

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

Fianna Fail: Plumbing The Depths

The Great Eoghan Ruadh

Poetry Of The Taliban

Trinity, Its Works & Poms (6)

The Staggered End Of Western Civilisation

End Of The Ottoman Eden?

Editorial

Plumbing The Depths

Fianna Fail has been described as one of the pillars of the state. But the leadership of that party, with the partial exception of Eamon O Cuiv, has lost all sense of itself and its past. The following is a transcript of an extensive interview, which Pat Kenny conducted with Fianna Fail leader Michael Martin on 30th April 2012.

Interview

Pat Kenny: Well that seems to be the view of former Deputy Leader, Eamon O Cuiv, when he said in an interview in the *Connaught Tribune* that both parties [Sinn Fein and Fianna Fail] come from the same tradition and are therefore more compatible than a partnership with either Fine Gael or Labour. I'm joined from the Cork studio by the Leader of Fianna fail, Michael Martin. Good morning.

Michael Martin: Good morning Pat.

PK: You must be tempted to use that old phrase, *Rid me of this turbulent priest*.

MM: Not at all. I think people in politics are free to articulate their positions and indeed to articulate what their particular beliefs and thoughts are. I wouldn't share Eamon O Cuiv's analysis at all in relation to Sinn Fein. I don't see Sinn Fein as a Republican party in the first instance. Their actions, not just in the past but even in the present day are the very antithesis of what Republicanism should mean—

PK: Are you saying, to quote Garret FitzGerald about Charlie Haughey, they have a *flawed pedigree*.

MM: I wouldn't use that phrase. Basically, Republicanism to me is the capacity to unite Protestant, Catholic and Dissenter. And I think Sinn Fein do not have that capacity. We saw evidence of that during the Presidential election when large sections of society here found it difficult to comprehend the prospect of a Sinn Fein Presidency because of the murders and the activities that they engaged in. And yesterday in my speech at Arbour Hill, you know, I made it very clear that there is no connection, nor can there be any attempt to connect the activities of the Provisional IRA with the War of Independence period, or indeed with the leaders of 1916: 1916, which is part of the narrative that Sinn Fein have been endeavouring to articulate.

PK: You said Sinn Fein prolonged suffering because of its delay in embracing democratic politics.

MM: Absolutely. And if you talk to some ex-combatants and people who were members of the IRA, they now realise that. And they believe that there was a fundamental dishonesty at the earth of the Provisional IRA campaign from the mid seventies onwards, particularly after Sunningdale. And that thousands of people lost their lives needlessly. If you read *Voices From The Grave*, Ed Molony's book, which as you know deals with the testimony of Brendan Hughes, who was a close ally of Gerry Adams in the IRA at that time, it's very very clear that there was huge disillusionment set in, and indeed, you know, I instanced the issue of The Disappeared, and last week we had further news with relation to Colin McBain—attempts to find his body so that his family can give him a decent burial. He was a young teenager when he was

abducted in 1975. And I genuinely believe there's been a fundamental lack of accountability in relation to those kinds of incidents and those issues and therein lies really the fundamental problem with Sinn Fein terms of describing itself as a Republican party. Both in terms of its behaviour and activity, even in terms of its [indistinct] in Government in Northern Ireland, tend to be very sectarian and tend to be very partisan in their approach.

PK: Later on in the programme we'll be talking about a book called *Overcoming Violence* by Johnston McMaster, and he goes back looking at the tradition of violence going back to the Tudor Plantations and all the rest of it. But in the period that we're about to celebrate, this one hundred years, starting from this year and going through to 1922, it was a very violent period, and one of the things he talks about is the shooting of James Bardon in the face by the IRA. I mean it was dirty war at that time. And Sinn Fein might say, you know, making omelettes involves the breaking of eggs, or the taking of lives, in this case.

MM: Well, I would ask people to read *Lost Lives*, which is basically the most comprehensive list and account of all those who lost their lives in Northern Ireland, over a very prolonged thirty-odd year period. And, if you read that and look through the individual cases, you come away from it really understanding this wasn't about any war or conflict, but it's something that went very quickly out of control after '74. All wars are nasty. All conflicts, I accept, are—you know there's no glory in war. There's nothing to be passionate about in terms of the fundamental loss of life and misery for people. But there was absolutely no need, and there was a fundamental dishonesty at the heart of the Provisional movement, both political with Sinn Fein and indeed militarily within IRA, about what they were about in terms of the violence that they wreaked on Protestant communities in Northern Ireland in particular and given all the agreement we've had since then— You look back at the 74 period, the Sunningdale Agreement and so on, you do ask very basic questions: Why—why did so many people have to lose their lives over such a prolonged period.

PK: Now, I'm not justifying anything done by Sinn Fein and by the IRA back in the twenties. But the notion of [indistinct] in the Border Counties, the genocide of farmers, or farmers' sons indeed, where there might only have been one or two children in the family, and looking at what happened, particularly in places like Cork, where there was what looked like the genocide of the landed gentry or an attempt at that. I mean there are parallels.

MM: Which would be fundamentally wrong, and equally to be condemned. *T G Ceathair* and others did documentaries on that, and you know there's an ongoing debate in relation to Peter Hart's book in relation to that particular period. But I think what we need from Sinn Fein and its leadership is a genuine accountability for some of the atrocities that occurred and in particular, if you just take The Disappeared, if you take the case of Thomas McGearey who I mentioned yesterday, who was murdered in 1984 by a booby trap bomb—they denied it first—I think Sinn Fein have not come to terms with that past and have not been honest in terms of accepting that it wasn't just part of a genuine sort of conflict with an Imperial Power but rather that it was genocidal in some respects. And also based on a sectarian approach to the other community in Northern Ireland, as they would have seen it.

PK: If you take a broad brush-stroke here though, and you say civil war in this country was caused by Fianna Fail's

rejection of the Treaty——

MM: ——Fianna Fail didn't exist during the Civil War, Pat.

PK:—well the antecedents, shall we say, that gave rise to Fianna Fail. And equally you can say that Sinn Fein, by their rejection of what they saw as an illegitimate Government in Stormont, certainly contributed to the Troubles as they unfolded. I mean they weren't going to lie down. John Hume nobly of course decided to take the non-violent route and he knows whether or not that would have succeeded if the Troubles had not erupted in the way that they did.

MM: Yeah, I think, I mean, I mean, we know that John Hume was an outstanding politician, a pacifist, a person who believes in the political road forward, and ultimately you know, his perspective and others in the Republic, our own Party, made a very noble contribution to achieving peace in the end. But it just went on for too long. And I think, when you read *Voices From The Grave* and other books which have just come on the scene in more recent times, and the evidence of those who were directly involved, you begin to see that there was a huge lie at the heart of the Provisional IRA's movements and its campaigns and indeed in the Sinn Fein political presentation of what went on. Sinn Fein need to be more honest and accountable for what happened and what transpired than all of the denials we're receiving. Every political party's past is up for inquiry and investigation. And I think in this context, given the enormity of what happened, given the number of lives lost, the circumstances around The Disappeared and thus there was a need for a greater degree of open and honest accountability about that and honesty about it, and not to continue to portray it in the manner that Sinn Fein continue to do.

PK: However, politics is about being pragmatic and Eamon O Cuiv points out that to look for an alternative to the present Government, if the public decide that they don't want to vote for that Government, and he suggests that they will present themselves as a Government for re-election in four years' time, doing the sums, if Fianna Fail recover somewhat, and Sinn Fein continues to make progress, maybe a Fianna Fail/Sinn Fein alliance might be the only alternative.

MM: Well, I think in the first instance, the over-riding objective of Fianna Fail must be to renew itself, to develop fresh policies and bring new people into the party, facilitate the people coming into the electoral situation and getting elected to Councils and Parliament. And that's our first and over-riding objective. I think we're not being presumptuous at this particular juncture. And, secondly, I think the overwhelming evidence from the RTE Exit Poll at the last General Election was that about 22% of our vote went to either Fine Gael or Labour or indeed the Independents. And that only about 3% went to Sinn Fein.

PK: So you think Eamon O Cuiv has it wrong.

MM: I do. I think fundamentally Fianna Fail must present itself as a credible alternative, as a credible and progressive Republican party. I think Sinn Fein is adopted a position of opposing everything and being for very little, and isn't offering an alternative vision that is practical or implementable.

PK: In fairness to Eamon O Cuiv, by the way, he does say——

MM: ——he does say, in fairness to him, he has a right go at Sinn Fein's economic policy—— ...mad or...

PK: I don't want to suggest that Eamon O Cuiv is at one with them on every thing. But in terms of criticising Sinn Fein and what has been achieved by Gerry Adams and Martin

To page 4

Contents

	Page
Plumbing The Depths. Editorial	2
<i>Is fíor trim aisling.</i> Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin	7
Lamentation. Séamas Ó Domhnaill	11
Food For Thought. Wilson John Haire on <i>Poetry Of The Taliban</i>	15
Glove Puppets? Donal Kennedy	15
John O'Connor Power. Jane Stanford (Report)	16
Mary Kenny's 'Error'. Julianne Herlihy	16
Vox Pat: Gerry Foley; French Presidential Race; Conrad Black; Damien Thompson; Fr. Sean McManus; 'The English'; American Civil War; English Politics	17, 36
A Proposed University Merger. Jack Lane <i>Trinity, Its Works And Poms, Part 6</i>	18
De Cobain. Seán McGouran	19
Labour And Irish Army Deserters Manus O'Riordan (Report)	19
Out To Grass. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	19
End Of Eden? Pat Walsh	20
The Staggered End Of Western Civilisation Desmond Fennell	24
A Gospel Journey. Stephen Richards	30
Nuclear Disarmament & Non-Proliferation Issues (Report)	34

Some web addresses for associated sites——

The Heresiarch:

<http://heresiarch.org>

Athol Books:

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

There is a great deal of interesting reading. Go surf and see!

Sales:

<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney

All Correspondence should be sent to:

**P. Maloney,
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork City.
TEL: 021-4676029**

SUBSCRIPTIONS

€15 (Sterling £12) for 4 issues

ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS

€5 (Sterling £4) for 4 issues from
athol-st@atholbooks.org

McGuinness, this business—the term used by Tony Blair—about constructive ambiguity, you know, bringing the hard men along by this kind of process. And we were reminded again, to misquote or borrow from Gerry Adams, *they haven't gone away, you know*, with the bomb that was decommissioned by the British Army in Northern Ireland, which would have killed everyone within fifty metres of it, had it exploded. I mean that's overnight...

MM: Your point?

PK: You know, I mean, that sometimes it takes constructive ambiguity to stop the violence, bring people along, and, you know, to apologise abjectly for some of the things that they perhaps in their hearts feel sorry for, would maybe alienate those people who felt that they put their lives on the line in vain.

MM: Well, I think we've come a long distance from the Downing St. Declaration, from the Good Friday Agreement, and whereas at that particular time in order, in terms of making the peace, yeah, there was a constructive ambiguity, yes decisions were taken by both the British and the Irish Governments to facilitate that Peace Process. But if you're entering into the full rigour of democratic politics and you feel free to attack everybody left right and centre about their sins, then I think you have an obligation to be equally forthright about that since you've—

PK: Do you think there is an amnesia there?—

MM: —I think there is—

PK: —a public amnesia. It doesn't suit everybody, I mean, I remember Charles Haughey when we were trying to organise an interview with him on television or radio and he would say, I'll do it as long as there's none of that old Arms Trial ---and I won't use the expletive he used—there comes a time when you just get tired of asking Gerry Adams *were you in the IRA? Why don't you own up* etc. etc. etc.

MM: But that goes to the heart of the integrity argument in politics. I think people do find it incomprehensible and find it very difficult to believe that Gerry Adams was not in the IRA, given all the evidence and testimony to the contrary, and commentary from fellow combatants at that time. That creates a huge credibility problem for Gerry Adams, and for Sinn Fein, and indeed for Martin McGuinness. And I think, yes, people were very very wary of the North, and became very wary because of the longevity of it. But equally we are in more recent times beginning to hear in much more starker

terms and clearer terms what actually went on within the Provisional IRA. They had been particularly disciplined in terms of preventing a lot of stuff from coming out and holding it all together, but the *Voices From The Grave* and other testimonies are beginning to give a different story, which is important by the way, in terms of the culture. You mentioned the Real IRA and the dissidents. When I was Minister for Foreign Affairs we did a lot of work trying to develop cross-community healing, to work with Co-Operation Ireland, for example, on young people in marginalised communities, both on the Loyalist side and on the Republican side, to keep them away from the culture of violence, the culture of the gun, the bomb and the bullet. And, unfortunately, unless there's greater honesty by all those who were involved, I think that from that honesty will come a far more effective tool and approach to preventing a younger generation from going down the route of violence in the North. That's a critical issue.

PK: We talked about amnesia a moment ago, but there are virtually no one of a certain age who does not remember and condemn Enniskillen and what went on there, the murder of the people at the Cenotaph. People remember the cowardly murder of Lord Mountbatten. People remember the killing of Garda Gerry McCabe. And yet, in spite of knowing all of those things, which are very much in the public domain, unlike some of the things that you've mentioned (you'd almost have to do research to learn about them), in spite of all that, they are prepared to accept members of Sinn Fein in Dail Eireann without heaping odium upon them at every hand's turn.

MM: Yes, they do. And people have the freedom to vote at the ballot box. And people do that. But equally in terms of political debate and discourse these are very legitimate issues to raise. And I think it's very very important that, in the context of my speech yesterday at Arbour Hill, and it's very important that Sinn Fein would de-mythologize their war in the North, and their conflict in the North, if for no other reason, to prevent future generations from going down a very futile path. And indeed, if you talk to some of the ex-combatants who have gone away from the Provisional IRA movement, they do that a lot. They actually [indistinct] up to a lot of young people in those communities in the North, warning them, saying *Don't allow the armchair Generals walk you down a life of misery, a life of death and destruction.* and so there's a very com-

elling case for those who are involved in the Provisional IRA and those who are still involved in that movement, and to be far more open and honest about the needlessness, the futility of what went on for the last—

PK: Are you ruling out any Coalition with Sinn Fein while you are leader of Fianna Fail?

MM: As leader of Fianna Fail, I mean we'll campaign on our own.

PK: But are you ruling it out? I mean it could happen that the numbers might stack up after the next General Election. I mean are you ruling it out definitively?

MM: We have no compatibility with the Sinn Fein economic platform, with its platform on the Euro. So certainly we would not be going into Government with Sinn Fein.

PK: But I mean, on the basis of what you said about their history, that alone should be enough for you to say *No, no, never.*

MM: Well in terms of— that's one aspect of it. And you're right in identifying that as a key issue for me. But equally a key issue in terms of the future, of the generations to come, is the direction that Ireland takes. and I think Sinn Fein's fundamental policy platform is one that would move Ireland to an isolationist position in terms of both Europe and the global context. And, secondly, it was economic policy which would de-incentivise enterprise, fundamentally about over-taxation, and I think it would lead to a loss of jobs, and a loss of economic credibility in the international sphere.

PK: And that brings us to the Fiscal Compact...

Some Comments

Martin was under some slight pressure from Sinn Fein. He might have rejected O Cuiv's suggestion of a coalition with Sinn Fein on the ground of an incompatibility of policies with relation to the governing of the Republic. He chose instead to make a kind of historical Declaration of Faith in emotional terms, and to condemn Sinn Fein's part in the devolved government in the North. With his historical remarks he makes nonsense of the origins of Fianna Fail, following the lines set by Martin Mansergh when he was adviser to Bertie Ahern. And his remarks about Sinn Fein's conduct in government in the North are merely ignorant nonsense.

The origins of Fianna Fail lie in Anti-Treaty Sinn Fein. Pro-Treaty Sinn Fein

very quickly ceased to be Sinn Fein—though gaining a small majority in the Sinn Fein Dail—as wealthy anti-Sinn Fein tendencies gathered around it. The element in Sinn Fein which supported the Treaty did so on the basis that a submission to Crown authority was the only way to ward off a comprehensive British reconquest. Michael Collins's strategy was to gain a secure foothold as a Government under British authority and then at an opportune moment to break free of British authority. The British Government saw what he was up to and countered it. It ordered him to break the election Pact he made with the Anti-Treatyites in May 1922, under which Sinn Fein, straddling the Treaty issue, would have contested the June election as a Party. And then in July 1922 it gave him a further ultimatum, compelling him to make war on the Anti-Treaty Republicans, with the threat that, if he did not do so promptly, the British Army would go into action again. So Collins went to war at the insistence of Britain, supplied with British arms. And Treatyite Sinn Fein lost itself in the war it fought on British orders, while winning a crushing military victory.

De Valera refused to recognise an election conducted under a threat of massive Imperial violence as being democratically binding. Who today would recognise such an election as democratic?

Three years later De Valera proposed that Sinn Fein should contest Free State elections, without recognising the legitimacy of the Treaty under whose authority they were held, in order to destroy the Treaty from within. When he failed to get a majority in Sinn Fein for this strategy he formed Fianna Fail.

The Treatyite authorities decided to use the Treaty Oath to keep Fianna Fail out of the Dail. They reckoned that, by keeping it off the gravy train, they could stifle it. But support for Fianna Fail kept growing until it arose as a practical possibility that the majority party elected by the people would be locked out of the Dail by the Government. That was averted in 1927 when by subterfuge Fianna Fail was let into the Dail without subordinating itself to the Treaty Oath. It became the Government five years later and set about repealing the Treaty without consulting Britain.

That Fianna Fail had its origins in Anti-Treatyism, that it did not recognise the legitimacy of the 1922 regime, and

that the 'Civil War' was launched under a Whitehall ultimatum, were things not disputed in Fianna Fail circles for half a century. Signs then began to appear that Fianna Fail was uneasy about its origins. Then, lacking historical orientation, and faced with the War in the North, it declined into an evasive, tricky, managerial party, frittering away its historical heritage, and relying entirely on power for the maintenance of power. Because of the place it had acquired in the state as the bearer of the history of the state, its rejection of its own history had a disorientating effect on society.

When did democratic government begin in Ireland? January 1919 on the basis of the electoral mandate of December 1918? Or 1922 with the establishment of the Treaty state on British authority? Martin Mansergh has dated it from 1922. So what were the founders of Fianna Fail doing in 1922-3, when they were active in opposition to the Treaty State?

But recognition of the 'Treaty' as the founding document does not only question the democratic credentials of Fianna Fail—it questions the legitimacy of what was done in 1919-21 by defenders of the Dail against the British administration.

When Martin condemned the Provos in the North as a murder gang, Pat Kenny put it to him that there was "*Genocide of the landed gentry*" back in 1919-21. He does not disagree. How could he? "*Peter Hart's book*" has said it.

But surely this is in conflict with his denial that there is any similarity between the Provo War and the War of Independence—both were sectarian and genocidal!

The fact that the leader of the Party, a Party that was the hinge of the state for a couple of generations, can make a remark like this in passing, on the authority of an academic chancer whose work has been heavily discredited, shows what a morass the political life of the Republic has become.

Factual Digression: the "*genocide of the landed gentry*" in Cork during the War of Independence would have been an impossibility, because they had been got rid of long before the War began. No doubt the agrarian terrorism directed against their oppressions would now be regarded as attempted genocide. But, in the end, it wasn't the Whiteboys who disposed of them. They were got rid of through a collaboration between William O'Brien's agitation and the Tory (Union-

ist) Government of 1895-1905. Under the 1903 Land Act, they were given golden handshakes by the Government to induce them to sell their estates to their tenants at reasonable prices and they had pocketed the money and left.

Second factual digression: John Hume, the noble pacifist, declared early in 1972 that it was now "*United Ireland, or nothing*". Nobody was then under the illusion that the Protestants would agree to a united Ireland. Hume acted as if he understood the mutual relationship between force and "*constitutional*" action that the circumstances of the Northern Ireland structure decreed for the Catholic community. And he played a crucial part in realising the Provo strategy, adopted when it was seen that the war could not be won outright, of transferring the momentum of the War into a Peace Process, without conceding defeat. He was reviled in the Dublin media and came close to being ousted from the leadership of the SDLP. When he retired his successors lapsed into the kind of simple-mindedness now shown by Martin, and the SDLP collapsed.

Third factual digression: who are the "*armchair generals*" who led the young people astray? Martin Mc Guinness! Gerry Kelly!!

Fourth factual digression: 1974 has become popular as a date at which an acceptable Northern settlement was made, with the implication that the Provos subverted it without sufficient reason, and after which their murders, though always abominable, became even more abominable.

But what part did the Provos play in subverting the Sunningdale Agreement? None at all. It was destroyed by a Unionist General Strike against the Council of Ireland aspect of the Agreement. The Strike was provoked by the revelation made in Court by the Fine Gael/Labour Coalition Government in Dublin that it had swindled the Unionist negotiators at Sunningdale. The Unionists thought it had been agreed that the legitimacy of the North as part of the UK was accepted as a *quid pro quo* for Power-Sharing and a Council of Ireland, but the Coalition, when challenged about this in Court said that was not the case and that the Sovereignty Claim over the North still stood. The SDLP leader declared that the Unionist Strike against the Agreement was a Fascist uprising, and demanded firm Government action against it. But strong action against a determined General strike is problematical.

When the Strike could not be broken,

the Secretary of State scrapped the whole Sunningdale system. The major terrorist action during the Strike, which was also the major terrorist action of the whole War, was the combined bombing of Dublin and Monaghan, supposedly by Loyalists. There is now little doubt that it was organised by the UK security apparatus—which is why successive Dublin Governments have been afraid to conduct a thorough investigation. That was 1974.

There is a reasonable degree of stability, for the time being, in the present Northern arrangements. The policy of the Fianna Fail leader, adopted out of ignorance (or under Eoghan Harris's influence, which comes to the same thing) is to destabilise it by raking over selected incidents in the War and demanding that Sinn Fein admit to being a murder gang.

The Provos have been criticised for not quite understanding the South. They understand it very much better than Fianna Fail understands the North, though there is some truth in the criticisms. The Provo leaders compared themselves to Michael Collins at one point. There is no similarity of any substance. They carried the great bulk of the Republican movement with them, leaving only a small "*dissident*" margin, on whose resentment Martin now bases his condemnation. When Collins decided to take matters into his own hands he split the Republican body politic, alienated most of those who had compelled the British to negotiate, became increasingly dependent on elements that were opposed to the whole Republican enterprise, and launched a 'Civil War' on orders from Whitehall.

Fianna Fail has branches in the North, but it keeps them moribund instead of activating them and showing Sinn Fein how things should be done. If it does not try to become active in the politics of the North as Sinn Fein has done in the South, it would be well advised to put on a muzzle and treat the North as a faraway country of which it knows nothing.

*

Martin was a member of the Government which facilitated the invasion in 2003 of another faraway country of which it knew nothing, even though it had been doing good business with it—Iraq. Mansergh, as its spokesman, sort of apologised for having done business with the Tyrant, but said it had now helped to put things right by over-

throwing him. We have not since heard any good confessions of guilt for the ongoing mayhem it helped to unloose.

Government Incoherence

Centuries of sectarian Protestant government of Ireland by Britain resulted in the oppressed religion, which was marked down for extermination, becoming the nucleus around which Irish national resistance developed. What Ireland resisted was not some benevolent liberalism but theocratic Protestantism acting despotically. Fanatical belief was on the English side, not the Irish, and the culture developed in the course of resistance is not conjured away by scepticism about God or his relationship with the Pope.

Gaelic, having survived centuries of oppression, was undermined as the major language of the populace by the event that is euphemistically called *The Famine*. It was less effective as a mode of political resistance than was Catholicism, with its international ramifications and its intellectual force. But it never became a dead language, and in recent times it has been undergoing a strong revival, and the system of *Gaelscoils* provides some of the best education in the country.

The Education Minister has projected a reform which, if he has his way, will lead to a uniform system of nondescript education from which what he sees as backwardness will be removed.

In the mid-20th century there was a modernist complaint that the education system did not shape people for emigration, which was the major export. It shaped people to the particularity of society in Ireland, as if national Ireland had a future. The projected reform would tend to shape people into blank ciphers, not suited for national life, but adapted to the requirements of globalist capitalism.

The accidents of PR politics have thrown up in Dublin two Ministers who are free to ride their hobby horses on issues which are subversive of the ethos of the state and which are not the subject of popular demand. Ruairi Quinn, a closet anti-clerical during the years when the Church was a force in the country, is now intent on eradicating religion from the life of society, insofar as it is in his power to do so as Education Minister. This is not even in accordance with the wishes of his own party, the Labour Party, which is the minor partner in the Coalition, as was made clear by the Party

Conference.

