

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

Education Social Engineering

The Holocaust & Vichy

Connolly, Greaves Lenin

William Jennings Bryan

Solzhenitsyn

**Bollywood:
an Irish angle!**



No. 123

First Quarter, 2016

Education Social Engineering?

The educational policy of the Government—Labour's educational policy—is that people must not be allowed to have the kind of schools that they want.

"Equality" is the buzz word of the moment. And equality means uniformity. It means an intolerance of difference.

The vital difference between heterosexuality and homosexuality—the difference imposed by nature, without which the human race could not continue—has been over-ridden institutionally by the Marriage Equality Act. Nature will no doubt continue to assert the difference. Only heterosexual marriages will produce children. But society, as concentrated in the State, has ruled this difference out of order. It has embarked on a new form of make-believe.

It is small wonder, then, that the State is intent on establishing uniformity in a sphere where the differences are man-made, and can therefore be regarded as never having been more than make-believe?

Baptism is the point at issue just now for Education Minister Jan O'Sullivan. People keep up the practice of drenching their newly-born children's heads with water, and uttering incantations over them, when naming them, thus enrolling them in life membership of the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church. And then they want them to be schooled in an environment where a further elaboration of this gibberish is treated as being part of the reality of life. Well, I ask you—!! Doesn't that beat Bannagher!

Time was—and it was not a very long time ago—when it could be assumed by 'progressives' that these divisive practices were imposed on the populace by a regime of terror exercised by a clerical dictatorship. That assumption—or that pretence—is no longer sustainable. The Church is down. It has been down for a generation. The progressive object now is to kill it off.

The difficulty is that the people, to a surprising degree, remain addicted to the practices imposed on them by the Roman Catholic Church in the days when it exercised power over society.

What is required, therefore is not to give the people rights against the Church, but to act against the historical conditioning which causes them, in this era of freedom, to act protectively towards elements of the Church which the progressive State is committed to eradicating:

"Ms O'Sullivan conceded that moves to divest religious schools of their patronage have been slow and held up partly by local resistance."

And she is looking for a way of by-passing this local resistance to enlightenment.

Five years ago, at the outset of its career, the Fine Gael/Labour Coalition broke off diplomatic relations with the Vatican, and put Confession on the political agenda. That is the meaning of its closing of the Vatican Embassy and having a Dublin civil servant fill in as Envoy.

Diplomatic relations with the Vatican have been restored, and the project of abolishing Confession is no longer even hinted at. (The plan was to force priests to testify about some crimes they heard about in the confessional.) And it seems that even the *a la carte* Catholics who voted to abolish marriage in the name of Equality, scorning both nature and doctrine, want to retain the man-made difference of religion.

It makes sense. Nature will look after itself, despite the hyperactivity of the well-funded Equality NGOs, but if the man-made differences are blotted out, what will remain in the cultural dimension of life?

The Confessional was the great hate-object of the English Protestant Reformation—that, and nunneries. It was scandalous—a refuge from God and man. It enabled you to unburden your mind in safety from the law of the State. And the priest had the devolved authority to act as intermediary between yourself and God and enable you to turn up innocent for the Day of Judgment. In the midst of civilisation it was a safe-haven, like certain temples of pagan Gods in the days of barbarism.

Five years ago we were looking forward to its abolition, and to the civilising of the Confessional priest into an officer of the law. But then somebody must have remembered *The Croppy Boy*, and his confession to an officer of the law masquerading as a priest. The project was dropped almost as soon as it was mentioned.

Anyhow, Confession is not in the news. Whether this is because the Confession rate has fallen or the state considered it too dangerous to act against it, we cannot say.

It is Baptism that is the fly in whatever ointment it is that the State is trying to massage into society.

"*Minister calls for places for unbaptised pupils*": that was the front page headline in the *Irish Times* on December 28th.

The second headline said: "*Equal Status Act lets schools discriminate in favour of children on the basis of religion*"—meaning that it lets *Catholic schools* be Catholic to a considerable extent.

There is legal provision of non-religious schools, but the Government which is now complaining about the persistence of religion in the populace, has been lethargic about pushing the development of the ideological anti-religious sphere. (It might be said that the term "*anti-religion*" is unfair, that we should say "*non-religion*". But we know very well that the driving force in "*non-religion*" is anti-religion.)

A big *Irish Times* headline on November 30th was "*Is Ireland's high Baptism rate a badge of identity or a passport to education?*" The sub-heading, by *Irish Times* Education Officer Carl O'Brien, said: "*Mass attendance is falling and church weddings are declining, but baptism rates remain resilient*".

There is a blurb from a statement by a priest, Fr. Joseph Mullan:

"When I meet couples, I ask them where the oil of

catechumens [used to anoint children in baptism] comes from. Generally, no one can answer me. One person said Spar."

So where does it come from, if not Spar? Maybe the article told those who read it, but the *Irish Times* conveys the news it considers relevant by its headlines. It long ago adopted the practice described by James Connolly in his article *Press Poisoners In Ireland*.

Does it matter where the Christening oil was squeezed out of the olive—assuming it to be olive oil, if it is a practice that began in Palestine, which seems to have needed little but olive groves until the enlightened West, supported by John Redmond's Home Rule Party, decided to impose fundamentalist Jewish colonisation on it? The sacredness of the oil, presumably, is not inherent in the olive it comes from, but is bestowed on it somewhere along the way to the Christening font.

It the *Irish Times* suggesting that parents who do not question its provenance are failing their children?

Another blurb on the article, presumably by the author, says:

"There's no question that in Ireland, the safest way for parents to ensure the best educational opportunity for their children is to baptise them. For nonbelievers, is it hypocritical? Yes. Do I sympathise? Yes."

Which does he sympathise with? The hypocrites or the nonbelievers?

Why does baptism ensure the best educational opportunity? Presumably because the educational structure based on it is best.

We have heard it said over the years that the National Schools which are Catholic produce students who are well-equipped to thrive in the world at large. But there has now been an anti-Catholic movement in education for at least a quarter of a century, and it has established itself as a sector of the education system. If the Enlightenment assumption about Catholicism was well-founded, anti-Catholic education should be doing outstandingly better than the Catholic system. The Enlightenment belief is that Catholicism is an obstacle to knowledge because ignorance and superstition are essential to it—because it is anti-scientific.

This journal, founded over forty years ago, pioneered a campaign on the Church/State issue, at a time when those who now want to abolish religion found it prudent to keep quiet. But we made it clear that we did not base ourselves on Enlightenment ideology. We could not discover any particular in which the Roman Catholic belief about another world blocked access to knowledge of this world.

In the governing of Ireland over many centuries it was Protestant belief that sought to keep—or to make—the Irish people ignorant and feckless. The Protestant State that oppressed the Irish, and sought to destroy them, consisted of fanatical believers in some version of the Protestant version of things for a while. Then the Protestant Church (Anglican), as a department of the Protestant State, came under the control of unbelievers—of cynics in the matter of belief. But it made no difference to the way the English State handled the Irish. The State system, whether operated by Protestant fanatics or Protestant cynics, maintained the actively anti-Catholic ethos of the State. Anti-Catholicism was the medium of common belief between fanatical Nonconformists and cynical Lord Bishops of the Established Church.

To page 4

Contents

Page

Education Social Engineering?	
Editorial	2
Alain Michel On The Holocaust	
Cathy Winch	6
Old Paths And New Paths Of Righteousness	
Stephen Richards: William Jennings	
Bryan 90 Years On, Part Two	10
Vox Pat: The Bantering 'Father Prout'; Toibin;	
Dominicans; Syria; Snob Value?; Paris & The	
Dream; Ideology; Sutherland sans Borders;	
Diplomacy; Illiberal; Blood And Guts!;	
Lolly; Perjury; Slavery; Pugwash; Ireland	
PLC; Caring Employer; Nobel Prize;	
Rote Value	14, 36
Connolly, Greaves And Lenin;	
Or, how to get from A to C!	
Brendan Clifford	17
Shah Rukh Khan, a Christian Brothers	
<i>success story</i>	
Cathy Winch	27
Confronting The Soviet Regime	
Peter Brooke. Part Two, Alexander	
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin	
And The Russian Question	28
The Irish and Habsburgia:	
Pat Muldowney	33

John Minahane's **The Spanish Polemic on Colonisation**, Part 9, will appear in the next issue

Some web addresses for associated sites—

Athol Books:

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

The Heresiarch:

<http://heresiarch.org>

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

Sales:

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

Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney

ISSN: 0332-3625

All Correspondence should be sent to:

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS: €20 (Sterling £16) for 4 issues

ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS: €8 (Sterling £6)

Cheques/postal orders payable to ATHOL BOOKS please
from

athol-st@atholbooks.org

A series of articles in the early issues of this journal described the Catholic Church in Ireland, which was still close to its prime, as a new construction of the mid-19th century. It was not a mere continuation of the Church of Gaelic society. Nor was it the Church of the Jacobite era, when the Stuart monarchy, whether in Office or out of it, mediated relations between Ireland and Rome. It was a new Church, constructed by the populace itself, and placed directly under Rome by the will of the populace. Nobody had imposed it. It was a popular construction, and was the major means by which the large residue of Gaelic people, on the verge of extinction, pulled themselves together, and took issue with the British system in Ireland, and eventually with the very presence of the British State after it had been compelled to enact extensive reforms.

In those articles the abnormality of the position of the Church in the Irish state was said to be the absence of a national mediator between Rome and its Church in Ireland. The absence of a national mediator was traced to the great Veto Controversy amongst Catholics in the early decades of the 19th century, when the Catholic middle class in Dublin rebelled against a compromise on the appointment of Bishops that was negotiated between Grattan and the Irish Bishops. The Bishops were made to toe the line, and to support the demand of the laity for direct subordination to Rome—which they knew to be an abnormality.

We proposed, as a normalising measure, that there should be a Concordat between Church and State.

Description of the Church as a means of socio-political modernisation constructed in the mid-19th century by the populace, and the proposal that the time had come for a Concordat, offended everybody. The clergy enjoyed their freedom, and the anti-clerical cabals that met in conclave in certain Dublin pubs but were too prudent to say boo to a goose in public, would not have their notion of the Church as a force of evil, that had gained its influence by underhand means, take away from them.

An ill-informed equation was made by those cabals between ultra-Romanist Catholicism and rural Ireland. In fact the equation was with urban Ireland, and with the Metropolis in particular. The modern city of Dublin, with its grand Squares and its Hanoverian architecture, was made by the aristocracy put in place by the Williamite conquest of 1690. For

a century that aristocracy had substantive independence as the rulers of Ireland, and their masterwork was the Penal Laws. For their last generation in power they had full constitutional independence. They caused mayhem by the use they made of their independence. England, which had created them, then relieved them of their political independence by bribery. Their Parliament was merged into the British Parliament and they followed it to London.

They abandoned their great urban creation, leaving it desolate, but they retained the land. The Orders of the Catholic Church then took command of what the aristocracy left behind, and, in conjunction with Daniel O'Connell, took the urban populace in hand. In the country the farming tenantry soon began the business of asserting rights on the land, taking it over, and establishing a mass system of property ownership which had a different kind of relationship with the Church than the Dublin proletariat, abandoned by the Ascendancy, had.

