancient days discovered a time when men and women were equal, when there was no class structure, when warfare was not a way of life, when leadership was based upon natural abilities rather than hereditary rights. These ideas were inimical to the power structure. Hence the patriarchy began violently

persecuting those holding onto the old beliefs. The old beliefs did not just fade away in the face of a superior culture as many writers would have you believe.

Incorporation into Mythology

Additionally as a warning to later generations, they incorporated into their myths warnings against the old ways. One patriarchal myth that is fairly common is that the spreading of magic to the people is revolutionary and will be suppressed. Think what happened to Prometheus in the Greek myths. He brought fire to the humans and as a punishment was chained to a rock and had his heart eaten out by an eagle each day. Pretty intense. Think of the serpent sharing a fruit from the tree of knowledge with Adam and Eve. For this transgression, the snake is cursed as a creature, Eve is given a painful birthing process and they are all banished from the Garden of Eden. An angel with flaming swords is left to guard the entryway to this idyllic paradise. Think of the scientists guarding their discoveries so that they can be the first and get all the glory. There was also the story of Pandora, whose curiosity unleashes the troubles of the world. This myth warns women, in particular, against curiosity into things that only the gods should know. Retained knowledge. Furthermore in the Biblical myths Lucifer, the bearer of light in the preceding Goddess cults, becomes the embodiment of evil in Christianity. Light is dark and Black is White.

The staying power of the Goddess

It is a testament to the staying power of the Neolithic Goddess cults that violent repression was needed all the way into the 18th century to suppress their ideas. In the 18th century we had witch trials from the Protestants all over northern Europe and America and we had the Inquisition of the Catholics in Southern Europe. In looking over those killed, they were primarily women accused of witchcraft. It was a sexual genocide against herbalists and those believing the old ways. In our century the American Medical Association, the AMA, was formed to retain power and knowledge for doctors by banning herbalists, midwives and those practitioners of alternative medicine. Still now in the 1990s it is illegal to list known health benefits upon herbal remedies. In the 1980s a health food store in Texas was raided and shut down for claiming health benefits for their herbs. Presently in 1997, those proclaiming benefits for the ultimate herb, hemp, had better watch their backs against prosecution and imprisonment. Hence even now at the turn of the second millennium, there is a certain persecution associated with Goddess concepts. It is no wonder that scientists take the safe road, distancing themselves consciously and subconsciously from any belief system that smacks of Earth worship.

However as those of us in coastal California know, the worship of the Earth is huge. We celebrate the Summer Solstice in Santa Barbara annually. We have an Earth Day nationally. There is a Green Party dedicated to the Earth. Ecology is in. Waste is bad. Health is good. Trees are good. Pavement is bad. Protecting the environment is good. Toxic waste is bad. Productivity is important but life is more important.

The re-emergence of the Goddess is not perceived positively on all fronts. Organized religion is threatened by this shift because it threatens their congregation size. Manufacturers are threatened by a society that is not based upon consumption but is instead based upon conservation. The political organizations are threatened by a thinking population that craves knowledge and will see through their propaganda and lies. The armies are threatened by those opposing war as a way of solving problems. Hence the power structure is still fairly solidly opposed to Earth worship in its different manifestations.

Modern Manifestations

Idealized Academia & the free flow of information

Idealized academia embodies many of the concepts of the ancient Goddess cults. First it worships knowledge. Second it worships this world. Scientists study the minutiae of the physical universe in order to open its secrets. Academia is not obsessed with belief and faith except as it relates to the study of religion. Idealized academia is firmly behind the open flow of ideas and concept. Of course practical academia retains knowledge in order to win grants. After all we do live in the hierarchy.

Practical Academia, without a heart

Of course the down side of academia and of knowledge without belief is that it has no soul. It is disembodied and irresponsible. The pursuit of knowledge, independent of divine connection, is like the headless horseman, creating atomic waste, indestructible plastics, medicine with toxic side effects. However the reason that academia tends towards the dispassionate is two fold. First they consciously attempt to distance themselves from the religion that has thwarted the progress of science by putting up roadblocks to the free flow of knowledge. Christianity has tended to be anti-knowledge because it threatens their power structure. Secondly scientists that have bucked the power system of church and state have been persecuted of which Galileo is the most famous.

Materialism

Because of this opposition to Earth worship from the power structure, the populace has shifted from organized religion to the new religion of materialism. This new

religion has no church which is good because it does not compete with organized religion. This new religion promotes consumerism which is good for business. In many ways materialism is amoral which is good for the warmongers because there is no collective responsibility or moral consciousness. The gods of materialism are Santa Claus, St. Valentine, the Easter bunny, in short any icon that promotes consumerism. While it is illegal to celebrate any of the organized religions in the public schools because of the separation of church and state, it is perfectly all right to worship the gods of materialism. The church of materialism is the shopping mall. Witness their growth and the care with which they are built to indicate the importance to the modern day power structure. The motto of materialism is 'Buy now and save', or 'Charge it' or have it today and pay for it tomorrow. Credit cards identify one as a participant in consumerism.

Science aloof to avoid controversy

In summary, science has remained aloof from the divinity of creation because of conflicts with the power structure. This has led to a disembodied lack of responsibility for the application of their discoveries. Modern man to a large extent has adopted materialism as their religion. Without the divinity of the earth behind it, materialism leads to rampant consumerism and waste of natural resources. Of course the old patriarchal religions still debate woman's role as an equal partner in religion.

What is needed

What is simply needed is a respect for the divinity of nature. We are not advocating the overthrow of materialism, organized religion, the scientific method, or the quest for power. We are not advocating a detachment from this world. We of the Great Earth Mother are advocating a heavy participation in the material world tinged with this divine respect for Nature. This means cherishing the Earth and the assumption of meaning. My aren't we preachy today? See my paper *What is a Mountain, anyway?* A hairbreadth's difference between the two, but what a difference. Simple eh? Not really when our bodies are being poisoned by substandard food and our minds are poisoned by the media. But ah well. What else is new?

Nature and Sex

In many ways the followers of the Goddess in Neolithic Europe could instead be called Nature worshippers. Everything about nature is fascinating and worthy of exploration. This is contrasted with the Kurgan ideology that nature is bad and to be resisted. The modern scientist is a nature worshipper. He attempts to reflect nature

without judging it. It is considered a flaw if the scientist or scholar is less than objective. The Kurgan rejection of nature is manifested in their attitude towards sex.

To the Nature worshippers, sex is natural and pleasurable part of existence. To those of Kurgan persuasion, sex is the Original Sin. The Virgin Mary is glorified because of her celibacy. Women are called witches because they control men through sex. Thus in Kurgan culture sex is to be resisted in order to resist and dominate Nature. The attitude towards sex is gender based. Somehow in the Kurgan society if the emotional content of sex is eliminated it is OK. Getting laid, fucking, scoring, is validated, while emotional intimacy is a sign of weakness.

The attitude towards sex is subtle. The divestment of emotional content from sex is somehow more masculine. This is because emotional intimacy means a relinquishing of independence. This is because when an emotional link is established that it means that one cares. If one cares then one is tied. One's freedom of choice revolves around the one that is cared about. When the emotional bond becomes too strong, the man in particular is not so attracted to the glory of war. Men in love are not good soldiers. Not only that but emotional intimacy leads to a breaking up of the Hierarchy because of the sensitivity of mutual exchange. Sex grants power to the feminine sex.

Ivanhoe

This is seen clearly in Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*. Sir Brian de Bois-Guilbert of the Knights Templar falls in love with the Jewish Rebecca. This diminishes his power because he can't kill so indiscriminately anymore. The head of the Knights Templar doesn't hold Bois-Guilbert responsible for his desire. Instead he accuses Rebecca of enchanting Bois-Guilbert as a witch and wants to burn her at the stake. This is classic Kurgan mentality.

Eve temptress; Adam innocent victim

Another more familiar but subtle example is from the Bible. In the story of Adam and Eve, usually Eve is blamed for the Fall from Grace. She fell for the temptation to the serpent and then tempted Adam. Although Adam suffers with Eve for these transgressions, he is somewhat absolved of the blame for the cataclysm. The usual interpretation is that poor innocent Adam is victimized by that temptress Eve. Eve has a fairly bad historical rap, while Adam though considered weak for succumbing is not viewed negatively. While Eve symbolically is the Temptress, Adam is just the first man.