Alan Shatter, Fine Gael Minister for the Army, and for Justice, is intent on undermining Army discipline by establishing a right of desertion from the Irish Army to join another Army when the individual soldier, having enlisted voluntarily, changes his mind about who he wants to fight for. This is being done in order to legitimise desertion from the Irish Army to the British at a moment when there was a distinct possibility of an invasion of the Irish state by the British Army, and only the remotest prospect of a German invasion.

Shatter's ambition to undermine Irish Army discipline is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to de-legitimise the decision of the Irish Government in 1939, supported by the Opposition (Fine Gael and Labour), not to make war on Germany. Churchill declared at the time that Ireland, under the terms of the Treaty, had no right to be neutral when the Crown was at war. In 1945, when Russia and the USA had defeated Germany, Churchill said that, if it had been necessary for the British war effort, he would have invaded Ireland and made it do its duty; and that he would have been in the right in doing so. And now it is being put to the Dail to confirm Churchill's view of the matter and reject De Valera's rebuttal of it.

Shatter is not doing this because he has gone into the character of the War declared by Britain in 1939 and established that it somehow negated national rights throughout the world and made it right for Britain to do whatever it wanted to do to states and peoples it disagreed with. He is doing it because he is a Zionist. Zionism is having a thin time with Irish public opinion. It has been losing influence steadily as the merits of the Jewish nationalist colonisation of Palestine, and the squeezing out of the native population are discussed. But Shatter finds himself in an institutional position where he can strike a blow for Zionism without discussing its merits.

The sanctification of the 2nd world War is achieved by removing detailed knowledge of it and reducing it to a handful of slogans. During the war the unprincipled alliance of UK, USSR and USA, calling itself the United Nations, felt free to do just what they pleased, since their cause was sacred. After the War the victors then promptly conducted actions of the kind which were War Crimes when the vanquished had done them. The British fought two very dirty

wars, in Malaya and Kenya. And the French Resistance, having become the Government, fought dirty wars in Algeria and Indochina. And, in the immediate aftermath of the defeat of Germany, the United Nations authorised the greatest ethnic cleansing in history, in Central Europe, in which many hundreds of thousands, and possibly over a million, died. (The United Nations is not careful about counting its victims.)

There was no attempt at a systematic history of this event until the appearance this year, from Yale University, of *Orderly And Humane* by R.M. Douglas. We quote the first paragraph:

"Immediately after the Second World War, the victorious Allies carried out the largest forced population transfer, and perhaps the greatest single movement of peoples—in human history. With the assistance of the British, Soviet, and U.S. governments, millions of German-speaking civilians living in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the parts of eastern Germany assigned to Poland were driven out of their homes and deposited amid the ruins of the Reich, to fend for themselves as best they could. Millions more, who had fled the advancing Red Army in the final months of the war, were prevented from returning to their places of origin, and became lifelong exiles. Others again were forcibly removed from Yugoslavia and Romania, although the Allies had never sanctioned deportations from those countries. Altogether, the expulsion operation permanently displaced at least 12 million people, and perhaps as many as 14 million. Most of these were women and children under the age of sixteen; the smallest cohort of those affected were adult males. These expulsions were accomplished with and accompanied by great violence. Tens and possibly hundreds of thousands lost their lives through ill-treatment, starvation, and disease while detained in camps before their departure—often, like Auschwitz I, the same concentration camps used by the Germans during the Second World War. Many more perished on expulsion trains, locked in freight wagons without food, water, or heating during journeys to Germany that sometimes took weeks; or died by the roadside while being driven on foot to the borders. The death rate continued to mount in Germany itself, as homeless expellees succumbed to hypothermia, malnutrition, and other effects of their ordeal. Calculating the scale of the mortality remains a source of great controversy today, but estimates of 500,000 deaths at the lower end of the spectrum, and as many as 1.5 million at the higher, are consistent with the evidence as it exists at present..."

Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin

Is fíor trím aisling

Iarghnó ar bhás an Athar Conchubhar
 Ua hArgáin .i. sagart
 Búidh-bhriathrach beath-mhúinte
 Cráibhtheach caomhach coisruighthe
 Diadha déirceach deagh-shomplach
 Fáthach fiosrach fíor-eolach
 Grianach greidhineach glémhianach
 Líomhtha léigheanta lán-taidhbhseach
 Measardha méinneamhail mór-
 chroidheach
 Niata nósfar neamh-iomarcach
 Planndamhail páirteach príomh-
 lóideach
 Ríoghda ráthmhar réim-díreach reimh
 Soilbhir sóthchánta
 Truathach tréitheamhail
 Noch d'éag i nDomhnach Mór
 An t-aonmhadh lá déag ós cionn 20 do
 Ianuair 1773.

A lament on the death of Father Con Horgan, i.e. a priest who was sweet-spoken, well-educated, pious, kindly, blessed, devout, almsgiving, good example-giving, philosophic, knowledgeable, truly well-informed, bright, jolly, pure-countenanced, polished, learned, fully magnificent, temperate, high-minded, great-hearted, neat, well-mannered, humble, witty, affectionate, kingly, prolific, of just sway, mild, pleasant, peacable, princely, accomplished, of great substance, who died in Donoughmore 20 January 1773.

A: Eoghan's encounter with the goddess Clíona

Is fíor trím aisling gur feasadh aréir dham
 Nidh chuir sealad mé ar mearbhal céille
 Gur theasc an bhás, gan spás le
 Gaedhealaibh
 Polla is flaith do shleachtaibh Éibhir
 Bíodhgaim suas, monuar, níor léir dam
 Cia an seabhac do thuit tré nimh'na
 shlaoda
 Gur chlos i ngleann cois abhann im
 thaobh-sa
 Caoin mná go cráidhte'na haonar.

Is éascaidh ritheas gan earradh, gan éadach
 Fá dhéin an ghuil dar liom ba fhraochda
 Do dhearcas sídh-bhean íoghmhar aordha
 Ar bhruach na Laoi is í ag caoi na
 mbraonta.

A basa sá sníomh , is dlaoithe a céibhe
 Dá stathadh aici anuas go buan dá
 bhpréamhaibh
 Tuile deor tar fóir dá dtaoscadh
 Osnadh is áladh ar lár a chléibhe.

1. Truly in my vision was manifested to me
 last night/ something that for a while drove
 me out of my senses / that death cut down
 without reprieve, with darts / the stalwart
 and hero descended from Éibhear.

2. I sit up of a sudden, alas! it was not clear
 to me/ who was the hero who fell through
 poison in a heap / until I heard in a valley by
 a river near me / the keening cry of a woman,
 tormented, alone.

3. Swiftly I ran without a stitch, without
 clothes / towards the crying that I thought
 was intense / I saw a distressed banshee of
 the spirit world / on the banks of the Lee and
 she in floods of tears.

4. Wringing her hands, and locks of her hair/
 tearing by the roots, in a frenzy / floods of
 tears streaming without limit / sighs and
 wounding to the heart of her breast.

Ba ghreannta a gnaoi, ba mhíonla a héadan
 Ba gheárr a braoithe suidhte ar réalt-
 dhearc

Ba lonnach lile tré luisne na gcaora
 Ag caismirt'na gruadh, is gan luadh cia
 ghéillfeadh.

Do thóg a ceann céir canntlach céasta,
 Is d'amhairc mise bí ag druidim's ag
 téarnamh
 Fá n-a dáil an tráth soin,'s d'éirighidh
 Is measann gluaiseacht uaim faoi
 néaltaibh.

Gur fhiafruigheas di, do ghuth mar fhéadas
 Fáth a cumadh is cúis a géar-ghuil
 D'fhreagair dúinn go búch le séimhe:
 "Is follas gur duine thú ar uireasbaidh
 céille,

"An tráth nách feas duit leagadh an phéarla
 Ón bhFrainc thug clú go tríúchaibh
 Éireann
 Conchubhar Ua hArgáin, sagart
 grádhach béasach
 Do chailleadh anocht, ciodh docht an
 méala."

Fochtaim a hainm go tapaidh don
 réilteann;
 Mise Clíodhna, ar sí, ón Léith-Chraig.
 Cráidheacht chughatsa, adubhart, a
 mhéirligh –
 Créad ná stracaim thú id bhallaibh ó
 chéile.

An tráth i n-ar fhuilingis ursa na cléire
 Is comhairle dín na diadhachta naomhtha
 Bhí i réim's i ngradam fá thearmann
 tréimhse
 Do leagadh gan maidhm is feidhm-
 cath laochradh?

5. Her countenance was well-formed, her face was gentle / her brows were fine, in place over bright eyes / The lily was resplendent through the flame of the berries / in contest in her cheek, and it was hard to tell which one would surrender.

6. She raised her head, though it was sorrowful and tormented / and she spied me in motion and drawing near / to her company at that time, and she arose / and considers evading me in the fog.

7. Until I questioned her in words I could command / the reason for her grief and the cause of her severe weeping / She answered me freely in kindness / "It is clear you are a person who lacks sense,

8. "That at this time you do not know that was laid low, the pearl / from France who brought fame to the lands of Ireland / Con Horgan, a kindly, civil priest / who died tonight, though hard the loss."

9. I swiftly requested her name of the beauty / "I am Clíodhna, said she, from Carraig Liath" / "Torment to you, said I, you harlot / why should I not tear you limb from limb?"

10. "The hour that you should permit the stalwart of the clerics / the guard of holy divinity / who had status and esteem and patronage for a time / to be killed without warlike outburst or stout battle."

Adubhairt an ainnir, dom fhreagairt,
led shaor-chead
Coisc dom ghearradh go n-aithrisfead
scéal duit
Is, d'éis mo thuarais, má thuigir gur
daor mé
I Déan do thoil is stroill mo ghéaga.

An tan do buaileadh cuan na feile
Do chorruig do bhíodhg, do líon-rith
mé ann
Níor fhágas bruidheann ná sídh-lios aerach
Ráth ná beanna ó Ghaillimh go Béara
Nár thugas cuaird is luath-thuras éadtrom
Síth go ráthmhar, is amú go héascaidh
Is slugh gach beanna fá a n-armuibh
taobh liom
I gcomhair cabhartha ó dheartaibh an éaga.

Níor stadas dom ráig go dtáinig naomh-
ghuth
Chugham trím scím le díograis scéalta
Nár bh'fuiláir dó freagairt go flaitheas
dá chéile
Is gur ghéarr Atropos snáith a shaoghail.

Iar gclos dúinn go dtainig dát a laetha
Is go ndéarna Clíodhna a dícheall
saothair air
D'éis maithimh don bháb, ár ngáir le chéile
Do chuir a thásc tré Chlár Luirc Éibhir.

11. The maiden said in reply to me: "By your leave / desist from attacking me until I tell you a tale / and, after my effort, if you believe I am a villain / do your will and rend my limbs.

12. "When the refuge of hospitality was stricken / my heart stirred, aroused, beat swiftly / there was not a fairy palace or ghostly fairy fort / a rath or pinnacle between Galway and Beara,

13. "Which I did not attend with light, speedy visit / in graceful swoop and speedy descent / and the host of every hill in arms beside me / in company to rescue him from the darts of death;

14. "I did not desist from my rampage until I heard a heavenly voice / in a vision, with urgent news / that he was compelled to answer to his heavenly guardian / and that Atropos severed the thread of his life."

15. When I heard that his allotted time had arrived / and that Clíodhna had done her utmost to save him / after I had forgiven the lady, our cries together / proclaimed his death throughout Ireland.

B: The rivers of Ireland and all Ireland in mourning

Uaill is gáir is crádh-ghol éagnach
Is gruaim is glám is lán-tocht éighmhe
Greadadh bas is stracadh céibhe
Brón is caoi go cíocrach céasta.

Do mhaitheadh spás ón Mháig go Léith-
chloch
Is ón Laoi ghil go himeal Léan-loch
An bocht's an nocht go docht'san mhéala
Tré threascadh an bhile ceann urraidh
na cléire.

Tá glór is grásta i gClár Luirc Éibhir
Caoi na mbruinneall sioscaidhte séimhe
Lachach doilbh is golairt ban aosta
I ndiaidh an fhilatha do teaschadh go
déidheanach.

Níor bh'ionadh liom an tSiuir dá
ngéimfeadh
Abhainn Dá Luadh's an Chuanach
chraosach
An Fhéil's an Bhrighid's an Fhuinnseann
fhéarmhar
Is gleann Abhann Bige dá gcluainim
tar aon-tsruith.

Caoi na mban is greadadh na gcéad-fhear
Uaill-ghuth báb i ngearán's i ngeár-ghol
Níor lucht mo dhreac, ciodh feacht gur
déarach
Doilbh duairc do chuaidh an scéal dam.

16. Wailing and screaming and distressful,
bitter crying / grief and cursing and full fit of
groaning / beating of hands and tearing of
hair / sorrow and weeping, earnestly, in torment.

17. Extending for a time from the Maigue to
Cloch Liath / and from the bright Lee to the
banks of Lough Leane / the poor and the naked
firmly in grief / because of the cutting down
of the great man, the leader of the clergy.

18. There are shouting and screaming in
Ireland of Éibhear / the keening of the choic-
est tender ladies / melancholy groaning and

weeping of old women / for this gentleman
lately cut down.

19. It would be no surprise to me that the
river Suir cried out / the river Dallow and the
fierce Cuanach / the Feale, the Bride and the
grassy Fuinseann / and the valley of the
Awbeg, I hear as one stream.

20. The keening of women and the hand-
wringing of hundreds of men / the wailing
voice of girls lamenting and bitterly weeping
/ my eyes did not shed liquid, though indeed
tearful / gloomy melancholy the news to me.

C: Eoghan's emotional breakdown

Do chuala caoi-scread caointeach céasta
Cathach cráidhte cásmhar fraochda
Na mná na leanbh do dhalta na hÉireann
Thug sugh a brollaigh gan choigilt's a
saor-lacht

Iar gclos na ngártha ngáibhtheach géar-
ghuil
Coitcheann, le fíoch, ón dtír go chéile
Tig saor-sruth caoi-ghuil síos lem
chaomh-dhreach
Cnead is osnadh go sochair im thaoibh
dheis.

21. I heard the screeching keening grievous /
sorrowful, tormented, piteous, furious / of
the woman who gave to the foster-child of
the muses / the juice of her breast as un-
restrained freely-flowing liquid.

22. On hearing the piteous cries of keen
weeping / widespread, with ferocity, from
one land to the next / a free stream of
lamenting tears fell from my sad eyes /
groaning and sighing fixed in my right side.

D: Qualities of a true taoiseach

I ndiaidh an bhile ba chomairc dá
thréadaibh
Comhairle chaoin dá ndíon ar faolchoin
I gcéill ba chosmhail le Solamh gan
séanadh
Is gach téics dá gcanadh dá tharraing ar
Naomh-script.

Bláth-ghas buidheanmhar bríoghmar
béasach
Carthannach cáilmhear cráibhtheach
caomhna
Duineata diadha dian-cheart déarcach
Flaitheamhail fáilteach fálach féastach.

Grian-fhlaithe gaoiseach gníomh-ghlan
Gaedhealach
Lasamhail lonnrach leomhanta
léidmheach
Measardha míonla mín-tais maordha
Neartmhar i ngníomharthaibh
naoidheanta naomhtha.

Plannda oirdheirc, polla'gus péarla
Ráthmhar i riaghail, rianach, réim-cheart
Soinneanda stuamdha suaimhneach
séimh-dhreach
Taithneamhac triathach siansach
teicseach.

23. For the knight who was safeguard of his flocks / with tranquil counsel protecting them from wolves / in wisdom there is no denying he was like Solomon / and every text he recited was drawn from Holy Scripture.

24. A blossoming scion, sociable, lively, cultured / charitable, of good repute, pious, companionable / humane, devout, strictly just, alms-giving / generous, welcoming, protective, feast-giving.

25. Sun-prince, talented, of pure deeds, Irish / brilliant, resplendent, lion-like, valiant / temperate, mild, tender, dignified / strong in innocent, holy acts.

26. A noble scion, a champion and pearl / prosperous in rule, influential, in true order / serene, wise, calm, of peaceful countenance / amiable, of good qualities, good-humoured, fond of texts.

F: Fr. Con's learning & education

Réilteann solais, is eochair na ndaor-cheist
Céir na n-ollamh, is tobar na héifeacht
Féinics forusta, soitheamh gan saobhadh
Déas gan choigilt, is polla gan staonadh.

Ré gan daoilcheas teimheal ná éiclips
Riaghluidhe cáidh i gcásaibh léigheanta
Scéaluidhe suairc is suadh nár aontuigh
Céim tar ceart ná samhail chlaonta

Saoi do mheabhruigh eagar is éifeacht
Eagnadh is iul i bpúnnaibh dreachta
Laidin is diadachta, Gaedhilge is
daonnacht
Cneastacht le cuimhne is mílseacht
Béarla.

27. A star of illumination, and the key of difficult problems / most excellent of savants, and the well of good sense / a paragon of basic knowledge, persistent in calmness / a man not stinging, an unchanging stalwart.

28. Illumination without darkness, blemish or eclipse / a noble arbiter in learned issues / a jolly storyteller and an expert who never condoned / a wrong turning or a false comparison.

29. A learned person who ponders order and sense / wisdom and knowledge in points of verse / Latin and divinity, Irish and humanity / kindness to remember and sweetness of English.

F: Fr. Con —Christian Pastor

Flaith do bhocht do choisceadh geibheann
Scaoilteoir ceasa do lagaibh le daonnacht
Órdaidhe diadha liaigh na ndaor-chnead
Is diadhaire daingean an anama ar
dhaor-bhruid.

Easna don cheap nár mheath a phréamha
Géag do bhile tá bileamhail craobh-ghlas
Plannda caoin don fhíodh nár chlaochluigh
Duille ná dreach gur gearradh a shaoghal.

Rós gan teimheal is ursa na cléire
Grian gan smúit ná dubhchan éiclips

Réilteann eolais óg is aosta
Is naomh mar Eoin i gclódh's i
gcéimibh.

Tobar gan trághadh bhí lán do dhaonnacht
Peadar i ngníomh is Maois i dtréithibh
Níl acht cumha i dtríúchaibh Éibhir
Ó teascadh go hóg é i bhflós a shaoghail.

Taca mar Phól ba chomhairleach tréada
Mar Naomh Lúc do scrúdadh na naomh-
téics
Mar Eoin do bhaist an Mac do céasadh
Nó mar Phádraig, fáith na hÉireann.

Comairce an chreidimh an chreidimh
gon teibeadh do shaothruigh
Eochair na bhflaitheas ón Arad-Mhac
éachtach

Taca mar Philib ba thuigseanach téasca
Is do chaill a theanga tre theagasc na
naoimh-cheacht.

30. A decent man to the poor, who would put a stop to distress / reliever of hardship with humanity to the weak / a holy ordained person, healer of severe cases / and strong pastor of souls in dire difficulty.

31. A timber of the block that did not decay from its roots / a branch of the tree that is tree-like and greenbranched / a gentle sapling of the forest who did not a change / a leaf or an aspect until the ending of his life.

32. A rose without blemish and the defender of the clergy / a sun without cloud nor darkening of eclipse / a star of knowledge to young and old / and a saint like John in form and degree.

33. A well never empty who was full of humanity / a Peter in deeds and a Moses in qualities / there is nothing but grief in the lands of Éibhear / since he was cut off in his youth, in the flowering of his life.

36. A support like Paul in counselling his flock / like John who baptised the Son who was crucified / like Saint Luke in examining holy scripture / or like Patrick, prophet of Ireland.

37. Protection of the faith who sought ceaselessly / the key of heaven from the almighty noble Son / a support like Philip who was understanding of scripture / and who lost his tongue from dint of teaching the holy gospel.

G: Fr. Con —Guide of the Éigse & Court of Poetry

Ughdar ársa i gcás nár aosuigh
Tré iomarca tuigsiona i dtuisibh na héigse
Seanchuidhe suairc is suadh na saor-bheart
Is ceap-rí cáidh do dhámhaibh dréachta.

Tuigseach dáin tar bhárdaibh dhaor-cheist
Dá fheabhas le faghbháil i n-áitreach
Fhéidhlim
Do chuireadh le slacht'na gceart gach
Gaedheal-treabh
I mBanba ghluais anuas ó Éibhear.

Flaith gan mheang gan cham gan
chlaontacht
Gan ghangaid gan phuimp gan teimheal
ná éalainn
Acht modhamh mhín is mílseacht bréithre
Féile shíor is aoidheacht gan éaradh.

Níor bh'ionadh an líog ag maoidheamh
le géim-ghuth
A haiteas's a gean tré shearc go scléipeach
Ó thaisceadh fúithe, cúis mo dhéara
An cholann'na raibh gach maith dár
léigheas-sa.

38. A veteran author who was not made senile by the difficulty / of poetic measures overladen with meaning / a jolly storyteller and creator of great works / and noble chief of poetic academies.

39. Interpreter of poems, greater than rigorously correct bards / the best to be found in the habitation of Feidhlim / who would add to the true elegance of every Gaelic tribe / in Ireland, descended from Éibhear.

40. A noble man without deceit or crookedness or treacherous deed / without spite, without arrogance, without blemish or flaw / but gentle modesty and sweetness of speech / true generosity and hospitality without refusal.

41. No wonder the headstone was declaring in bellowing voice / her pleasure and affection through love ostentatious / since deposited beneath her, cause of my tears / the corpse which contained every virtue that I have recited.

H: Mná Sí

Níl báb ghlan-ghrúadhach ná cuairsce
aerach
I gceill, i gcarcair, i gcathair, ná i maol-
lios
Ó chuan Fionn-trágha go tráigh Locha
Éirne
Nach clos a ngáir's a ngláimh'san éacht
so.

Do scread Badhb gan mheidhir san
Léith-chloic
Do mhúscail suas gach buadach-bhean
aerdha
Ar gcloistin gháir a crádh-ghuil éignigh
Do dhruideas spás i ndáil na béithe.

D'fhiosruigheas, is í ag sileadh déara
Cár ghaibh suim ban chaointe Éireann?
D'fhreagair dam go doilbh fraochda
Tá an t-éacht ró obainn le cloistin,
cíodh méala.

Níor bh'fada dúinn fá smúit'n-ar n-aonar
Gur gháir scaoth go caointeach taobh
linn—
Aoibhill Craige's a scata ban aosta
Madhlion Eala is ceann beanna-chnuic
Gréine.

Bainríoghan bruidhne Carobhe an éirlich
Bean sidhe sinsear clainn Mhic Shéamais
Mis inghean Dáire, Gráinne is céile
Curanta calma, cailleadh le claon-bheart.

A n-áireamh súd dar liom ní fhéadfainn
Acht tháinig chugainn gach bruinneall
baoth-ghein
Ó thaobh Chnuic Loinge go himealaibh
Béara
Ag caoineadh an tsagairt bhí geannnach
tréitheach.

Ag lachtadh a ndearc i bhfarradh a chéile
Go pras ag caoi's ag sníomh a gcaol-bhas
Iad-san uile 'gus mhise'san méala
Tré bhás Chonchubhair chruthamhail
léigheanta.

42. There is not a pure-countenanced girl or
wraith / in a churchyard, a prison, a stone
fort or an unprotected fort / from Ventry
harbour to the shores of Lough Erne / that
did not hear her cry and lament for this
sorrowful event.

43. Badhbh shrieked without happiness in
Cloch Liath / Every triumphant fairy-woman
was aroused / on hearing her distressful
tormented cry / I moved a step closer in the
company of the lady.

44. I asked her, as she wept tears / "Where is
the company of the keening women of
Ireland?" / She answered me in fierce grief /
"This event is too sudden (for them) to hear
of it, alas!"

45. We were not too long alone in our grief /
until a flock cried out in lamentation near us
/ Aoihbheall of Carraig (Liath) and her host of
fairy women / Madhlion of Ealla and the
summit of the peaked hill of Gréine (??).

46. The battle-queen of the Branch given to
slaughter / the banshee of the ancestors of
the clan of Mac Shéamais / Mis, the daughter
of Dáire, Gráinne and the wife / of the brave
warrior, who died through treachery.

47. To count them all I believe I could not /
but every tenderly fashioned lady came to us
/ from the sides of Knocklong to the coasts
of Beara / lamenting for the priest who was
chaste and virtuous.

48. With eyes liquefying in each others
company / weeping copiously and wringing
their graceful hands / all of them, and I, in
grief / because of the death of creative,
learned Conchubhar.

I: Fr. Con's noble ancestors

Beartaid lucht eoluis fós is léighte
Réime ríomhtha, ríoghradh is réacsa
Gur eascair an fhlaith de cheap na Seasar
Do riaghluigh sealad i dTeamhair na
dtréan-fhear.

I dtaoibh a ghaolta, a n-áireamh ní
dhéanfadh
Ciodh gur síor-scoth taoiseach saor é
Is flatha ba ghnáthach tráthach tréitheach
Bronntach bríoghmhar fíontach féastach.