The rise of the strictly Papal Church was chiefly an urban affair. In the country many of the practices of pre-Papist Catholicism were retained, defying the systematic reform attempts of Cardinal Cullen etc. When the collapse came (we were active in starting it), it was most rapid and thorough where the new construction of the mid-19th century did not rest on, and had not been restrained by, a strong underlay of ancient tradition.

In 1950 the Labour Party acted with Fine Gael to crush Noel Browne's health reform that the Bishops didn't like. Fine Gael was the Church Party. The Church had come to its assistance in 1923 by excommunicating opponents of the Treaty for it, getting a free hand with education in return. And Labour, to the extent that it was not rural, was unquestioningly loyal to the Bishops. And even Browne's own party, Clann na Poblachta, did not stand by him. So he turned to the party of small-scale property in rural Ireland, the party that survived excommunication in 1923, and that, regardless of the views of the Bishops, considered itself to be fully Catholic, on the sensible condition that in practical matters religion should be taken with a pinch of salt.

The recent collapse of the intense, brittle Romanism of Fine Gael into fashionable vacuousness was no surprise. Nor was that of Labour in the hands of Official Sinn Fein/IRA. The only surprise was the collapse of Fianna Fail,

in the hands of Micheál Martin, into all sorts of fashionable doctrinairism.

A retired Foreign Affairs civil servant wrote the *Irish Times* Rite & Reason column for December 29th. The headline is *Heavy-handed School Teaching Of Nationalism*. The sub-heading is: "*Some 50 years ago, I associated 1916 with beatings by the Christian Brothers*". His beatings were delivered at *Coláiste Mhuire* in Parnell Square.

The source of this journal is a region of rural Ireland where there were no Christian Brothers, though there were beatings at school—if the stroke of a cane on the palm of the hand for something not done, on the understanding that not doing it would lead to a stroke on the palm of the hand, is to be called a beating.

When we saw it asserted by eminent academics that the Christian Brothers had about the 1916 Insurrection by beating extreme nationalism into their pupils, we went in search of the evidence. We couldn't find it. What we found was that the Christian Brothers taught Redmondism until 1916, and then adjusted gradually to the Republicanism that became dominant despite their Redmondism.

We have used every opportunity to question people educated by the Christian Brothers about their experience. The impression we got is that the Brothers were serious about education and went out of their way to equip young men with the means of making their way in the modern world. Religion was taken for granted as a general cultural medium of life. *Avant-garde* nationalism was not taught.

The Christian Brothers contribution to the Easter Rising, authoritatively asserted by many fashionable academics to have been Republican indoctrination, was in fact the provision of good secular education to young men who were active in the Rising and in the subsequent developments, and who would otherwise only have had access to poor education. The young men who engaged in a revolution against British rule may have been educated by the Brothers, but it was not the Brothers who taught them revolution.

The history the Brothers taught, about how Britain had ruled Ireland, was in fact the Home Rule view of history. It was only after 1914—after Redmond led the Home Rule Party into participation in a British war of conquest—that there was any attempt in Home Rule

circles to prettify the history of British rule in Ireland.

The Brothers taught standard Home Rule history until 1916. And they supported Redmondism in the War until 1916—when they noticed that Britain, which had supposedly launched a World War on the issue of the sacredness of Belgian neutrality, was itself breaching Greek neutrality, and going on to overthrow the Greek Government and install a puppet Government.

We remedied our ignorance of the Christian Brothers and published our findings. Those findings have not been disputed. But the same old thing continues to be said. Official Ireland today has little concern with historical fact.

Irish society, which had been almost wrecked by British/Protestant Imperial rule under the semblance of Union, modernised itself, and effectively took issue with British rule, in conjunction with the formation of a Catholic Church of a new kind. It is therefore hardly surprising that there is a good education system associated with the Church.

That educational system was established before the establishment of the Irish state. It happened under British rule, partly because Whitehall had the bright idea of using its diplomatic influence with Rome to get Rome to curb national developments in Ireland. But national development, which had its cause in the way Britain ruled, continued.

When the Free State was set up on the wreckage of the Republic in 1922-23, the Irish Government, backed by British arms and propaganda, sought to legitimise itself in Irish eyes by ultra-Romanism, and over-did it. A move back towards the Republican norm was achieved in the 1930s. But there could be no fresh start. There could only be a modification of the Free State system. The educational system, as set up by the Free State, continued.

In the new Republican Constitution, adopted against Fine Gael opposition in 1937, there was a clause recognising the "special place" of the Catholic Church. That clause did not give the Church a position, but merely recognised the position which it had achieved for itself under British rule, and under Treatyite rule enforced by Britain.

The practical alternative to this at the time was making the Catholic Church the Established Church of the State, as the Protestant Church had been the

Established Church of the State in Ireland for centuries. That was the Fine Gael ideal.

Education was multi-denominational under the 1937 Constitution, in that different forms of denominational education were provided for by the State. Then, at a later stage, an additional system of non-denominational education was provided for.

What the present Government is attempting—a Government dominated by the Party which gave the Church a free hand in public life in 1923 in exchange for excommunicating the opposition, and that was the ultra-Church Party for three generations—is to erode the Catholic sector of National Education.

About forty years ago we were associated with the late Jim Kemmy of Limerick in the matter of Church/State relations, and in relations between the Republic and the North. Kemmy had set up an independent Labour group which was in conflict with the Labour Party, which was strongly Catholic and Anti-Partitionist in its politics.

Kemmy supported the removal from the Constitution of the sovereignty clauses over the Six Counties, and he was for recognition of the Ulster Protestant community as a distinct nationality. We had proposed these measures in order to facilitate a rapprochement between the Republic and Northern Ireland. The Labour Party was strongly opposed to both measures. It somehow convinced itself that maintaining a policy on the North which roused the Protestant majority into a fury against the Republic was conducive to ending Partition.

(The Labour TD for Limerick at the time had such an unrealistic idea of the British State that he imagined that it would be eager to ditch the Six Counties if they became troublesome enough. The obvious fact that trouble is meat and drink to the British State escaped him.)

Then somebody had the bright idea that, given the fixed idea that there was a single nationality in Ireland, the resistance of the Unionists in the North to the national state had to do with the strong presence of the Catholic religion in the 26 Counties and that diminishing Catholicism would tend to bring about unity. (This was somewhat in conflict with the notion that the Unionists were positive Protestant bigots, but was often held in association with it.)

In fact, eroding Catholicism in the South would not have contributed more

than a debating point to the ending of Partition. But it became a debating point under which a degree of movement against the Church in the South could be generated without taking issue with the Church as such. And then the debating point about religion was extended to nationalism, and the era of post-nationalism was entered.

Conor Cruise O'Brien was the great ideologue of this phase. And the attitude of profound sympathy with the predicament of the Catholic minority in the North, so strongly evident in 1970, began to give way in the 1990s to impatience with them. O'Brien, in the end, saw the Northern nationalists as a mere security problem.

We dissociated ourselves from both of these trends at an early stage, and our contact with Kemmy ended.

We had never espoused the Enlightenment ideology. We said that "liberal" exhausted its meaning as an adjective and was without meaning as a noun. One had to be a liberal something in order to be a liberal anything.

If Catholicism, as a force by which the Irish had saved themselves from utter destruction by British/Protestant rule, could be wiped out, as Voltaire urged, what would there be in its place?

The Enlightenment notion of human nature was an illusion. A child left to itself would not grow naturally into a human being. We sided with Rousseau against Voltaire—and then, of course, Eoghan Harris, the C.C. O'Brien of our time, denounced Rousseau.

On the North, we said that the cause of the War was the perverse system of communal government established there by Britain in 1921, outside the democracy of the state. And we said that the Northern nationalists had the right to democratic government, and were denied it.

In the attitude of the Education Minister we seem to recognise the ground on which we parted company with Jim Kemmy.

The Veto Controversy by *Brendan Clifford*. An account of the fierce dispute among Irish Catholics, between 1808 and 1829, as to whether the appointment of Irish Bishops by the Pope should be subject to a degree of Government influence, as was generally the case elsewhere. Includes **Thomas Moore's Letter To The Roman Catholics Of Dublin (1810)** and extracts from polemical writers on either side: J.B. Clinch, Dr. Dromgoole, Bp. Milner, Denys Scully, Rev. Charles O'Conor etc. 203pp. **€18, £15 postfree in Ireland and UK.**

Cathy Winch

Book Review:
Vichy and the Holocaust, an Enquiry on the French Paradox.
Alain Michel, Editions Elkana, 2012, Jerusalem

Alain Michel On The Holocaust

A plaque outside Dijon railway station reads:

"Passerby

From 1940 to 1944, because they wanted to defend their freedom and your freedom also, thousands of French women and men, taken out of Dijon prison, were embarked from the platforms of this station towards the Hitler death camps.

More than half never came back.
Remember!"

A second plaque next to it reads:

"The French Republic in homage to the victims of racist and anti-Semitic persecutions and of crimes against humanity committed under the de facto authority known as 'Government of the French State' (1940-1944)

Let us never forget"

Each plaque reflects the politics of the time; the earlier one extols the Resistance, the later one blames the Vichy Government. Both make the same historical error of considering the period 1940-1944 as one bloc; the earlier one to make it look as if a continuous four year fight for freedom started in 1940, the second to give the impression that Vichy was nothing but the author of crimes against humanity for the four years of its existence.

The point of view on the Holocaust in France, especially since the 1990s, is that Vichy was responsible, and if the numbers are relatively low, it is thanks to the French population. Alain Michel in his book wants to show that Vichy was active in saving Jewish lives, whereas the population, especially after 1942, had other concerns, and the Resistance as a whole played no role in limiting the number of Jewish deaths.

Alain Michel is a historian and a rabbi, born and brought up in France and now living in Israel. He has studied the documents for each deportation convoy from France as well as countless other documents of the period. I will say later how he came to write this book.

Vichy and the Holocaust, an enquiry on the French paradox. The paradox of the title is that although France had a

collaborating regime, the number of Jews of France who were victims of the Holocaust is lower than the number in countries that did not have such regimes.

The paradox is a well-known one: 25% of Jews in France died, 80 000 people, whereas the figures are 40% in Belgium and 73% in the Netherlands, where the Governments had fled.

No one disputes these figures; indeed it was Serge Klarsfeld who established the figure of 75,721 Jews killed in deportation by analysing the records of each deportation convoy. Before his work, the estimation was that 120 000 Jews had died in deportation.

What is in dispute is how it happened. Who or what is responsible for the relatively small percentage of French victims? The earliest Holocaust historians said the actions of the Vichy Government accounted for the relatively small numbers. But, since the 1970s, historians have reversed the proposition, and said Vichy was responsible for the number being as high as it was: Vichy made it worse, and it was the actions of the population that kept the numbers low. The President of the Republic Jacques Chirac said, following this line put forward by Serge Klarsfeld, in an official speech in July 1995:

"Vichy contributed strongly to the loss of a quarter of the Jews of France. The French strongly helped to save three quarters of the Jews of France."

This is what Michel calls the "*doxa*", the established and now undisputable view that, as far as the Jews are concerned, '*Vichy made it worse*'. This view is the view of authorities such as Serge Klarsfeld and Robert Paxton. Serge

Klarsfeld was a lawyer who, he said, became a historian to stop anyone from ever saying that '*Vichy had saved Jews*'.

Because the matter is settled, there is no longer a debate about it in France. What Michel wants to do is rekindle the debate by putting forward arguments in favour of the earlier position, that Vichy was responsible for saving Jews.