God's punishments are noteworthy. While prior to this transgression, Adam was able to live off the fruit trees in the garden, now he must toil as a farmer. Eve is given the pain of childbirth along with miserable menstrual periods. Furthermore and more importantly, she is made subservient to man.

“And thy desire shall be to thy husband,
And he shall rule over thee.”²⁶

Thus because Eve has tempted Adam, he is made her ruler and the object of her desire. Eve is not to desire spirituality or union with God. Instead women are to focus only upon their husbands. The Temptation has also removed Eve from the spiritual realm.

These early sections of Genesis are meant to reinforce man’s superiority over women. Just before the Temptation and the Fall, Eve is created from Adam’s rib to be his helper, not because Adam is lonely.

“The Lord God said, “It is not good for the man to be alone.
I will make a helper suitable for him.”²⁷

After the creation of Eve, Adam comments to the effect that because she came out of me, she shall be called ‘wo-man’ i.e. out of man. Or more to the point, in ancient Hebrew the word for woman sounds like ‘for man’²⁸. Even more sexist. Woman is made out of man, for man, to be his helper. Thus in the first few pages of the 900 page Old Testament of the Bible, woman is made not only subservient to man to be his helper, but she is also removed from the spiritual realm. Definitely Kurgan.

The Druids

Celtic attitude towards knowledge

Before getting too far off the supposed topic, let us look at the attitude towards knowledge in the Celts. It is easy to see from the Celtic attitude towards knowledge that their culture was a hybrid between Kurgan and Nature worship.

On a symbolic level, the number of stripes on the Celtic shirt, léine, precursor of the Scottish kilt with its tartan plaid, represented the status of the wearer. The king wore 7 stripes. “The Ollamh (chief man of learning) wore six, a striking reminder of the importance attached to scholarship.”²⁹ The Celts even had a word for this ‘chief man of learning’, i.e. Ollamh. They were certainly not afraid of knowledge.

Historically

We also see this personified in the figure of the Druid. Remember that “in *Ireland and Scotland, her people, the Dé Danann, were famous as magicians,*” These ancient ‘magicians’ were akin to modern scientists in that their knowledge of natural phenomenon far surpassed that of the average person. To discovered some possible links between these ancient scientists let us look at the druids and druidism.

“Druidism, known only in Transalpine Gaul, Britain and Ireland, but not recorded in Britain outside Anglesea and the northern Pictland, is likely to have originated in Ireland. J. Pokorny’s view, supported by Irish tradition, is that among the pre-Celtic inhabitants there existed a class of seers and sorcerers from which, under the Celtic regime, the druids were developed. The druids may be described as an association of professional wise men, philosophers in the early Greek sense, claiming to be experts in all the higher branches of knowledge. They professed special knowledge of the gods, the other world, the future life, the form and measurement of the earth, the movements of the heavenly bodies, the history of men, and they were accepted as authorities in matters of religion and law. They also claimed occult and prophetic powers. In the Roman world, after their suppression by the state, and in Ireland, after its conversion to Christianity, they were chiefly remembered as prophets and magicians. The notion that they were the priests of a particular religion is of modern growth.”³⁰

In Ireland under Christianity the druids became poets, or *filid*. While there is virtually no mention of druids in Roman England, they certainly existed in Scotland and Ireland.

“There is a strong tradition current in Irish literature that the druids and their lore were either of an aboriginal or Pictish origin. ... The Irish druid was a notable person, figuring in the earliest sagas as prophet, teacher, and magician. ... Further, there is no mention in any of the texts of the Irish druids presiding at sacrifices, though they are said to have conducted idolatrous worship and to have celebrated funeral and baptismal rites, They are best described as seers who were, for the most part, sycophants of princes.”³¹

“Druidism is probably in its simplest terms of pre-Celtic and aboriginal faith of Gaul and the British Isles that was adopted with little modification by the migrating Celts.”

The etymology of the word druid is controversial. One school said the word meant a strong knowing; the other more accepted version is that the word is derived from an oak word.

The Druids in Gaul, possibly influenced by the hierarchies of Greece and Rome had adopted a somewhat hierarchical structure with an archdruid invested with supreme power. These druids were trans-national and were the judges when it came to legal matters. They were also linked with a priestly class associated with human sacrifice. I will stress that the druids were not associated with human sacrifice in Ireland, where the druids presumably originated. In both places however the druids were the wise men associated with the transmission of culture to the youth of the tribe. They also were

accepted as arbiters between clans or tribes. They were not of a tribe but outside of it and so could act as an impartial judge.³²

Archetypal Druids, Wise Men

The Druid in its historical sense of wise man, seer, is seen in the archetype of the Hermit Sorcerer represented by Gandalf in Tolkien's *Lord of the Ring* trilogy. The same archetypal image comes through Merlin in the King Arthur mythology. In both cases we see a wise old man, trans-national who is working for the good of the whole nation, not just the rulers. But he is accomplishing this task by working with leaders, though not a leader himself. He is the advisor to leaders but seems to be off on personal missions of his own. He seems to be many times surrounded by books, studying ancient and arcane knowledge. The Arthurian legend is specifically set in England, while the *Lord of the Rings* is written by an Englishman in an English type environment. But the archetype does not stop there.

Morgan le Fay

While the original King Arthur portrays Morgan le Fay, Arthur's half sister as an evil sorceress bent on destroying Arthur, a modern retelling of the tale *Mists of Avalon*, portrays Morgan as a high priestess of a druidic cult with more noble intentions. It shows two world views battling for supremacy, the Christian and the old religions, with the intolerant Christianity winning out. These high priestesses fulfilled the archetype of the Druid.

Female Druids, Archetypes

In America in the Oz books by L. Frank Baum, of which the Wizard of Oz is most well known, we have a archetypal representation in Glinda the Good. Wow! Shivers up the spine. Tingling of my gateway to heaven. A reverberation upon higher levels. An opening. Ever so small. But an opening never the less. Anyway Glinda the Good is a sorceress, surrounded by books, with knowledge of most everything, working for the general good of the people. Although she has her own kingdom, the land of the Quadlings, which she rules justly and kindly, she acts in deference to and acts as an advisor to Ozma, the Queen or Princess of Oz. Ozma resides in the Emerald City which lies in the center of the Land of Oz. The different kingdoms of Oz are like the Irish Tuath with the Emerald City its center.

In China we also have the archetypal representation of the Druid in the flesh in Confucius. Confucius was a wise man who wandered the countryside of China from Duke to Duke giving them wise advise which would be good for the people as well as the state. In some ways the legendary Lao Tzu also fit this role. He is the typical Hermit, spreading wisdom from isolation.

The *Dé Danann*, early Druids

Let us tie this in with what we have already discovered in a poetical way. The Goddess people, the *Dé Danann*, came over to Britain to escape the militaristic Kurgan culture. In this primarily agricultural community, there developed a tradition of wise people, men and women, who in this oral tradition were the transmitters of culture. Most oral traditions have somebody who fulfills this role in the tribe. Today we have historians and the universities who fulfill the role of transmitting culture to the youth. Gradually in Ireland the druids in fully manifesting this role became scientists, doctors, historians, nutritionists, judge and priest all rolled into one. Because of their all encompassing knowledge they were viewed as magicians by the people. I'm sure that the druids didn't contradict these notions. Modern scientists create magic all the time but don't call it such because they are not attempting to create the illusion of supernatural power. Also because of the tremendous amount of study necessary to become a druid, they isolated themselves somewhat from the common culture. In time they became the Hermit with a lantern in his hand guiding the Way. In Christian times these Druids became the monastic monks of Irish Catholicism. They still were the preservers and transmitters of culture but now they had the written word to aid their task. However these wise men, monks, because of their isolation from Rome, continued to develop independent thinking. This freedom of thought led to inevitable conflicts with hierarchical Roman Catholic power structure.

Why research the Family Heritage or What does it mean?