Oscailt do ghnáth roimh dáimh is éigse
Taisteal bárd is táirdíol cléire
Cistin lucht siubhail is cú na n-éagnach
Is cabhair na mbaintreabhach bhfeidhn-
lag céasta.

An gabhal fine ór geineadh an glé-ghas
Meanmnach múirneach múinte méinneach
Croidhe glan ceannsa cabharthach
céimeach
Líonta'ghreann gan leamhas'na
bhréithribh;

Eoluidhe eagnach eachrach éideach
Prionnsa sámh na bhfaidhe bhféastach
Treoruidhe cuimseach, croidhe na féile
Is dochtúir díodhachta i ngníomh's i n-
éifeacht;

Fiannuidhe forusta foistineach faobhar-
neart
Grian-ráib shoilbhir shocharach shéadach
Dalta na ríobh ó fhíoradh an réidh-chnuic
Do hoileadh go húr i bponncaibh naomhtha.

49. They reckon, persons of knowledge, and
also of learning, calculating dynasties, lineage
and kingships / that this noblemen descended
from the ancestry of the Caesars / who once
ruled in Tara of the valiant men.

50. Regarding his kinsmen, I will not recount
them / though he is of the truly choicest of
noble chieftains / and gentlemen who follow-
ed custom, who were protective, of good
quality / generous, vigorous, plentiful of
wine, feast-giving.

51. Customarily open to scholars and poets /
travelling bards and visiting clergy / the
kitchen of vagrants, and the hound of the
miserable / and the saviour of tormented,
helpless widows.

52. The family tree from which was descend-
ed the bright scion / spirited, amiable, educat-
ed, of fair mien / of pure heart, beloved,
helpful, dignified / full of humour and levity
in his sayings.

54. A learned guide, knowledgeable of horses,
well-clothed / tranquil prince of festive
experts / competent guide, hear of generosity
/ and a doctor of divinity in actions and in
effect;

55. Solid, serious, well-armed warrior /
happy, wealthy, bright-scion, abounding in
jewels / pupil of the muses in the settlement
of (linguistic) difficulties / trained as a young
man in points of divinity.

J: Summary

Úr-ghas óg, gan feodh ná staonadh
Biadhtach fairsing na ndéalbh do
réidhteach
Bleachtaidhe buadhach ar dhuanaihb
éifeacht
Is nósaidhe ceart ar reachtaibh cléire.

Ceann banna na sluagh is cuan a saortha
Re seanmóir chaoin, mílseacht bhréigthre
Le sompla thabhairt tré rún dá thréada
Is re sna beartaibh lean asoail Aonmhic.

Dá mb'eol dam laoidhthe a ríomhadh
le héifeacht
Damhna cathach, nó marbhna céasta
Trian a ghníomh ná suim a thréite
Do ghrian-chur síos go cruinn ní
fhéadfainn.

56. Young, noble scion, not in decline or
cessation / generous provider who gave
succour to the poor / eminent supporter of
(those who compose) poems of substance /
and a true guide to the laws of the clergy.

57. Leader of multitude and their saving
resort / by gentle discourses, by sweetness of
words / for giving example in confidence to
his congregations / and by his deeds which
adhered to the apostles of the Only Son.

58. If I knew how to compose powerful verses
/ a poem of lamentation or tormented elegy /
(Not so much as) a third of his deeds or of all
his qualities / would I be unable to clearly
and accurately express.

K: Fr. Con's immediate family

Is truagh a athair go foirbhthe aosta
Díombáidheach diachrach dian'sa mhéala
Lacht a rosc le tocht dá thaoscadh
Tré fheochadh an ubhail ba chlú dá
phréamh-stoc.

Dar Duach, is abhar cáis le héistracht
Uaill a mháthar atá gan éiféacht
Gan mheabhair, gan chiall, 'na dhiaidh
go céasta
Is níor bh'ionadh linn-ne dá sileadh'na
braontaibh.

Tá bráithre ag screadaigh ar mearbhall
céille
Gan tábhacht ná suim i maoin ná
saoghaltacht
An bháb do bhí aige ós cionn tighe fé
chion
'Na collainn gan cheann go canntalacht
céasta.

Ní hiongnadh liom fá phúdair a ghaolta
Is go follas fá shubh-bhrat cúmhadh
na céadta
Is gan comhgas aca le ceachtar dá
ghaolta
Acht tré n-a theist nár theip ón bhféile.

59. The weeping of his aged, feeble father is
pitiful / In grief, bereft, sorrowful, vehement
/ the liquid of his eyes flowing in floods /
because of the withering of the apple who
was the pride of his kin.

60. By Jove, it is a cause of lamentation to
hear the wailing of his mother, who is
stricken, out of her mind, without sense for
the loss of him, tormented. And, no wonder
to us that she is weeping great drops.

61. Brothers are screaming, out of their minds
/ without regard or interest in wealth or
worldliness / The well-regarded lady who
was in charge of his household / is a headless
body, sad and miserable.

62. It is no surprise to me that his kinfolk are
bereft / and hundreds clearly under a black
pall of grief / though unrelated to either of
his parents / because of his unfailingly
hospitable character.

L: Eoghan's philosophic resignation

Is é deireadh gach smúite dúire a
thréigean

Is ó cuireadh mo pheann nach teann
chum saothair
Gur folamh mo cheann ó ogham dréachta
Is gan eagar ná umhail ionnam ná
éifeacht.

Is gur sladaidhe an bás atá i ndán dár
dtéarnamh
Ó geineadh Ádam ársa is Ébha
Níl agan acht guidhe le hinntinn eagnaigh
Chun aingil is naoimh bheith síor dá
aodhaireacht.

63. The end of every cloud is the abandon-
ment of melancholy / and since my feeble
pen was put to work / my head is devoid of
the letters of verses / and there is no order or
expression or purpose in me.

64. Death is the thief that is the destiny of all
who survive / of the progeny of Adam and
Eve / I can only pray with plaintive intent /
to angels and saints to be ever-watchful of
him

M: Prayers & Devotions for the Dead

Is athchuinge chur, tré nimh a chéasta
Chun Éin-Mhic Mhuire fuair iomaraca
péine
Anam an diadhaire dhiadha shéimh seo
Do ghlacadh go humhal'na chúirt gan
éaradh.

Scaoilim feasta mo phaidir gan séanadh
Sailm Dáibhí is páis an Éin-Mhic
Fáilte an Aingil is ceachta na Cré anois
Mar ghárda ar a anam go Flaitheas na
Naoimh ngeal.

65. And to make entreaty, by the anguish of
His passion / to the Only Son of Mary who
endured excess of agony / the soul of this
gentle, holy divine / to receive in His court
without refusal.

66. I despatch also my prayer, not to be
denied / the Psalms of David and the Passion
of the Only Son / The Angelus and the
message of the Creed / as escort for his soul
the the Paradise of the holy Saints.

N: Epitaph

An feart laoidh

Fad chom i dtaisce atá adhbhar cáis
suadh, a líogh
Crobhaire ceannais cáidh blásta
buadhach binn
Plannda is leabhar d'fhás do mhaitibh
ráib uaisle is laoich.
Conchubhar Ua hArgáin, sagart sámh
suaimhneach síothac.

67. The Epilogue. O gravestone, under your
length is the reason for the trouble of fine
people / an authoritative, famous, elegant in
speech, polished, lofty, sweet-voiced
champion / a plant which grew gracefully in
the eyes of gentlemen, noble heroes and
warriors / Conchubhar Ó hArragáin, a benign,
tranquil, peaceful priest.

Séamas Ó Domhnaill

Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin
1748—1784
Aspects of his Life and Work
Part 7

Lamentation

Eoghan Ruadh's lament for Fr. Horgan is rather long, the longest of his songs. I have included headings on the various sections I identified which I hope will prove helpful in getting a handle on the composition and guiding you through. The second Editor of Eoghan's songs, Risteárd Ó Foghludha, left several songs out of his 1937 edition on the grounds that they were too risqué for use in schools but he left this lament out simply because it was too long: "*Ní misde innsint annso gur fhágas ar lár roinnt iarrachtaí de chuid Eoghain—ceann aca atá ró-fhada don leabhrín seo .i. Tuireamh ar an Athair Ó hArgáin agus nidthe eile ná hoirfeadh do chúrsaí scoile...*"

Laments and other long compositions of the Irish poets have often been dismissed as simply meaningless exercises of verbosity padded out with excessive adjectives and lists of supernatural, historical and legendary characters in order for the poet to impress his gullible patrons with a view to maximising his payment. In my view however it is unlikely that intelligent people who were highly trained and educated in a culture would put up with this type of thing. Before passing such a judgement on an Irish *Amhrán* it is necessary to hear the song being sung to its original music and to have some understanding of its setting as a work of art.

Woody Allen in his 1986 comedy film, *Hannah And Her Sisters*, includes a lighthearted meditation on the issue of "size" in art. One of the characters, Frederick, is a "starving artist" living in New York whose friends have been trying to bring his work to the notice of wealthy buyers. The scene in question is set in Frederick's loft. It is day. His girlfriend, Lee, wearing a baggy plaid shirt and jeans, has opened the door for Elliot, an art agent, and his client, a wealthy rock star named Dusty Frye:

Elliot (leading the way into the loft, gesturing)—"Lee, Frederick ... say hello to Dust Frye ... Dusty's just bought a huge house in Southampton and he's in the process of decorating it."

Dusty—"Yeah. It's kind of a weird

place, actually. A lotta wall space" (chuckling).

{They walk into the living room area of the loft, where Frederick, his hands in his pockets, neatly attired in vest sweater and white shirt, stands, waiting.}

Dusty (to Frederick, giving him a "hip" handshake)—"How ya doin', man?"

Elliot (to a less than enthusiastic Frederick)—"I told him about your work, and he's very excited."

Dusty—"Yeah, I got an Andy Warhol. And I got a Frank Stella, too. Oh, it's very beautiful. Big, weird ... you know. If you stare at that Stella too long, the colors just seem to float. It's kinda weird."

{Frederick covers his face to hide his disgust.}

Lee—(chuckling, her arms crossed) "Are you excited about becoming a collector?"

Dusty—"Yeah."

Lee (nodding)—"Yeah?"

Dusty (shrugging)—"I got a lot more to learn, though. I really wasn't into art when I was a kid."

Lee (nodding)—"Uh-huh."

Frederick (addressing but not looking at Dusty)—"Do you appreciate drawings?"

Dusty (shrugging)—"Yeah (chuckling as he notices and points to some offscreen drawings Frederick has set up). Oh! Hey! Wow! (pointing to an offscreen nude drawing.) She's beautiful. But, uh, really, I-I-I-I need something ... I'm looking for something big."

Lee (looking at an offscreen Frederick, gesturing)—"Big. Frederick, show him the oils."

Frederick (offscreen)—"They're in the basement."

{The camera leaves Elliot to follow the enthusiastic Lee as she takes Dusty by the arm and starts leading him to the door. Frederick follows at a distance.}

Lee (to Dusty)—"Frederick's done this whole new series that I'm sure you would really love."

Dusty—"Well, are...are they big?"

Lee—"Yeah. Some of them... yeah, some of them are very big."

Dusty—"Cause I got a lot of wall space there (chuckling).

Frederick (angrily stopping in his tracks)—"I don't sell my work by the yard!"

Lee (chuckling, reacting)—"Oh, Frederick!"

There are occasions, however, when a large canvas is necessary and appropriate to express what it is the artist wants to say. I would argue that this is the case in relation to the Irish elegies. For a thousand years it was a principal function of the poet to compose a proper elegy or lament for a dead Chief. These compositions tended to be very long in order to adequately express the importance of the deceased, his ancestors, ancestral lands, children & dependents—his clan, and his allies. Praise was an important feature of these elegies. The poet was speaking on behalf of the whole community and emphasised those qualities and values which were deemed to most benefit society. While the whole of the elegy was written to the same metre, different parts may have been written and performed at different occasions such as the wake, at the graveside or perhaps even at the month's mind.

Daibhí Ó Bruadair wrote such an elegy for Sir Edmund Fitzgerald of Claonclaise, Co. Limerick who died in 1666. This has 105 verses in total and contains a section delivered at the graveside and a section addressed to the son of the deceased, urging him to return quickly from France to fulfil his duty to the people left vulnerable by the death of their protector.

* * *

Eoghan Ruadh's lament for Fr. Horgan is categorised as a "*Caoine*" in Pádraig Ó Duinnín's 1907 edition whereas, to me, it would be more accurate to call it a "*Marbhna*", based on the definitions given by Ó Duinnín himself in his dictionary:

Caoineadh: Act of mourning, lamenting, wailing, deploring; a lament, an elegy; a keen; the form of metre used in keens; "*i gcaoinibh*"—in keening; "*dhein sé caoine dhí*"—he composed (or chanted) an elegy for her; "*bean chaointe*"—a keening woman; "*cluiche caointe*"—a funeral game or rite; "*i ngábhadh chaointe*"—requiring to be lamented i.e. dead.

Marbhna: An elegy, soliloquy, reflection; act of meditating, thinking. "*Táim ar mo marbhna*"—I become wrapt in thought; "*ag déanamh mo mharbhna*"—reflecting, soliloquising on, composing an elegy ...

The *caoine* or keening-song has been described by Breandán Ó Madagáin as a form of vocal music used in many cultures which mixes supernatural ritual, emotional release and a social expression.

In Ireland it often involved nonsense vocables and constant repetition of the

dead person's name. There followed a dirge in old *reacaireacht* chanting music in which the dead person was addressed. These were often composed on the spot but were made up of phrases traditionally used for that purpose. Also included was the *Gol*, or Irish cry such as "*och ochón ...*" or "*ululoo ...*" in which all present joined. While the woman of the house would commonly perform the keen there were also women in certain families who were professional keeners, *mná caointe*, and were seen as essential to a proper funeral.

The custom of public mourning is very strong to this day in Asian cultures as evidenced by the mass weeping at the recent funeral of North Korea's "*Dear Leader*", Kim Jong-il. Amongst the Chinese community in the Philippines it is common for "professional mourners" to be hired to weep and wail during the wake and burial. The practice is depicted in the 2003 movie, *The Crying Ladies*, starring Sharon Cuneta.

As it happens the most famous *caoine* of all was composed for a man whose death was separated from that of Fr. Con Horgan by 15 miles and 15 weeks. Art Ó Laoghaire was killed on 4 May 1773 at Carraig an Ime which is 15 miles from Donoughmore via the Butter Road.

Breandán Ó Madagáin explains the difference between a Keen and an Elegy:

"The elegy (*marbhna*) was a learned composition, unlike the keen. Anybody could do a round of keening, extempore, whereas the elegy was a carefully wrought poetical composition, taking time and trouble. Down to the seventeenth century, when a chieftain died, he would be keened like anybody else as part of the obsequies. But it would be the function of his bardic poet to compose an elegy, at a commemorative ceremony some time after his interment." (*Caointe & Seancheolta Eile*)

* * *

The whole first quarter of the *Lament* for Fr. Horgan is devoted to Eoghan's encounter with the goddess Clíona. I do not know enough about this supernatural character, Clíona, to give a full explanation of the encounter. Dear reader, I would be delighted if you could contact me at jimaricel@eircom.net if you know more about her. The basic information about Clíona is that the dangerous current at Cuan Dor, Glandore, in the barony of Carbery, is known as *Tonn Clíona*.

Clíona was supposed to reside in a natural rock formation which is located in the townland of Carrigcleena in the parish of Cill Sheanaig on the road

between Dromahane and Bweeng. Significantly, as we are exploring this particular song of Eoghan Ruadh's, Carrigcleena is only 6 miles from Donoughmore. I travelled out there a few weeks ago and I had the good fortune to meet a local man who knew a lot about the place. Carraig Clíona is about twice my height and sticks out from the ground like a tooth. It used to be in a middle of a field with a number of other stones surrounding it. The field is now gone however and the Carraig currently hangs precariously over a massive open-cast quarry hundreds of feet deep. Apparently the stone from that quarry is very highly prized in motorway construction. The operation has taken away many fields.

At first I was surprised that such a project would be allowed which could potentially undermine an important *dinnseanachas* site like Carrig Clíona. Only afterwards did it dawn on me that it is not a structure as such but rather a natural phenomenon which is not even listed in the Ordnance Survey Maps. It is often said that the people's belief in fairies and otherworldly characters has meant that many ancient monuments such as ring forts have been preserved in Ireland. It seems that this has preserved Carrigcleena so far but it looks like it has been seriously undermined.

In 1961 Nikita Khrushchev gave a speech to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union about the State's anti-religion campaign in which he said that Yuri Gagarin flew into space, but didn't see any god there. I wonder, could a similar claim be made in relation to digging under Carrigcleena. Traditionally, it was considered very bad luck to interfere with a fairy fort or anything like that. This superstition has been credited with the preservation of the very large number of ancient monuments in Ireland. You might say that such *pishoguary* is a load of bunkum but, I wonder, if you happened to be an explosives contractor or a JCB driver and were given instructions to undermine a site like Carrigcleena would you think twice about it?

This matter raises another question which is: to what extent did Eoghan Ruadh, his fellow poets and his audience believe in fairies? Apparently the poets of Munster referred to Clíona and other goddesses as sources of inspiration. But I don't know how much of this was meant figuratively and how much was really believed.

When Seán Ó Tuama died 30 August

1775, Andrias Mac Craith was among many poets who composed elegies for him. Andrias refers to Clíona in one of his verses:

Tá Clíodna is Áine cráidhte céasta
Aoibhill ársa is mná Chnuic Gréine
'S gach sidh-bhean bhlaith ón Máigh go
hÉirne
Ag caoidhe de ghnáith ó táir gan
faesiomh.

Clíona and Áine are troubled and tormented / ancient Aoibhill and the women of Knockgreen / and every fairy woman beautiful from the Maigue to the Erne / weeping constantly wretched without relief.

This brief mention of Clíona is a far cry however from the major role she plays in Eoghan's lament, where we are brought right up close to her and we hear her voice strongly in direct and violent conversation with the poet. Clíona clearly had an importance and a relevance which Eoghan's audience would understand even if we do not.

One straightforward explanation for the prominence given to Clíona in Eoghan's lament is the geographical proximity of Carrigcleena to Donoughmore. 12 miles on the other side of Carrigcleena is Cluain Mín (Clonmeen) which contains the town of Bántír (Banteen) in the barony of Duhallow. On 24th August 1724, the lord of Clonmeen, *taoiseach* of the O'Callaghans died. Aodhagan Ó Rathaille wrote the *Marbhna* for him which contains the following verse:

Do-bheart Clíodna ón gcarraig mbáin
ngruaidhghil
Gur bh'é seabhac sámh Chluana ghil Mhín
Ceap rioghdha Chaisil, árdchuaille
Ua Ceallacháin uasal'sa shíol
Brat díona ar Eallaibh lá an chruadhtain
Dá gcasnamh le cruas nirt is claidhimh
Cois Laoi theas marbh tá ar fuaradh
Mo chealg bháis chruaidh ghúirt, ar sí.

Clíodhna from the white fair-fronted rock, said / that it was the noble warrior of bright Clonmeen / a royal scion of Cashel / a high branch / the noble O'Callaghan and his seed / the protecting robe of Ealla in the day of distress / to defend them with the vigour of his strength and sword / who lies beside the Lee, in the south, cold in death / O bitter piercing sting of death to me, said she.

* * *

I have given the label "*Qualities of a true taoiseach*" to verses 23, 24, 25 & 26, which I think form the central and key element of this whole song. The importance which Eoghan attaches to these lines is indicated by the extraordinary level of ornamentation he gives to them. In addition to the disyllabic end

rhyme of every line and other rhymes common to the rest of the song, the master verse-mason gives us twelve lines of alliteration in alphabetic order. Next he provides double assonance on the following phrases: *chaoín dá ndíon ... buidheanmhar bríoghmhar ... diadha dian-cheart ... gaoiseach gníomh-ghlan ... míonla mín-tais ... ngníomharthaibh naoidheanta ... riaghail, rianach ... triathach siansach.*

The Irish word for alliteration is "*uaim*". *Uaim* was the only form of ornamentation in the very earliest Irish poetry prior to the introduction of rhyme in the 7th century AD. The entry for the word in Dinneen's dictionary indicates its use in welding a series of phrases into a framework or a single unit of thought:

"*Uaim*: Act of joining, sewing or rivetting together, welding; a joint or seam; junction or epoch; alliteration (especially between the last two important words in a line, e.g., *fear gan feall*), union or concord in a verse, fig. verse; embroidery. *Uaim cláraidh*: joinery ... In *uaimaibh cuil*: in the webs of sin. *Gan uaim snáthaide*: having no needle's seam (of Christ's garment). *Gan uaim 'na mbeol*: devoid of poetic diction. *Iar scaoileadh a n-uamann*: their seams having loosened. *Leabhar uama agus oiris*: poem books and histories ..."

In addition to all this ornamentation Eoghan links the last words of the alternative verses. For example, the last two syllables of verse 23, "*Naomh-script*", match those of verse 25, "*naomhtha*". Similarly, I also believe that the same can be said of verses 24 and 25. "*Féastach*" reflects the responsibility of a true *taoiseach* to provide hospitality to his followers. This was essential to the operation of the clan as a viable social unit. "*Teicseach*" is given as simply being fond of texts or books. In this context however the word would reflect the intellectual hospitality of the *taoiseach* or patron who spent his wealth on collecting valuable manuscripts and allowed poets access to his library for copying *lámhscríbhinní* which was central to the transmission of Gaelic culture.

Some of the words used by Eoghan Ruadh in making these verses are more commonly used than others, but all of them have a role to play in expressing his meaning. *Díon* is one of the key words used, meaning an "*act of protecting; cover, shelter, roof, thatch; protection, defence, patronage; quality of being waterproof or tight ...*" (Dinneen).

The *Clan* is the elephant in the room of Irish History. Clanship and its associated values were the default structure of Gaelic society down to the 19th century. Clanship was the source of all resistance to English rule and it was the function of the Penal Laws to eradicate it. I have not come across anything written about Clanship in Ireland but here is what Allan Macinnes has to say about Clanship in Scotland:

"The primary value of clanship was protection. *Dion*—the protective ethos of clanship was personified in the chiefship, specifically in the designation of the chief as *ceann-cinnidh*—head of the kindred and was made manifest specifically by his bestowal of hospitality and generally by his patriarchal attitude towards his clan. These traditional values were pre-eminently propagated through tightly structured, if stereotyped, eulogies and elegies of the bardic schools from the high middle ages. Common classical Gaelic, the literary language of the bards in Scotland and Ireland, gave way to the more discursive but also more adventurous and pertinent compositions in Scottish vernacular Gaelic in the course of the seventeenth century. Nonetheless, eulogies and elegies upholding traditional values remained a staple output of the vernacular poets. The last systematic bardic practitioner, Niall MacMhuirich, eulogised Donald Mac Donald of Clanranald who died in 1686" (*Clanship Commerce And The House of Stuart*).

Dinneen gives the following definition of "*Gaedhealach*":

"Irish, Gaelic, Irish speaking, Irish made, simple, unsophisticated, generous, easy going; common, native ... *Nach Gaedhealach na ruidíní iad*: what common folk they are. *Duine breágh Gaedhealach*: a nice affable fellow.

Hillaire Belloc uses the word "*English*", like the word *Gaelach*, as a compliment when he compares bad university Dons to a good ones:

"Remote and ineffectual Don that dared attack my Chesterton with that poor weapon, half-impelled unlearned, unsteady, hardly held unworthy for a tilt with men—Your quavering and corroded pen; Don poor at Bed and worse at Table, Don pinched, Don starved, Don miserable; Don stuttering, Don with roving eyes ... Don different from those regal Dons! With hearts of gold and lungs of bronze, who shout and bang and roar and bawl the Absolute across the hall ... Dons English, worthy of the land; Dons rooted; Dons that understand. Good Dons, perpetual, that remain a landmark, walling in the plain—the horizon

of my memories—like large and comfortable trees."

The following verses are taken from Daibhí Ó Bruadair's lament for Edmund Fitzgerald in 1666:

Codhnach ba cobharthach ar charaid
Is ba dána ar námhaid do leagadh
Biadhtach an iarthar nar feasadh
Anam dáimhe an árais d'fhreastal

Cathmhíleadh cruaidh nár thuar
tathluinn
Is nach tug tuath ná truagh gan eallach
Nár chuir brón ar chomhairle Pheadair
Is nár éar an éigse fá aisece

Leoghan lonn nár throm ar cheallaibh
Is treoraidhe gan chróilighe'na chasnamh
Triath áluinn áthasach fairsing
Do bhaineadh riar is giall do ghallaibh

Trusty champion, who to friends was ever helpful / who prompt and fearless was in smiting low a foeman / In western regions hospitality's exemplar / when entertaining the retainers of the castle.