Did Vichy make it worse? Or did Vichy save Jews? Michel thinks that Vichy did not make things worse, on the contrary Vichy saved Jews. He puts forward evidence for the point of view that Vichy had a positive as well as a negative role in the fate of the Jews. Because of this, he has been accused of wanting to rehabilitate Vichy. Michel defended himself against this accusation:

" "Rehabilitating" a regime implies not only a desire to sweep under the carpet its sins, but also adherence, however minimal, to its ideology, as well as an intention to promote its ideas. I am a historian and a rabbi of French origin living in Israel. I have worked for almost thirty years at Yad Vashem, the World Center for Holocaust Research, where I created French-language seminars on teaching the Holocaust in 1987. Nothing in my "pedigree" fits the description of a Vichy rehabilitator" (See Michel's blog, under *Jews: How Vichy Made It Worse*, a comment on Paxton. In <http://vichyetlashoah.blog.lemonde.fr>).

Michel has given conferences on this topic and at the end participants almost always ask: '*You are probably right, but is it worth saying? What use is it to know that Vichy was not as bad as we thought?*'

He does not reply directly; but he says later on that "*as a teacher, a researcher and a speaker, he has always aimed at making the heart of what he said or wrote correspond to his intimate conviction of what was in his eyes the truth*".

Alain Michel started to doubt the accepted view of Vichy as an entirely negative factor in the fate of the Jews of France in the period 1940-1944, when he wrote a student dissertation on the Jewish Scouts in WW2, and discovered that the Jewish Scouts were among youth



Dijon Railway Station Plaques

associations protected by the Pétain regime. Another factor from his private life was the difference between the stories of the war told by his family, who were Jews settled in France for centuries, and the stories told in his wife's family, newly arrived from Poland. His family had lighthearted stories, his wife's family quite the opposite.

Alain Michel says that, contrary to received opinion, Vichy, despite being criminal, anti-Semitic and xenophobic, was instrumental in saving Jewish lives.

It did this because of its conviction that French Jews must be protected; because it had some influence on Nazi actions in France through bargaining to maintain collaboration; and because the country was divided in two zones, one occupied and one not occupied.

Historians of the Holocaust

Vichy had not one but two Jewish policies: one for long-established French Jews, and one for recent arrivals. The first they wanted to protect, the second they wanted to expel. They stood by this policy, and less than ten per cent of French Jews were deported and died in deportation. The corollary was that up to thirty-eight per cent of foreign Jews were deported and died in deportation. In the main French Jews were not deported until after mid-1943, when the Nazis ended their agreement with Vichy not to deport French Jews.

Alain Michel found that, unlike present-day historians, two respected earlier historians of the Holocaust, the American Raul Hilberg and the Frenchman Léon Poliakov, had come to the conclusion that the existence of the Vichy Government was responsible for the "relatively more lenient fate of French Jews". Léon Poliakov took part in rescue operations of Jews and was in 1943, in Grenoble, one of the founders of the Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation. He made a number of points to prove that Vichy policy and practice resulted in the relatively lenient fate of the Jews in France, and I will summarise these at the end of this review.

Hilberg is an uncontested authority; his book *The Destruction of the Jews of Europe*, was published in 1961, and revised in 1988 and 2006 without his views on the positive role of Vichy changing over the years. Present-day historians refer constantly to Hilberg as the all-important source of information; they just ignore what he said about Vichy.

An English historian, Gerald Reitlinger, in *The Final Solution*, New

York 1953, reached similar conclusions about Vichy:

"No Jewish community in occupied Europe suffered such low losses, if you except Italy and Denmark, and that was due to a large extent to the tactics of Laval, who was nevertheless shot for treason by his compatriots."

Michel prefaced his book by quotations from Poliakov and Hilberg. (Omissions are his.) Here is Hilberg:

"In its reactions to German pressures, the Vichy government tried to confine the destruction process to certain limits. {...} When German pressure was intensified in 1942, the Vichy government fell back upon a second line of defence. The foreign Jews and immigrants were abandoned, and an effort was made to protect the native Jews. To some extent, that strategy met with success. By giving up a part, most of the whole was saved." (Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 1961, revised 1985.)

And Poliakov:

"Vichy was the chief factor accounting for the relatively more lenient fate of the French Jews. {...} In the matter of the 'final solution', Vichy's position was essentially determined by Pierre Laval. His policy seems to have been to get rid of the foreign Jews, but to protect French Jews in the two zones as much as possible" (Léon Poliakov, *Bréviaire de la Haine, le IIIème Reich et les Juifs* (Harvest of Hate, the IIIrd Reich & the Jews) Calmann-Lévy, 1951.

I will now summarise the main points of the Michel book; all the information that follows is in the book, I have not added extra information or made any intentional omissions.

A Summary

French and Foreign Jews

French Jews are those in families that took part in the First World War; many had of course lived in France for centuries, but WW1 is an important date because the Sacred Union of 1914 brought all Frenchmen together, and in the Twenties anti-Semitism practically disappeared. 'Despite their 6500 dead, the Jews thought their sacrifice had not been in vain.' As P-E Landau says in '*French and German Jews in the Great War*', quoted by Michel.

French Jews also include those who in 1927 and 1933 had been granted French nationality in two generous waves of naturalisations; Michel calls the 1927 law 'very liberal'. Vichy refused to allow them to be deported and refused to withdraw their naturalisation.

Serge Klarsfeld established the figure for France in 1940 of 195 000 French Jews and 135 000 foreign Jews. Michel does not make it clear if the 135 000 were all recent refugees, but it is the implication of what he says, unless not all Jews who came from the 1920s received French nationality in 1927 and 1933.

The foreign Jews were those who came to France after 1933 from Central and Eastern Europe, followed by tens of thousands Hitler expelled from Baden and Wurtemberg in 1940. They were not the only refugees in France then. They joined the tens of thousands of Spanish Republican interned in camps set up in 1938 by the previous Government, that is, the IIIrd Republic. These internment camps also held Communists arrested also by the IIIrd Republic after the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939. Between Autumn 1940 and Spring 1942, the camps held at any one time between 15 000 and 40 000 Jews. They were places where people died of cold, hunger and illness. Three thousand Jews died in those camps between the end of 1940 and Summer 1944.

The internment camps were meant as temporary before refugees could be moved.

Laval at first looked for ways to move these refugees out of France. He looked to South, Central and North America to accept the refugees. There was talk of Mexico accepting a number of Spaniards. Laval suggested to the USA that they use part of French assets frozen in the US by the US Government to finance transport and accommodation for Jewish refugees. As with the 1938 Evian Conference on refugees, these efforts led to nothing. Just 2,216 visa applications from Greater Germany were granted by the United States between July 1940 and March 1941, when the quota for that period allowed for 27 370 visas to be granted.

Laval therefore did not refuse when the Nazis demanded that Jews be deported from France to the east. He stipulated that they be foreign Jews and, since he thought they would be resettled, he wanted families to be deported together. This is the explanation for Laval 'going further than the Germans in wanting the children deported'. Laval only agreed to this as a counterpart to French Jews not being touched.

Did Laval know what would happen to the people deported? Michel says that, since Auschwitz only became an Extermination Camp in Summer 1942, Laval could not have known in 1941 what the final destination of deportation was to be.

From 1942 the situation changed. The population saw the inhuman way the round-ups were carried out, the children and parents separated for example. Personalities from Catholic and Protestant Churches, as well as the head of the Jewish Consistory, made representations. According to Michel, Laval used these representations as an argument to demand that there should be no more 'quotas' of deportations. On 25th September 1942 Himmler approved the Laval-Knochen-Oberg Agreement that there should be no arrests of French Jews for the time being and the pressure to hand over Jews should be lightened. There was a decrease in the number deported at the end of 1942.

Relations between French Jews and Jewish refugees.

The CRIF (Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France/ Representative Council of French Jewish Institutions) was founded in 1944 under the name of Representative Council of French Israelites, to bring together the old established French Jewish organisations on the one hand, and on the other hand Communist, Bundist and Zionist organisations, which were mostly formed of refugees. Richard Prasquier, President of the CRIF, in a Foreword to Michel's book, recalls this and says that prior to 1944, Jews from these different origins had not really come into contact and that the old established Jews were not immune to the anti-immigrant prejudice which existed in France at the end of the Thirties and early Forties.

The use of French police.

Relations between occupier and occupied are governed by the Hague Convention of 1907, plus, in the case of France in 1940, the Armistice Agreement, which follows the Hague Convention. Even if there had been no armistice, the occupying force would have had the right to use the French police service. The Hague Convention says:

"Art. 43. The authority of the legitimate power having in fact passed into the hands of the occupant, the latter shall take all the measures in his power to restore, and ensure, as far as possible, public order and safety, while respecting, unless absolutely prevented, the laws in force in the country."

The Armistice clause that follows from this says:

"In occupied regions of France, the German Reich exercises all the rights of the occupying power. The French government promises to facilitate by every means the regulations pertaining

to the exercise of those rights and their implementation with the aid of French administration.

The French government will immediately enjoin all authorities and all administrative services of the occupied territory to obey the regulations of the German military authorities and to collaborate with them in a correct manner."

In other words, the police in the occupied part of France had no choice but to obey German orders. The Nazis did not need the acquiescence of Vichy to use French Police; nevertheless Laval included it in his bargaining.

The Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives.

Vichy set up a General Commissariat for Jewish Questions under pressure from the Nazis but according to Michel it played almost no role in the deportations of Jews from France. This was because its first Director, Vallat, an anti-German nationalist, followed Vichy policy of protecting French Jews. He played an important role in allowing Jewish Associations to continue their activities in the non-occupied zone. He refused to cooperate with the first round-up in Paris in May 1941, whose victims were sent to French Internment Camps (as "surplus to requirement in the national economy") and finally deported in June 1942.

The Nazis refused to work with Vallat and replaced him with a determined anti-Semite, Darquier, which led Laval to bring the Commissariat directly under his authority, greatly limiting Darquier's power of action.

Confiscation of Jewish property.

The October 1940 Vichy Statute of the Jews had promised to respect Jewish life and property. When the occupying forces decided in 1941 to confiscate Jewish property, Vichy objected and refused to countenance the measure, until July 1941, when it passed a law implementing confiscations in both zones.

Vichy preferred a law it had passed to a similar one passed by the occupying forces; also it wanted the fruit of the confiscation to pass to French hands rather than German ones.

Naturalisations.

The Nazis wanted the 1927 and 1933 laws granting French nationality to large number of foreigners, including Jews, reversed and the naturalisations annulled, so that these persons could be included in the deportations but Vichy refused to do this, after dragging negotiations along for some months in 1943.

Vichy had to negotiate, as part of the

obligation to maintain relations with the occupier. It played for time, obstructing without giving an outright refusal, which might have been disregarded.

Negotiations regarding Jews were not the only topic of disagreement. Michel says:

"You have to remember that the Jewish Question is only one of the subjects of collaboration between France and Germany, and not necessarily the greatest priority as far as the Nazis were concerned."

The situation after June 1943, with the arrival of Aloïs Brunner.