A gut response

Before moving forward to nowhere, let us take a step backwards, whichever way that may be. Why are we searching out our family heritage, whoever we may be? Why does it matter if there was a king or serf in our background? We still have to make our own lives anyway. Whether Niall of Nine Hostages was my great great ... great great grandfather in 400 AD or not is not going to help me 1600 years later in any practical way. Whether or whether not, a million different reasons why not, I am interested. Many are interested. It is a gut response.

Seeking the deep reverberation

Although this has been primarily a gut response, my brain will assign reasons to the gut as it has a tendency to do. We seek a reverberation from a deep seated source. We are looking for someone through the haze of time that we might relate to. We are looking for family traits that may still remain in some form or other. In some sense we are looking for an inspiration from the past that will propel us magically through

difficulties. We are looking for an affinity that will give us strength. As a side benefit we also find the negative.

The Highlander's quest for freedom at any cost is exhilarating on one hand foolhardy on the other. Independent thinker on the one, stubborn and obstinate on the other. Inspirational and unique, but out of touch and unable to fit in. So let me not be proud that I've chosen freedom and independence over anything else. Let me realize that it is a blood line that has been selectively chosen over many hundreds of lifetimes. Let me realize that while independence is to be valued that cooperation and conciliation might be given equal weight. Let us realize that the independence and accompanying pride, which kept us from bowing before the Hierarchy, also resulted in our destruction and exile in the rebellion of '45, 1745 that is.

As a Taoist quest, we attempt to be ultimately light, in order to not be blown away. This seems contradictory looking at the leaf blown by the smallest breeze, but not when you're so thin that the wind blows right through you. The winds of impulse are rooted in early childhood, primarily. But some extend to earlier cultural lifetimes. Some transmitted by the behavior of the parents. Some transmitted by the content of the gene pool. Understanding which are which can reveal the depth of the problem. Something that seems trivial might go back deeply in the blood. To resist these urges, to not be blown away by them, one must become so light but rooted that they blow right through. When we hold onto personal traits like a Badge of Honor, we are not light enough and are blown away, a victim of our own personality. I love my Freedom, but dread my Isolation. Don't put me in the closet. I will go first.

Hence in our family quest, we understand family of man and women lessons. It helpful to hold up a mirror to the family history in order to better understand ourselves. The question is to differentiate who we are this life time, from who we were past lifetimes, from who we are as human beings? Lest you think this quest overly mystical, let us point out that our past lifetimes are referring to our particular family genetic heritage.

Who are we?

Who is this we, we are referring to? On a specific level we are referring to any in our bloodline family who might have a vague interest in self perfection. On a more general level this story is for anyone, anywhere, anytime, who might have lost the battle with the Hierarchy but somehow now wants to reclaim his or her soul. We are identifying the Enemy in order to turn him into a Friend, for after all withdrawal of Love doesn't really work very well. This is the We, we are writing to.

Who are the we who write this garbage, (pronounced in the French sense with a soft g)? We are the conglomerate of souls seeking to be heard through this frail shell. He is trying to so hard to empty himself, to lighten up, so that our wind can blow through. We are not the One, We are not the Many. We are All.

Now that we've answered that question? Let us step back out.

Homo Sapiens, Evolution and Culture

The question of whether is man is shaped by environment or heredity is misdirected because the two are integrally linked. It is like asking which is more important the sperm or the egg, water or air, matter or energy. The evidence is that culture and man developed simultaneously rather than that culture came because of man. The implications are that the evolutionary fitness of homo sapiens, the cultural animal, is determined by how well he fits in with and furthers a culture, rather than by how strong he is. This is contrasted with man the mighty, whose evolutionary fitness is determined by his personal might. Of course in Kurgan society and in later Norman-French-English society the fitness of a leader was determined by his ruthlessness, personal magnetism and might. The evolutionary fitness of a peasant was determined by how well he determined who to bow to. The evolutionary fitness of the Highlanders was determined by their independence of thinking and loyalty to the Clan. Therefore each class of humans in different parts of the world at different times have different types of cultures that they must fit into. Their relative fitness is determined by local historical cultural traditions rather than by over all human fitness. Hence a local family will develop certain family traits developed over a culture over centuries. This is what we are seeking out. What are these past lives telling us to do. Not transmigration of the soul, but simply Darwinian family genetics.

A Druidic Paper

In our long winded way we are getting somewhere, where is another question. In reading about the Druids, we felt a deep, chasmic, gorge like reverberation, echoing deep through our collective souls. We felt the many tales of tragedy, joy and woe, told so many times over and over by our ancestor of yore. And we knew, this body knew that we too were to play this same role. The resonance set up standing waves that jerked us to attention. We are playing the Druidic role of transmitter of culture, in a subconscious way. We had no Druid father to pass down the family history. We had no family tribe to choose out a special child to be trained by the wise people in the history, science and philosophy of the tribe. We had no encouragement, no kind words, no contemporary parallels to connect us in. It was only an undeniable urge that started small but has since grown huge. Where do these strange desires and urges come from.

Druids, wise men, shamans, high priestesses and the like have been created by Mother Nature in each tribe and state since the world began. A gut level I tell you. Evolutionarily fit. I'm not sure. But strong and kicking never the less. And as last we find a harmony, never felt before. It wasn't from our father, nor our mother. This then is a druidic paper which attempts to relate a family history as we see it. The Reverberations Come From Deep in our Souls.

The Hermit

Let us look at the development of the Hermit in the Tarot Deck to understand. At the time the Tarot deck emerged into public consciousness the Hermit was shown carrying a Lantern in the night. The Hermit is the Druid. From a position of political power, through persecution, our Druid is pushed into hiding. In the times of the Earth Goddess the Druid spread his light throughout the world publicly, she Dana, he Lucifer. Now after the fall of the Goddess with the Kurgan invasions, he must go into hiding to survive. Although the Light has been dimmed in the darkness, it has not gone out. It is still there to Light the Way for those who seek. In modern times even the isolated wisdom of the Hermit had nearly faded away except in mythology. But then from the East came the Yogi, the Guru, the Taoist, the Sufi, wise men guiding from outside the corrupted power structure.

In Cognito

They came in hiding, we come in hiding, realizing the ruthlessness of the power establishment when it comes to dealing with divergence from the modern gods of materialism. This paper then is a lantern in the Darkness to guide the Way. But it's Light only shows if you open the book to turn it on. The Light is disguised as family history. But let us turn it on. Lest you be blinded by the brilliance, overwhelmed by the truth, remember that this is only fantasy, nothing close to the truth. It is merely the tale a drunken man tells before falling off to sleep in the gutter somewhere. It is only the ravings of a lunatic before they lock him up.

Generalists vs. Specialists

The Druids were generalists in a time when there was not as much to know. This general knowledge helped give perspective to the myopia of agricultural societies. It was an evolutionary fitness for the tribe to have a sense of history and purpose. Hence came the Druid. In our age of specialization, the Druidic perspective is obsolete. The tribe has been absorbed in the greater culture. WE have found meaning in things and possessions. We still worship the gods of sticks and stones. Cultural awareness provides no economic advantage. No money in it. What service does it provide? We Druidic types are an archaic throwback to ancient cultures. We are like an appendix

which needs to be removed, tonsils taken out. A dead appendage with no apparent purpose. Let the specialists do their job and we'll just stay on the surface with the oil slicks.

A return to the Highlands of Scotland

Bronze Age Britain

Let us look at what was happening in Scotland in prehistoric times. Remember historic means written. The Celts didn't write. Hence historic Scotland comes with the Romans and Christians who wrote about their experience. Thus prehistoric times in Scotland extended to about 400 AD.

Re summarizing: in 3500 BCE \pm 1, ho ha, the Neolithic agricultural revolution arrived in Britain. For a few thousand years they led their peaceful agricultural lifestyle. Then in about 1500 BC, summarizing from the first paper on Scottish Ancestry, new invaders came from Spain with weaponry made of bronze. As sailors they established trade with the continent in crafts as well as in slaves and mercenary soldiers. The violent patriarchy of the Bronze Age had finally arrived in the British Isles. However the communities remained small and most of the population still farmed.

Prehistoric Scotland

Once agriculture reached the Highlands little changed. For over two millennium the cultural style of northern Scotland remained the same.