Doughty battle-chief, who never augured insult / nor robbed the peasant nor the needy of their cattle / Who gave no cause for sorrow to Peter's council / nor ever turned away a poet unrewarded.

Fierce as a lion, he oppressed not churches / but as a guide and leader guarded them uninjured / Comely, open-handed lord of joyful triumphs / exacting from the Galls obedience and submission.

Ó Bruadair wrote his elegy for an actual practising taoiseach. There is no such taoiseach with landed title in Eoghan Ruadh's day. Instead it falls to the priest to act as leader to his community who are a repressed people. The Poet, the Priest and the People live outside the law. The linguistic world of Irish (and Latin) in which they talk and sing and weep and pray is alien to the powerful official state which lives in English. The two worlds occupy the same space but hardly see each other.

There is a parallel here with the Jewish community whose story we hear in the musical film *The Fiddler on the Roof* which is set in the village of Anatevka in tsarist Russia in 1905. The village is mainly Orthodox Russian with a closeknit Jewish minority. At the beginning of the film Tevye the Milkman sings the song "Tradition (*dai dai dai* ...)" and introduces us to his neighbours:

"Tevye: And in the circle of our little village, we've always had our special types. For instance, Yente, the matchmaker, Reb Nachum, the beggar. And, most important of all, our beloved Rabbi ...

Leibesh: Rabbi, may I ask you a question?

Rabbi: Certainly, Leibesh.

Leibesh: Is there a proper blessing

... for the Tzar?

Rabbi: A blessing for the Tzar? Of course. May God bless and keep the Tzar far away from us! *Dai dai dai dai dai dai* ...

Tevye: Then there are the others in our village. They make a much bigger circle. We don't bother them and so far, they don't bother us."

The Jews of Anatevka speak Yiddish amongst themselves and read the Scriptures in Hebrew. While they can speak Russian they have little use for learning to read that language. In one scene all the Jewish men gather in the village square to buy milk for the Sabbath from Tevye. Avram, the bookseller, who can read Russian, approaches in a panic:

"Avram: Look at this! Look what it says in the paper.

Crowd: Look, look, look!

Mendel: Quiet! Quiet! Stop braying like a pack of mules! Let the man talk. Talk, Avram.

Avram: My paper came to the post office today, like it always does. Usually it comes on a Thursday, but it can be a day late...

Mendel: Avram, that's not talking! That's babbling.

Crowd: The news... What does it say?

Mendel: Quiet! Talk, Avram.

Avram: Well, I was reading my paper. It's nothing very important, a story about the crops in the Ukraine, and this and that.

Mendel: Avram! Talk.

Avram: And then. I saw this.

Mendel: All right. We all see it. What does it say?

Avram: "In a village called Rajanka, all the Jews were evicted, forced to leave their homes."

Mendel: For what reason?

Avram: It doesn't say. Maybe the Tzar wanted the land. Maybe a plague?

Mendel: May the Tzar have his very own plague (spitting on the ground).

Crowd: Amen (spitting on the ground)."

* *

Eoghan indicates the enormity of Fr. Con's death by telling of how he was keened by all of the *Mná Sí* (Banshees) of Ireland. Verse 42 refers to young human girls who were abducted by the fairies when passing by fairy forts etc. and who acted as *banshee* to their own families and people of their surname from then on. Other types of human could also become a *banshee* such as deceased professional keepers and damned women. *Badhbh* is the name most commonly associated with the supernatural *banshees* (Patricia Lysaght). Eoghan seems to include both human and supernatural types of *banshee* in this section.

* * *

It is interesting that Eoghan does not include the Rosary, *an Paidirín*

Páirteach, in his list of devotions to be offered for the repose of Fr. Con's soul. The Rosary was the prayer of the common people whereas the Psalms and the Passion would require access to a bible or a missal and, more than likely, knowledge of Latin. Eoghan was very friendly and involved with various priests throughout his life. It is possible that he was originally intended for the priesthood and shared their junior seminary education.

The reading of the Passion, the section of the Gospels which tell of the suffering and death of Jesus Christ, is a central part of the celebration of Holy Week in most Christian Churches. In the Catholic Church the Passion is read on Palm Sunday and on Good Friday. In the Lutheran Church there is a rich tradition of setting Passion texts to music. The most famous being J.S. Bach's *St. Matthew Passion*, which is based on Chapters 26 and 27 beginning: "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his disciples, Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified" ... and finishing: "Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch. "The *Matthäus-Passion* was first performed in St. Thomas Church in Leipzig on Good Friday, 11th April 1727, 21 years before Eoghan Ruadh was born.

The *Feart Laoi* was an essential element of any elegy which is often addressed to the tombstone itself:

"*Feart*: a grave, a tomb, a vault, a trench. *Laoidh*: a lay, poem or lyric; a song or hymn. *Laoidh chumainn*—a love lay. *Laoidh luin*—the blackbird's song. *Laoidh suain*—a lullaby ..." (Dinneen)

Bibliography

- Pat Muldowney: *Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin—Dánta*. Aubane Historical Society, 2009.
- Athair Pádraig Ua Duinnín: *Amhráin Eoghain Ruaidh Uí Shúilleabháin*. Conradh na Gaeilge, (3rd edition) 1907, containing quotation re. genealogy from Fr. Jarlath, *Journal of Cork Archeological Society*.
- Patrick S. Dinneen: *Irish English Dictionary*. Irish Texts Society, 1927.
- Patricia Lysaght: *An Bhean Sí sa Bhéaloideas*, in Breandán Ó Madagáin, ed. *Gnéithe den Chaoiteoreacht*. An Clóchomhar Teo, 1978.
- Breandán Ó Madagáin: *Caointe agus Seancheolta Eile*. Cló Iar Chonnachta, 2005.
- Allan I. Macinnes: *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart*. Tuckwell Press, 1996.
- Rev. John C. Mac Earle, SJ.: *Duanaire Daibhidh Uí Bhruadair*, Part 1. ITC, 1910.
- Risteard Ó Foghludha: *Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin*. Comhlucht Oideachais na hÉireann Teo, 1937.
- James Carney: *Early Irish Poetry*. RTÉ—Thomas Davis Lecture Series 1965.
- Rev. Patrick S. Dinneen & Tadhg O' Donoghue: *Dánta Aodhagáin Uí Rathaille*. ITS, 1911.

Wilson John Haire

Poetry Of The Taliban,

edited by Alex Strick van Linschoten & Felix Kuehn.

Preface by Faisal Devji.

240 pp, Hurst & Company, London. £14.99

(These poems have been translated by
Mirwais Rahmany and Abdul Hamid Stanikzai
who live in Afghanistan today)

Food For Thought

Right at the beginning of the book a short and simple poem by Khepulwaak seems to say it all. The American occupiers are celebrating Christmas at Bagram Air Base, which is flooded by light while the Afghan people celebrate the *Festival of Eid* in which the oil lamps are extinguished. One line says:

"Suddenly at midnight, your bombs bring the light..."

Many of the poems are written in the discipline of the *Glazal* (love lyric) which was the form used throughout the Ottoman Empire and is still used throughout the Middle East today.

Poetry is very much a part of everyday life in Afghanistan and some exists in the oral tradition. In this method of conveying poetry, poets incorporate their names in many of their poems so they are not anonymous. With the advent of the mobile phone, people use Mp3s in exchanging poetry. Poetry is also published in book-form and on videos. The Taliban website is also a good source for the work of the communist poet Suleyman Laiq of the PDPA (People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, said to be now defunct or underground)

In his Introduction Faisal Devji says: "*Indeed, it is this eclectic spread that brings out the aesthetic and political continuity with the wider parts of Afghanistan.*" He goes on to show that Taliban poetry is also allowed to express the fear of some of its *mujahed* (someone engaged in *Jihad*/resistance fighter) that he is losing his humanity in a poem by Samiullah Khalid Sahak entitled *Humanity*. It says:

"Everything has gone from the world,
The world has become empty again.
Human animal
Humanity animality
Everything has gone from the world.
I don't see anything now.
All that I can see is
My imagination."

This must be the fear of so many guerrilla fighters who have been forced into action against their nature. I can think of those who joined Tom Barry in the fight for Irish Independence and how Barry says in his *Guerrilla Days In Ireland* that he had to train men who wouldn't normally break the law or do injury to anyone. In that book he mentions diplomatically the few who died while cleaning their guns. Some members of the more recent Provisional IRA also took on health problems after the guns fell silent. Later the poet says:

"We are not animals,
I say this with certainty.
But,

Humanity has been forgotten by us,
And I don't know when it will come back.
May Allah give it to us,
And decorate us with this jewellery,
The jewellery of humanity,
For now it's only in our imagination."

Many of the poems feature Nato air attacks on wedding parties, burning villages, terrified women and children and the fraud and underhand methods of the NGOs.

The US military in early 2011 hatched the idea of *counter-poetry* as a way of fighting a cultural war. But what can you do against the Taliban Cultural Committee of the Islamic Emirate who do not censor poetry coming to their website. So diverse is the circulation of this poetry that even those heading the Karzai puppet Government make no secret of being fond of reading it and quoting it.

This book of poetry has a good glossary, an interesting Preface and a very informative Introduction and an excellent Bibliography. The publishers are to be congratulated on their courage in giving the public access to these

235 poems, despite the tutts of some senior members of the British Army.

29th May, 2012

Donal Kennedy

Glove Puppets?

In his scathing poem "*Gas From a Burner*" James Joyce wrote the line—"Ireland my first and only love, where Christ and Caesar go hand in glove". At the time all of Ireland was directly ruled from Westminster, and it seems the writer saw John Bull's hand in the Catholic Church's glove. I'm reminded of the line by a piece by Paul Donovan which appeared in the *Irish Post* last April [2011], which has just come to my attention. He noted that the chief Catholic Chaplain to the British Army, Bishop Charles Richard Moth had issued a statement on intervention in Libya, but first had to pass it to the Ministry of Defence for its approval. Mr Donovan asks "*what next, the Easter homily to be passed to Downing Street?*"

I've never seen the text of the Bishop's message and had never heard of him but I recall with undiminished anger one of his predecessors, Bishop Gerard William Tickle, rushing to the defence of the Paratroop Regiment's murderous attack on defenceless civilians in Derry in 1972, on the grounds that they were merely following orders. When defeated German officers faced British judges at Nuremburg after the Second World War that plea did not save them from the noose or imprisonment. Tickle cannot have been unaware of this, for he was Vice-Rector of the Venerable English College in Rome during the Nuremburg Trials, not in some desert hermitage.

I find it impossible to believe that Bishop Tickle was not following the Unholy Orders of the Ministry of Defence when he offered such words of comfort to its men of violence, nor do I imagine that Lord Widgery felt free to conduct an honest Inquiry nor to produce an honest report. Tickle and Widgery were mere glove puppets of the British Cabinet. Prime Minister Edward Heath and Lord Chancellor Hailsham met with Widgery on his appointment and told him that Britain was fighting a propaganda war.

Most of the British media joined in the propaganda war and when Widgery died *The Times*, under the Editorship of Harold Evans, published a glowing obituary, particularly praising the conduct of his Inquiry. *The Times* under Harold Evans conducted its coverage of Ireland according to identical ethical standards, earning a Press Council rebuke and the accolade of "Editor of the Year" for Evans all in the one day. For his Glove Puppet mimicry Evans was later Knighted.

Outside the hermetically sealed and numb skulls of the invincibly ignorant the Widgery Report was recognised as a collection of blatant lies, a British Own Goal and a lost battle in the Propaganda War. So Lord Saville's Inquiry was set up by the British Government. I wouldn't suggest that His Lordship is a Government Glove Puppet. A Poppet, perhaps. Saville found those killed on Bloody Sunday innocent and found that they were all killed by Paratroopers acting on the orders of Lt. Col. Derek Wilford, who had disobeyed the orders of his superiors. A bit ironic, considering Bishop Tickle's defence of the killings at the time.

Perhaps it will be another forty years before our great grandchildren learn, from another Learned Lordship, who recommended that Queen Elizabeth appoint Wilford a Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, an Order of Chivalry to which he still belongs, before the earth had settled on the graves of his victims.

BOOKS

Received for Review:
**That Irishman, the life and times
of John O'Connor Power**
by
Jane Stanford

The story of John O'Connor Power is the story of Ireland's struggle for nationhood itself. Born into poverty in Ballinasloe in 1846, O'Connor Power spent much of his childhood in the workhouse. From here he rose rapidly through the ranks of the Fenian Movement to become a leading member of the Supreme Council of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. In 1874 he was elected Member for Mayo to the British House of Commons where he was widely acknowledged to be one of the outstanding orators of his day. His speeches, both in Parliament and to the US House of Representatives, secured crucial concessions and support for the Irish cause.

Julianne Herlihy

Mary Kenny's 'Error'

In the quiet backwater of journalism, Mary Kenny wrote an article in *The Irish Catholic*. It was a very good article in that it sought clarification for the word "abuse" as used against the Catholic Church. It was the first time I had seen a journalistic attempt to qualify what exactly this term meant. Well—what a response she got as she was howled down from all sides for such effrontery. The media went after her as one and she was called to account for her wickedness in making such a suggestion. Such was the explosion of fury against Kenny that one felt for her very safety as she was damned by every media quarter. The *Irish Examiner* not only gave over half a page to various well-known 'abuse victims' abusing Ms Kenny but they ran a side-bar of Twitter comments which was enough to raise the hair on one's neck. In the words of one twitter writer:

"Why is Mary Kenny being given a platform for her *horrendous and hurtful* questioning of the nature of child sexual abuse?"

The *Irish Examiner* ran the article with the headline: *Victims 'may be devastated' by call to spell out abuse*. Various well-known victims of abuse such as Marie Collins stated she was "sickened". Andrew Madden said he found Kenny's question "*stomach-churning*" and so on. The article was one-sided and as usual in these cases very unbalanced. For the past number of years between the official Inquiries/Reports, RTE documentaries, films, print media saturation of this whole subject—the victims have sought to "*have their voices heard*". In order to move from "*victims of abuse*"—they sought rightly to become "*survivors of abuse*". They had to tell their stories publicly again and again in order "*to heal*" and sometimes tagged to that was the wish that "*it would never happen again*". From my own perspective and experience, I

thought that was a very unhealthy way to go. I loathe the whole notion of the public confession. And it seems that, with all the counselling these victims got, they still have not come to terms with their differing experiences of "abuse". Healing means really moving on and above all truly forgiving the "abuser". It does not follow that giving constant sound-bites to the media when the necessity arises for another round of Catholic-bashing is what is good for the victims. The media now becomes the exploiter and more and more people are turned off by this ever-turning cycle.

Mary Kenny stated that her purpose was to support Archbishop Martin's call for an independent inquiry into "*Brendan Smyth's abuse of children*" but stressed that it must be "*honest and plain-speaking*". She then went on to make the point, and here I agree with her, that "*most of what has been written about child abuse cases*" had been "*shrouded in euphemism and evasion*". I have spoken with many friends and acquaintances over the years and asked them what their interpretation of "abuse" was and not one of them have been sure. Their responses have varied from rape, touching, to slapping or wiggling. So I think that now is a good time to know what actually transpired after all these years. The victims have been publicly vocal for so long and their response now that this would harm them makes no sense whatsoever. All we are asking now—and it is not a big ask—is that we are told *precisely* what was the nature of their abuse? And of course the real tragedy is that once again children are suffering again, but this time under State care by way of the Health Services Executive, with the added twist that they are disappearing and some are found dead—but the response from the media and the politicians—is so cavalier that it begs the question why? Are these present children somehow *less* than the ones of decades ago? Are they not to be examined or mourned because they are merely seen as collateral damage from the liberal agenda?

©

O'Connor Power campaigned tirelessly for the rights of tenant farmers, and pioneered the policy of obstructionism to this end. Following his address to a tenants' rights meeting in Mayo, a protest was launched which would quickly become the powerful political force that was the Land League. He was, in short, one of a distinguished

company, that indomitable Irishry of Charles Stewart Parnell, Michael Davitt and Isaac Butt, who made the dream of an independent Ireland a reality.

The History Press Ireland
isbn 978-1-84588-698-1. 2011, 285pp.

**£17.10 from the publishers,
www.thehistorypress.ie**

Gerry Foley
French Presidential Race
Conrad Black,
Damien Thompson

Gerry Foley

"The Civil Rights movement and the early years of the Northern Ireland troubles attracted the attention of radicals from abroad, excited at the possibility of major social change. As the violence intensified and political considerations were displaced, their level of interest declined." (*Irish Times*, 5.5.2012).

"One of the more committed and accomplished of these was Gerry Foley, a left-wing American journalist, intellectual and political activist, who died suddenly last month at his home in Mexico, aged 73." (*ibid.*)

Foley took a keen interest in the evolution of the official wing of the republican movement which had split away from the more militaristic Provisionals in December 1969 and espoused socialist ideals.

He had hopes that the "Officials" would build a mass movement, North and South, that would eventually unite the two parts of the island under the banner of Connolly socialism.

"He was a particular admirer of long-time republican Seán Garland who he described as "a devoted and pure-hearted revolutionary". For a time, Foley had high hopes for Garland as a socialist leader." (*ibid.*)

Foley's first encounter with radical politics came as a graduate student of Russian literature in the University of Indiana at Bloomington, Indiana. He joined the Fair Play for Cuba Committee which was initiated by the US-based Socialist Workers' Party and its youth wing, the Young Socialist Alliance, to defend Castro's revolution against US intervention.

Foley did further graduate study at the University of Wisconsin at Madison and then went to New York City where he worked full-time with the SWP, under the direction of Joseph Hansen at Intercontinental Press.

It was Hansen, one of Leon Trotsky's secretaries during the latter's exile in

Mexico, who gave Foley his early journalistic training.

He developed political differences with the SWP and left for Paris in 1980 where he worked at the magazine, *International Viewpoint*, published by Trotsky's Fourth International.

A decade later he returned to the US to work for Socialist Action, founded by disillusioned SWP members, as the international editor of its newspaper.

An enthusiastic linguist, Foley had a reading knowledge of numerous languages, including Irish, and was said to be fluent in more than a dozen. He had a collection of an estimated 10,000 books.

"He died less than a week after moving from his semi-retirement residence in Mérida, Mexico to San Cristóbal de las Casas, in the mountains of Mexico's poorest state of Chiapas, perhaps from the strain of moving his enormous book-collection into his newly rented home." (*Irish Times*, 5.5.2012).

French Presidential Race

A secret memo—

"Dear Friends, Our agency, under the many different names it carries, advises the major candidates for the French presidential election. And we can take great pride in this fact. All of this is the fruit of extensive efforts, which have been deployed for many years, to gain the confidence of all these people, and those close to them.

"This is also the result of extensive work of your advertising, sociologists, specialists in polls, interactive marketing, internet teams, and all the other techniques, constantly renewed, so necessary for your work, which I would remind you the lofty and noble mission: to convince.

"For now, the French presidential campaign is unfolding smoothly and perfectly, in accordance with our recommendations and our interests.

"As we have required, all the serious candidates are carefully refusing to talk

about their record and even less about their programs. We managed to convince them that voters are amnesiac and myopic, that the campaign is just a show for them and that they are not interested in the past or in the future.

"It was easy then to demonstrate the necessity to come up with a new idea every day, blotting out the idea of the day before.

"No subject should remain a dominant news story for more than 24 hours. It is up to you to offer every day to every campaign team, depending on the outcome of your studies, new and different subjects. It is up to you to create controversy, to test moods, words, gestures, attitudes, smiles and slogans. Everything except projects."

(Extract from Jacques Attali, *L'Express* (Paris), 19 March 2012).

Conrad Black,

the former owner of the U.K. *Daily Telegraph*, was released from a Florida, U.S.A. prison in May, after serving three years for defrauding investors, and deported to Canada.

Canadian Government sources said he would be allowed to live there upon his release, where he would be granted a one-year temporary residence permit.

A member of the House of Lords, he had been sentenced to more than six years in prison after his 2007 conviction in Chicago, but had then been released on bail two years later to pursue an appeal that was partially successful. A judge reduced his sentence to three years and he returned in prison last September. With time off for good behaviour, he has completed his sentence.

Black, told *The Catholic Herald* that he found spiritual serenity through Catholicism in his Florida prison. He is a covert to Catholicism and is a major shareholder in *The Catholic Herald*.

"The Catholic life in the prison where I write is active and intellectually stimulating."

Lord Black is not, however, admitting guilt for his crimes: on the contrary, Catholicism helps him deal with what he regards as his unjust conviction for fraud by an Illinois court in 2007. As he writes:

"Though there are many moments of scepticism as matters arise, and the dark nights of the soul that seem to assail almost everyone visit me too, I have never had anything remotely resembling a lapse, nor a sense of forsakenness, even when I was unjustly indicted, convicted, and imprisoned, in a country I formerly much admired."

Trinity, Its Works And Poms, Part 6:

Book review. "Trinity College: its income and its value to the nation"

(1911) by Daniel Cohalan.

A Proposed University Merger

The University Question was a much discussed issue in the early years of the 20th century. It was simple but made to seem a most complex issue. How to arrange to have a University that served the needs of the Catholic majority was the issue. As part of the general policy of *Killing Home Rule with Kindness* the British Government came up with what seemed a logical and obvious solution.

On publication of the *Report of the Royal Commission into Trinity College*, on the 26th January 1907, Bryce, the Chief Secretary, proposed a new Dublin University to consist of two Colleges in Dublin: the existing one for Protestants (TCD) and a new College within the same University for Catholic. The new University was also to include the other Colleges in Cork and Belfast within this new University. It was modelled on the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with their various Colleges within these Universities.

The Catholic Hierarchy was happy with the proposal, but Trinity was not and scuppered the proposal. Trinity was liberal but not *that* liberal. Its attitude was similar to the liberalism displayed on the walls of Bandon—"Jew, Turk or atheist may enter here but never a Papist!" They kept pointing out the huge differences between its liberal approach to education and the Catholic dogmatic approach and declared that such divergence could not be contained within a single University.

The Catholic argument was that they both shared the same basic Christian dogmas in theory and practice and all other differences were immaterial in the practical matter of University education. They were more than willing to compete with them on academic grounds, given a level playing field. Newman was their guide in these matters. The claims of each would be proved by what they produced academically in their Colleges and there could be clear comparisons and contrasts made to enable a proper judgment to be made on who could 'deliver the goods' for the nation. The proof of the pudding would be in the eating.

There is no doubt that such compet-

ition within one Irish University would have transformed Irish University education for the better as both would seek to outshine each other. But it was not to be, thanks to Trinity. The College authorities prevented an obvious solution to the 'University question'.

This was the background to the publication of the book by Daniel Cohalan, later to become the infamous ex-communicating Bishop of Cork. (There is story told that as he was dying he heard that his friend, the Protestant Bishop of Cork, had just died and muttered: "*Now, he knows who is the Bishop of Cork.*")

His argument/question was that, in view of TCD's decision to opt out of this new national University, what use was it to anyone except itself? And, to emphasise the point, he utilised the information provided by Trinity itself to the Royal Commission to illustrate how useless and expensive an institution TCD was. Obviously that was not Trinity's intention but it seemed obvious to how damning its evidence was.

He looked at its income. TCD had to produce some 'returns' for 1905 and this was the first time that such information was openly available. The Commission referred the 'returns' to Price, Waterhouse and Co. for auditing (yes indeed, for it was that very company!). Cohalan provides a detailed breakdown of the income of £93,000 for that year. Taking inflation into account, that can be multiplied at least a hundredfold to equate to something in the region of 10 million Euro today. The TCD estates throughout the country accounted for nearly half of this. He also explains that TCD was specifically protected from any loss through the operation of the Land Purchase Acts. The 1903 Land Act provided that £5,000 be paid annually from the public purse to TCD in compensation.

Then he gives the average intake of students for the previous 15 years which was 229 and the average graduation numbers which was 158. Readers can correlate the annual income with these student numbers.

There are very illuminating descrip-

In the Spring of 1986, Cardinal Carter (Archbishop of Toronto and a close friend of Black) asked Black about his religious beliefs.

"I recited my plodding baby steps on the ladder: there were spiritual aspects to life that were not mere superstition, and that constituted or at least evidenced God; that Christ was divinely inspired, had told St Peter to found a Church, and that the legitimate continuator of that Church was Roman Catholicism... I believed that miracles occurred, though I couldn't attest to particular ones, that given the wonders of creation and of the infinite, and the imperfections of man, we all properly belonged, frequently, on our knees before an effigy of the Creator or his professed and acclaimed son, and that sincere and concentrated worship could be enlightening.