Brunner was a high-ranking Nazi who had been in charge of the destruction of the Jews of Vienna, Berlin and Salonika. He was sent to France in June 1943. In Paris, he took charge of the Drancy Camp and dismissed the French administration and police. He used Jews to organise the camp instead, which was his preferred method of action. He acted without reference to previous agreements with Vichy and stopped recording the nationality of deportees. (For the convoys after July 1943, the nationality of the victims is inferred from their place of birth.) When Italy was out of the War, Germany occupied the territory of Nice and its region which the Italians had occupied, and where they had protected the Jewish population. Brunner went there to deport the 25 000 Jews estimated to be present. The French police, as well as the administration and Government Departments, refused to cooperate. Over 3000 Jews were deported from the region up to July 1944.

Jews saving Jews

In the Vichy-administered area, the police, government officials and administration were able to withhold collaboration because they depended on Vichy, not on the Paris German authorities, and were not subject to the Armistice/The Hague conditions. This was a gain for the population, and for the French Jewish population in particular. This benefit remained, even after the Nazis occupied the hitherto non-occupied zone on 11th November 1942.

Vichy refused to countenance the wearing of the yellow star. It never happened in the non-occupied zone.

The division between Occupied and Vichy France also enabled France to be the country in Europe where the greatest number of Jews were saved by Jews. This was because of the UGIF. The Union Générale des Israélites de France (General Union of the Israelites of France) had been set up under Nazi pressure as a way to dissolve all Jewish organisations, and gather them into one

association, which the occupying power could then more easily force to obey. Thanks to the division of the country in two, there were two UGIF, set up in different places with different personnel, which acted differently because they had different authorities to deal with.

In the non-occupied zone, the UGIF, made up of French Jews, enjoyed the protection of Vichy and was able to allow organisations to affiliate to it while remaining independent. The Jewish Scouts for example received funds from UGIF South but continued their own programme, which by 1942 included helping foreign Jews in danger. In 1943 the Jewish Scouts, along with other Jewish organisations, became a clandestine movement.

The Righteous Among the Nations

Since 1963 Israel has recognised individuals who put themselves in danger, for no reward, in order to save Jews, as *The Righteous Among the Nations*; the case of each candidate has to be agreed by a body in Israel that oversees the titles. Michel discusses them for two reasons. One is that the Jews who were saved by the *Righteous* were mostly foreign Jews and this confirms his thesis that it was foreign Jews who were most in danger. The other reason is that the number of individuals recognised as Righteous is very small and their action can in no way explain the relatively small number of victims in France, contrary to what Klarsfeld and Chirac implied.

Conclusion

Poliakov's points, mentioned above, provide a good summary of the situation:

"Vichy was the main factor in the relatively more clement fate of Jews of France thanks to:

1. The existence of the free zone which became a place of refuge.

2. The affirmation of the rights of sovereignty of Vichy which played a positive role vis a vis the Germans.

3. The policy of Laval {in 1942} which consisted in getting rid of foreign Jews to better protect French Jews of both zones.

4. A typical bargaining {in 1943} would have led to accepting denaturalisation of the Jews who arrived in the Twenties and Thirties in order not to touch the 'old' French Jews. In the end the denaturalisation did not take place, both thanks to information getting more and more precise regarding what was happening in the East, but also because of the German military setbacks on all fronts.

5. The French police collaborated less and less.

6. The Wehrmacht refused to lend its help for arrests."

Some Comments

I would like to add some remarks.

There are many points on which more information is needed, such as the question of the police. Michel made the general point that the occupier has the occupied police at its disposal, but he also quoted Poliakov saying that the French police did collaborate less as time went on, and he, Michel, also mentioned variations in the degree of collaboration. The general point is, of course valid, but a more detailed history is needed. The other is the question of the refugees in 1940. It sounds as if the numbers were extremely large.

Readers today might perhaps have a better understanding of the position of the French in 1940, faced with a refugee crisis on a par with the crisis in Europe in 2015, while their country was divided, occupied, and the economy in disarray. They might therefore perhaps be less ready to apply the adjective "*xenophobic*" to the Vichy regime, as Michel does.

Readers today might also perhaps judge, from the emotions created by the January and the November 2015 Islamist attacks in Paris, the feelings of the French faced with the unimaginably greater disaster of the 1940 defeat. The shock was extreme. How could this have happened? How did we declare a war we were not going to win? The wrong decisions were taken, the wrong policies followed. Who influenced those decisions? The Jews were blamed, but they were not the only people blamed. The Freemasons, schoolteachers, teacher training institutions, left-wing Town Councils, and politicians were all blamed. The *Journal Officiel* (Official journal, a daily record of government acts) of 1940 is full of the names of officials sacked, Town and Village Councils dissolved. Teacher Training Colleges were all closed. Freemasons were outlawed. The members of previous Governments were arrested and put on trial (the Riom trial: only one member of government on trial was Jewish, the 1936 Prime Minister Léon Blum; his Jewishness was never mentioned during the trial, except once by Blum himself).

The Vichy *Statute of the Jews*, which restricted the role of Jews in public life, has to be understood in that context of shock and recrimination; Michel does not mention this context, he sees the *Statute of the Jews* as an extension of the anti-Semitism of the Thirties. Add to that the fact, which Michel mentions, that the occupiers were preparing a Statute of the Jews of their own, which they would have imposed on the occup-

ied zone, and which would have reflected their own, racial, hatred of Jews. Vichy's attitude is based on a reaction to the defeat; this is how Vichy presented the Statute to the press:

"Some Jews served our fatherland well, everyone knows of honourable exceptions, nevertheless Jews and other foreigners have contributed to our defeat; in positions of power and influence, they have shown too great a tendency to individualism bordering on anarchy; our disaster forces us to regroup French forces."

To put this in perspective, it should be remembered for example that Eton had a 1945 rule designed to exclude Jewish pupils, which was in force until 1961; Westminster School also restricted its Jewish intake. The English did not want their ruling class to have too great a Jewish element in it. The Vichy Statute aimed at removing Jews from positions of influence in politics, teaching, the law, the media and show business, but said that Jewish life and property would be respected. It made pension arrangements for the better-paid officials. That was the position in October 1940.

Michel has a Chapter on the specificity of French anti-Semitism, which I have not touched on. He pointed out that Laval was not anti-Semitic, and as for Pétain, he says that an author, Gérard Miller, writing a book to discredit Pétain by quoting his own words, was unable to find any first-hand anti-Semitic quotes.

To go back to the two plaques in Dijon station, the Resistance plaque and the anti-Vichy plaque, I would like to end with Michel's comparison of the Resistance and Vichy.

He compares the Free French of London with Pétain and Laval and asks, who did the most, from the point of view of saving Jews: the Resistants of London or the collaborators of Vichy? He replies that the London Free French had absolutely nil results from the point of view of saving Jews, whereas Vichy saved Jewish lives.

Vichy was there, and it was able to obstruct the Nazi will to deport as many Jews as possible. If Vichy had not been there, and France had been entirely occupied—and judging by the record of what resistance there was, where not one action was aimed at saving Jews—no one would have stood against the programme of Nazi deportations.

NOTE: See also Cathy Winch's *Vichy And The Holocaust*, Parts 1 and 2 in issues 119 and 120 of *Church & State*

Stephen Richards

William Jennings Bryan 90 Years On
Part Two

Old Paths And New Paths Of Righteousness

Now that "*crusade*" and "*crusader*" have become political boo-words, largely thanks to George W. Bush, I'll have to be content to designate William Jennings Bryan (1860-1925) as a lifelong campaigner instead. He campaigned for workers' rights, women's franchise, and free trade, but against the Gold Standard (on which we touched last time) and strong liquor. It's on this last theme that I'd like to kick off. The battle was conducted in typically American confrontational style, and, arguably, it rages there still, whereas in Britain and Ireland the combined impact of the permissive society and the drinks industry has long since annihilated the opposition.

Prohibition

A hundred years ago the cause of Prohibition seemed rational, progressive and socialist, a cause that went hand in hand with women's franchise. By 1909 Bryan, having gone down to defeat in the previous year, and perhaps sensing he had had his last run at the Presidency, could afford to be more relaxed about the Irish vote and the approval of the liquor lobby. Accordingly he was free to turn his rhetorical guns on what we might term Big Alcohol: the brewers, distillers and saloon syndicates.

That Bryan was riding a big existing wave there is no doubt. The Revival of 1857 (in the American context, the last episode in the Third Great Awakening) had produced a zeal for moral reformation, while the Civil War, following on its heels and the subsequent push westward, had resulted in the breaking up of settled communities and the weakening of social constraints. The prohibitionists were therefore all the more appalled when they witnessed the alcoholic fallout. That post-Revival, post-Bellum world was the world of Bryan's youth.

I suspect, though I don't know, that it was from the 1860s onward that the temperance movement became powerful in the British Isles, borne on a transatlantic wind. There's a fascinating passage in Arnold Dallimore's fairly short biography of C.H. Spurgeon from which it appears that beer and brandy featured regularly on the dinner tables

of Spurgeon's Nonconformist youth in the 1840s. It is only from the 1870s on that alcoholic drink *per se* begins to be condemned in his sermons. One wonders if he was unconsciously imbibing the influence of the American evangelistic duo, Moody and Sankey, who conducted their first evangelistic mission in England in 1873.

The English Puritans wrote extensively on all manner of sin under the sun, but apart from some sideswipes at drunkenness, there is little there to support the abstinence campaigner. As for the Scottish Covenanters, known as the Cameronians or Mountain Men, it would appear that in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries they had their own elaborate alcoholic rituals at funerals, while remaining solemn and sedate throughout, as noted by Ayrshire exciseman and antiquarian, Joseph Train. The adjective "*puritanical*" hardly describes the Puritans in this or other respects.

For myself, I think there's a Ph.D. thesis to be written on the connections between the theology of abstinence on the one hand and non-Trinitarian, indeed anti-Trinitarian, theology on the other. In one sense Islam is a Christian heresy, and its stances on the deity of Christ and on the legitimacy of alcohol are well known. A less venerable but equally interesting Christian heresy is Mormonism, which had Joseph Smith as its Muhammad. Once again, the position is very prescriptive, or, one might say, proscriptive, on the subject of alcohol. From what little I know of the New England Transcendentalists I get the impression that their high-minded philosophy was equally contemptuous of alcohol and of the idea that God might have done anything so vulgar as to become a man.

Chesterton got there before me with a novel called *The Flying Inn*, now largely forgotten, about a Muslim takeover of England involving the forcible closure of all the pubs, and the conversion to Islam of some of the leading gentry.

As for Bryan, he simply went with the *zeitgeist*. Men and women of goodwill, whatever their denominational background, should not hesitate to fall

in behind his campaign: didn't it spring from the purest of motives, born of a desire to help his fellow citizens develop to their fullest potential, to become better husbands, fathers, and employees? To become better church attenders too.

For many women sobriety was the key to a more prosperous future for themselves and their children. With the removal of the temptation to drink, which their men were obviously too weak to resist, the main roadblock to social betterment would be removed. I have commented before on the non-theological nature of Bryan's Christian faith, but here we have the social gospel *par excellence*, devoid of much theological content. In the same way the late Lord Soper, the Methodist peer, was a lot more certain about the evils of drink than about the assertions made in the Apostles' Creed. No doubt it's nice to be nice, and to be clean, and sober, but Jesus had something to say about whited sepulchres and the clean outsides of cups.