“It cannot be stressed too strongly that there was no major cultural break in Scotland from the end of the Bronze Age through to the Middle Ages. Throughout this long period of time (nearly two millennia) there was, however some minor regional variation, as types of monument evolved or fell out of favor.”³³

The inhabitants of Scotland at this time were not Celtic, nor Christian. They have been called Picts. But there were no trends which identified them as a linked culture, except that they farmed. Virtually all of the bones excavated at one prehistoric site were domesticated animals, just a few fish bones and a bit of wild game. It was mostly cattle 61%, then pig 31% and finally sheep at 8%. At another site was a similar distribution.³⁴ There was no central government. There were no big cities. The trade that existed was mostly local. Hence there was nothing that bound them culturally. Therefore the idea of a Pictish culture is inaccurate. Was this a kingdom? No. It was a group of small economic units that were somewhat self sufficient.

Hill forts in the East & brochs in the West

Between 900 BC and 500 BC the Eastern Highlands began to build hill forts, presumably to defend themselves from attacks from the north European mainland with whom they were beginning to have contact.

While the Easterners were learning about defense, the Westerners began building brochs. They are 'popularly known in Scotland as 'Pict's houses''. There are about 500 brochs sprinkled over the north and west of Scotland and into the islands. The brochs did not extend as far south as Dalraida.

The first stage of broch building made "these undefended, round, isolated houses more monumental." The true brochs came about 200 BC. These "became the centers of 'villages' which clustered round them, perhaps numbering thirty to forty families, ... where approach to the broch was by way of a long path through the buildings it dwarfed." These brochs probably housed the 'chieftain' of the village. There was both bronze and iron work at these broch sites but it was of ornamental nature instead of weaponry. "The accouterments of war are generally absent from broch sites. ... Instead of weapons, broch sites produced a diversity of subsistence equipment suited to the needs of a farming community with, in particular, an array of bone artifacts and stone rubbers."³⁵ Much of the bone work was specialty equipment associated with the sewing and weaving of textiles. The long winter evenings were lit by stone lamps where they played different board games and dice. There was both stone furniture and built in cupboards. The owner might have Roman artifacts indicating his status. These Neolithic farmers traded extensively with other tribes throughout the islands.

We've gone into such detail to indicate the peaceful life of the broch builders. This unfortunately was to change rapidly. This non-military social organization had already ended long ago in Europe. This idyllic state was soon to end here as well. In the west of Scotland hill forts had already begun in 900 BC. In the east of Scotland however the broch building began and continued into the Roman times. And remember "the accouterments of war are generally absent from broch sites." With the Celtic invasions from the West, the Roman invasion from the South, the Scandinavian invasions from the North and Kurganized Pictish invasions from the east, these remnants of Neolithic harmony in the west of Scotland were doomed.

We've called the indigenous population Pict and identified it with the Neolithic Goddess cultures, but it is likely that they had already Kurganized Britain with their Bronze weapons when they arrived in 1500 BC. The indigenous population which continued to farm and trade freely was Neolithic but those who came bringing weapons, class distinctions, rulers, and violent domination already belonged to the other side. Hence the Picts who fought for supremacy of Northern Scotland against the

Romans, Scots, Scandinavians, Angles and Normans had already been polluted by the Kurgan mentality. These broch builders however were still leading the peaceful lifestyle up until Roman times.

First the Romans attacked from the south in the 1st and 2nd century AD. They did not subdue the Highland Picts. But they certainly forced them into a military posture which unfortunately was to grow. The Highlander Picts, not conceiving themselves as a nation up until now, presumably banded together to defeat the Romans.

Next came the Scots from Ireland to the west of the Highlands in the centuries after the Romans left. During the Roman times, as mentioned earlier, the Irish Celts had already been raiding Britain for slaves and goods. After the Romans left the expanding O'Neill empire moved from Dalraida, Ireland to set up colonies in Scotland. Because of the murkiness of records, this could have happened as early as the 3rd century and as late as the 5th century. As dynasties broke apart so did Scottish Dalraida separate from Irish Dalraida. This happened after 637 AD.³⁶

In the centuries that followed the Scots, Picts, Angles, and Gaelic Brits all wrestled for control. Just to establish a little of the tenor of the times let us look at the infighting that was going on in the 7th and 8th centuries in the north of the British Isles. In the 7th century the Anglian kingdom of Northumbria attempted to expand northwards into southern Pictland. At first successful they were defeated substantially by the Picts in 685 AD ending Angle influence in the North. But now the Picts were united as a military force. After defeating fellow aspirants in a series of battles early in the 8th century, Oengus mac Fergus, became king of north and south Pictland in 729 AD. After consolidating control Oengus turned his attentions on Scottish Dalraida, finally conquering them in 741 AD. While Oengus was campaigning in Scottish Dalraida, the Angles attacked Pictland again in 740 AD. But as the Angles were campaigning in Pictland the Saxons of Mercia attacked the Angles from the south, ending the Angle dreams of conquest. After conquering Dalraida, Oengus went on to attack British Strathclyde. He formed many alliances for naught, finally losing to the Brits and returning home to die by 760 AD. The point here is that the Picts were united as a military force by the Angle invasion in the 7th century, and as a result then went on to conquer their neighbors in the 8th century. Prior to the invasions there had been no united Pictland and hence no conquering force.

However this wouldn't be for long. Briefly in the 8th century "the Picts became supreme in the north and gained control over both the Scots of Dalraida and the British of Strathclyde. Then the Picts were weakened by the attacks of the Norsemen, who first attacked the coasts in the end of the 8th century."³⁷ The Norsemen came in two waves,

first the Danish invasion from Denmark and then the Viking invasions from Norway. Subsequently the Scots of Dalraida and the Brits of Strathclyde threw off Pictish rule.

Kenneth MacAlpin 843 AD

The Picts were substantially weakened by these attacks. Then in 843 AD “Kenneth MacAlpin, the king of Scots, established a claim by the Celtic law of tanistry to the Pictish throne.”³⁸ Who was Kenneth MacAlpin and what is this Celtic law of tanistry.

First the law of tanistry.

Definition: “tanist n. Among the ancient Celts, the heir apparent to a chieftainship, elected in the lifetime of a chief from among the chief’s kinsman [Irish *taniste*, heir presumptive]”³⁹

Hmmm. The Celtic law of tanistry seems to have something to do with electing a new king from the family to succeed the old king when he dies. For those of us without nobility in our country, what is the heir presumptive?

Definition: “heir presumptive n. One who is at present the heir to someone but who might lose out to someone of closer relation who is then born.”⁴⁰

Thus the law of tanistry seems to relate to someone assuming the throne who is not in the direct line of succession, but close to it. We are getting closer to understanding. Let us look at how the Celts chose a new king.

“If a man died without issue, his property was divided in regulated shares among members of his *fine*. ... When a kingship became vacant, any man whose father, grandfather or great-grandfather had been king was eligible to succeed. The power of election belonged to the freemen in assembly, but it seems to have been usual for them to accept a choice made first by a meeting of the nobles.”⁴¹

Ahhh. We seem to be honing in. The Celtic freemen in assembly would elect, with a suggestion from the nobles, a new king from members of the *fine* who were related to any of the last four generations of kings. There was nothing automatic here. The assembly of freemen would choose the most eligible king from a list of family candidates.

Now that we know a little more of this tanistry, let us look at Kenneth MacAlpin. We know little of MacAlpin except that his father had a Pictish name. In 726 AD an Alpin was briefly king of Pictland. There was a king of Scottish Dalraida called Oengus II in the early 800s. Two sons of Oengus of Pictland had been killed in a battle with the

Vikings in 839 AD. Remember King Oengus of Pictland had conquered Dalraida in the 700s. Also MacAlpin removed the Stone of Destiny, upon which the Scottish kings were crowned, from Dunstaffnage in Dalraida, to Scone, in Pictland and traditional capital of 'Pictavia'.