The Cardinal replied that I was "*at the door*", but that the one point I had to embrace if I wished to enter, and without which, all Christianity, he boldly asserted, "*is a fraud and a trumpery*", was the Resurrection of Christ.

"After a silence of perhaps five minutes, I said that I thought I could clear that hurdle. He asked me if I wished to be received. I did, and was, in the chapel in his home a few days later, on June 18 1986.

Lord Black's membership of the British House of Lords is unaffected by his US prison term.

Damien Thompson

"As I write, Cardinal Seán Brady of Armagh still hasn't resigned despite questions about his failure to pursue the child abuser Fr Brendan Smyth in the Seventies. (He was Fr John Brady in those days; I never trust priests who Hibernicise their names, particularly if they insist on that silly acute accent.) There are lots of theories about why the Catholic Church failed to respond to sex allegations. In my experience a key factor is often overlooked. The Church in Ireland and Britain has a public-sector mentality; its culpable stupidity is that of buck-passing social workers. The Vatican should sack the clerical shinpants and build a new Irish hierarchy from scratch." (Damien Thompson, *Daily Telegraph*, 5.5.2012.)

Thompson is Editor of *Telegraph Blogs* and a columnist for the *Daily Telegraph*. He was once described by *The Church Times* as a "*blood-crazed ferret*". He is on Twitter as *Holy Smoke*.)

tions on the low standards for matriculation, the fact that there was no money allocated for research, no teaching of History was included, there was totally inadequate provision for a host of subjects, and there was a farcical disagreement among TCD's witnesses as to whether there was or was not a Department of Agriculture in the University. TCD was not sure if it had such a Department in a country whose major industry was agriculture.

Seán McGouran

Radio Review: "Not One Of The Elite"
BBC Radio Ulster
Producer: Stephen Walker

De Cobain

A *Very Victorian Sex Scandal*, (BBC Radio Ulster) was about the life and times of Edward Samuel Wesley de Cobain. Jeff Dudgeon, who contributed, described him as "*criminal and unpleasant*". De Cobain, born 1840 and definitely plebeian in origin, became a figure of great consequence in Belfast due to his vigour, intelligence and application. By the 1870s he was the Grand Master of the Orange Order in Belfast (at that point a rather raffish organisation), and 'Chief Cashier' of Belfast.

Belfast, (historian Brian Walker claimed), was stitched-up by the Conservatives. The Liberals had to spend huge sums on a prolonged court case to break their stranglehold. De Cobain broke the monopoly of the élite (the Harland's, the Wolff's, the Corry's {the timber merchants}), becoming Conservative MP for the new seat of East Belfast in 1885. Nicola Morris, a Queen's University, Belfast academic, said the élite had used de Cobain but he represented an independent-minded Protestant working class constituency (in the sense of 'cohort' or body of opinion). In Parliament he annoyed Belfast's bourgeoisie by arguing for greater workers' rights, and fought on the floor of the Commons.

It was the Parliament of the First Home Rule Bill, and of confusion in politics. The (socially radical) Liberal Unionists split from Gladstone's party to join the Conservatives in upholding the Union.

De Cobain authored a pamphlet attacking *The Papist Constabulary* (the Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC)) as "*Morley's Murderers*", referring to the bloody Belfast 'riots' of 1886. Morley was Gladstone's Chief Secretary for

Ireland (a Cabinet post). De Cobain, thereby, added the RIC to his—long—list of enemies.

RIC Sergeant David Farrell attempted to serve a warrant for his arrest, signed by Belfast's Head Constable, Edward Hussey, in Goole, Yorkshire, on 4th April 1891. De Cobain had just left for London's Bloomsbury. Another was issued, on April 8th, from Dublin Castle (the legal systems had not been integrated after the Act of Union, a Court of Justice oversaw 'Irish law'). On April 12th de Cobain returned to Belfast, then went to Bilbaõ, where his street preaching annoyed the locals. He went on to Boulogne, (where Home Rule MPs may have been in discussion with Parnell who had had his own troubles with the Puritan conscience).

Guardian journalist David McKie said Nationalist MPs objected to the demand of the influential *Pall Mall Gazette* that de Cobain be expelled from the Commons. There was a suspicion that this scandal was the result of a young man blackmailing de Cobain. And that Belfast's Conservative élite was trying to humiliate a vigorous representative of the Protestant working class. Some Nationalist MPs, like Michael Davitt, were Labourites, others probably just wanted to break up Ulster's Unionist Conservative consensus.

By April 1892 de Cobain was in New York, supporting himself by street preaching (in Brooklyn—the programme was very site-specific). He claimed "*the Lord had no plans*" for him to meet his accusers, but he did not repudiate the accusations. He was expelled from the Orange Order (very 'respectable' after the 1886 and '93 Home Rules Bills). The Conservatives rushed to replace him with Wilhelm Wolff.

De Cobain returned to his home on Belfast's Ormeau Road. He was arrested for Gross Indecency with five men. He claimed he was the victim of blackmail, the Belfast public seems to have agreed with him. There had been questions about his sexuality prior to his arrest, and prior to the 'Cleveland Street scandal': he had, allegedly, been a client of that brothel. He, also, allegedly, only 'did it' with good Protestant boys, using his physical and social power to overcome any objections on their part. One boy's description of his (rape, in effect) convinced the jury, along with other, circumstantial, evidence. De Cobain was given 12 months' hard labour. He made history by being the first person to be convicted under the Labouchère Amendment.



Report

The following letter was published in the *Irish Examiner* on 30th June 2012

Labour and Irish Army Deserters

Further to the current controversy regarding those who deserted the Irish Army during World War Two, the silence of the Labour Party is deafening. It was far from silent at the time. Speaking on behalf of the Party on October 18th, 1945, James Larkin Jnr TD explained why the Labour Party as a whole would be voting against the Fine Gael motion to annul the Government Order in respect of such deserters: "While knowing personally that many men did desert and go elsewhere because of the undoubted hardships their dependents were undergoing during the war, countless other men bore equally great hardships on themselves and their families and did not desert. Whatever may be said for the views held by individuals as regards the issues involved in the war—and I suppose we all have our own views—it is correct that our own country claims our first duty and responsibility. From that point of view, we must take the attitude that we support in principle the continuance of the Order and will vote against the motion."

Manus O'Riordan

OUT TO GRASS?

He tells the truth about Israel but in dishonest even-handedness sells out the elected leader of Iran. No reward there from those who murder and steal Palestinian land. His enforced teenage days in the Waffen SS is not forgotten by Mossad who destroys with zest flesh and reflections of the mind. Now Günter, to pay back in kind, has thoughts on re-working his poem: 'It was not the nation but the government' he meant to weed from this fertile loam. Tell me, Herr Grass, did such an authority ever exist that did not, do not, will not persist with *lebensraum* while most of the world looks on.

Wilson John Haire
12th April, 2012

End of Eden

Mr. N. Mayer gave a lecture entitled *The Jews of Turkey* before the Jewish Literary Society, at the Beth Hatnidrash in London, on Saturday, 29th March 1913. It is of interest because it took place at a very momentous time for the Ottoman Empire and its Jews. The great Jewish city of Salonika had fallen to the Greeks in the Balkan War (December 1912) and the Jews of that city found themselves in a Christian State rather than within the great Islamic Empire which had accommodated them for centuries.

Mr. Mayer took the opportunity in his speech to give praise to the Ottoman State for the beneficial opportunities it had afforded to its Jewish citizens and mourned its passing in Europe with a foreboding about what lay in store for his people in the nationalist constructions that the Imperial Powers were encouraging.

At the time of Mayer's speech Salonika was a very ethnically diverse city, made up of Turks, Jews, Greeks, Macedonians and Bulgarians and was regarded as the greatest Jewish city in Europe because the Jews more or less owned it and ran its civic and commercial life. It contained a large Jewish proletariat, of a strongly socialist disposition, as well as a prosperous and hard-working commercial bourgeoisie. Mayer, a factory owner himself, saw it as evidence that Jews had a capability for organizing their own affairs that the Christian West had declared impossible. And he thanked the Ottomans for their foresight in facilitating this.

Ottomans & Jews

The first non-Turkish people to settle in the Ottoman Empire had been the Jews of Byzantium, who had been subjected to persecution by the Byzantine Emperors and the Greek Orthodox Church before the arrival of the Ottomans. The Jewish population of Anatolia had been drastically reduced by the time of the Ottoman Conquest as Jews were required to convert to Christianity (See Steven Bowman's *The Jews of Byzantium*).

The remaining Jews of the Byzantine Empire had assisted in the Ottoman conquests, particularly in the capture of Bursa and Constantinople in 1453, and were rewarded for this by being given a

privileged position among the non-Muslim *millet*s.

In the fifteenth century persecuted Jews from various parts of Europe took refuge in the Ottoman Empire. After the Inquisition the Ottomans welcomed the Sephardic Jews to Salonika, and other cities in the Empire, when they were expelled from Spain (and Jews who fled Portugal slightly afterwards). The Jews who arrived in the Ottoman Empire sent out declarations to the persecuted Jews of Europe, usually written in the names of rabbis and important scholars, praising the security and prosperity that they found under Ottoman rule and these declarations encouraged even more Jews to come.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire continued to be a magnet for Jews escaping persecution in Christian Europe—particularly the Jews in Russia suffering the pogroms of 1881. Many of the Jews fleeing from the Russian pogroms settled in Rumania, where they were subjected to further persecution by the Rumanians aimed at forcing them to convert to Christianity or to move on to Ottoman territory. The newly-independent state of Serbia expelled what had been extremely prosperous Jewish communities in both Sarajevo and Belgrade. The result of all of this was that around 100,000 Jews fled from South-eastern Europe into the Ottoman Empire throughout the late nineteenth century up to the Great War.

As Mr. Mayer noted Salonika was the main area of a Jewish heresy known as the Dunmehs (from the Turkish, 'to turn'). These were Jews who had followed their leader, Sabbetai Cevi of Smyrna, and converted to Islam during the seventeenth century.

Tolerance

Leon Sciaky, a Salonika Jew, who grew up in the city during the final years of the Ottoman Empire and who left with his family for a new life in America in 1915 had the following to say about the experience of Jews in the Islamic State:

"Contrary to popular belief, Muslims have always been more tolerant toward other nationalities and other faiths than

has the Christian world, and with the coming of the Turks in Europe the indigenous Jewish population grew apace, steadily increased by migrations of persecuted Jews from other parts to the more hospitable and liberal treatment in the Muslim empire. They were invariably well received. In the early Turkish casteless social order they rapidly rose to prominence in positions of confidence at the court of the sultans. History speaks of several Jewish physicians, able ministers and trusted councillors. The largest influx, however, began toward the end of the 15th century and continued well into the middle of the 16th. The Jews torn from their Spanish homeland by the edict of expulsion signed in 1492 by its Catholic monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, flocked to Turkey, and principally to Salonika, where their coreligionists had been living in freedom. Sultan Bayezit II, in a letter to his governors, ordered that they be received with kindness and that all possible assistance be extended them in their resettlement. Oppression or ill-treatment of the newcomers was to be considered a major offence and severely punished. 'They say that Ferdinand is a wise monarch', he exclaimed before his courtiers, 'How could he be one, he who impoverishes his country to enrich mine'. In a short span of years some 25,000 émigrés arrived in Salonika, to find a peaceful and secure haven, free from the persecutions and terrors of the past. Their enthusiastic messages to friends and relatives who had found a temporary and precarious surcease to their miseries in France, Italy or Holland, urging them to join them in the land of freedom, steadily increased their numbers. Not a ship anchored in the gulf that did not bring families of Spanish or Portuguese Jews, come to dwell under benevolent Muslim rule" (*Farewell to Salonica, City at the Crossroads*, pp.124-5).

Rena Molho has an interesting piece called *The Jewish Community of Salonika and Its Incorporation into the Greek State 1912-19*. In it he describes how the poorer Jews of the city, as well as the business class, regretted the end of Ottoman authority and feared incorporation into a Christian Balkan state. Because of this they supported a proposal that Salonika should be internationalized or placed under the jurisdiction of the multi-national Hapsburg Empire, if it were to leave the Ottoman State:

"It should... be noted that a majority of the Jewish working class was active within socialist organizations and it was clear to them that the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire put paid to any hope of a confederate state. Consequently the Jewish proletariat came to reject the newly created establishment and to consider it as 'foreign occupation.' Furthermore the Jews suspected that

annexation would be followed by the systematic settlement in the city of Greeks, given special distinctions and privileges as inducements, so that the Greek element would finally prevail, and also become dominant in the economic, social and cultural life of the city... As a result the Jewish community embraced the Austrian plan for an internationalization of the city, seeing it as the only way to preserve the city in its present form and meet the expectations of the working class... By adopting this plan, the Salonika Jews considered that they would be ideally suited since they would secure the support of the powerful Austrian Empire, whose economic interests would be promoted by maintaining the autonomy of the Jews. It should also be noted that the Jews welcomed and were eager to fall under Austrian influence rather than that of any Balkan people" (*Middle Eastern Studies*, October 1988, p.392-3)

Young Turks

The Young Turk revolution of 1908 had been greatly supported by the Jews of Salonika and Mayer, in his speech, blames the Western Powers for subverting the Young Turk administration, after always proclaiming that a liberalizing and democratizing of the Ottoman State was in order.

In fact, the Young Turk revolution was viewed in British diplomatic circles as something of a 'Jewish-Masonic' plot and part of the German bid for 'world domination'.

Sir Gerald Lowther, British Ambassador in Constantinople before the War, sent a 5,000 word report to Edward Grey on 10th May 1910 which contains this flavour of English understanding of the Young Turk revolution, as a 'Judea-Masonic conspiracy' inspired by Masonic French Revolutionary ideals. Here are some extracts:

"Some years ago Emannuele Carasso, a Jewish Mason of Salonica, and now deputy for that town in the Ottoman Chamber, founded there a lodge called 'Macedonia Risorta' in connection with Italian Freemasonry. He appears to have induced the Young Turks, officers and civilians, to adopt Freemasonry with a view to exerting an impalpable Jewish influence over the new dispensation in Turkey, though ostensibly only with a view of outwitting the Hamidian spies... The inspiration of the movement in Salonica would seem to have been mainly Jewish, while the words 'Liberte, Egalite, Fraternalite,' the motto of the Young Turks, are also the device of the Italian Freemasons. Carasso began to play a big role... and it was noticed that Jews of all colours, native and foreign, were enthusiastic supporters of the new dispensation, till...every Hebrew seemed to become a potential spy of the occult

Committee, and people began to remark that the movement was rather a Jewish rather than a Turkish revolution..."

"Talaat Bey, the Minister of the Interior, who is of Gypsy descent... and Djavid Bey, the Minister of Finance, who is a Crypto-Jew, are the official manifestations of the occult power of the Committee. They are the only members of the Cabinet who really count, and are also the apex of Freemasonry in Turkey... The invisible government of Turkey is thus the Grand Orient with Talaat Bey as Grand Master. Eugene Tavernier... describes the French Republic as the 'Daughter of the Grand Orient'.

"The same epithet perhaps might be appropriately applied to the Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress... Like French Republicans and Freemasons, the words most frequently on its lips are 'reaction' and 'clerical'. Its first tendency was not to modify and modernise the Mahomedan sacred law, but to undermine and smash it. Most of its leaders, while frankly rationalist, also paradoxically endeavour to use the Islamic fervour of the masses as a political weapon and to divert it into chauvinistic channels on the lines of national, i.e. Asiatic Pan Islamism. It is intolerant of opposition, and one of its principle methods of destroying its adversaries is to drive them into opposition and crush them as 'reactionaries'.

"The Turk is mainly a soldier and... the economic organism of the Turk is of the feeblest kind, and unsupported could not stand alone a week. It was hoped in the beginning that the Armenians, Bulgarians, Greeks and the Ottoman Jew would serve as economic props, but the Young Turk seems to have allied himself solely with the Jew... The latter seems to have entangled the pre-economic-minded Turk in his toils, and as Turkey contains the places sacred to Israel, it is but natural that the Jew should strive to maintain a position of exclusive influence and utilize it for the furtherance of his ideals, viz. the ultimate creation of an autonomous Jewish state in Palestine or Babylonia... He would kill two birds with one stone if he could obtain from the Turk unrestricted immigration of Jews into Turkey, an aim that he has been pursuing for years back, and transfer to Mesopotamia millions of his co-religionists in bondage in Russia and Roumania... Mesopotamia and Palestine are only, however, the ultimate goal of the Jews. The immediate end for which they are working is the practically exclusive economic capture of Turkey and new enterprises in that country.

"It is obvious that the Jew, who is so vitally interested in maintaining his sole predominance in the councils of the Young Turkey is equally interested in keeping alive the flames of discord between the Turk and his (the Jew's) possible rivals, i.e. Armenians, Greek

etc... This aspect of the Turkish revolution... is not without its direct and indirect side-problems of the Near East. The Jew hates Russia and its Government, and the fact that England is now friendly to Russia has the effect, to a certain effect, of making the Jew anti-British in Turkey and Persia—a consideration to which the Germans, I think, are alive. The Jew can help the Young Turk with brains, business enterprise, his enormous influence in the press of Europe, and money in return for advantages and the eventual realization of the ideals of Israel... The Jew has supplied funds to the Young Turks and has thus acquired a hold on them... Secrecy and elusive methods are essential to both. The Oriental Jew is an adept at manipulating occult forces, and political Freemasonry of the continental type has been chosen as the most effective bond and cloak to conceal the inner workings of the movement...

"Young Turkey regards itself as the vanguard of an awakened Asia. It fancies itself bound to protect the nascent liberties of Persia 'now endangered by the selfish and over-bearing policy of Russia and England'. ... It is also coquetting, assisted by the Jews... to create a sympathetic current in Afghanistan and among Indian Moslems.

"The Young Turks, partly at the inspiration of Jewish Masonry, and partly owing to the fact that French is the one European language extensively spread in the Levant, have been imitating the French Revolution and its godless and levelling methods. The developments of the French Revolution led to the antagonism between England and France, and should the Turkish Revolution develop on the same lines, it may find itself similarly in antagonism with British ideals and interests" (From Elie Kedourie, *Young Turks, Freemasons and Jews*, *Middle Eastern Studies*, January 1971, pp.95-102)

The British Ambassador's Report goes on, for page after page, about Jewish influence here, there and everywhere in the Ottoman Empire and their nefarious schemes of creating a Jewish state in Palestine and Mesopotamia in return for the financial help of Jewish finance to the Young Turks. And in one part it even recommends an alliance with the Arabs—who, it suggests, would have the most to lose from this creeping conspiracy.

During the Great War the Czech leader Thomas Masaryk, who was being promoted by the *Entente* as a leader of a new construction of Czechoslovakia which would displace the Hapsburg State in the area, wrote the following portrait of Enver Pasha, one of the Young Turks who hailed from Salonika, for a British propaganda organ, *The New Europe*:

"Entering the army in the Hamidian

era, he became aide-de-camp to Hilmi Pasha when the latter was Governor of Macedonia, and plunged with a will into the labyrinth of conspiracy and treachery which centred on the Masonic lodges of Salonica. He had a greater share than any other Turkish officer in the formation of the Committee of Union and Progress, which these crypto-Jewish intrigues—with their ramifications among the *haute* finance of Vienna, Budapest, Berlin, Paris, and London—did so much to produce" (9th Nov. 1916.)

A reading of Masaryk's portrait of Enver gives a clue to why the *Entente's* destruction of the Hapsburg and Ottoman Empires proved so devastating for their Jewish communities. Masaryk went on to lead the newly constructed 'nation' of Czechoslovakia and it was not surprising, given his view of the Jews in the Hapsburg Empire, that their fortunes took a drastic turn for the worse in "*The New Europe*" that he assisted Britain in producing.

Homeland?

The destruction of the Ottoman Empire and the placing of its territories under the control of the Western Powers marked the beginning of the end of other Jewish communities as Britain prepared a new nationalist reorientation for the Jews in alliance with Zionism.

Baghdad was the home to 50,000 Jews in 1917, a fifth of the population of the city. Arnold Wilson, Political Officer with the British Mesopotamian Expedition, recorded in his memoirs the effect (or lack of it) of the Balfour Declaration on the Jewish community there:

"The announcement aroused no interest in Mesopotamia; nor did it leave a ripple on the surface of local political thought in Baghdad, where there had been for many centuries a large Jewish population... I discussed the declaration at the time with several members of the Jewish community, with whom we were on friendly terms. They remarked that Palestine was a poor country, and Jerusalem a bad town to live in. Compared with Palestine, Mesopotamia was a Paradise. 'This is the Garden of Eden', said one; 'it is from this country that Adam was driven forth—give us a good Government and we will make this country flourish—for us Mesopotamia is a home, a national home to which the Jews of Bombay and Persia and Turkey will be glad to come. Here shall be liberty and with it opportunity! In Palestine there may be liberty, but there will be no opportunity'..." (*Loyalties, Mesopotamia, 1914-1917*, pp.305-6)

The Jews who flocked to the Ottoman Empire over the centuries did not bother to settle in their Biblical

'Homeland'. They much preferred the great Ottoman commercial cosmopolitan centres to it.

Ottoman Salonika became the greatest Jewish city on earth; Baghdad was the Garden of Eden; Ben-Gurion recruited a Jewish militia to defend Palestine from the British in 1914, Moshe Sharett (later Prime Minister of Israel) and many other Jews joined the Ottoman Army. But this could hardly be the same Ottoman Empire of British war propaganda?

For about two thousand years Jews were taught to long for a return to Judea. But they refused to return—and not because they couldn't. They did not return because their religion taught them that they were to await the return of the Messiah before they could return. And the Ottoman Empire provided them plenty of places that they preferred in their secular pursuits.

There is little doubt that the Jews were at the centre of progress in the world in all its facets—capitalism, socialism and internationalism. But what Britain did to the Jews was akin to turning the clock back and remaking them in their Biblical image, as a Biblical people, in modern times.

The lecture by Mr. Mayer, reproduced below, is therefore something of an epitaph for the Ottoman Garden of Eden in which the Jews lived before the ending of innocence.

"THE JEWS OF TURKEY.

A LECTURE DELIVERED BY

Mr. N. MAYER,

Before the Jewish Literary Society, at the Beth Hatnidrash, on Saturday, 29th March 1913.

"This period of freedom, this promise of internal development, this new order of things was not to last. I do not wish to discuss politics, but it is impossible to touch upon the events in the near East without giving expression to some of the views so strongly held by everyone who has taken a sympathetic interest. For, was not Turkey the only European Empire in which the Jews enjoyed absolute freedom and in which no religious persecution against any other race or faith had been perpetrated? But political ambitions did not always square with internal freedom and economic development, and the whole policy of the Christian Powers of Europe for the last two centuries at least had one steady aim, to crush Turkey, to drive the Turks out, to despoil them of their European possessions, and to make it impossible for Turkey to regenerate or to become internally strong and withstand the intrigues and attacks from whichever quarter they may come. Those who remember the promulgation of a constitution under Midhad Pasha

immediately after the Russo-Turkish war in 1878 will remember also the machinations and intrigues set on foot to destroy the constitution, to deprive Turkey of the strong men who had come to the fore and to favour absolutism, tyranny and re-action. If Turkey was to be financially exploited it had to be kept politically weak, and those European Powers were practically responsible for the events which finally led to the overthrow of Abdul Hamid. But those who had been working for years to establish the Hamidian regime were the same forces and the same Powers who speculated on the downfall of Turkey and on its slow disintegration, so as to become an easy prey to its enemies. The new regime, however, was not to be allowed to work out the salvation of the people, and to bring in a new era of internal consolidation and proper development. The young Turks were undermined, their work thwarted, the European press especially the English press vying with one another in vilification and in making out of every small blunder a tremendous crime, of every molehill a huge mountain. It was to be foreseen that no peace, no rest would be given to them, and thus we have seen the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Italian attack on Tripoli and the latest war of the allied little Balkan States against Turkey. What the future may have in store it is difficult to say, but to us Jews, the affairs which have changed again so dramatically within a few years are pregnant with grave dangers for our own people, now divided up among the various little Powers of the Balkans and forced to change their political allegiance in the twinkling of an eye..."

"It is not easy to estimate the number of Jews who live in Turkey. For the purpose of my paper I will with your permission obliterate the modern subdivision of the Balkan Peninsula, and I will speak of Turkey as I knew it in my young days, stretching from the Aegean Sea in the South, to the Danube in the North, and from the Adriatic in the West, to the Black Sea and Marmora in the East. Up to 1877 such were the boundaries of Turkey. Servia stood under the Sovereignty of Turkey whilst Bulgaria was simply a *villayet*.

"I well remember the Turkish flag floating over Widdin and Rustchuk. Varna was a Turkish port and the Balkans only divided one province from another. The number of Jews living in that greater Turkey may be estimated at 250,000 to 300,000 if not more..."