Anyway, Bryan was just one persuasive voice among many. America as a nation did reach the Promised Land, embracing Prohibition at the start of 1920 when the *Volstead Act*, the eighteenth amendment, came into force, riding roughshod over states' rights. As is common knowledge, this turned out to be a false step and was unsustainable in practice. Ironically the legislation was repealed by the Roosevelt New Deal administration in 1933, eight years after Bryan's death. The New Deal for the toilers was going to be laced with alcohol. As Mrs. Thatcher said, you can't buck the market, and likewise you can't buck human nature. Governments can and should regulate the drinks industry and should endeavour to curb the excesses of drunkenness on our streets, but ultimately we all have to make our own treaty with alcohol.

But the reverberations of those times still echo, in the strict licensing laws of many states, and many dry counties within states, in some ways a heartening contrast to the licensing free for all that prevails in many parts of England. One wonders what Bryan would have made of the cannabis debate currently exercising minds on both sides of the Atlantic. We have had several thousand years to get acquainted with all that alcohol can do for us, and do to us, and we have determined as a society that it's a risk we have to take.

By contrast, the unknown unknowns of substance abuse must give us pause. In the ongoing analysis of Islamic attacks

and also of the gun attacks carried out by various right wing loners very few commentators have been anxious to pursue what seems to be a common denominator: the fact that many of these young men had a long term history of drug abuse, and were quite possibly out of their heads with drugs when they went out on their killing sprees. That may go to aggravate the crimes, not to excuse them, but it may also go some way to explaining them.

The Monstrous Regiment

Women's suffrage was another obvious cause for Bryan to attach himself to. His biographer, Michael Kazin, comments:

"Like most pietist reformers, Bryan had long believed that women were the morally superior gender."

He had supported votes for women from 1910, but from 1916 onwards (when he was free from the trammels of Office) this became a major theme in his speeches. He must have known he was riding a winning horse; and in 1919 the two required two-thirds majority in the Senate was duly achieved, more or less contemporaneously with Prohibition, and in step with similar post-War legislation in Britain (countries such as France and Switzerland took longer to see the light).

America marched into the 1920s therefore with every apparent advantage. Bryan was to some extent bewitched by the assumptions of the Left. If we have universal education, universal suffrage, universal social security benefit entitlement, and universal health care provision, then there will be no impediment to national health, wealth and happiness being multiplied. The universal twist in human nature isn't taken into account, our unerring genius for turning all our blessings into something else. "*You taught me language*", Caliban complains, "*and my profit on't is, I know how to curse*". In many parts of the British Isles that seems to be an all too common result of eleven years' schooling. The greatest educational tool ever devised, the most amazing source of information—the Internet—records more searches for pornographic sites than for any other.

Anyway, the admission of women to the electoral roll, which of course was desirable on simple grounds of human parity, has doubled the size of the electorate without significantly altering its character. The Liberal landslide

of 1906 in England obviously pre-dated women's suffrage. Asquith was terrified that women would tend to favour the Conservatives. At times it would seem that women have voted for more radical parties, but at other times this hasn't been so. A recent movie tried to portray the Suffragette movement in England as having a strong working class element, which was in no way the case. On the contrary, it was dominated by upper middle class ladies. One has no objection to upper middle class ladies voting Conservative, but Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughter Christabel (but not Sylvia) also committed the mainstream movement to the war propaganda effort in 1914, and campaigned in support of conscription. As we all know, women were largely responsible for handing out the notorious white feathers.

I'm probably now in danger of getting into a rant about how the modern feminist movement has slid into becoming an anti-women, indeed an anti-human, movement, which concerns me very much. Suffice to say that feminism, which I come across chiefly as mediated by the BBC and its dreadful *Women's Hour*, has taken us to some strange and contradictory places in recent times. Despite the best attempts of the liberal media to persuade us otherwise, women aren't a segment of society, like the old working class, with a common agenda. As I see it, women are basically the same as men, only different, and very different from one another as well. But then we have lost the wonderful, apparently patriarchal, word, "*mankind*".

Universal suffrage may be an important plank of a functioning civil society, but it's far from being the only one. Conversely, there have been societies that have been relatively free and sane which haven't included universal suffrage in their fabric. We have a tendency to focus on great causes, some of which are worthwhile enough, as if nothing else matters, and then when that cause is achieved we see it as a false summit and fix our gaze on something beyond. This is seen particularly in relation to the rights of perceived sexual minority 'communities', among whom the Left has been reduced to grievance-mongering. There is reform which is good and proper, but in its obsession with pushing frontiers the 'reform' movement ends up devouring its own children, as in the French Revolution. And at the root of it all is the unshakeable belief, axiomatic to Bryan and his followers, that legislation can make us both happier and better people.

Free Trade

Moving on to another of Bryan's mantras, we come to the Free Trade agitation. One is tempted to look at his concerns through Irish or British eyes. If he had thought more about British developments, he would have been less starry-eyed. Dissension over Free Trade split the British Tories in the 1840s and again sixty years later when Joseph Chamberlain came out for an Imperial Tariff. In similar vein the debate over Europe could split it again. At least the Tories are sophisticated enough to know that there is a debate to be had, whereas Bryan once again sticks to the moral high ground.

One of the most sensible and obvious of Ed Miliband's utterances, for which he was excoriated, was that there was such a thing as predatory capitalism. To say so was certainly not to damn capitalism as a system, which is not really a system at all, but exists in all kinds of exotic, healthy and noxious forms, a bit like human nature really. Part of the tragedy of Bryan as a politician was that, with all his charm, charisma and influence, he tended to spray his rhetoric like buckshot all over the place. Here is what Kazin says:

"Bryan grumbled loudest about the tariff, the perpetual obsession of American politics. Almost twenty years before {this was 1910, so this refers back to the early 1890s}, he'd made his maiden leap onto the national stage with a speech in the House blasting the high duty on wool and accusing the GOP of coddling its wealthy beneficiaries. Now he attacked Representative Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for seeking to cut the tariff on wool only in half (to 20 per cent) instead of eliminating it altogether. 'Without free wool', Bryan moaned, 'tariff reform would not amount to much.' He also suspected Underwood of trying to scuttle a downward revision of the taxes on imported iron and steel. Bryan announced that opponents of his stand were making a fateful pact with 'the predatory interests.' ...The most popular Democrat in the country had thus made the price of a sheep's coat the supreme test of loyalty to his ideas and status within the party."

Any discussion of the tariff question can't avoid the mid-nineteenth century English crisis during which Sir Robert Peel allegedly betrayed his party by converting to repeal of the Corn Laws. The Repeal was enacted in 1846 and so its impact is linked with the year when the Irish Potato Famine really started to

take hold. Popular culture of that day, even in the North of Ireland, has cast Peel as the saviour of the working man, but, as Brendan Clifford points out in his 1995 Talk given at the Duhallow Heritage Centre, it's not really that simple. Instead of Repeal of the Union, Ireland got Repeal of the Corn Laws, and the advantages that may have derived in the short term to the industrial classes in England weren't achievable in Ireland, where the labouring classes had no buying power at all, as they had no money.

Reform of tariff law is really an incalculable business and is certainly no panacea. The Free Trade mantra projects the facile illusion of putting us all on a level playing field, but since the 1950s it has slowly but surely destroyed British and Irish manufacturing capacity in the areas of shipbuilding, steel, textiles and coal, to name but a few. The playing field is in fact tilted. The Republic of Ireland economy through necessity and its low Corporation Tax rate has managed to adapt better than that of Northern Ireland to the remorseless economic pressures of the Whiggish Free Trade philosophy, called Globalism, to which all parties now seem to subscribe.

Local Heartaches

A couple of local examples, the ones I'm most aware of, will bear out the truth of this. The land at the back of my house slopes down to the Braid River about a field length away, and on the other side of that, with a field and a road intervening, is spread out the Michelin Tyre plant. This was one of the jewels in the late Brian Faulkner's crown during his tenure as Minister for Development in Northern Ireland in the late 1960s and beyond, when he achieved more concrete good for the population than any of our local politicians before or since, though the competition hasn't been great.

Michelin is a thriving factory turning out big lorry tyres. It has weathered recessions, booms and busts during the decades since 1969. The workforce has expanded and sometimes contracted, and more efficient shift patterns have been embraced by the workers, who number about 860. Besides that, there is a host of other local jobs that depend, directly or indirectly, on Michelin. The plant has been performing well, but not well enough. It can never perform sufficiently well to satisfy the bean counters (not least because of high energy costs due to taxes on conventional sources of energy to subsidise "green" energy). The workers have been put on notice that the

factory is to close, in the early part of 2018. Some jobs will be relocated to Dundee, but much of the manufacturing will shift to Third World centres in India and Thailand. This is the logic of Globalism.

The other shock from which my home town is still reeling is the announcement of the forthcoming closure in 2017 of the JTI factory, formerly Gallahers, at Galgorm, with the loss of another 900 highly paid jobs, plus the knock-on effects as before. These jobs are being outsourced to Romania and Poland, where wages are lower, and health and safety requirements are less strict (despite both these countries being EU members, so, go figure).

Up to now the third local giant has been Wrightbus, which has expanded hugely from the days it was Robert Wright and Son, Coachbuilders. By dint of hard graft and capable management it's now a leading bus manufacturer on the world stage, and has won important contracts in London (the "Boris Bus"), Malaysia and elsewhere. But you're only as good as your last order, or your next order. What follows is a quotation from a letter that Michelle McIlveen, the DUP Minister for Regional Development in the Northern Ireland Executive, recently sent to the local paper. She is defending the decision by her Department to award the contract for "the Belfast Rapid Transit Vehicle" to a Belgian company called Van Hool:

"In all major procurement competitions, including this one, my Department must adhere to the relevant EU procurement legislation and regulation... Wrightbus submitted two tenders... The second tender met the specifications and was fully considered against set criteria. However, that bid was more expensive than the successful bid and could not be delivered to meet the required timetable."

Michelle goes on to express her disappointment and so on. But there may well now be a shrinking base of taxpayers to fund her pension and her foreign trips. She can hardly rely on the Belgian Government to support her in her old age. Eventually economic reality will catch up with the civil servants and the heads of departments, as well as with the rest of us. As John Buchan observes, in a different context, in *The Thirty Nine Steps*, "that's the sort of owlish way we do things in the Old Country".

A Cheer

For Free Trade?

And yet, there were undoubtedly

astonishing levels of inefficiency and multitudes of "Spanish practices" in our traditional industries, such as in the Belfast Shipyard. Over the last fifty years of its life, it was hardly a shining example of the Protestant work ethic. Structural inequalities between Belfast and other, foreign, shipbuilding cities weren't the only reason for its demise. This can be seen in how Japanese car companies such as Nissan can make a go of manufacturing in the North East of England, and provide their workers with decent wages. Why should the State subsidise lousy management and lazy workers, as the UK Government did for years with British Leyland and its predecessors?

And again, the EU has effectively closed its borders to the African textile industry and to African food produce, by means of high external tariffs. Trade with the African countries might help them more than the present policy, which is to shove huge sums of "development aid" at them.

Equally scandalously the English Parliament used high tariffs to keep out Irish wool imports in the early eighteenth century, to the ire of Jonathan Swift. These were sister kingdoms, and Ireland was the equivalent of a Third World country trying to get back on its feet after the wars of the Glorious Revolution that had been inflicted on her by the Government in England.

To quote Townes Van Zandt, "Answers don't seem easy, and I'm wondering if they could be". Any help that readers can give to help me to disentangle these knots would be most welcome.

Socialism Or Humanitarianism, Or Both?