What we see from this mish mash of facts is that the Scots and Picts had intermarried extensively by MacAlpin's time. Because of his dual heritage, and with the deaths of the direct heirs, MacAlpin laid claim to the Pictish throne. There may have still been some heirs who were closer in succession to the Pictish throne but by the law of tanistry, a little personal charisma, and probably some force, he was able to claim the throne. The interesting thing is that he moved the Stone of Destiny from Scotland to the capital of Pictland. Was he affirming his Pictish roots or was he consolidating his power or both. What is certain is that dynastically Scotland and Pictland had merged by the 9th century and that the takeover was more dynastic than military. Hence this was more of union of the Picts and the Scots rather than a conquering of the Picts by the Scots. Thus somewhat in response to the larger military groupings of the time, the Picts and the Scots merged to form a larger kingdom.

Many times in both British and Scottish history the heir presumptive assumed the throne from the more direct heir by virtue of personal popularity and/or military force. Queen Elizabeth's succession to the throne of England was of this type. Somehow this type of succession is more palatable to those people of Celtic descent than a direct military takeover. Another pattern that is followed regularly in the history of the British Isles is the dynastic conquest vs. military conquest. Scotland itself was not conquered militarily but dynastically. But we haven't quite reached that part of our story.

10th and 11th century Scotland

During the next few centuries under the ancestors of Kenneth MacAlpin, the Scot-Pict kingdom attempted to expand into the Lothians, part of Angle Northumbria, devastated by the expanding Danish empire, which also conquered England. Simultaneously the Scots were under attack by the Vikings, especially in their islands. Alliances were made and broken by the English Saxon kings, the Scottish-Pictish Kings and the Scandinavian powers. Finally in 1016 Malcolm II decisively defeated the Angles of Northumbria and the Lothians became permanently part of Scotland. By 1034 all of Scotland was united under Duncan, his grandson, who by marriage succeeded to the throne of the British Strathclyde and Scotland. Thus modern Scotland came into being.

In 1040 Duncan was slain by Shakespeare's Mac Beth in a civil war. The civil war was a reaction of the Pictish Highlands to the southern dynasty represented by Duncan.

Mac Beth was recognized by the Picts as monarch of Scotland but was slain by Malcolm III, son of Duncan, in 1057.

Because the British of Strathclyde were Celts from Wales, the kings of Scotland, from Kenneth MacAlpin through to Malcolm III, were of primarily Pictish/Celtic descent. With Malcolm III this was to change significantly. But before we trace this path, let us look back upon England.

The Normans

Edward the Confessor 1005-1066

Just about the time that modern Scotland was finally united under Duncan, we have the first Norman blood on the throne of England. No, not William the Conqueror, but Edward the Confessor. Edward, whose mother was Norman, was raised in Normandy until the age of 37, when he was invited to be King of England. Invited to be King of England? Why?

Emma of Normandy, his mother

Edward's mother, Emma of Normandy, had first married Ethelred, a Saxon king, and then, after he died, hedging her bets, had married King Canute of Denmark. Canute's Danish empire was the one who had conquered England and deposed the Saxons. They had ruled England for 26 years from 1016 through until 1042. King Canute, and his sons Harold Harefoot and Hardicanute had all died. Hardicanute was Emma's son by Canute. The Saxons still considered themselves the rightful rulers of England. Therefore with the waning power of Denmark and lack of a Danish successor; with Edward half brother of the last king and half Saxon king to boot, he was the logical choice of everyone for King. His mother was the last king's mother as well as his. Additionally the Earl of Godwin, a rich and powerful Dane, the moving force behind Edward's kingship, was offering Edith, his daughter's hand in marriage, who happened to be descended on her mother's side from the King of Denmark and the King of Sweden. Lots of royal marriages going on in those days. With this union of Edward and Edith, Godwin's daughter, the Saxons and Scandinavians would all be happy. Or so thought Godwin. he forgot the Norman blood.

Edward the Confessor, whether gay or celibate, we don't know, would not consummate his marriage with Godwin's daughter, hence produce no heirs. While Edward hunted and hunted for religious relics, Godwin ruled the kingdom, the force behind the throne. Then suddenly in 1051 after nearly a decade, Edward put Edith in a nunnery and exiled Godwin. The ruthless Norman blood suddenly emerges possibly through the influence of an ambitious Norman faction at Edward's court. Watch your

back with those Normans around. They'll kill brothers, fathers, nieces or nephews, for power.

William of Normandy, his half cousin

In the same year 1051, Edward invited William of Normandy, his half cousin, to England and promised him the kingship upon his death. William's grandfather, Richard II of Normandy, was Emma's brother. Thus William, although a bastard son, had the necessary royal blood to make a claim to the throne of England. This sidestep, of course, thwarted Saxon and Scandinavian claims to the crown, which would, of course, not make those factions happy. An unstable situation, to be sure.

Harold Godwinson, his wife's brother

In 1052 Godwin returned from exile with a fleet to enforce his claims to power. Edward yielded. Edward, an albino with a long white flowing beard, became more and more mystical as he aged. He began the laying on of hands to heal people of ailments. Probably from this and his mysticism he was sainted by the Catholic church. But in the meantime Godwin and then after his death, his eldest son Harold ruled England. On his deathbed in 1066, under the influence of the Godwins, he named Harold Godwin's son his successor.

Now in Saxon law, a little more exclusive than the Celts, a collection of nobles called the Witan elects the next king. It was they, under Godwin's influence, who had invited Edward the Confessor over from Normandy to be their king after Hardicanute died. And it was they who now must now ratify the new king. It was not Edward's spot in Saxon law to name his successor. This was the role reserved for the Witan⁴². The Witan after Edward's death under Godwin influence still, elected Harold king. But, as we know, in politics power rules regardless of what the law says.

Possession is nine tenths of the law. Harold was there. William had been in Normandy for 15 years. While possession is nine tenths, the other tenth is the ability to hold onto it. When Edward died in 1066 not only did William have a claim, but also Harold of Norway had a claim. Harold of Norway attacked first. Harold Godwinson defeated him, holding onto his royal seat. But then William attacked out maneuvering Harold's exhausted army and killing him. While Harold had the crown of England, he couldn't hold onto it. Thus William's one tenth of the law became ten tenths because he could claim the crown by birthright and hold onto it. This is William the Conqueror who established the Norman dynasty which lasted centuries.⁴³

Succession

No sense from an American perspective

From an American perspective, this whole birthright stuff makes no sense. Every two years we elect new leaders at local, state and national levels. Although occasionally a son will follow his father's path into politics, this has no bearing upon a person's right or ability to hold office. Essentially bloodline does not play a role in determining leadership in a democracy. But let us look a little closer at hereditary succession to learn something new.

Birthright

In the time of the first millennium, rulership was decided by birthright, whether Celtic, Norman, Anglo-Saxon, or Pict. Why?

Essentially since the Kurgans invaded the Old European Culture, the ruling class came from a different culture than the indigenous population. They had a different religion and far different customs than the dominated culture. There was no thought of sharing power with the dominated peoples. The conquering tribes on a whole worshipped power. They believed that might makes right.

Who takes over after the general dies?

Hence the violent cultures destroyed, enslaved or dominated the existing cultures. This established in their minds the rightness of their culture. Of course, the general only shares power with his first in command after himself, his fellow leaders in battle.

But once the general dies, who takes over? The second in command of course. But supposing there is a conflict, then there might be a civil war, between the opposing sides. Civil wars are never good for a culture. It weakens the culture for invasion from the outside. Eventually by a process of natural selection, the cultures which didn't destroy themselves in civil wars survived. How did they avoid this self-destruction when their cultures were based around the idea that power brings happiness?

Election

They survived by determining leaders through a cooperative process, election or through hereditary claims or both. Let us first look at election. Both the Celts and Saxons determined their rulers through election. In these cultures we don't know if election to leadership evolved from succession battles for leadership or whether it was a custom held over from the Neolithic nature worshippers. Who got to vote? In the Celtic case, the nobles, who were friends of the king, suggested a likely successor who was then ratified by the freemen. The freemen, as mentioned previously, were property owners or craftsmen. (Again the status which is granted the craftsmen in Celtic culture is a sign that it is a hybridized culture.) In the Saxon culture, the Witan, a collection of nobles selected the new king.