"The first question is how long since the Jews have settled in what is now called the Balkan Peninsular?... leaving legends aside... of the migration of the Jews to Spain long before the destruction of the Temple, there can be no doubt that, in fact, long before the destruction of the Second Temple, large colonies of Jews must have been living in what is

now called the Balkan Peninsula. The spread of Christianity can only be explained by the existence of such large Jewish settlements in these parts of the world, and the oldest record of the journeyings of the Apostles may be considered more or less as a kind of geographical sketch of the places where Jewish colonies flourished and Jewish synagogues existed. Salonika, which is older than Constantinople by many hundreds of years, for Constantinople was built by Constantine in the 4th Century, was one of the places visited by Paul and he gives a graphic description of his meeting there with the Jews and his going into the synagogue to preach, and in the same description of his journeyings we find a large number of places mentioned and everyone with Jewish communities.

"Unfortunately, we have no ancient description by a Jewish traveller older than Benjamin of Tudela, but it is sufficiently old enough for our purpose, because he visits the Balkan Peninsula in the year 1160. His narrative contains a graphic description of Jewish communities scattered all over the Balkan Peninsula. Although it is very brief, still, it allows us a glimpse into the inner life of the people at those remote times. We find, curiously enough, almost the first ghetto mentioned in Constantinople where the Jews were not allowed to live in the town itself, but they occupied that quarter of the town which was already then called Pera, that is the other side, and it is now the most important quarter of Constantinople. Probably the second in order, as far as the number and activity of the Jews is concerned, is the community of Salonika. Jews everywhere seem to have taken up manual labour, mostly silk weaving, cloth dyeing, and tanning. There are also artificers in gold and silver. In one or two places we find them tilling the ground and getting crops of their fields. But most notable of all is the fact that they had Rabbis at the head of their communities, learned men, scholars versed in the Law, and therefore, they must have had schools and charitable institutions, as well as trades by which to earn sufficient income to keep up these institutions.

"In Constantinople itself, the Jews were badly treated by the Greeks. It is not at all impossible that the Jews in Central Europe had to suffer, later, exactly the same kind of persecution probably because of the intimate contact brought about by the Crusades between the West and the East, and nothing is so easily learned as a bad example in the treatment of the weak and meek. Jews were not allowed to ride on horseback in the town or to live in the town of Constantinople..."

"The number of Jews must have increased after the great persecution under the crusaders when vast numbers of Jews migrated from Germany to the

East of Europe in the 12th and 13th centuries, and probably a good number of them sought refuge also in the Greek Empire. But the decisive turn arrived with the expulsion of the Jews from Spain at the end of the 15th century. From that moment, practically, the Jews came into close contact with the Turkish Empire.

"I have already remarked at the beginning, that the Turks never persecuted any other race, and showed the broadest example of religious tolerance just at the time when the Catholic Church had established the Inquisition, and when Spain and Portugal invented the most cruel persecution of the Jewish inhabitants who had lived in the *Iberian Peninsula for close upon 1,000 years, and had proved their attachment and their services to that country in innumerable ways.*

"When the Turks occupied Adrianople and then afterwards broke down the Greek Empire and occupied Constantinople, the first act almost was to do away with that ancient Ghetto, and we are told that a large number of Jews were brought from the interior and asked to settle in the new Capital of the Turkish Empire. Honours were shown to them and every possible protection was granted to them and to this practice they have remained faithful to this very day..."

"The favour they showed to the Jews ... rested on that political perspicacity which the ancient rulers of Turkey had shown in the choice of men and in the broad tolerance which they showed to everyone whom they expected to be of benefit to the Empire. When then the Catholic Kings decreed the wholesale expulsion of the Jews and the people did not know where to go and they became scattered, some landing on the shores of Italy, some reaching Holland, and others creeping in here in disguise, everywhere merely tolerated, it is then that Bayazet, the great Turkish Sultan hearing of this act of cruelty gave orders everywhere that the gates of the Empire should be opened wide, for he said those famous words 'Spain's loss is our gain, Oh! The folly of the Nazarene.' And then the broad stream of immigrants flowed into the Turkish Empire. They settled in large numbers in Salonika. They overflowed into Constantinople and they went and settled throughout the entire Turkish Empire, as far north as Bukovina and Galicia, Hungary and Transylvania included, and as far as the Turkish Empire stretched. They reached as far east as Aleppo and Bagdad. They went down to Egypt in boats, and even into Asia as far as Bokhara and numbers have probably reached the borders of Afghanistan.

"It must be remembered that at that time Turkey was the dread power, which ruled all the lands between the Black Sea and Vienna. Everywhere Jews found shelter and protection where the banner

of Turkey floated and the Pashas with the three horsetails held sway. Not from among the Jews were the Janissaries recruited. They were allowed not only to worship their God in peace and freedom, they were allowed to settle under their own administration and they were given the same privileges as were granted to the representatives of the various Christian faiths, recognised and tolerated by Turkey, notably the Greeks.

"In order to better understand what I mean, I may say that in the East, nationality and religion are considered as one, and on recognising the religion, the existence of the nationality which professed that religion was by itself included.

"The religious representative became thus, the political representative of these nationalities. He had full power of administration, but he was also responsible for the wellbeing and the good behaviour, and the proper payment of the taxes which were imposed upon these nations. The Jewish Haham Bashi i.e., the Chief Haham or the Chief Rabbi was therefore, and is, the political representative of the Jews, in the same manner and with the same powers as are granted, say to the Greek Patriarch, the representative of the Greeks. Whilst being the representative of the Jews on every question, he is the one who is responsible to the Government, as he is the protector of the Jews in every question that affects their political position. But besides this, the Turkish Government allowed these various nationalities complete internal freedom. They could order their communities as they chose. They could appoint their Rabbis as it pleased them. They could impose their taxes and could fight or compose their quarrels among themselves, and the Jewish Rabbis, or Jewish tribunal, had exactly the same power over the Jews' executive as well as administrative as the Turkish Court of Law. The Jews had to bring their cases before their one tribunal and be judged according to the Jewish code. At no time and under no consideration did the Turks interfere with the funds collected for the establishment of charitable or educational institutions, legacies left in former times were perfectly safe, they were treated like *Etkafi* i.e., *Wakf* or religious endowments. Now, when the Jews came into Salonika, they found there a new Promised Land. They could expand, they could do whatever they liked no one there to hinder or to interfere. It was then at the end of the 15th Century that the first immigrants arrived *en masse* and settled both in Constantinople as well as in Salonika and Adrianople, not to speak of other towns like Janina, and Monastir up to Sarajevo, Belgrade, Bucharest and Jassy. Everywhere they established communities on the basis of the tradition they had brought with them from Spain, and everywhere they formed centres of industry and education... Thus

from every point of view the life of the Jews was an easy one and comparatively speaking a very successful one. They took to every possible branch of trade, commerce, industry, science, and they assimilated more or less with the Turks, being faithful and loyal subjects in every way and contributing to the remarkable commercial development of Turkey which took place in the 16th century..."

"I cannot discuss here at any length the remarkable Messianic movement which has shaken Judaism to its foundation in the middle of the 17th century. Known by the name of Sabbetai Sebi, although he originated in Smyrna the later development took place in Constantinople and Salonika... Salonika which was more or less the birthplace of the new Turkish political movement and which for centuries had been the very centre of Jewish learning in the east became at the same time the very centre and birthplace of this new sect. No sooner had he turned, than some of his followers deluded into the vain belief that it was necessary to pass first through a kind of apostasy before they could reach the Messiah, followed his example and embraced Islam. To this very day the followers of the old Sebi known as Donmah live in Salonika and play an important part in the commercial life of the city, on the other hand they live amongst themselves, marry amongst themselves, keep to their own private customs, although publicly and openly they say they are Turks or Mohammedans. They are very rich and form amongst themselves a kind of Ghetto into which no outsider has yet been allowed to enter... it suffices to show to what remarkable length the religious tolerance and liberty has gone. Though after his death, Sabbetai Sebi was more or less considered as a rebel, nothing happened to his followers whether they had become Mohammedan or whether they continued to live as Jews so long as they did not meddle with politics and did not interfere in the State. The Turks left the Jews to work out their salvation as they understood best..."

"The general standard of Jewish life can best be gauged by a study of the Jews of Salonika... The Jews of Salonika form the vast majority of the inhabitants of the town which is practically a Jewish town; and yet the Jews are often charged that they cannot form an administration, that they can only follow certain trades, that they are too quarrelsome to work with one another and that a Jewish autonomous settlement is therefore an impossible Utopia, Moreover that the Jewish religious life is an impediment, or that the Jews left to themselves would not develop on lines of progress intellectual as well as industrial. In Salonika we find now the Jews living entirely to themselves. There are many nationalities in Salonika but each one in so small a number and with such

distinctive trades allotted to them that there is no clashing of interest on any great scale.

"The Turks are officials, big landowners, small shop-keepers, but not of any commercial importance. The Greeks are the public house-keepers, the grocers, shippers and merchants, The Bulgarians are gardeners, and those who deal with the produce of the land in Salonika. There are no less than 73,000 Jews out of a population of 120,000. Of these 4,000 are merchants who do a large export and import trade; and some are also the factory owners. There are about 5,000 to 6,000 tradesmen and artisans, shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and about 3,000 to 4,000 in the tobacco industry. The majority of lawyers, doctors, teachers and journalists are Jews. But the special feature of Salonika is the Jewish fishermen and the Jewish porter energetic, robust, virile men, of whom the others stand in great awe. They load and unload the ships, and they are such faithful and excellent workmen that many of the big liners will take the Jewish porters or *hamals* from Salonika to Constantinople to unload the ship instead of using the lazy *hamals* of the latter town. There is no trade, high or low, mental or elegant, to which the Jews will not turn their hand and not do excellently..."

"It may be said that more or less the same thing that happens in Salonika, happens all over Turkey. And it has happened, so long as Jews have been under the sway of the Turk.

"Now things have changed, and it is not pleasant to state that things have not changed for the better. Even if the Christian Powers would like to be tolerant in their own interests, the old animosities which have been kept under by the Turks would break out fiercely as soon as that Power has vanished which kept their passions in check, and the more these nations imbibe the so-called modern civilisation and assimilation, the more the feeling of jealousy against the Jews grows. First of all, these nationalities were living on a footing of absolute equality. Now, one wishes to lord over the other and the Jew being the weakest, will become more and more oppressed and reduced to a secondary position. Anti-Semitism creeps in everywhere. It spreads as poison and infection will spread. We have witnessed it in Roumania; signs of it are not wanting in the Balkan Peninsula, and the wires have told us of the outbreaks of Greek fanaticism in Salonika.

"What the future of the Jews will be in these countries it is difficult to forecast. That the time of absolute tolerance has gone, there is no question, and whether constitutional guarantees will be more than mere paper guarantees, may be shown to us perhaps quicker than we anticipate. There can be no doubt, moreover, that the example set by Roumania and the teaching of the West will also create great havoc in the religious life and in the political situation of the Jews in these countries..."

Desmond Fennell

The Staggered End Of Western Civilisation

During the last ninety-odd years, European or Western civilisation has been rejected by three revolutions: the Russian and German Revolutions and the Second American Revolution. In each case the central aim has been to replace European civilisation with a new framework for life. The Russian Revolution accomplished this for seventy-odd years, the German attempt was stopped by military defeat. While the post-European rules system imposed by the Second American Revolution is still shaping life in the West, its days are numbered, its collapse into social chaos is in sight. Before tracing the course of this fatally flawed venture, third in a line, let me clarify a *civilisation, European or Western civilisation, and a revolution.*

A *civilisation* is essentially a grounded hierarchy of values and rules covering all of life and making sense, which a citted community's rulers and

ruled subscribe to over a long period. "Over a long period" (unless a military or natural disaster overwhelms it) because the community is motivated to keep reproducing itself by the sense, and therefore goodness, that it finds in its set of rules, its framework for life. The rules derive hierarchically from the hierarchy of values. This dual hierarchy is 'grounded' in the sense that there are interconnected reasons, understood or intuited by the community, for the presence in it of those values and rules and for their order of ranking. Many of the rules are adjustable or replaceable as the centuries pass and circumstances and mentalities change. The essential rules are those whose continuous acceptance is necessary for the civilisation to remain itself. They form its defining core.

European or western civilisation was constructed in western Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries AD by

Latin, Germanic and Celtic Christians; it later crossed the Atlantic and other seas and lasted into the twentieth century. Among its essential rules were the following:

The West is a Christian community of Christian nations. Its divinity is the Christian God. Whether on religious grounds or for secular motives, national and international law generally subscribes to the Christian principles of interpersonal and international behaviour. Connection with the West's Roman-Greek-Judaic roots is maintained through the educational system and educated public discourse. An educated man knows Latin. Art is work which has a formal crafted beauty. Frugality and chastity are admirable virtues. Reason takes precedence over feeling and desire. Private property is protected by law. Massacre is grievously wrong and strictly forbidden. Sexual relations are legitimate only in the monogamous betrothal and marriage of man and woman. Homosexual relations are unnatural and abhorrent. Abortion is a heinous crime, pornography a degrading evil that must be denied circulation. Adults do not foist sexual awareness on children. A girl who bears a child without a committed father is a disgrace. Human nudity and bodily intimacies are not for public display, but nudity may be represented decorously in art. Men's work and women's work are different. Men have authority and legal preference over women; they accord women social pre-eminence and physical protection. Age has authority over youth.

Such were some of the essential rules which, in combination with others, made sense to the vast majority of our ancestors for nearly a thousand years.

Finally, a *revolution*—as distinct from a mere *coup d'état*. It begins with a group of people who adhere to a new ideology which they believe contains the formula for a morally better and more just life. These people, the revolutionaries, take possession of a nation's central Government and by unconstitutional means increase its power. Using that augmented power, they preach their ideology, establish new rules derived from it, empower those who are likely to support the new rules, and disempower opponents. This process takes at least twenty years, maybe thirty or more years.

Until the first half of the twentieth century there existed a tacit agreement of European nations, at home and overseas, that all political and military action must respect—or after a transgression re-assert—the essential rules of European civilisation. This tacit agree-

ment, applied to revolutions, meant that the new rules which a revolution enduringly established must not breach the essential European framework of rules. In the early twentieth century the Irish Revolution and the Italian Fascist revolution operated within this framework.

But three revolutions, in three large and powerful countries, Russia, Germany and the USA, rejected the rules system of European civilisation. The revolutionaries, finding that European civilisation unjustly obstructed their power to create the good life they envisaged, made a new set of rules—new do's, don'ts and do-as-you-likes combined with some old ones—for the purpose of creating and maintaining the good life they aimed at. After Germany's attempt had been militarily crushed, and while Russia's novel framework was still in place, the third effort to do likewise, the Second American Revolution, was establishing its post-European rules system in its own country and, by proxy, in Western Europe. That rules system is still in force and we in Ireland live under its sway.

"There were whispered arguments between our parents while we watched TV—arguments about changing the rules, we gathered, that applied to all of us, the dads and moms as well as the kids..." (Naomi Wolf in *Promiscuities* (1997) on San Francisco in 1970).

The Second American Revolution was a tacit revolution in the manner—to cite a classic example—of Octavian Caesar's transformation of Rome's Republic into an Empire behind the advertised facade of restoring the Republic. It began after Franklin D. Roosevelt had become President in the same year that Hitler came to power. Having decided that a greatly increased, but unconstitutional, state power was needed to tackle the economic and social ravages of the Great Depression, Roosevelt surrounded himself with left liberals who shared this belief. By making formal use, as did Octavian Caesar, of the existing constitutional procedures, he acquired the radically changed Constitution. that he and the left liberals needed.

Between 1937 and 1946 a Supreme Court packed with sympathisers reversed thirty-two earlier interpretations of the Constitution extending back over a period of 150 years. In 1940, in disregard of American precedent, Roosevelt sought and won the Presidency for a third term. Four years later, while America was at war, he sought and won election for a fourth term and died in office in 1945, the same year in which Hitler died.

The Big State attains its apogee of power

During the 1930s, and with the help of the emergency powers required by the War, the left liberals, calling themselves simply 'liberals', had succeeded in getting their 'Big State' constructed. They had used it mainly for a re-organisation of the economy and of social welfare. The Big State reached its highpoint of power with the manufacture of the atomic bomb, the use of this weapon against two Japanese cities, and the official justification of the enormous resulting massacres.

Massacre was forbidden by western morality and law. When massacres had previously been committed by Westerners, they had been retrospectively condemned by the prevalent public judgment, and the ban on such action vigorously re-asserted. The official American declaration that the Hiroshima and Nagasaki massacres were legitimate had—apart from making the USA the first 'superpower'—four important consequences. By implication it justified, retrospectively, the previous American and British aerial massacres during World War II. It declared indiscriminate massacre to be henceforth an optional element of American warfare. It licensed the American state, and by extension its British and French allies, to construct thousands of weapons of massacre similar to, but more powerful than, those two American bombs. Domestically, it sent a signal to the liberals about the State they had worked to create; namely, that it was likely to approve those elements of their programme which rejected other core rules of western civilisation.

The liberal programme

The liberals' ultimate aim was to use the Big State, the mass media, the universities and science to bring about a perfect human condition. For that purpose, first, there must be an end to the tacit recognition of the Christian religion as America's 'national' religion, and to the consequent role of Christian morality as the chief indicator of behavioural rules. Second, categories of citizens who were legally or otherwise unequal must be raised or lowered to legal equality, so as to create a fraternity of self-determining individuals, equal in law, in their treatment by their fellows, and in opportunity for advancement. Third, all citizens must have access to education and health services and be equipped with buying power. And finally, with due regard to the rights of others, the desires of individuals must be recognised as

rights and realised as far as possible.

Implicit in that programme were Black civil rights and radical feminism; normalisation of homosexuals and of unmarried mothers and their offspring; political and financial empowerment of young people; maximal facilitation of the physically deficient; invalidation of intrinsic personal authority such as that possessed by clergy, men, parents, teachers and the aged; ample social welfare; unshackling of sex and of pornography of all kinds; legalisation of abortion; and a blank cheque for science.

Implicit, therefore, in their programme was a new collection of rules, many of which would replace essential European rules, which were traditional in the USA and which they deemed oppressive or unjust. These new rules, combined with some European rules that seemed useful, would affect, besides laws and behaviour, thought and language.

Culmination of the revolution

The liberals' chance to advance their programme further came in the 1960s and early 70s. when the US Government and manufacturing industry needed to increase consumption, with its dual yield of revenue and profit. The Government required more money to manufacture atomic bombs and missiles for the Cold War, to put a man on the moon, to finance the war in Vietnam, and to pay for a big social welfare programme. In the early 1970s manufacturing industry, with the help of computers and automation, was producing more goods than it could sell. First Government, then also manufacturing industry, perceived in the unfulfilled parts of the liberal agenda the means of increasing consumption and with that the flow of revenue and profit.

From the 1960s the American State began endorsing that agenda selectively through Supreme Court rulings, by legislation, and administratively. Under the liberal President, Lyndon Johnson, the revolution made its great breakthrough. In the *Partisan Review* for Winter 1967, Susan Sontag, high-priestess of the American intelligentsia, set the tone for these historically decisive years with the following ringing phrases:

"If America is the culmination of the Western white civilisation, as everyone from the Left to the Right declares, then there must be something terribly wrong with Western white civilisation... The truth is that Mozart, Pascal, Boolean algebra, Shakespeare, parlia-

mentary government, baroque churches, Newton, the emancipation of women, Kant, Marx, Balanchine ballets, et al., don't redeem what this particular civilisation has wrought upon the world. The white race *is* the cancer of world history."

Vigorous campus campaigns against the values and historical exponents of "*western white civilisation*" continued into the Nixon 70s.

Emergence of the 'liberal Correctorate'

The teachers of the post-western, liberal rules of correct behaviour, thought and language came to function, tacitly, as a sort of secular state church or informal, doctrinally paramount "Party". Henceforth, regardless of which political party was in government, this collective would retain its pre-eminent teaching status.

The emergence of this secular teaching authority brought the USA tacitly into line with the practice in revolutionary Russia and Germany, where the Christian clergy, as the principal public teachers of Europe's essential rules of right and wrong, had been replaced (or in the case of Germany had begun to be replaced) by a supreme Party teaching new rules. For convenience of the narrative this *de facto* new American authority needs a name. And since its role had to do with defining correct thought, speech and behaviour, to call it the '*liberal Correctorate*' seems appropriate.

The formation of this state-liberal system was a case of ambitious political power, and a new ideal vision of the good life, working together towards their distinct objectives. A phenomenon known to history, it operates like this. Rulers who wish to increase their power regardless of the rules, while continuing to rank as virtuous, find substantial common cause with innovative idealists who want society reshaped by new rules that empower people. The rulers increase their power by enacting the idealists' new rules, selectively, to their own advantage, while the idealists celebrate them as enlightened rulers. The idealists end up powerful in a semblance of their envisioned life that has been tailored to suit the rulers' interests. (In this particular instance, the rulers' interests required, both among individuals and as between swathes of the citizen body, an inequality of living conditions, education and political influence as extreme as in Communist Russia, along with a capitalist inequality of financial power.)

The construction of consumerist liberalism

The liberals represented their programme of new values and rules as a means by which people could become enlightened, modern and free. This implicitly elitist appeal won dominance for the new doctrine in the humanities faculties of the universities. As a tacit payback for the support of government and business the liberals preached their programme in tandem with the message that everyone had the right and ability to become rich and to consume at will, and that the rise in material well-being of the 1960s would continue into the future.

The principal preaching space which the innovators acquired was the mass media, including films. Here their pedagogical dominance was dependent on, and shared with, business big and small, inasmuch as the mass media were the principal public space where business, paying taxes to the state, paid to advertise its goods-for-sale. Committed to the liberal programme because its doctrines promised rising profits, the advertisers also felt a kinship with the reformers' zeal to shape and improve lives. Their campaigns, like that of the liberals, amounted to telling people how, for their own good, they should think, act and be; much of it, for example, had to do with personal body care. Thus they *de facto* formed an adjunct to the state-licensed Correctorate.

It was in this context that the left-liberals' programme of social ethics adapted readily to economic neo-liberalism and became in effect consumerist liberalism. The conjunction of all the interests involved made up the state-liberal system, with ethical, economic, technological and political dimensions, which contemporaries called simply 'consumerism'.

It worked this way. The hybrid Correctorate and its supporting legislation issued rulings and exhortations which promoted material and sexual consumption with a good conscience, rather than the previously inculcated virtuous restraint. Advancing military technology, by its offshoots, supplied a never-ending array of new, empowering tools for the consumers to buy. Buying potential and activity were maximised through payments by the state to the poorer citizens, encouragement of all women and teenagers to earn money, incomes constantly rising, goods promotion by television and radio in every home, and the prolongation of active individual life by advances in medicine.

Thus mass consumption, together with the instigation, nourishment and exploitation of it under both forms, material and sexual, constituted the main motor of the economy, society and the state.

Powerful as instigation was the Correctorate's reasoned assurance that all these new ways of thinking and behaving, so much at variance with the old ways, constituted ethical advances, liberations from thralldom, justice finally achieved. All in all, the West's consumerism of the late twentieth century was the culminating realisation of the centuries-old drive by westerners to acquire, collectively and individually, ever greater power, but not just more power, more *ethical* power, in the sense of ability to do more things and bigger things, including things previously illicit, *and be justified*.

Consumerism spreads to Western Europe

In London's *Sunday Times*, 21st October 1962, Maurice Wiggins wrote: "Freedom of speech includes the temporarily unfashionable freedom to express a certain scepticism of liberal shibboleths." "Every little authoritarian these days pays lip-service to liberal ideals..." wrote Judith Pakenham in the London *Spectator*, 18th January 1963. They were speaking of 'liberals', not in the old British Liberal sense, but in that new small-l, American sense which was to become the normal usage in English-speaking countries.

In the 1960s, while the American State's imposition of the new liberalism in the USA was under way, pressure from the USA via London began the imposition of the new state-liberal system in America's West European satellites. (As it happened, the 'Europe' on which it was imposed was a politically united entity that had rejected the Europe of history: a dynamic community of competing nations bound by a common history, culture and religion in the manner of classical Greece.) Ostensibly the purpose of this ideological colonisation was to spread personal liberation by replacing the oppressiveness of European civilisation with enlightened rules of virtuous living. The *realpolitik* aim of the American rulers was to widen the area of maximal money yield and to counter, with a display of "permissiveness" and prosperity, the Communist indoctrination of Eastern Europe.

In each West European state, successively, mass-media sympathisers with American left liberalism introduced

the new rules; a national correctorate took shape; the media as a whole conformed; and the rulers, in varying degrees, gave legal force to the new teachings and placed correctors at key points in the state administration. The ideological takeover included the Brussels bureaucracy of 'united Europe', so as to colour accordingly its flow of directives to the Governments of the member states.