As for Bryan's commitment to Socialism, I don't think he saw himself in that category, or that Karl Marx was anything more than just a name to him. He was pleased to get the Union endorsements that formed an essential element in the mosaic of his constituency of choice. Apart from those special causes I've remarked on, there seem to have been few specifically socialist planks in his platform. It was second nature to him to inveigh against the railroad barons and even to advocate railway nationalisation, but there is no sense of a self-conscious socialist world view, in contrast to Eugene Debs, five time Presidential candidate, who was ten years older than Bryan, and represented a much more single-minded, ideological approach to labour issues. Of course

neither of them gained the presidency, but Bryan, with his more folksy style and sunny, inspirational approach to politics, at least was a serious contender. Debs had been one of the toilers himself, and had no hesitation in following out his principles to a prison cell, whereas Bryan could be said to be socialist lite.

Nationalised railways certainly make sense. This is one function the State can carry out reasonably capably. But I think Bryan would have been appalled by the way family life, social life and the independence of local communities have been eaten away by the encroaching claims of the State, the impact of which has been just as detrimental as that of the multi-nationals and the big banks. Sometimes one wishes that Dickens had never been born. In the wake of *Oliver Twist* such a reaction set in against the system whereby charity was administered by the parish that it was torn down instead of being reformed. Maybe if he were around now he could start writing tearjerkers about the exploitation of young people in Local Authority "care" in England, and about the many perfectly happy children abducted by English Social Services Departments from despairing parents, abductions rubber-stamped by secret courts.

Despite his opposition to American involvement in the War, Bryan was also out of sympathy with some of his fellow campaigners, the younger socialist types such as John Reed, who certainly seems to have been a fairly unlikeable person. In 1916 Reed was sent to do a journalistic interview with Bryan while the latter was on a family boat trip in the swamps of northern Florida. The published account was faintly mocking of the grand old Radical icon. Kazin comments:

"That both Bryan and he were great idealists who agreed on most political issues mattered less than did the cultural gulf between them... As prairie Victorians, Will and Mary recoiled at John Reed and the qualities that had turned him into a modernist hero. Son of a rich Republican merchant from Oregon, Reed had attended an eastern prep school and then Harvard, where he blossomed as a writer and a socialist. He then moved to Greenwich Village and quickly became an avatar of the new bohemianism—literary, philosophical and sexual. One can only imagine what Mary Bryan would have thought of about the famous 1916 photo of Louise Bryant, Reed's lover and political comrade, nude on a beach in Provincetown... John Reed hated monopolists, whose greed he thought made war inevitable, and he placed his formidable talents at the

service of striking workers. But he had no use for the churches, the temperance movement, or rural America—all of whose virtues Bryan and most of his followers took for granted."

Reed was an early example of the "*socialist as hipster*", a tribe that has become wearily familiar to us. Attitudinising and grandstanding take the place of concern for working people, which Bryan undoubtedly possessed. I knew a number of these socialists at university in the late seventies, and while they were often pleasant enough to talk to, I couldn't understand how their minds worked. They mostly later morphed from Bennites into investment bankers, and one even ended up on the hawkish fringe of the Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee. Maybe their adolescent socialism was for them just a rung on the *cursus honorum*. In any event, I wasn't cool enough for the first rung and not clever enough to make the shift to the second.

Bryant would have been all at sea in the interminable culture wars that the modern Left has been engaged in on both sides of the Atlantic, where racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, etc. are sniffed out in unlikely places with the zeal of McCarthyite witch hunters; where the family is an endangered institution, the State having taken over many of its functions; and where the big multinational corporations—as opposed to small businesses—still get away with paying very little tax (in the UK and Ireland the multinationals can benefit from convenient tax boltholes provided by EU Directives). What has happened is that the time and energy of what one might call the Left has been consumed by identity politics, of all politics the most useless.

Unreconstructed Darwinians

I haven't left much space for Bryan's last campaign, where he ended up on the opposite side to his old buddy Clarence Darrow in the 1925 Scopes Monkey Trial. Scopes, the young school-teacher prosecuted by the State of Tennessee for teaching evolutionary doctrine, was himself an enthusiastic political supporter of Bryan, and his father had even been an Elder in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Speaking of McCarthyism, the 1960 movie, *Inherit The Wind*, was apparently not *really* about the Scopes trial at all but, like Arthur Miller's *Crucible*, was a metaphor for that more recent upheaval.

Then, as now, there was a valid

liberal, humanist, even socialist critique of Darwinism. The molecular biologists, biochemists, geologists palaeontologists and sociologists can argue among themselves as to whether the Darwinians present a convincing narrative but the politicians, philosophers and theologians will always have something to say about the implications of the theory for our self-understanding. The critics would be concerned at the tendency towards Eugenics, a great preoccupation of Darwin himself, and of his successors, until the Nazis gave this particular preoccupation a bad name.

We have still in our house the 1938 10-volume edition of the Arthur Mee *Children's Encyclopaedia*, which manages to be wrong about almost everything. I remember the obsession with racial groupings and stereotypes. I was intrigued by the threefold analysis of the Irish racial stock: the good-looking charming folks of the south and south east, descended from Normans and Danes no doubt; the dour, flinty but upright citizens of the North (as a ten year old I didn't realise they were supposed to be us Prods and imagined these were some other people I hadn't encountered yet); and the inhabitants of the West, who, as far as I could make out, were a race of cabin-dwelling troglodytes: the native Irish, I presume?

Survival Of The Fittest

And so on with Mr. Mee: the Teutons, the Slavs, the Alpine peoples etc. The classification of human beings into racial blocs comprising less and more advanced types is part of the warp and woof of Darwinism. This was a concern for Bryan. But at the forefront of his mind, in the years after the Great War, was another more immediate concern. Probably he could have made more of the eugenics side of the debate than he did. Kazin writes:

"But he was alarmed that the 'Darwinian doctrine' he had always condemned in a minor way had now become the prime enemy of a just society. Its exponents, he charged, had 'plunged the world into the worst of wars, and {are} dividing society into classes that fight each other on a brute basis.' A Christian counter-offensive was needed to save the coming generation".

So, there we have it: the ideologies of capitalism, socialism and militarism are the philosophical offspring of Darwin. In these days when Darwinism, like anthropogenic global warming, has

become unquestionable orthodoxy, propagandised for by the BBC and other media organisations at every opportunity, it's impolite to dredge up these less attractive facets. Social Darwinism, being non-respectable, is held to be a severable component. But this can hardly be right when Darwinism (as Marxism used to be) is at the same time held to be the universal explicator, the key to unlock the mysteries of life. For example, we have such things as evolutionary psychologists. Hardly a day goes by but some aspect of our behaviour (things like road rage, or deferred gratification) is ascribed to our long trans-species pilgrimage. Surely transgenderism is an easy pill to swallow when we have trans-speciesism thrust down our throats. There was even a German biologist called Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) who formulated the theory that the human baby in the womb went through various stages from embryo onwards, e.g. the fish stage, the lizard stage, the rabbit stage etc. Haeckel was later shown to be a charlatan whose drawings erred on the imaginative side, but long after the fraud was discovered the theory was still being promulgated in medical textbooks.

Haeckel also willed Java Man into being, some decades before this creature was discovered in the Dutch East Indies. Java Man sadly turned out to be simply *homo erectus*. It's strange how the proponents of evidence-based science, so contemptuous of the relics of the Catholic Church, end up clutching credulously at bones of even more doubtful provenance, as Chesterton pointed out long ago. One might be tempted to think they hold *a priori* philosophical beliefs.

Forbidden Or Compulsory?

Back to the American South in the 1920s. This was an interesting period, as with the period in the fourth century between the Christian religion being decriminalised and all other religions and cults being outlawed. Only five states had bans on the teaching of evolution. Bryan was not at all convinced by the wisdom of the prosecution of Scopes, believing that evolution should be taught as a theory, a mere hypothesis, faulty and inferior to special creation, but not as "*settled science*".

By 2005 things had come full circle, with the case of *Kitzmiller v. Dover* (i.e. the Dover Board of Education in Pennsylvania), in which Dover Board declared it unconstitutional to teach the theory of intelligent design (ID) in schools it controlled. ID was also defined

as being a subset of biblical creationism. Michael Behe, a biochemistry professor at Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, and the doyen of ID theory, gave evidence for the Board, but apparently was destroyed in the witness box. I haven't read the transcript of this, but was very impressed by his 1996 book, *Darwin's Black Box*, and by Behe himself when I heard him lecture in Belfast a few years ago. He would say that while he is a practising Catholic, his critique of neo-Darwinian theory is biochemical and observational, not theological, and he does hold to many of the tenets of original Darwinism. But all this avails him little as he leaves open the possibility or indeed scientific necessity of some outside intervention along the way, for which he has become a hate figure.

Monkey Business

The *Scopes* trial proceeded in a bizarre way, in the courthouse in Dayton, Tennessee in July days that were hot even by Southern standards, with Judge Raulston concerned that the floor of the courthouse might collapse at any minute, due to the crowds. For these two reasons the case was in part heard out of doors. Despite being supposed to be the prosecuting counsel, Bryan took the stand. Cross-examined by Darrow, he made a complete fool of himself, so much so that the judge was prevailed upon to have his testimony expunged from the official record.

In the end the State of Tennessee had a pyrrhic victory, with Scopes being found guilty by the jury, and fined \$100.00, a sum immediately paid by the *Baltimore Evening Sun*.

Bryan had no aspirations to be a theologian. His was a simple New Testament faith, common to the smallholders and artisans of rural America, and indeed held to be composed of self-evident truths. He felt instinctively that the inroads of evolutionary teaching would destabilise and ultimately overthrow that small town Norman Rockwell idyll, and make his country a meaner, nastier place.

His closing speech, though he never got to deliver it, salvaged his reputation somewhat:

"Again, force and love meet face to face, and the question, 'What shall I do with Jesus?' must be answered. A bloody, brutal doctrine—Evolution—demands, as the rabble did nineteen hundred years ago, that He be crucified."

Bryan's Last Ride

It was to be Bryan's last appearance in print. He stayed on the rest of that week in Dayton and went to a local Church on the Sunday morning. He was on the board to preach there that evening and went to bed in the afternoon, but he never woke up.

Three days later his coffin was placed in a Southern Railway train for a farewell tour, ending up, strangely, with interment at Arlington National Cemetery. A reporter wrote:

"Everywhere, at every station, there were men in shirt sleeves and overalls, women in gingham, and barefoot children."

Kazin writes:

"At most towns along the route, work was suspended to allow labourers, clerks and factory hands, both black and white, to visit the train. At Jefferson City, Tennessee, a male quartet stood beside the railroad car and sang one of Bryan's favourite hymns; at a tiny village in Virginia, an entire congregation came down to the tracks to pray as the train passed by. "

VOX PAT

Lolly!

"By 2006, as the Celtic Tiger was uttering its last roar, Irish homeowners were busy remortgaging their properties to invest in overseas property in locations from Dubai to Cape Verde. The country was awash with cheap credit as hundreds of millions in SSIA {Special Saving Incentive Accounts} money had just come to term. At the time, an assessment by the Revenue Commissioners estimated that by this time, around 200,000 property purchases had been made by Irish buyers abroad" (Mark Keenan, *Irish Independent*, 31.10.2014)

You don't remember! Introduced in the *Finance Act 2001*, the SSIA was structured so that the Government of Ireland contributed One Euro for every four invested by the account holder. The maximum contribution was €254 per month. For deposit account SSIA's, banks paid interest on top of the Government bonus and Principal accumulated. Equity SSIA's were also available to investors seeking higher returns than the state-guaranteed minimum of 25%. The scheme, which was restricted to those over eighteen, was most popular among middle-income earners. All SSIA's matured five years from the date of opening.