Who was in the pool of possible successors? Although the Celtic pool was much larger than the Saxon pool, as mentioned earlier, in both cultures, the new King was still chosen from blood relatives of prior kings. The new leader was not chosen from the complete population of freemen, but only from those with royal blood. Why did you have to have 'royal' blood to become leader?

Royal Blood

Let us look at the ancient concept of king to better understand royal blood.

“...the English people, who believed that the rite that consecrated the communion bread and wine turned it actually and physically into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, believed similarly that the rite that consecrated and anointed and crowned a king turned him into someone very different and special, somewhere between men and the angels.”⁴⁴

The idea of transubstantiation, the actual transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus, was very important to the Europeans. The western Christian church based in Rome had split with the Christian church based in Constantinople over this idea. This was called the Grand Schism. The Eastern church maintained that Communion was only symbolic, i.e. the wine and bread only symbolized Jesus' body and blood. It has been suggested that this obsession with objects was a throwback to the Celtic society which worshipped stones, trees, mountains, and places. Indeed the Stone of Destiny, the Stone of Scone, upon which the Kings of England and Scotland have been crowned for thousands of years is said traditionally to be Joseph's pillow. The Crusaders who invaded the Middle East during these times carried the cross of Jesus into battle to inspire them. When it was captured from them they were incredibly demoralized. Thus when Harold was elected and crowned he was turned into a supernatural being.

Here

Lest we get too carried away with this concept, let us point out that the animistic cultures believed that anyone knowing the right procedures could influence natural law. In James Frazer's unfairly maligned *The Golden Bough*, there are a multitude of examples of common people having an effect upon nature. There are rainmakers, voodoo dolls, magicians who know how to fly, love potions. There were two ways in which people transformed their world. First they would bring supernatural powers into their own bodies and become the god, going into some kind of trance.

“A savage hardly conceives the distinction commonly drawn by more advanced peoples between the natural and the supernatural. To him the world is mostly worked by supernatural agents, that is, by personal beings acting on impulses and motives like his own, liable like him to be moved by appeals to their pity, their fears, and their hopes. In a world so conceived he sees no limit to his power of influencing the course of nature to his own advantage.”⁴⁵

Man teh experimenter, the manipulator, attempts to mold nature to his will. It is easy to see that there is a continuum of personal strength, wisdom, and beauty. Hence it follows logically that some individuals can influence nature more than others. These people became the priestly kings such as Moses and Abraham in the Jewish faith. Just as big parents had big children, as fast horses when bred produced fast horses, it was logically inferred that those priestly kings who were a little closer to the gods would also produce heirs who were a little closer to the gods. Starting from the initial premise, these are very logical conclusions.

The Nordic perspective Three classes

This made great sense from a Nordic perspective. After all there are three classes of beings each with their own gods. We are the Takers who are very strong. We are the best warriors. We take what we want. There are the Makers who create things that we take. Then there are the Workers who grow the food we need to eat and the men we need to fight our wars.

Hence there was the Warrior-Ruling Class, which came from superior stock. while the others came from inferior stock. Therefore it became necessary to insure the purity of the ruling line. Additionally these warrior-rulers were not part of the classes they ruled and thus attempted to maintain their ruling culture separate from the masses under their control.

He is your lord. He is nobility. He is higher than the rest because we have ratified that he has noble blood. From henceforth the rules of primogeniture govern Noble succession.

Celtic vs. Norman succession

Let us contrast this style with the Norman idea of primogeniture. Under the rules of primogeniture the first born son of the king automatically assumes kingship upon the death of his father. Should there be no son, there are fairly strict rules of succession that have been set up to determine the new ruler. Hence the new ruler is almost an automatic, with no popular choice involved. If the king dies when his direct heir is an infant then a regency is set up to rule until he or she comes of age. The possible

advantage is that because there is no choice, there is no fighting over the new ruler. The disadvantage is that because there is no choice, one might be saddled with an incompetent for king. When the succession is automatic there is no sense of accountability to the people that are ruled. Furthermore while all the freemen are somewhat involved in a choice of leadership in the Celtic system, no one gets to choose the new King within the Norman practice of primogeniture.

Finally because the family inheritance is split among the descendants in the Celtic *fine*, it tends to diffuse central authority. Hence we see after Niall died, his centralized kingdom was immediately divided into many parts amongst his sons. This has an advantage for the populace. The government never grows too large. It remains intimate. The disadvantage is that because of decentralization that it was many times difficult to organize the many *tuath* to defend themselves against outside invasion. Operating in a vacuum the Celtic rules of succession and inheritance kept the political organization smaller and hence more intimate.

The Norman rule of primogeniture on the other hand tended to concentrate wealth and power in the hands of fewer and fewer. With intermarriage the nation-states grew bigger and more powerful. Eventually these mega-states were able to overwhelm these smaller more intimate states by sheer size alone. The natural resources and larger population base of these mega-states was overwhelming to these smaller Celtic communities, no matter how fiercely they fought.

While the Celtic community was partially Kurganized, the Norman culture was Kurgan. These Norsemen had already conquered the North establishing a warrior religion on top of the existing Goddess religion. In their Norse religion only by dying in battle would you go to a heaven where every day you battled. They believed that the highest warrior class took what they wanted by force. They further believed that the craftspeople and merchants were in lower class because they had to work for a living. The lowest class worked for somebody. The slave had no class. Hence the ruling class didn't have to provide anything but protection from the other ruling classes. At least they were honest about their philosophy

Born to rule

While we are here, let it be pointed out that the ruling class has institutionalized their leadership through hereditary succession. The idea is that their class was born to rule. The obsession with noble blood continues into the underlying modern mythology. King Arthur is hidden in a lower ranking nobles house as a child, but when he comes of age, his royal blood comes through and he assumes control of the kingdom. Sleeping Beauty, in the American Disney's version, is hidden with peasants to avoid her fate. The

prince falls in love with the 'peasant' girl upsetting his father. But it all ends happily when they find that she is of noble blood only disguised as a peasant. Hence noble blood is attracted to noble blood regardless of physical circumstances. The prince has not fallen in love with someone from a lower class. Thank God, sighs the audience.

Is there a king in the family?

Not to be above my culture, secretly without admitting it, even to myself, I too am looking for royal blood. And I too was happy to find some. I guess the idea is that if you have royal blood in your gene pool that you too might have the innate ability to rise above your class. We have all been programmed by the Hierarchy to desire upward mobility for economic as well as status reasons.

Hereditary succession for stability

For Americans, in particular, raised without nobility, it is sometimes perplexing at what lengths the Europeans of the past would go to find someone of royal blood to rule their kingdom. There are a few factors behind this. First mostly rulers choose rulers. Thus they want someone from their own class to work with. But secondly, the bourgeois and proletariat classes hate warfare and chaos most. Hence a stable succession is most preferred to civil war. Normally the farmers suffer most in a war. Their crops are burned, their wells are poisoned, their homes are destroyed or troops are garrisoned there. Additionally the peasant classes are drafted for the armies of the nobility. Thus wars of succession are no good for the people. Hence although in most modern democracies, we have come to realize that a variety of people are quite competent to rule a country, in past times the death of a king could signify a time of turbulence unless a successor was chosen in advance. We will see many examples of this.

Although the Normans haven't quite reached our story yet, let us talk about the Celtic vs. Norman succession. As we've just seen the Celts chose their next leader somewhat democratically from a wide group of applicants. The applicants all belong to the same bloodline or *fine*. This serves several functions. One it eliminates the state of regency, when nobles rule until the king comes of age. Two it creates a pool of family members from which the new king is selected. Third both the freemen and nobles have a hand in selecting the new king. Compare this with modern American democracy. The pool of potential leaders come from all the American citizens. But the political parties determine the choices before the common assembly of voters gets to decide. Although the Kurganized Celts are choosing a military leader from a family line, there is still a choice.

A Title

Baron MacLachlan 1292

Interestingly, Argyll was turned into a sheriffdom in 1292 by King John Balliol. This created a Duke of Argyll with 12 principal Barons of which Gillescop MacLachlan was one.

How romantic! A Baron in the family.

How limiting. How boring!

Let us look a little deeper at this benign statement

That turns cancerous. What's the dirt?