National liberal correctorates and ruling Communist parties

From the late 1960s onwards, in North America and Western Europe, the national liberal correctorates functioned much as the national Communist parties in the Soviet satellites, except in one respect. Whereas the leading doctrinal role of the Communist parties in the "people's democracies" was constitutionally formalised, that of the liberal correctorates was exercised, with the tacit support of State and business, extra-constitutionally, as a matter of fact.

In both instances the doctrinal teaching authority, using the homogenised mass media and the multi-party parliament, defined the set of values and rules within which society in general, and the political parties, Churches and other institutions, were required to operate. But whereas the Communist parties did this by imposed constitutional right, the liberal correctorates did so by using the mass media in two ways concurrently. While giving prominence and honour to 'correct' elements in society, they allocated to dissident institutions, individuals, writings and speeches, treatment ranging from selective presentation to hounding or effective silencing. They thus won sufficient acceptance of liberal values to induce a parliamentary majority to legislate accordingly. The correctorates called their system "pluralism".

In the prevalent discourse in the communist countries the word "socialist" was made to connote "good". In the English-speaking countries the case was similar with "liberal", in the language of citizens who ranked as right-thinking. Conversely, the negative connotation of the ideological terms "right" and "right-wing" in the communist East was reproduced in the prevalent discourse of the liberal West.

Frequently in the 1960s, and to a degree in the 1970s, serious talk of "revolution" had occurred in the political talk and writings of western radicals. Gradually, as a tacit signal that in the

West, as in the East, a definitive revolution had already taken place, that word passed out of politics into commercial advertising, where it served in the promotion of new soap powders and face creams.

The net result, with regard to rules to live by, was that in North America and much of Europe—Ireland centrally included—a collection of non-European rules, combined with some surviving European rules, became the reigning and widely accepted system of do's, don'ts and do-as-you-likes.

"The radical evil—the radical senselessness, with which the world presents itself—must be explored to its core, in order to tackle it with hope of overcoming it. The only adequate response is a continuous, humble, undogmatic search for hierarchies of values."

Claudio Magris,
Dialoghi in Cattedrale (1997)

The new system's intrinsic senselessness

For a post-European rules system to enduringly replace that of European civilisation, it would need to make lasting sense to the great majority of westerners, as the European rules system had for many centuries so evidently done. In other words, it would need to offer a new civilisation. But the production and presentation of civilisation-creating sense is the fruit of creative interaction, employing all the human faculties, between a people's rulers and ruled over a considerable period.

The post-European collection of rules—new ones combined with some old—that by the 1990s had come to hold sway in the West did not and could not make sense to the human collective, white westerners in the first place, on whom it was imposed. Thrown together by a late-European ideological sect and its supporting Governments, to promote justice, virtue, consumption and power, its sponsors had treated overall sense as superfluous.

What white westerners were faced with was a framework for life similar to that which had confronted every so-called 'primitive tribe' after its rules system had been adulterated by colonising Europeans. The resulting hybrid of new and old lacked, *a priori*, two qualities which a set of rules-to-live by must possess to make sense to a human community: namely, a venerated source, divine or human, guaranteeing the rightness of the rules, and a single rational structure pervading all domains

of life from the most abstract to the most particular.

Small wonder, then, that the hybrid framework imposed on such tribes had, in one instance after another, produced a condition of anomie or normlessness, and with that—together with a lot of alcoholism, suicide and prostitution—a sort of creeping despair and the gradual dying-out of the tribe. The fact that among the ethnic groups that made up the contemporary USA, the American "Indians" had the lowest fertility rate illustrated this phenomenon in action.

The hybrid rules system imposed on the white western 'tribe' lacked those two above-mentioned qualities necessary for sense. Clearly without a venerated source, it was also in practice an orderless hotchpotch offensive to reason. And, leaving aside the intrinsic senselessness of the hybrid system, this was independently the case with by far the larger part of it: the left-liberal, evolving into consumerist-liberal, collection of rules.

Chaos of the left-liberal rules system

Assembled piecemeal over several decades and variously grounded, these new rules comprised qualitatively undifferentiated do's and don'ts for parts of life and virtual do-as-you-likes for other parts. Among the do's and don'ts, the latter predominated. They were taught much as if the things *not* to do when driving a car were to be imparted without distinguishing in order of importance between failing to glance regularly at the rear-view mirror, passing on the inside, driving on the wrong side of the road, and starting in second gear; that is to say, in a senseless manner, useless to the would-be driver.

Take a random array of don'ts as taught and administered by the Correctorate. No intelligible ranking of incorrectness was indicated as between don't kill civilians unless collaterally in righteous wars, don't be fat, or think or speak badly of Jews, or urge that a law should reflect Christian morality; don't be smelly, or invade another country without the authority of the United Nations, or smoke in an enclosed public space, or think or say that homosexuality is a perversion or "deny the Holocaust"; don't torture prisoners, pollute a river, treat women as sex-objects, ban pornography that does this, or prevent women aborting offspring; don't restrict what adults think, say or write or, if a man, hit your wife or children, or pat a female

colleague's bottom in the office.

Leave aside the contradictions in that sample. Because the consumers did not have available a grounded exposition by the Correctorate of which of these incorrectnesses was gravely, less gravely or only somewhat incorrect, they had perforce to try to gauge this from the Correctorate's reactions or non-reactions to incorrectnesses as they occurred. And the teaching thus delivered was bafflingly dual. On the one hand, it was to the effect that all behaviours, thoughts or language forbidden by the Correctorate were, for a variety of variously grounded reasons, very grave. On the other hand, the same teaching indicated—read the contemporary newspapers—that the gravity of many incorrectnesses was greater, lesser or cancelled, depending on who committed them or why; or if there were victims, on which nation, creed, party or sex they belonged to.

Inevitably, the conclusion drawn by the consumers was that all the Correctorate's don't rules were of more or less equal importance, and were in practice not really rules. Thus the liberal system lacked a third quality necessary for a people's set of rules to make sense: namely, consistent application, reflected in corresponding condemnations and punishments for breaches.

The do's and do-as-you-likes

Much the same would appear if we were to look at a bunch of the consumerist-liberal do's. In passing, for the plight of young mothers was special, note the particular array of unranked obligations that fell on them if their behaviour was to be correct. Widely broadcast do's of equal imperativeness exhorted them to meticulous body care, paid employment, personal assertiveness, vigilant child-rearing in person or by delegation, diligent participation in the consumerist good life, and successfully orgasmic sexual intercourse.

Intensifying the normlessness were the many virtual do-as-you-likes which operated alongside the do's and don'ts. They were 'virtual' in the sense that the positive rules they contained were so minimal as to leave caprice or desire substantially in command. In the Correctorate's teaching, virtual do-as-you-likes operated for art in all its forms, for official killing in righteous wars, for borrowing and lending practices by banks, as for dress, dancing, social manners, modes of personal address, utterances about Christians, freedom-fighters, or other non-protected cate-

gories, and for relations with the supernatural on condition that these did not impinge on the body politic. A special do-as-you-like applied, in defiance of international law, to the behaviour of the state of Israel.

The new rules and human reproduction

In a fourth and decisive way the new set of rules offended against sense. Innate in human beings as in other animals is an overriding imperative to reproduce the species or in its lieu a representative group. Consequently, in a framework for living presented to a human community, the fundamental element in determining whether it makes sense to it or not is the cluster of rules relating to reproduction: that is, to the conception and birth of children and the raising of them to adulthood by their father and mother. If that cluster of rules seems unfavourable to reproduction, then, *a priori* the entire framework fails the test of sense. The liberal element in the hybrid rules system was not only unfavourable to reproduction: it communicated disregard for it.

Invariably, the basic rules in this zone of behaviour are those which apply to the use of the reproductive organs. The Correctorate's new rules ran as follows: provided that minors and adults used their reproductive organs separately, that if more than one user was involved there was mutual consent, and that a contraceptive was employed unless conception was intended, do as you like in private or, in public, to gratify a paying audience.

These basic rules sufficed of themselves to signal that the liberal rules system did not respect the collective instinct to reproduction. But the ideological outgrowths from rule changes made the disheartening message clearer still. Out of the simple decriminalisation of homosexuality had grown an aggressive celebration of it; out of the decriminalisation of abortion, an imperious assertion that its legal availability was a necessary characteristic of a good society and that it was a good thing if a woman chose it; out of the opening to women of careers previously closed to them, had grown public celebration of any kind of female achievement or public service except that of good motherhood; and out of the ending of legal preferment and privileges for men had issued a downgrading of fathers. Add that the ending of social disapproval of sexual intercourse outside marriage had metamorphosed into the ubiquitous representation of sexual intercourse as primarily a recreational activity. Small wonder, then, that only in the aftermath of the

greatest wars of the past did so many households consist of a mother living alone with young children.

Direct reactions to the pain of senselessness

For this combination of reasons, white westerners, partly consciously, mainly subconsciously, experienced the West's new rules system as senseless. For the most part, they experienced it as senselessness unreflectively, in that depth of their being where countless generations of human beings before them had trained them by heredity to assess—in a combined act of reason, feeling and intuition—any presentation purporting to be a framework for life. And that encounter, when their minds and hearts were seeking sense, sent distress pressing into their consciousness.

To be precise, white westerners found that consciousness of the rules-to-live-by that were presented to them was accompanied by a pain of soul; a feeling of offence that sense in life was not being provided to them by their society. Nothing more natural, then, than that they should want, as individuals, to annul that pain and, collectively, feel little desire to reproduce that white western life.

Sensitive young people, on the threshold of life, are particularly attentive to the framework of rules presented to them. Little wonder then that many of them practised various methods of annulling the pain. Some, mainly females, did so by superficial self-injury, in an effort to manage the pain by transferring it from soul to body. More commonly, male and female, they sought the desired annulment, recurrently, through a temporary or partial annihilation of consciousness. Recurrently, they did this through binge-drinking or drugs or reckless sex, through motorised speed or shrieking self-immersion in celebrity pop concerts or hours-long disco dancing; or, ubiquitously, by means of personal stereos or mobile phones feeding distraction, suspending reflection. Or else, as we know well in Ireland, they increasingly opted for annihilating consciousness permanently; if female, often irresolutely and unsuccessfully, if male, usually with full resolution and success.

Monthly, from Afghanistan, Columbia, Mexico and other producing countries, tons of mood-altering and hallucinating drugs arrived to dull the West's pain. Used by some young people, but mainly by their more affluent elders—they were illegal and therefore dear to buy—these, along with alcohol and self-immersion for long periods in

mind-numbing work, served when an acquired ability to ignore the pain proved insufficient.

To these manifold efforts of self-help were added two phenomena characteristic of the age: an unprecedented profusion of professionals of various ilk offering to cure or alleviate psychic distress, and massive production by the pharmaceutical industry of medicaments with a similar purpose. Those were the years in the history of Europe when women stopped singing as they went about their housework, and boys stopped whistling in the street.

Protracted collective suicide

As in the case of the colonised "primitive tribe", when any human collective encounters in its collective life a famine of sense, motivation to reproduce that life flags. What seems, rather, to make sense is a protracted collective suicide. Significantly, by the early 2000s, among the ethnic groups in the USA, white people had, after the American "Indians", the lowest fertility rate. For the European Union that rate had fallen to 1.5, well below the 2.1 children per woman needed for maintenance of the population. Several of the larger European countries were expecting sharp declines in population in the next twenty-five years.

The demographic situation of the white West repeated that of Russia in the latter decades of the Soviet Union. There, the similarly utopian rule-changing under Communism had produced rampant vodka addiction with a steep lowering of Russian male life expectancy, Russians noted with dismay an increasing fall in their fertility rate in contrast to that of the Union's Asian republics. In the foreseeable future they would be a minority in the Union.

Ersatz sense eases the hunger pain

The consumerist-liberal system included an effective means of countering, if not the famine of sense, then the conscious impact of the hunger pain. As a result, most westerners most of the time managed to suppress consciousness of it. On top of the training they had inherited from the generations before them in assessing for sense the life presented to them, another skin-deep training was now superimposed. From tender years onwards, the consumerist economy, and the Correctorate's teaching, conditioned them to accept an *ersatz* sense in place of the real sense they craved for.

This substitute sense was provided,

fundamentally, by the *continuously increasing power to buy things and to do things* which the consumerist economy supplied to individual consumers as well as to states and business firms. The persuasive force of this increasing power to buy and do was actualised for the consumers in two interlocked ways. Repeatedly it enabled them to acquire more, bigger or costlier things, and these included the powers of new tools that enabled them to do more things than they previously could. Among the many secondary powers thus conferred on consumers were the ability to pause a television programme while answering the phone, to use cellular phones for many things besides phoning, to fly through the air to a holiday resort, and to live lives increasingly longer than those of their ancestors.

While such benefits, in the eyes of most people, gave material sense to the life on offer, a central message of the Correctorate's teaching furnished it, for some, with moral sense. This message, constantly repeated, told them that those who thought and lived in accordance with the Correctorate's rules lived a freer, more just and kinder life than the western generations that had preceded them and than all the other peoples that had inhabited, or that now inhabited, the planet.

The net result was that most consumers, most of the time, believed in the surface of their minds that this current life of westerners was a pretty good life. "Stress", everyone recognised, stress of body and soul, regularly accompanied the living of it. But stress with recurrent depression, most westerners resignedly accepted, was an inevitable condition of living a life which despite all—despite even its moments of clear, shocking vision—was a pretty good life.

As the new millennium arrived

As the new millennium arrived, that was the situation. For as long as the power to buy and do of Governments, corporations and consumers kept increasing, and the teaching that this new western life was morally the best life ever, continued to have force for some, the West's post-European system would continue to function. Dating its launch from that first, momentous rule change of 1945, it still had some years to go before it would match the life span of its more conservatively post-European Soviet counterpart. That the American system could last as long as did its former antagonist seemed possible. That it could endure much longer was excluded by

the extreme fragility of its life-support mechanism.

Inevitably, within a matter of years, there would be an end to the continuous increase of the power to buy and do, and with that the main source of the system's *ersatz* sense and social glue would vanish. *Ipsa facto*, its vaunted moral superiority would become an irrelevant twaddle. Nothing would then remain to prevent the direct and continuous impact of its senselessness on the consciousness of westerners, nor to make the system's senseless and unloved life framework seem a good life. Bereft of its life-support mechanism, the chaos of its values and rules would translate into violent social disintegration.

Addendum seventy years from now

What was inevitable happened. With that, the final episode in the staggered and war-filled end of European civilisation concluded. That end had begun with the rejection and replacement of European civilisation by the Russian Revolution driven by a West European vision. The fact that this operation was soon followed by the Nazi German and American left-liberal rejections, and that the latter was democratically supported by millions of people on both sides of the Atlantic, indicated a shared conviction among many twentieth-century Europeans, in Europe and overseas.

It was a conviction that the civilisation which their ancestors had created, and which had enabled them to lead and dominate the world, had exhausted its usefulness and required replacement. (As it happened, the fact that the third and last attempted replacement coincided with a steep decline of Europe's importance in the world suggested that its first choice of a system of values and rules to live by had been, pragmatically speaking a wise choice.)

The two attempted replacements, Russian and American, which lasted through several generations failed because neither of them provided the only adequate substitute: a new civilisation, such as we see emerging around us now. Instead, they offered, grafted onto some remnants of European civilisation, utopian constructions fashioned by the pursuit of perfect justice and unlimited power, which the peoples, being made up of human beings, experienced subconsciously as senseless. So it was that, in the historical succession of great civilisations, Europe's followed Rome's and ended.

Stephen Richards

A Gospel Journey

On the principle that it's better to do something than nothing I thought that, at the eleventh hour before *Church & State* goes to press, I would get in with a bit of metaphysical moralising. Nothing sophisticated you understand, not too much topspin; and from where I sit it's not even metaphysical at all. So I'm going to say some things in my own simple way, putting the stylistic flourishes to the one side as I've so little time. And even the time I might have is stolen from me by other family members who won't let me get near our swanky new Apple computer, which is still 99 per cent mystery to me, in terms of its operations.

And isn't that just like reality? Most of reality, as defined by what is "out there", we don't know or understand, and there's quite a lot of it that we're incapable of understanding. It's puzzling to me why it's often assumed that we should. We have no reason for believing that our minds are congruent with the external world; the mystery is that we have gathered any true knowledge at all. Similarly, why should we expect the world to appeal to our sense of beauty? Given that there is such a thing as the beauty of the world, we still have no way of knowing that others experience a sunset in the same way we do. There's some evidence indeed that they don't, from Turner and the Impressionists, and from Homer who seemed to have a very basic sense of colour; whereas there are others who don't really notice the sunset at all.

Natural Good Taste

And, as for taste and smell, the argument may be that evolution has taught us to like what we have to eat, otherwise we wouldn't eat it and would die off. But did evolution have to make our taste buds just quite so subtle? Couldn't we have made do with a basic, filling kind of stodgy food? Irish people over countless millennia had to make do with a potato-free diet, and there was no reason for evolution to prepare us for the potato. But the potato came. It started in America as Gordon Brown would say, and we fell for it, fatally indeed. Not

only did evolution have to prepare us for the food, it had to prepare the food for us, so to speak. While with one part of its brain evolution was developing these bipeds with such a range of gastronomic interests, with the other part it was preparing strawberries, fish, oats, and all my favourite things.

I suppose what I'm talking about is what is called in shorthand the anthropic principle in nature. What should any of it be about us and yet so much is? So we get fooled into thinking it's all about us and that we therefore have a divine right, no, just some kind of human right, to understand it all. And some day we will, says Richard Dawkins, in one of the most breathtaking faith-based assertions ever made. There's us, some kind of highly improbable accident, and there's the whole big universe. What could be more natural than that we should winkle out its secrets?

It's All About Me

There's another thing that troubles me, and as I get older I think about it a lot. It's a Bishop Berkeley kind of thought. When I'm dead and gone the universe in a sense will cease to exist. All my knowledge of it, even my knowledge of its existence or my own, is filtered through my own consciousness. So when I'm gone it might as well not exist. When I put it like that I'm being subjective in the extreme, even megalomaniac; a sort of ancient Pharaoh, 2012 style. As a Christian believer I'm confident with one part of my mind that I have a future after death ("my heart will go on!"), but it's not easy to shake off at times a sense of impending total oblivion. If a man dies, will he live again? That's the great question posed by Scripture.

But leaving aside Scripture for the moment, and thinking just about our knowledge of reality, we'll all have to lay down whatever knowledge we've gained, whether first-hand or second-hand knowledge, plus of course the knowledge of people and the intuitive knowledge we've gathered up in the course of our fretful lives. That idea of a body of knowledge residing in a culture

or civilisation is in a sense a highly metaphysical idea. The knowledge exists, but not in any place, and we don't all understand the same things by it.

That's not all. Even the things we think we know we don't know as well as we think we do. There are surprising twists and turns in our relationships with other people, even those we've been close to over a long period of time, leaving us to wonder if we've known or understood these people at all. So we can end up playing blind man's buff all our lives in our relationships.

Hard Science

If we strike out along the supposedly rock-solid path of scientific observation (not that I have, very far) we can see it very quickly turn into a quaking bog, with the odd will o' the wisp floating around. I'm not talking about pseudo-sciences like Psychology and Economics but the really hard technical areas which like every other field of study are a battleground, and then eventually an elephant's graveyard, of competing theories. Think of phrenology in the seventeenth century, the authoritative theories of racial groupings (Celts, Teutons etc.) which were all the fashion a hundred years ago, and the scientific underpinning of climate change theories today, which is crumbling away before our eyes. As late as the 1950s the "*solid state*" theory in cosmology (that the universe never had a beginning as we would understand it) was dominant, with its opponents the objects of derision for holding to what was contemptuously called "*the big bang*", which is the term describing the present orthodoxy.

Poets And PhDs

Of course when we move into the world of literary study, well, literature is all just "*lies of poets*", constructed for our diversion in this tough old world. But it does give rise to all kinds of cottage industries for academics. First there's the business of working out what the purest text is, which is more of a problem with older manuscripts; then what the text actually means on its own terms, which is exegesis. After that comes the whole grand business of explaining to the rest of us what the author is trying to say—is that hermeneutics?—and how well he or she has succeeded. Somewhere in this Byzantine process the literary academic may engage in a bit of "higher criticism" (as opposed to "lower" criticism which is really about textual emendation). This is the arbitrary

process by which certain portions of the text are assigned to particular sources, based on stylistic and linguistic patterns in the text. These sources may be hundreds of years apart, and linked together by the work of skilful editors, who have also carried out redactions or deletions to exclude dissonant elements, so we have yet another pseudo-science called redaction criticism. It may sound from the name as if these critics have come straight from the large hadron collider, but it's all more or less inspired guesswork which has funded Ph.Ds and whole careers.

The point is that if you're a post-graduate student in fields where there are a lot of old manuscripts you have to have something original to say. In the 1930s there were Italian scholars, probably influenced by the the German higher critics in Old Testament, who applied the same techniques to the Justinianic corpus of Roman law, and were seeing later interpolations right left and centre. As a result we couldn't really be sure what the classical Roman jurists had really said. But it was only a fashion, and the current orthodoxy is to accept that that Justinian was pretty faithfully representing the work of the earlier writers. I think there's also a reaction against the earlier tendency to claim that lots of different people had a hand in the Homeric epics.

Fools' Gold

So all this knowledge is slipping through our fingers. You can spend your whole life developing a thesis that is demolished overnight by some new discovery from out of left field.

Our knowledge isn't complete, indeed is ludicrously incomplete; it's very subjective; and we can't be sure that it's true knowledge. Maybe that doesn't matter very much in this post-modern world where we're all meant to be constructing our own narratives. But it's enough to give us pause; and I haven't even got on to the Cartesian problem about how we can verify our own existence and the existence of the world we live in.

The upshot of all this is that philosophy is in an epistemological swamp. The philosophers can't get off the starting blocks to begin studying their subject. Every time they try to begin they end up further back on the preparatory road, as in *Tristram Shandy*. Moral philosophy too is up against the problem of trying to provide some coherent basis for advocating some course of action as

being more ethical than another. You really have to assume some first principles if you're going to get on.

Canine Philosophy

For my own part I don't think there's any point in turning ourselves inside out over Descartes. As the politicians say, we are where we are. My view is that we're a lot like dogs. We have a real but limited knowledge of the world. The things that men and women obsess about are (it's been said) money, sex and power (or status), just as dogs obsess about smells, cats and squirrels. Of course we're interested in other things, music, the arts and so on, and we have a conscience that nags at us in the most irritating ways. Dogs know about some other things too, like the importance of obedience to commands, but once a rabbit or squirrel appears then the basic doggy nature takes over. So, these things that drive us mad are real things, but we just don't know if they're the most important real things for our wellbeing; and we get disturbing glimpses from time to time of a beauty in the world that's just out of our reach, and of terrors too.

Damned Statistics

This is a long preamble to the assertion that, without natural law and revelation, we're like the babes in the wood. Bad babies too, or lost sheep always going astray. What made me think about this lately was the newspaper reports of a survey to the effect that the levels of crime are much lower in societies where there was a lively belief in the doctrine of Hell. Conversely, crime levels were significantly higher where the prevailing beliefs are about heaven and forgiveness. These were strange results because I would have thought that these beliefs weren't mutually exclusive; and indeed that the real division would be between those who believed in all those phenomena and those who didn't believe in any of it at all. And how do we explain the orderly, law-abiding instincts of the Germans and Scandinavians, where Hell is only a vestigial folk memory? I think the statistics would probably bear out the claim that rates of serious crime are much higher in God-fearing Mississippi than in liberal secular Vermont.

It's also unsatisfactory to think of the threat of hellfire being held over people as a means of social control. Hell could be seen as having a certain social utility. Clever sophisticated people don't

need to believe in it, but it does keep the *hoi polloi* in check. One could equally argue that if you were to think about it long enough the Christian teaching on Hell would drive you mad, so it's best avoided. Theological arguments based on social utility are both patronising and wrong-headed.

But still, it seems to me that there may be some truth in the survey. In 1995 a lecture was delivered at the Evangelical Library in London entitled *Why the English stopped going to Church*. The lecturer, Michael Watts, had come to his subject on the assumption that the reason for the decline was rooted in the impact of Darwinism from 1860 or so onwards. But he was forced towards the surprising conclusion that the real reason was the almost unspoken decision within the Anglican Establishment and among the Nonconformists to soft-pedal and then to phase out altogether the scriptural teaching on Hell. The preaching of the Pauline, Augustinian, Calvinistic equation of sin, death and Hell wasn't going to turn the hearers into Christians but the bad news was the necessary backdrop for the good news. And in the interim it would instil a certain caution about how one should behave. If there's nothing to be worried about, why bother?