V O X	Snob Value? Paris & The Dream Ideology Sutherland sans Borders Diplomacy Illiberal Blood And Guts! Perjury; Slavery Pugwash Ireland PLC Caring Employer Nobel Prize; Rote Value	P A T
----------------------	--	----------------------

Snob Value?

"My guess is you would rather meet a guy who went to a school like Pres or Christians. No need to ask a Cork guy if he went to a fee-paying school. He'll mention it within 10 seconds of meeting you" (Ask Audrey, *Irish Examiner*, 20.11.2015)

Paris & The Dream

"The French ambassador eventually departed to drop into the Seanad, where a minute's silence was also observed.

"There was one moment of light relief, though, when the few deputies still in the chamber stifled grins at the heartfelt contribution from Labour's Eric Byrne.

"The Dublin South-Central T.D. solemnly "put into the public record" the lyrics of John Lennon's 'Imagine'.

"*"You may say I'm a dreamer, But I'm not the only one. I hope someday you'll join us, and the world will be as one"*, he intoned.

"*Mon Dieu*. Sometimes in our parliament, one minute's silence just isn't long enough" (Miriam Lord, *Irish Times*, 18.11.2015).

Ah, Miriam, you should hear the Eagles of Death version!

Ideology

Paul Kelly, a commentator for *The Australian* daily newspaper, states that there are questions about the real ideology of the same-sex marriage campaign.

"Is it merely to allow gays to marry? Or is its ultimate purpose to impose 'marriage equality' across the entire society, civil and religious? Ideologies do not normally stop at the halfway mark" (*The Australian*, July 11, 2015).

Sutherland sans Borders

"Sophistry of denying national sovereignty

The UN special representative for international migration, Peter Sutherland, says "*sovereignty is an absolute illusion that has to be put behind us.*

The days of hiding behind borders and fences has long gone".

Mr Sutherland seems to think that human beings are as neutral as packaged goods and finance though they clearly are not. The statement is also in breach of the recognition of UN charters, Article 2.7 and Article 2.1 that states that the UN organisation is "*based on the principle of sovereign equality of all its members*". His concepts might have some merit if every nation and sovereign jurisdiction upheld the idea of the Sovereign Man as emphasised by constitutional republicanism, but this is sadly not the case.

Nor indeed, are such concepts and ideas necessarily held as core values by the mass of immigrants. If it were so there would hardly be any tension or anxiety in welcoming immigrants.

Should the concept of the Sovereign Man be universally held there would be little requirement for mass immigration. That of course is a dream—one Mr Sutherland ought to recognise. And it may well have been the dream of the foundation of the UN—an acknowledgement and recognition of the great thinkers of the enlightenment and universal human rights. Those principles that are today hamstrung by a score of intellectual sophists that inhabit the mindsets of our educational institutions and inhibit the necessary requirement of true assimilation."

John McGrath, Hollyford, Co Tip.
(Letter to *Irish Examiner*, 3.11.2015)

Diplomacy?

"It would be some time before I fully realised that the United States sees little need for diplomacy. Power is enough. Only the weak rely on diplomacy. The Roman Empire had no need for diplomacy. Nor does the United States", *Boutros Boutros-Ghali* (Boutros Boutros-Ghali is an Egyptian politician and diplomat who was the sixth Secretary-General of the United Nations from January, 1992 to December, 1996.)

Illiberal?

"It was ever thus, even when Roman Catholic atmospherics whistled through almost every nook and cranny in southern Irish society.

Pollak's {Andy Pollak} mistake, a typical one, is to see our socially separated populations as homogeneous entities, one liberal, the other illiberal. In fact, during the 1960s young people within both population groups revolted against excessive social controls. The rules and regulations were in fact tighter among Protestants.

Paranoia about young Protestants meeting and marrying Catholics, thus losing children to Rome, gave impetus to an elaborate machinery of separation. Young Protestants found this "stifling atmosphere" (as F.S.L. Lyons put it) as stultifying during the 1960s as did many Catholics resentfully occupying their confessional domain.

"The point is, why don't we hear about it? The reason is because it challenges a prevalent stereotype that Pollak perpetuates. Some Protestants liked things the way they were. For instance, Maurice Dockrell T.D. was criticised as Lord Mayor in 1960 for kissing the ring of a visiting Roman Catholic prelate. Dockrell responded, *'I thought it was about time an Irish Protestant paid tribute to the wonderful Catholicism of the Irish people. {...} Let's not fool ourselves—if the majority of the Irish weren't Catholics they wouldn't be good little Protestants, they'd be rip-roaring anti-clerical communists'...*" (Niall Meehan, *Irish Times* 24.10.2015)

Blood And Guts!

An old law passed under Henry VIII in 1530 was eventually repealed in 1863. It required that those convicted of wilful poisoning should be boiled alive. It was not until 1870 that hanging, drawing and quartering, the traditional punishment for traitors, was abolished. The last public hanging in Britain took place on 26th May 1868. The victim was Michael Barrett, a Fermanagh man and a Fenian who was alleged to have caused an explosion at Clerkenwell prison in London.

Perjury

In December, 1640, John Atherton, Anglican Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, was executed for committing an act of sodomy with his tithe collector, John Childe. Both men were put to death. Atherton was executed in Stephen's Green, Dublin. The only witness to the crime was a disgruntled servant of Atherton.

ton's who had been discharged from his service. The servant later confessed to have perjured himself.

Slavers

THE IRISH BOURGEOISIE, sorry, Irish Catholic bourgeoisie—There were two good reasons not to rejoice when the British empire finally abolished slavery in its colonies in 1833. Firstly, it was replaced by a system of indentured servitude that was not much better and, secondly, parliament decided slave owners would have to be compensated handsomely for the loss of their property.

The payout was nothing short of a bonanza. It amounted to £20 million—almost half of Britain's annual exchequer budget at the time.

There were thousands of eager claimants, among them James Kelly of Newtown House, Abbeyknockmoy, Co Galway.

Kelly had two plantations in Jamaica. One was Crescent Park, St Anne, where he had 101 slaves, the other was Green Castle at St-Thomas-in-the-East, where 215 people were in forced servitude. Green Castle today is a hotel on a 1,600 acre estate.

In total, James Kelly received £6,141 6s 3d in compensation for the loss of these 316 pieces of 'property'. By a conservative estimate, based on historical standards of living, that's worth almost £500,000 in today's money.

The prosperous Catholic family had bought the Newtown estate in 1802 and three generations of the family lived there in the 19th Century. The last was a county court judge and vice-president of the RDS, Charles Kelly, who died in 1905 - his daughter Countess Matilda Turquet de la Boisserie wrote a memoir of her childhood at Newtown.

The house had a succession of owners afterwards, including Major Frederick Carr of the Carr's water biscuit family. In 1967 it was sold to Lord Richard Wrottesley, who was killed three years later in a car crash on his way home from Dublin Airport having reportedly made a bet that he could complete the journey in less than two hours.

Wrottesley left a wife and one child—a two-year-old son, Clifton Hugh Lancelot de Verdon Wrottesley, who grew up to be a fund manager, British peer and skeleton racer, finishing fourth for Ireland at the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City.

Newtown House, the 18th century Galway mansion and just a little over 30 km from Galway city can be yours for

≈2.3 million. (No, the price doesn't include Slaves)

Pugwash

"What we are advocating in Pugwash, a war-free world, will be seen by many as a Utopian dream. It is not Utopian. There already exist in the world large regions, for example, the European Union, within which war is inconceivable" (Joseph Roblat, 1995) Sir Joseph (Józef) Rotblat, KCMG, CBE, FRS, (4 November, 1908—31 August, 2005) was a self-described "*Pole with a British passport*", a nuclear physicist and a tireless worker for peace and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995.

Ireland PLC

"Mr Justice Hedigan remarked that there is 'no such thing as the Republic of Ireland' as the name of the country is Ireland or Eire. 'Republic of Ireland is a soccer team', he said.

It was not a Country or a State. *The Times* (of London)'s Counsel, Mr. Murray defending his client in a case brought by *The Irish Times*, concurred with the Judge: legally, there is no such place as the Republic of Ireland. While the marketing team did not see ROI as an ideal solution at all, it could be a solution pending the full action, he said (*Irish Examiner*, 23.7.2015).

"The name of the State, in the language common to both papers is Ireland.

The case arose because *The Times* (of London) is launching an "Irish Edition" and *The Irish Times*, for commercial reasons, does not want there to be any confusion.

This is understandable. As a daily reader of both papers over many decades I'm sometimes confused myself. That said, I'd have been very surprised had *The Irish Times* carried a photograph showing a future King and two future Queens of England giving Nazi salutes, as was done by *The Times* of London's stablemate, *The Sun*.

It is well known that *The Times* of London in the 1930s advocated appeasement of Hitler. Less well-known is that *The Irish Times* in March, 1933, editorially welcomed Hitler's accession to power, and that its Obituary for Lord Carson in 1935 said that he was a man born before his time, otherwise he "*might have been a Mussolini, or even a Hitler*".

This was written not to bury the noble Lord, but to praise him."

(Letter to *Irish Post*, London from a Mr. D. Kennedy, 24.7.2015)

NOTE: "The High Court has refused an

application by *The Irish Times* for injunctions restraining the publishers of *London Times* using the words "*The Times Irish Edition*" in promoting a new digital Irish edition of the UK newspaper.

"He adjourned a decision on liability for costs of the three-day application to Wednesday." (*Irish Times*, 27.7.2015)

Caring Employer

In April, 1912, as soon as the *Titanic* went down, the White Star Line, the ship's owners, stopped the wages of the crew.

Nobel Prize

Donegal-born, 85-year-old William C. Campbell became the second Irish scientist to win a Nobel prize. Here, he talks about work and education:

"I think you need to work to ensure that life has some joy now, even if it's difficult. Gratitude is a totally pervasive thing {for me}. I have so much to be grateful for.

"Doing small creative acts can be very important—along with meaningful work. Yet, to be meaningful, work has to be hard work. So many people think it would be nice to have a nice, cushy job. If it's a really cushy job it's not really work.

"At the same time I've learned that one should not engage in oppressive work on the grounds that, when it's all accomplished, then you'll start living properly. Some people have this idea that when you get through this miserable period, then you'll start living, then you'll start having fun.

"There's no need to be berating yourself and banging your head as you struggle through, on the grounds that it will one day become better."

Rote Value

"I am biased on this. I'm no educational expert, but I was taught via rote learning, and learned to recite poetry with my tutor, Ms Martin. Parts have never left me.

"I learned things by heart in college too. In Trinity in those days the exams came at the end of vacation, so I had to do a great deal of self-learning, and self-reinforcing of what you learned, and this was by memorisation.

"That's my personal experience: it has added a richness. Now, maybe other people can learn other ways. Educational experts might know better." (*Irish Times*, 10.10.2015)

Brendan Clifford

Part 2 of Connolly & Lynd will appear in the next issue

Connolly, Greaves And Lenin Or, how to get from A to C!