William the Conqueror, the Normans and their castles

First the Normans conquered England and made themselves kings. They attempted to conquer Scotland but were thwarted as were the Romans, Angles, Vikings, and Danes by the geography of the Highlanders. They hid behind Hadrian's Wall and built one of their fortress castles in Carlisle on the border. These Norman castles were different than their European and Scottish counterparts. The Norman castles were built as military garrisons to suppress the local population while the Scottish and European castles were many times built to protect their citizenry in case of attack. The Norman castles are shaped like cruel fists. These Normans warriors fulfilled their Viking destiny. Only the lower classes work for a living. The ruling class takes. Might makes right. Die by the sword and go to Valhalla, oh excuse me, I mean heaven. They have converted to Christianity by this time. More politically expedient. Especially when you get into that Old Testament stuff. Jehovah was certainly no wimp. Look what he did to the almighty Pharaohs of Egypt for denying the Jews exit. No matter that he put it into the pharaoh's mind to disobey him, so that he could show his strength to the ancient world.

Margaret's yin

Anyway the Scots under Malcolm III fought off the yang of William the Conqueror, the Norman, but succumbed to the yin of Margaret, Saxon princess deposed by the Normans and seeking refuge in Scotland in 1066. While warding off the vicious thrusts of William, Malcolm succumbed to the softness of Margaret and married her in 1070. This was the kiss of death for Scottish independence more than any other cause. The soft yin always conquers the strong yang.

Saint Queen Margaret conquered Scotland through her sons. Remember from the first paper that Queen Margaret upon arriving in Scotland with her brother in 1070 was disgusted by the uncivilized Scots and made it her mission to civilize the Scots religiously and politically. For her untiring efforts to bring the Catholic Church of Scotland under the sway of the Pope, she was sainted by the Catholic Church of Rome.

In some ways she was more effective than either St. Columba or St. Patrick in increasing the power of the church and converting the most people to Papal Catholicism.

Papal vs. Celtic Catholicism

This may be a little confusing. What is the difference between Papal Catholicism and the Catholicism practiced by the Irish and the Scots? Papal Catholicism was based upon a hierarchical system with the Pope at the top followed by Cardinals, then Bishops, then Priests, and finally the congregation. Thus the Truth came to the Pope who passed it down through the others until it reached the people of the Church. Bishoprics are associated with larger cities. The parishes are associated with smaller communities which are under the sway of the larger communities politically, economically, and now with bishops religiously as well. This system worked well in Lowlands all over the world, where all roads led to Rome, Constantinople, Paris, London or whichever big city dominated the countryside. But Celtic Ireland and Scotland had no big cities. The one bishop they had wielded no power.

“The Celtic church did not repudiate papal authority, but there was no opportunity for the exercise of papal jurisdiction. Diocesan organization did not exist. There was only one bishop of the Scots; his see was St. Andrews and he could enjoy little influence outside his own neighborhood.”⁴⁶

Local practices, abhorrent to Margaret

The Catholic Church of Scotland in merging with local religions in order to supplant them had also assumed some of their practices. These other practices were also objectionable to Margaret. These ‘other practices’ were again attacked during Scotland’s witch hunts in the late 1600s where thousands of people, mainly women, were burned or hanged for witchcraft.

Scots vs. English

A constant conflict between the Scots and English to this day is that to the English the Scottish people don’t know their place. To the Scottish the English are too class conscious. According to Ludovic Kennedy, a Scot-Norman, in his book [In Bed With An Elephant](#) the class consciousness of the English creates an emotional reserve that discourages intimacy while the lack of class consciousness in the Scots leads to a demand for personal involvement which leads the English to label them combative and argumentative, without finesse. Essentially those that survived in England through their thousands of years of invaders, learned to bow before the Hierarchy. By natural selection those that didn’t bow before it either left, were executed, or were treated poorly. Those that bowed might have both survived and thrived. Those that were most

sensitive to social caste were also most effective at manipulating it to their own advantage. Hence the subtlety and sophistication of the English. Also because of the struggle in moving up the Hierarchy, knowledge is power. Hence knowledge is concealed rather than shared. Therefore British reserve.

The Hierarchy vs. Freedom

The Highlanders especially resistant to domination by the Hierarchy, also treasured freedom from it. "Give me liberty or give me death!" The Scottish American Patrick Henry's famous phrase is typically Scottish. It harks back to Declaration of Abroath in 1320, which many Scots knew at that time.

"As long as but a hundred of us remain alive, never will we on any conditions be brought under English rule. It is in truth not for glory, nor riches, nor honors that we are fighting, but for freedom — for that alone, which no honest man gives up but with life itself."⁴⁷

The English that were so passionate about freedom were either dead, exiled or dishonored and thus held no power. Those that had remained had already chosen survival over freedom. Thus to them this statement of bravado seemed curiously childish. However, for those of us who don't know our place, for those of us who thumb our noses at the Hierarchy, for those of us who love to choose what we're going to do today, these words are stirring. They brought tears to my eyes and an involuntary sob, when I first read them.

But for those who want to climb the corporate ladder of success, for those of you who want to conquer the Hierarchy, rising to one of its pinnacles, disregard these words of liberty and freedom and bow before your Master, kissing his Feet. It's good for your chi flow anyhow. What have you got to lose anyway except your ego.

Queen Margaret and her 6 sons

Back to Queen Margaret. Having a lot invested in the Hierarchy, she wanted to maintain it. She married Malcolm III, the first ruler of all of Scotland in 1070 and promptly bore him six sons. She refused to give her sons Scottish names and instead gave them the names of Saxon rulers. Malcolm spent the rest of his life fighting the Normans over disputed land in the middle of England, Northumbria. Finally he and his son Edward were killed in battle in 1093. The beloved Queen Margaret and the rest of her English retinue, including her sons were driven out of Scotland back to England by the Celts in reaction to her Anglicization of Scotland. Four years later in 1097 her son Edgar was restored to the throne by the English army. The family was not exactly back by popular acclaim. But because of the force of English arms and Norman feudalism,

Margaret's sons ruled Scotland for the next 56 years enforcing patterns that continue to this day.

What were those patterns? First English the language was forced upon the Gaelic speaking population. Second they organized the church along English lines with bishoprics appointed by the powerful. Third in feudalizing Scotland they established a chain of command from which power could be wielded from the top. All three of Margaret's son had been educated in England, had English names, had English lands, and had all been expelled from Scotland by the native Celts. The native Scots can not exactly be called their good friends. Hence Margaret's sons ruled as fearful dominators rather than as protective fathers.

Co-option of the Clans

The three sons granted their English friends Scottish lands. But wisely they also granted the local Scottish Chieftains legitimacy by granting them both feudal rights and duties. The English with the cunning of foxes co-opted the Clan system. Previously the Clan system had been a protective system whereby the Clan leaders provided protection and care for those in the Clan. In exchange the Clan members granted the Chieftain and Clan absolute loyalty. Granting the Chieftain feudal legitimacy was the beginning of the corruption of power that finally led to the great clearings of the 1800s. But more on that later.

“[David I, (1124-1153) the last of Margaret's sons] changed his system of land tenure in Scotland by making to his English friends grants of land, on the model of the charters granted by the Anglo-Norman kings of England. ... There was no dispossession of the existing landowners; they were to hold their rights, in future, from the new lord instead of directly from the crown. Such charters were granted not only to newcomers, but also to great landlords who had hitherto held their lands by tribal custom and were glad to receive written guarantees of their possessions and privileges. Gradually the whole of the land, outside the Highlands, came to be held under feudal law.”⁴⁸

Charters of Confirmation

One history states that “*Charters of Confirmation exist from the 12th century.*” This is when David I was trying to Anglicize Scotland. It is very likely that it was he or his administrators who granted our family feudal legitimacy. These charters merely confirm that the MacLachlan clan controls the village of Stralachlan in the barony of Strathlachlan on the shores of Loch Fyne with their Lachlan castle. By this time it is likely that the ancestors of the MacLachlans had already occupied Loch Fyne for perhaps as long as 600 years. Hence these charters of Confirmation merely

acknowledged the status quo rather than granting title. Some historians suggest that these Charters of Confirmation were akin to the Domesday book of the Normans in England, i.e. they were the way of identifying the foe to tax him, rather than granting real legitimacy.