Fears And Tears

A sentimental belief in heaven did seem to survive for a while longer, but it was a hazy notion, and the advice as to how to get there was even hazier. I think that what happened was that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was quietly shelved, and in its place the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was adapted from Greek philosophy. The strongest contemporary example of this was the famous New England transcendentalism, as propounded by Ralph Waldo Emerson and others. But it at least made no claim to Christian orthodoxy.

Sometimes the impression is given that Hell is a peculiarly Protestant place, which played little or no part in forming the Catholic psyche. That may be the position post Vatican II, but historically speaking it's nonsense. Paul Johnson has written about some of the visiting preachers at Stonyhurst in the 1940s. From his account their sermons were every bit as terrifying as those of Jonathan Edwards in Massachusetts two centuries before. The boys were trembling in their seats.

Indeed the monotheistic religions all

have some sort of teaching about Hell. The ancient Greeks did too, with their stories about Tantalus, Sisyphus, and so on. And even our society that has rejected Hell out of hand has created plenty of mini hells over the past century. One only has to consider the mass bombing of cities, the rise of pornography and paedophilia, and the horror movies that have polluted our imaginations.

Back to Paul Johnson, this is how he talks about life in the Potteries around Stoke-on-Trent in the 1930s, in words that are echoed in many other reminiscences:

"It amazes me now, looking back, how free my life as a small boy was, how little I was supervised and how confident my parents were that I would come to no harm. Children today, by comparison, are prisoners of the evil which walks in the world. I was never molested. Nor did I know, or hear of, any child who was. Crime played no part in our lives. No door was ever locked except when we went on holiday. I never was told of any theft. If you dropped something in the street the person who found it would go to considerable lengths to find out where you lived and return it. Poverty was everywhere but so were the Ten Commandments. God saw everything you did, or did not do. All stories, books, plays, films, comics—I am tempted to add newspaper articles—had a moral purpose, implicit or open. No child I knew would have dreamed of trying to shoplift, let alone boast about it, as children now are said to do. The punishment would have been draconian, moral as well as physical, and affecting all the family. The prison population was only about five per cent of what it is now. If anyone had been to prison his family took desperate measures to keep it quiet. My mother spoke of such things in whispers, as though they occurred in a distant land" (from *The Vanished Landscape*, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 2004)

The Irish Experience

I don't think the situation was any different in Ireland, Slieve Luacra apart. In Irish Catholic society there was a deep underlying fear of stepping out of line with the Church, as the Church was the Noah's Ark that would prevent you from being finally submerged beneath the flood of God's judgment. As late as the 1970s, before the full impact of Vatican II hit home, Catholic attendance at Mass was nearly 100% in country districts, and about 80% even in Dublin and other major cities. Now, after years

of a soft gospel, that really is no gospel, attendances are going off the proverbial cliff, and that's only partly to do with the child sex scandals.

The contempt in which the Church is currently held isn't necessarily going to translate immediately into anti-social or criminal behaviour, but social cohesion is fracturing on both sides of the border, and levels of crime in the North (and, presumably, the Republic) are far higher than in the "dark days of the Troubles". I remember how back in the 1980s I could attend my local Petty Sessions Court, deal with a couple of cases and then toddle back to the office well before lunch. I haven't done cases myself for years now, because I know I wouldn't be back before three in the afternoon.

The Concept Of Law

In even earlier days, when I was studying Jurisprudence at University, I was introduced to the English legal positivists, and in particular John Austin, the legal positivist *par excellence*. Long years afterwards came Hans Kelsen, a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany, who ended up I think at UCLA and died just in the mid-1970s. Kelsen has always been associated with the *grundnorm*, the mysterious mechanism by which we escape from the *sein* to the *sollen*. He and the others were all critiqued by H.L.A. Hart, in his famous book-sized argument *The Concept Of Law* published in 1961.

But for me it was hard to improve upon Austin's blessedly simple thesis. You have an authority, a strongman, whom Hart rather dismissively calls Rex, as if he's a sheepdog. This is the power of the State, and it's not to be trifled with. The ruler lays down commands, and attaches a sanction to each. If you disregard or disobey the command you fall foul of the sanction and so you get punished in one way or another, because the ruler doesn't bear the sword in vain. That is the definition of law. The law doesn't have to be subjected to any moral test. It's quite beside the point if the law is unjust or immoral: it's still law. Hart very cleverly punched all kinds of holes in the thesis, but ended up endorsing it in more subtle language. He made some attempt to insert a minimal natural law content into it all, but it was a token move because Hart had nowhere else to go, no external point of criticism.

Roadside Ethics

There is a large core of truth in

Austin. Laws that are merely hortatory don't really work. We will do things because we can, because we think we can get away with them. This is seen most startlingly in the context of road traffic offences. My use of "we" in this context isn't meant to imply any particular tendencies in my readers or in me, but let's just think of speed limit signs. Unless there is some obvious hazard on the road, or pedestrians, cattle or sheep around, we're pretty blasé about the signs. If we're driving along deserted roads doing sixty in a forty, or forty five in a thirty (or the equivalent in metric measurements), we don't feel too bad about it at all. We lose no sleep over our transgression. If there are speed camera signs we might be slightly more circumspect, but still might take a chance if we're late. However, if there's a police car on our tail, or if we see a police speed trap up ahead, we immediately turn into model citizens. Unfortunately, it's only the fear of the penalty that keeps us honest.

Exactly the same logic applies in connection with parking fines. Some libertarians managed to persuade the Town Council in Aberystwyth to conduct an experiment whereby the local motorists would self-regulate their parking without the assistance of traffic wardens. The result was total chaos.

Virtue In Chaos?

Admittedly most people have few moral qualms about speeding and illicit parking. Maybe our conduct will be less cavalier when generally accepted moral codes are involved. Unfortunately most natural disasters as well as giving rise to many acts of individual heroism also present a sad litany of casual looting and violence. This was especially remarked upon in the aftermath of the floods in New Orleans in 2005. The evidence is all too plentiful that, when the machinery of legal enforcement breaks down, something like a Hobbesian state of nature can frequently take its place. Interestingly the evidence from the Japanese earthquake of 2011 was to the contrary, in that the Japanese seem to have come together as one big family, such is the sense of cultural cohesion.

What about us? We might not sell our souls for a 25 inch plasma TV, but if there was a Stradivarius in an unguarded shop window and we knew we could get big money for it, would we succumb? If we knew we could cheat on our spouses with the most desirable of sexual partners and with a guarantee of

immunity from baneful consequences, would we do it? Addiction to internet pornography is a huge problem both inside and outside the Churches. And that's despite the fact that (as I understand it) every computer has a sort of inbuilt recording angel which keeps track of all the sites visited, so be sure your sin will find you out.

Knuckling Down

Instinctively I recoil from this truth. I find it hurtful to my pride and antithetic to my basic philosophy, which is that the State is always and everywhere a bad thing. Unfortunately for me and those like me, the New Testament teaching is that we should basically submit ourselves to the laws of the State where we happen to be. There will be extreme examples, indeed, where we can't conscientiously comply with the law as we'll be in conflict with some fundamental article of our faith or some basic command of the moral law. But it's envisaged that these situations will be few and far between.

There's a common sense aspect to this, in that even an immoral Government is better than no Government at all. And, from a theological angle, human government is one of the mechanisms that God ordains to prevent our behaviour from sinking to the depths we're potentially capable of. As well as this, there is the suggestion that in some sense the authority of the State, whether or not it's based on a Christian worldview, represents some sort of dim reflection of the kingdom of God. This must have been a very powerful idea in Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe. It was argued then in its strongest form, that the State was there as the secular arm of the faith. The examples for this strong form tend to be drawn from the Old Testament history of Israel. The problem is that Israel and the Church aren't the same thing.

Despite all the evidence to the contrary in the Bible, there are those Christians of the Catholic and Protestant variety who denounce the very idea of the wrath of God, the idea that our wickedness stinks to high heaven and cries out for punishment. We've seen that penal sanctions are a vital underpinning of functional societies yet we don't think God will ever apply any sanctions, at least not to us. I'm not sure how these people can invoke the teaching of Jesus, because the best efforts of the higher critics haven't managed to undermine the authenticity of the many

dominical warnings about hell and judgment. That is, if Jesus said anything at all about anything, he undoubtedly said those things. It's been well said that Jesus wouldn't be allowed on *Thought for the Day*: it would just be too risky. If Hell goes out the window so does the rest of the Christian gospel. Without the Christian gospel there is no Christianity, and all the God-talk is just a lot of hooey.

Denial: Not A River In Egypt

As a culture and as individuals we've managed to build walls of denial round ourselves, just as alcoholics do, and chronic gamblers. *"I'm no worse than anybody else. If I'm going to go down I can think of a lot of others that will be in even bigger trouble."* Many of us attend Churches where we're told that we're a fine bunch of guys and gals and all we need is a bit of encouragement to inspire us to be even nicer than we are. I suppose at the bottom of it is our pride, that will admit to mistakes but not to the fact that we're rotten at the core. And we're not prepared to think of ourselves as being accountable to anybody else for our life choices. As well as that, the biblical teaching about Hell is extremely frightening. It can't possibly be true because it doesn't fit with our understanding of ourselves and the world, however much of a subjective, self-serving mishmash that understanding may be.

The New Testament message that there is hope in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus is equally obnoxious to us because we're still legalists at heart. We don't need somebody else to save us. We think that if there is an afterlife we're going to be patted over the head and everything will be fine, because we did our best, we were misunderstood, more sinned against than sinning etc. We want justice not mercy, and that's because we think we're basically good people. It all comes back to Calvin, and the first words of his *Institutes*, that there are only two vital aspects of knowledge: knowledge of God and of ourselves. Our conscience is a very blunt guide, and natural law is very incomplete. We won't get anywhere without news from outside, without revelation. What revelation will we trust?

NEXT ISSUE:

Church & State will carry **Brendan Byrne's** lecture on *Sarah Cecilia Harrison, 1863-1942. Artist And Friend Of The Poor*

Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Issues

A debate took place in Dáil Éireann on 21 June 2012 under the above title. The following are extracts from the contributions by *Pádraig Mac Lochlainn* of Sinn Féin and Independent TD, *Finian McGrath*.

Deputy Pádraig Mac Lochlainn

I also commend Deputy Eoghan Murphy, who is present, for proposing this important debate. Ireland has been at the heart of this issue in the past and can be again if we choose to do so. Ireland has a long and proud record on seeking to prevent nuclear proliferation. In 1958, when Mr. Frank Aiken was Minister for External Affairs, Ireland proposed the first UN resolution which sought to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. In 1961 the UN General Assembly unanimously approved an Irish resolution calling on all states, particularly the nuclear powers, to conclude an international agreement to refrain from transfer or acquisition of nuclear weapons. In 1968, when the non-proliferation treaty, NPT, was open for signature, Ireland was invited to be the first to sign in recognition of the part that Ireland had played in the international efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation.

The NPT has been a success and few people would deny that it has been an effective brake on nuclear proliferation. Today, the NPT has 189 signatories with five of them—China, France, Russia, the UK and the US—as "nuclear weapon" states and the other 184 as "non-nuclear weapon" states. Under Article IX(3) of the treaty, states that exploded a nuclear weapon before 1967 qualify as "nuclear-weapon" states and are allowed to keep their nuclear weapons for now but must disarm eventually. Three states—India, Israel and Pakistan—refused to sign the NPT and secretly developed nuclear weapons. As these states chose to remain outside the NPT, they did not breach any treaty obligations by doing so. In addition, North Korea developed nuclear weapons while a party to the NPT but later withdrew from it.

Today, more than two decades after

the end of the Cold War, there are upwards of 20,000 nuclear warheads in the world, according to the Federation of American Scientists. The vast bulk of these warheads are in the possession of the US and Russia, with approximately 5,000 warheads operational. There is a long way to go to bring about a world free of nuclear weapons, which President Obama talked about in his speech in Prague in April 2009.

Since the end of the Cold War, the US and Russia have significantly reduced their nuclear stockpiles, and so has the UK. However, it cannot be said that these or the other "nuclear-weapon" states have fulfilled their disarmament obligations under Article VI of the treaty. This states, "Each of the parties to the treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." None of the five states that possessed nuclear weapons before 1967 and were therefore allowed to join the NPT as "nuclear-weapon" states has disarmed. All of them have still got nuclear weapons and have continuously modernised their systems. There is no sign whatsoever of any of them giving up their nuclear weapons.

Is this fair to all those states that have signed up to the NPT as "non-nuclear weapon" states and undertaken not to acquire nuclear weapons? The five NPT members that possessed nuclear weapons in 1967 retain them despite their undertaking to engage in "nuclear disarmament".

In addition, the NPT is not universal. The three states of India, Israel and Pakistan have engaged in nuclear proliferation on a grand scale outside the NPT but they have not been subject to the kind of sanctions now being applied to Iran, which has no nuclear weapons. It is true that all three states used to be in the international nuclear dog house in the sense that they were unable to purchase nuclear material and equipment from the rest of the world, which made it difficult for them to expand their civil nuclear programmes. In July 2005, the

Bush Administration signed the US-India nuclear agreement, an initiative which has led to India being taken out of the dog house; it is now free to engage in international nuclear commerce while retaining and developing its nuclear weapons. India has, in effect, become the world's sixth officially recognised nuclear power.

As a member of the nuclear suppliers group, NSG, of states, Ireland played a small part in India's elevation. On 6 September 2008, it consented to the amendment of the NSG guidelines to make an exception for India and allow that country alone to import nuclear material and equipment without all its nuclear facilities being subject to International Atomic Energy Agency inspection. The NSG operates by consensus and theoretically Ireland could have prevented such an extraordinary anomaly being introduced into its guidelines but it did not. Ironically, the NSG came into being in 1974 as a result of India developing and testing a nuclear device using plutonium from a reactor imported from Canada for civil purposes.

The UK is currently upgrading its nuclear weapons and the Trident submarines to deliver them. The new system is planned to provide the UK with an operational nuclear weapons capability until 2050 and beyond. It is instructive to consider the arguments that have been made to justify the vast expenditure involved. A White Paper published by the Labour Government in December 2006 asserted that the UK must have nuclear weapons "to deter and prevent nuclear blackmail and acts of aggression against our vital interests that cannot be countered by other means". Last Monday, the UK Minister responsible for defence, Conservative MP Philip Hammond, told the House of Commons that "The possession of a strategic nuclear deterrent has ensured this country's safety. It ensured that we saw off the threat in the Cold War and it will ensure our security in the future." On the same occasion, Labour MP Ms Alison Seabek echoed Hammond, stating "In a security landscape of few guarantees, our independent nuclear deterrent provides us with the ultimate insurance policy, strengthens our national security and increases our ability to achieve long-term global security aims."

I quote these arguments to show that it is very unlikely that Britain will ever give up its nuclear weapons, as it is supposed to do according to Article VI

of the NPT. The arguments used are relevant not just for today but arguably for all time. British politicians will always be able to justify the continued possession of nuclear weapons "to deter and prevent nuclear blackmail and acts of aggression against vital interests that cannot be countered by other means", and the same applies to every other nuclear weapons state.

In one sense, nuclear weapons are "the ultimate insurance policy"; states that possess these are less likely to get attacked, at least by other states. We can consider what has happened to the three states that President Bush declared to "constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world" in his 2002 state of the union address. Iraq, which did not possess nuclear weapons, was invaded by the US and the UK in March 2003 and its regime was overthrown. Iran, which does not possess nuclear weapons, is continuously threatened with military action by the US and Israel and may yet be attacked. However, the US has not threatened to use force against North Korea because it has at least a rudimentary nuclear weapons system.

When North Korea exploded a nuclear device in May 2009, after initial condemnation the country was invited to take part in further negotiations. There is an important lesson there for states that do not possess nuclear weapons; if they want to be free from "the threat or use of force", which is supposed to be prohibited by Article 2.4 of the UN Charter, if at all possible, they should get at least a rudimentary nuclear weapons system.

I recommend to the Tánaiste that he read the pamphlet issued by the Peace and Neutrality Alliance, led by Mr. Roger Cole, a member of the Labour Party. It was drawn up by Dr. David Morrison, a respected and eminent expert in the field, and offers some balanced comments on the situation in Iran and the Middle East. It points out that the United States and its allies which claim they want to see the Middle East free from nuclear weapons are applying ferocious economic sanctions and threatening military action against Iran which has not got a single nuclear weapon and its nuclear facilities are open to IAEA inspections. However, they are utterly opposed to applying sanctions to Israel, despite its possession of perhaps as many as 400 nuclear warheads and its the ability to deliver them by aircraft, ballistic missile and submarine-launched

cruise missiles and wipe off the map any capital in the Middle East and probably much further afield and its nuclear facilities are almost entirely closed to the IAEA. Far from sanctioning Israel, the United States gives it over \$3 billion a year in military aid and, despite an enormous budget deficit, the amount has increased every year under the Obama Administration, as the President was at pains to emphasise in his speech to AIPAC on 4 March. More US tax dollars go to Israel than to any other state.

A double standard is being applied to Iran and Israel in this regard. The United States and its allies frequently state that if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, this will inevitably lead to the widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons the Middle East. That, they state, is one of the reasons Iran must not be allowed to acquire them. It is rarely mentioned that, because of Israel's acquisition of nuclear weapons, Iran and other states in the region would be within their rights to withdraw from the NPT and develop nuclear weapons as Israel which never signed the NPT has done without breaching international obligations. ...

The difficulty with the NPT is that while it has had a considerable impact in preventing the further proliferation of these weapons of mass destruction that pose an existential threat to the world, unbelievable double standards are at play. The five NPT states that have nuclear weapons and are permitted to keep them—the permanent members of the UN Security Council—can prevent a real removal of these weapons. As they hold a veto on the UN Security Council, there cannot be a UN Security Council resolution. While these double standards are in place, it undermines our moral credibility when trying to engage with states we are trying to persuade not to develop nuclear weapons.

We were leaders in this process when it started and have a great deal of credibility in the field. We still have neutral status, even though the use of Shannon Airport has undermined this. We are respected by the various players, particularly now, and could make an intervention to assist the process with Iran. We are respected by the United States and in Europe as honest brokers. I would volunteer that we are also respected by Iran as honest brokers. Could we not assist the process to reach its conclusion? These are the opportunities and the Government has stated it would like to reinstate Ireland's global

reputation. We have a great reputation in the defence of human rights, in this field and overseas development. We must reassert ourselves in these spaces and use the credibility and legacy we enjoy to address these issues.

Deputy Finian McGrath

I mention the misinformation in recent weeks on the topical issue of Iran's nuclear activities. The United States, its European allies and even Israel generally agree on three things about Iran's nuclear programme: Teheran does not have a bomb, it has not decided to build one and it is probably years from having a deliverable nuclear warhead. From my point of view, Iran has no nuclear weapons. I met the Iranian ambassador recently and received a commitment from him on that issue. Iran has no nuclear weapons programme. The supreme leader of Iran, whether we agree or disagree with him or like his politics, said that as far as he was concerned, the possession of weapons was a grave sin. The November 2011 report of the IAEA did not claim Iran had a nuclear weapons programme. Iran is not in breach of any obligation under the NPT. Uranium enrichment is Iran's inalienable right under the NPT. The United States and its allies are trying to deny Iran its right to uranium enrichment under the treaty. These are the facts. Iran's nuclear facilities are open to regular inspection but Israel's are not. That seems to be the elephant in the room and the silence in Europe is deafening.

A double standard is being applied in regard to the possession of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. Iran which has none is the subject of ferocious economic sanctions and the threats of military action. Sadly, the Government seems to be silent on this issue. Israel which has as many as 400 weapons and the ability to deliver them to any capital in the Middle East is the beneficiary of more than \$3 billion in military aid. How many houses and schools could be provided and how many homeless people and Palestinians could be helped with this money? That is the question we must raise. The United States, Israel and others which are threatening military action against Iran are in breach of Article 2.4 of the UN charter which requires all UN member states to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. This is something we should highlight.



Fr. Sean McManus

"So there you have it. In Britain the government tried to have me silenced. In America, the Dublin government tried to have me silenced.

"But here's the rub, the moral, if you wish, of the story; the Irish Embassy and Consulates only really escalated their attacks on me after the Irish National Caucus formally adopted non-violence and wrote it into our constitution. Instead of welcoming this development, the Embassy and Consulates were frightened by it. Why?" (*My American Struggle For Justice In Northern Ireland*, Sean McManus, p.125).

"Then I realised that Sean Donlon, Irish Ambassador to Washington (1978-1981) was seated next to the bishop. I knew he was hostile to me, but I did the well-mannered thing, held out my hand and said: 'Happy St. Patrick's Day, Mr. Ambassador'. With the entire reviewing stand looking on, Donlon burrowed himself deeper in his chair and refused to shake my hand. I kept my hand extended for a long while, until everyone could plainly see what was happening." (*ibid*, p.141).

"Donlon was the first person who ever refused to shake my hand. The second and only other person ever to do so, was Donlon's master, Garret FitzGerald." (This was in August, 1979 at the Corrymeela Reconciliation Centre on the north Antrim coast.)

"When I entered the room... I noticed FitzGerald was still sitting down with his eyes resolutely fixed on the floor. 'This is going to be interesting', I thought, suspecting what was going to happen. I pleasantly shook the hands of all the polite Ulster folk, as I approached FitzGerald. When in front of him, I held out my hand and said, 'I enjoyed your lecture, Dr. FitzGerald'. Like a clocking hen he fluttered in his seat. I kept my hand extended, it seemed forever. He finally hissed, 'Please go away, you are creating a disturbance.'... I finally moved on to shake the hand of Glenn Barr. {Ulster Defence Association} 'With a smile I expansively said,

'Maybe you guys are right, after all Glenn, that there are two nations in Ireland.'"

Sean McManus was born in the village of Kinawley, Co. Fermanagh, the tenth in a family of 12 children. He is a brother of Frank McManus, former MP, and Patrick McManus, an IRA Volunteer killed in an explosion in 1958. In 1971, McManus, a Redemptorist priest then based in Scotland, was arrested in the Six Counties during an anti-Internment demonstration. His superiors sent him to the United States in 1972, where he founded the Irish National Caucus in 1974, a Washington DC-based, Irish-American lobby group. He was opposed not only by the London and Dublin Governments but also by elements of the Republican Movement.

Sean McManus points out that over 600 people work in the British Embassy in Washington.

His book *My American Struggle For Justice In Northern Ireland* was published in 2011 by the Collins Press, Cork, and is a real good insight to the workings of the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs during the Northern War.

'The English'

"The moment the very name of Ireland is mentioned, the English seem to bid adieu to common feeling, common prudence, and common sense, and to act with the barbarity of tyrants and the fatuity of idiots." (*Rev. Sydney Smith*)

American Civil War

In 1863, the American Civil War had clearly become one of attrition, which did not bore well for the South. The Union outpopulated the Confederacy more than two to one. In terms of white males of military age, the ratio was almost four to one.

Over the course of the war (1861-1865), there were more foreign-born

Catholics in the Union Army than there were Virginians in gray.

Immigration was the major reason for the disparity. Nearly 30 per cent of the North was foreign-born, compared to just nine per cent of the South. Despite the outbreak of the War, the trend continued. Hundreds of thousands still sailed into the harbours of New York, Boston, and elsewhere each year, replenishing the North with fresh workers and soldiers.

Then, in the Summer of 1863, Pope Pius IX wrote to his Archbishops in New York and New Orleans and called for peace. The news came as a ray of hope for the Confederacy. The majority of the huddled masses coming into the Union were from Catholic regions of Europe—Belgium, France, southern Germany, Ireland, and Italy. Jefferson Davis, the Confederacy President immediately sent a diplomat to Rome.

Envoy Ambrose D. Mann reached the Pope in November 1863. In his hand was a letter from Davis, describing the unspeakable slaughter of Catholics in the New World. The Confederate President implored the Pontiff to discourage Catholics from coming to America, or at least to deter them from volunteering to fight. He added: "*We have offered up at the footstool of our Father who is in Heaven prayers inspired by the same feelings which animate your Holiness*".

Pope Pius IX was visibly moved and offered to write a letter in response for the world to see. Mann was ecstatic. Rome had "*all but recognised*" the Confederacy.

The dream, however, ended with the Pope's response. Although addressed to the "*Illustrious and Honourable Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America*", there was no mention of official recognition, no request to stop Catholic immigration, and no restriction on Catholics serving in the Union armed forces. The letter contained nothing except a repeated request to end the war.

English Politics

The Russian Ambassador's wife, Princess Lieven, later remarked: "*It is ridiculous to say that there are political parties in England. There are only men who wish to keep their places, and others who wish to occupy them*."