No titles for the Chieftains

The clan lands were turned into baronies, but the Chieftains didn't call themselves Baron. Instead they called themselves by their family name. It wasn't Baron MacLachlan, Lord MacLachlan or even Mr. MacLachlan. It was just MacLachlan of MacLachlan. As one replied in the Kennedy book. "I am the only one." The Highlanders were less focused on title and more focused upon Clan. But these Charters of Confirmation eventually corrupted the Highlands. While they ratified the status quo, they also distorted it.

Land ownership

First the idea of land ownership had been greatly changed by the Charters. Initially the Clan had controlled the land. With the Charter the chieftain became lord and owner of the land. The Chief had always been granted great privileges, but now he was turned from a tribal, clan chief to a landed nobleman. As chieftain, he was father to the Clan, protector and provider. As lord and master, he was the owner of the property, which included people.

Lachlan Mór, son of Gilpatrick, son of Gilchrist in the mid 1200s: For the "This is the land of the Clan and we will all fight to preserve our independence from outside authority. Now this outside authority says that yes the Clan owns the land, but the Clan Chieftain because he is the leader, he is also now the owner of the land and must pay rent to the Duke above him.

Most of the time the Dukes above the baronies were of English blood and/or orientation. Many of the times they owned land in England and so were actual subjects of the King. Thus King David and his brothers, surrounded by hostile forces, only contained by the military power of Norman England, granted Dukedoms to their English friends. He would build them a castle and give them an army and his royal backing.

Uncooperative Clans don't get to Participate

Those clans which didn't cooperate would be singled out and punished while those clans that cooperated would be left alone, except that they had to provide tribute money to the Duke, so that he could afford his castle and army with which he suppressed those paying the taxes. Great System. Impoverish and conquer. Have them work to create their own jails. Those that cooperated might even be given lands in England to make

them subjects of the King. Cooperate and prosper or don't cooperate and we will destroy you, with our collective forces. Hey you're not giving up that much freedom. It's only the freedom of your subjects that you are giving up.

"But they're members of our Clan."

"Clan Schman. Remember we have just made you lord of the land. You are really above your Clan. I can see it in your noble bearing. Why I bet you have an Irish king or two in your background."

"Why yes. I do. How could you tell?"

To himself: "{All Scots seem to.}"

To the Clan Chieftain: "You just seem to be a cut above the rest, more cultured, refined. I just assumed you must have noble blood. You deserve to be above the rest. This is why we have made you Baron of this fine Loch. All you have to do is supply troops to the Duke of Argyll in time of need, a maybe a little tribute."

"The Duke of Argyll, why he's the enemy, He's not even Scottish. He was appointed by your King David."

"he's not my King David. I helped throw him and his family out of England in 1093."

"You did, did you? What was that name again?"

"MacLachlan of MacLachlan."

"Well MacLachlan let me put it this way. You can take the barony and pay tribute to the Duke of Argyll, or you can reject it and we'll destroy your Clan and give it to someone else."

"You and who else will destroy our Clan. We've fought the Romans, the Picts, the Vikings, the Angles, and the Normans. No one has defeated us. What makes you think that you will?"

"Your own King David is behind this with the King of England's support."

"We'll take on the bunch of you."

"The Campbells, your neighbors, have joined the side of the Duke Argyll."

"Right Campbell."

"Right. Come on MacLachlan. It's time to stop living in the past. Think of the welfare of your Clan. Cooperate, survive and thrive. Fight it, get trampled, become slaves or extinct. Remember the Mac Dodos."

"Just sign right here. Hey don't be so nervous. It is only called a Charter of Confirmation. We are just confirming your place in history. We are not trying to dislodge you."

"Well all right. Somehow I have a sinking feeling about this."

“Don’t worry. Just cooperate. I bet your Clan will be in this castle 800 years from now.”

They are. There is a Castle Lachlan on the shores of Loch Fyne in which Marjorie MacLachlan of MacLachlan the 24th chief, still live today, 1997, over 800 years since the Charter of Confirmation was signed.

Poor Scottish nobility

One big problem was, as is normal, greed based upon desire. Those poor Scottish nobility, underclass to their English counterparts, had so many desires to contend with. Because of the rolling geography of the South a great trade had developed with the attendant prosperity. Because of the mountainous geography of the North, a more self sufficient economy had developed, based upon barter in the more remote regions. Thus the Scottish nobles had a substantially smaller tax base than did their English cousins. Coming up from England they had to be satisfied with less, poor second cousins to their English friends. There were two solutions, live with less, and enjoy the wilds of Scotland. Or get more out of your subjects to make up the difference. Both strategies and a combination thereof were employed.

King David to his English friends

One can imagine King David appealing to his friends. “Listen Edward I’ve got a great piece of land picked out for you. You will be its first Duke. Oh I know its not England. Oh yes and I know that those barbarian Scots aren’t exactly friendly to we English, but hey I’ll provide you with your own army and royal protection. Oh I know those Scottish Celts rebel from time to time. I’ve already thought of that. I’m going to supply you with a castle to protect yourself. Drawbridges and all. Don’t worry. You’ll love it. I’ll expect you as soon as possible. Besides you’ll never get ahead in the Norman hierarchy in the South. Also the King of England has agreed to help us out if we have any problems with our slaves, excuse me I mean subjects, A little joke. Ha ha. This will greatly expand your prestige. Hey if nothing else do it for your kids. A little intermarriage here and there. Hey maybe down the line you’ve got a King or Queen of England. Hey stranger things have happened.”

Footnotes

¹Scottish Clans and Tartans, by Ian Grimble, 1997, Hamlyn Publishing p176

²Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume 5, 1961, p 106.

³EB, Ireland, 20-598 bc

⁴Sassenach, Lowlander, a perjorative term used by the Scots towards the English and also used by the Highlanders of Scotland referring to the Lowlanders of Scotland.

⁵EB, 5, p105 c

⁶EB, 12-600 a

⁷EB, 12 600bc

⁸EB, Ireland 12-601a

⁹EB, 12 600b

¹⁰Scottish Clans & Tartans, p176

¹¹EB, 12 599b

¹²Scottish Clans & Tartans, p195

¹³EB, Ireland, 12-599d

¹⁴EB, Celtic Mythology, 5-107

¹⁵EB, Celtic Mythology, 5-107

¹⁶EB, Celtic Mythology, 5-107

¹⁷Wright, 1986, p. 16

¹⁸Eisler, p258

¹⁹Eisler, p 13

²⁰Eisler pp 14-5

²¹Tai Chi Master Fu Yuan Ni from mainland China in 1996 at age 81 in a private conversation

²²The Chalice & the Blade by Riane Eisler, 1987, Harper-Collins, p. 43

²³Eisler, p261

²⁴Bible, King James Version, p 312 First Book of Kings

²⁵Eisler, p 43

²⁶Bible, King James Version: Genesis 3:16 p. 8

²⁷Holy Bible New International Version: Footnote Genesis 2:18

²⁸Holy Bible New International Version: Footnote Genesis 2:23

²⁹Scottish Clans & Tartans, p 6

³⁰EB, Ireland 12-599b

³¹EB, Druids 7-680bc

-
- ³²EB, Druids 7-680bc
- ³³The Picts and the Scots by Lloyd and Jenny Laing, 1994, Sutton p.74-5
- ³⁴Picts, p 66
- ³⁵Picts, p79
- ³⁶Picts, p 42
- ³⁷EB 20, p148.
- ³⁸EB Scotland, 20-146a
- ³⁹EB Dictionary Volume 2 p1281
- ⁴⁰EB Dictionary Volume 1 p585
- ⁴¹EB, 12 599b
- ⁴²Murray, p 228
- ⁴³*The Kings and Queens of England* by Jane Murray, Scribners Sons of New York 1974,
pp221-230
- ⁴⁴*Kings and Queens* , p 221
- ⁴⁵The Golden Bough by James Frazer, Gramercy Books, 1890, pp 8-9
- ⁴⁶EB 20, p146c
- ⁴⁷*In Bed with an Elephant* by Ludovic Kennedy, 1995, Corgi Books, p186
- ⁴⁸ EB 20, p147