The *Pensive Quill* is a virtual magazine published on the Internet by Anti-Provo Republicans. I never see it unless I am given a print-out from it. I was given a print-out of an article about Desmond Greaves of the British Communist Party and the English *Connolly Association* by Liam O Ruairc. Greaves is accused of misquoting Connolly in 1916 about the "stages theory" of revolution.

"Greaves ascribed to Connolly a 'stages' theory of revolution in which the national democratic revolution is the first stage of revolution and thus 'recalls the approach of Lenin in Two Tactics..."

"To substantiate his claim Greaves quotes an article from Connolly entitled 'Economic Conscription' published in the *Workers Republic* of 15 January 1916 where he argues that as the 'propertied classes have so shamelessly sold themselves to the enemy, the economic subscription of their property will cause few qualms to whomsoever shall administer the Irish government in the *first stage* of freedom {Life of Connolly p284}. Greaves stresses this phrase—but it isn't there: what Connolly wrote was in fact 'whomsoever shall administer the Irish government in the *first days* of freedom'... This fact was pointed out by John Hoffman, a Connolly Association member in 1978 but as late as 1985 Greaves was still repeating this claim..."

(Also at issue for O Ruairc is the manner that Connolly advised the Citizen Army to hold onto their rifles in the event of victory as their Volunteer allies might want to stop fighting "before our goal is reached", and his instruction that no a shot was to be fired in the North lest it set off a sectarian rampage—Ulster would be dealt with after they had won.)

Packaging Connolly

I gave a series of talks about Connolly in Liberty Hall in the late 1960s in which I drew attention to the misquotation and misrepresentation of Connolly by Greaves and by others. After one of those meetings I had a long discussion with Roy Johnston, who was Greaves's man in Dublin and was said to be re-making the IRA into a Marxist organisation.

Johnston did not dispute what I said about the misrepresentation of Connolly. He said, in effect, that by means of these misrepresentations, skillfully woven into a knot that could never be disentangled, Greaves had given Connolly currency as a Leninist.

Around the same time I had some discussion with members of the CP,NI (Communist Party, not "of Northern Ireland" but comma Northern Ireland), who were not entirely in harmony with Greaves. They told me I was doing Connolly a disservice by publishing articles not included in the three-volume Three Candles selection, because Connolly had been wrong about many things. His understanding of things was very different from Lenin's and this was particularly the case about the World War. He was wrong about the War.

I forget what it was that they disagreed with Greaves about, but it was not his misrepresentation of Connolly into a Leninist. In the interest of practical politics Connolly needed to be misrepresented. He was the biggest name in Irish Socialism; he said he was a Marxist; functional Marxism was Leninism: it was therefore necessary to improve Connolly into a Leninist.

I went into the matter of the War and found that the CP,NI was quite right. Connolly's characterisation of it was essentially in conflict with Lenin's. But I thought it was Connolly who got it right. That was an improper thought. Something has got to be sacred, and Leninism was sacred then. The prestige of Leninism in the extensive British Left, and the budding Irish Left, of that period is hard to imagine today.

The North blew up shortly after that and interrupted our Connolly publishing. I think it was the middle or late 1970s before I got around to publishing Connolly on the War and arguing in support of it. There is not a shred of reasonable doubt that he supported Germany actively on Socialist grounds.

Ruth Dudley Edwards, who was bred to academia, and was fashionably radical to start with, published biographies of

Pearse and Connolly. In an ignorant response to the War that had erupted in the North, she turned against Pearse. Conor Cruise O'Brien had infected the bourgeois intelligentsia of Dublin with his nightmare of "*Pearsean Ghosts*" which inspired people to go on killing sprees. Pearse, with his rhetoric, caused all that killing in 1916, and his black magic was still active. Pearse was damaged goods—but she was still starry-eyed about Connolly, apparently not noticing that he had been the Commander in the Rising.

Ruth became a member of the English ruling class by marriage for a generation. She was commissioned to write the history of that essential capitalist institution, *The Economist*—and also to write the entry on Connolly for the new edition of the *Dictionary Of National Biography*. Though he was the enemy Commander of the first War within the United Kingdom since 1745, he was omitted from the first edition of the DNB. A volume of *Missing Persons* later brought him in, with an entry by RDE. Then much the same entry appeared in the second edition of the full DNB. The same thing is done with the Connolly entry in the *Dictionary Of Irish Biography*, published by Cambridge University and the Royal Irish Academy. In these entries the fact of Connolly's socialist support of Germany in the Great War is omitted.

After I was lured into politics by Pat Murphy around 1963 I was confronted with "*the Stalin School of Falsification*". The falsification had mostly to do with theoretical formulations regarding phases of the Russian Revolution, but there was a famous Missing Person case. Trotsky was deleted from a photo of Bolshevik leaders that was much used in propaganda. This was after he had set himself against the course of development decided on by the Party. It somehow seems much less of an offence against absolute truth than what Ruth Dudley Edwards did to Connolly.

As for Greaves's falsifications, they were done in an attempt to give Leninist Socialism currency under the name of Connolly in very Catholic Dublin. Camouflage was considered necessary to survival. And it was not only done by Greaves. There seemed to be a large undergrowth in which everyone was doing it.

BICO decided not to do it. We published a magazine called *The Irish Communist*, and were thought to be crazy for doing so.

I was arrested selling it at the GPO and was taken to Store Street station to be interviewed by Lugs Brannigan, who was a notorious policeman at the time but evolved into respectability warranting a biography.

There was nothing to the interview. He didn't seem to know what questions to ask. I suppose it was the business of the populace to throw Communists into the Liffey and not leave it to the police to rack their brains for laws to use against them. Anyhow, Lugs didn't know what to say when I was delivered to him. I suppose a concerned citizen must have phoned the Guards about me and they felt they had to arrest me, even though they didn't know why.

I had not caused public disorder. If I had done, the disorder would have dealt with me. But, since the public was not bothered by me, except for the concerned citizen, the police didn't know what to do with me, and they told me to go.

That must have been in 1966 or 1967. Then in 1968-9 Dennis raised a great commotion with the Housing Action movement and his Hunger Strike, as a Communist, in support of the homeless. He spoiled the half-centenary commemoration of the *Declaration Of Independence* by pointing up the failure to implement the *Democratic Programme*. And he emerged triumphantly from prison to be the Communist hero of the Dublin tenements.

Stages

With regard to the "*stages theory of revolution*", there is no doubt that Connolly took a very active part in what, in the Marxist scheme of things, was a bourgeois-national revolution.

The bourgeois revolution was the revolution that was there to be made. And Connolly, who had just got his small Citizen Army from the 1913 Trade Union war with the national bourgeoisie (the *Irish Independent*/William Martin Murphy connection), was determined to use it, when Britain made war on Germany, in an attempt to carry out the bourgeois-national revolution, even if the bourgeoisie stayed at home.

Jack Lane pointed out long ago that Connolly's political affinity in Europe was with Joseph Pilsudski's Polish Socialist Party, which was committed to the re-establishment of a Polish nation state. Connolly, like Pilsudski, took the establishment of the nation-state to be working-class business—even though the nation-state was understood to be a requirement of the development of the

capitalist market. He merged socialism and nationalism.

I collected Connolly's references to the PSP in both runs of *The Workers' Republic* (separated by 15 years) and published them in a pamphlet called *Connolly: The Polish Aspect*, along with a review of the preservation of ancient Polish culture to be the medium of modern national development by the poet Adam Mickiewicz, who had a strong influence on Pilsudski.

It seemed to me that Connolly would willingly have joined his Socialism with an Irish equivalent of the Polish development to which Mickiewicz was central, if it had existed. But it didn't exist. Then I got distracted into considering who might have been the Irish Mickiewicz—and was led back to where I came from. Eoghan Roe O'Sullivan, who came from a few townlands away from mine, was the only possible candidate. He lived in the two worlds (as Mickiewicz had lived for a while in Russia), but he refused to preserve the old world by making it functional against the colonial world from within. And it was then that I became aware of the singularity of Slieve Luacra. Until then I had never given a thought to Slieve Luacra. It was just where I had come from—where I was produced.

That pamphlet sold out in a couple of years—a batch of at least 500, possibly 1,000—and it was being re-done for a more modern printing method when some development in Northern Ireland politics caused it to be set aside for the time being. It did not, as far as I could see, have the slightest influence on the way Connolly was thought about—either by the Right, the Dudley Edwardses, or the Left, the Communist Parties and Trotskyist organisations (of which there were many).

Meyrick Cramb

Connolly, as far as I could discover, never mentioned Lenin. It seems unlikely that he had never heard of him. He took 2nd International affairs in earnest. And, since he expressed agreement with the Polish Socialist Party, it seems likely that he would have noticed the rejection by Lenin of its merging of socialism and nationalism.

Admirers of Connolly, both academic and polemical (a false distinction in contemporary Ireland), display a profound lack of curiosity about him. He is treated as a blurred icon capable of being carved into something usable in present-day factional disputes. The Pilsudski connection is ignored. So is Meyrick

Cramb, who appears as a pro-German writer in the 1915 run of *The Workers' Republic*.

I have never had the resources available to the academically-based or externally-funded Left, and I could only conduct a very limited search for Meyrick Cramb. He might have been the son of Professor Cramb of Queen's College, London, who was an influential writer on Germany in the pre-1915 generation. If so, he rebelled against his father during the War.

Jack Lane discovered a letter from a Meyrick Cramb to Lady Ottoline Morrell of the Bloomsbury Group of aesthetes. It would be very surprising if we had not heard more of a member of the Bloomsbury Group who wrote treasonable propaganda for an Irish revolutionary during the height of the War on Germany.

I noticed a resemblance between the writing of a Meyrick Booth and Connolly's Meyrick Cramb. (Booth published, before the War, a book about the contemporary German philosopher, Rudolf Eucken, who is mentioned in the *Workers' Republic*; and he published a pamphlet on foreign policy in the 1930s that seems to be in line with Connolly's position in the War.

The German socialists mentioned favourably by Connolly during the War all belonged to the Right. They all supported the German war effort as a war of defence. At the outset of the War, he wrote an article in praise of Karl Liebknecht, but that was in response to a rumour that Liebknecht had been executed for opposition to the War, and was at a time when it still seemed possible that 2nd International Socialism would try to stop the Imperialist War by means of general class war. Once the 2nd International collapsed in the face of Imperialist War, I do not recall that Connolly ever again mentioned Liebknecht's opposition to the German war effort, in which he held the German Government responsible for the War.

Nor do I remember any mention of the other prominent German socialist opponent of the German war effort, Rosa Luxemburg. And I do not know why we should assume that Connolly knew nothing of Luxemburg. He knew of Pilsudski, and therefore I assume that he knew that Luxemburg founded an anti-Pilsudski, anti-Polish nationalist, Socialist Party.

Rosa Luxemburg

Luxemburg was strongly anti-Leninist. She saw Lenin as establishing a bureaucratically-structured party to con-

duct the socialist revolution, in place of the actual working class. She appears to have had at the back of her mind a spontaneously generating working-class/socialist revolution. Early in 1919 she and Liebknecht raised a revolutionary agitation against the Social Democratic Republic and they were assassinated by ex-Servicemen banded together as *Freikorps* and acting in place of the dissolved Army. The remnants of her spontaneous agitational movement were then absorbed into the viable Leninist structure of the new German Communist Party.

In 1916 a German socialist pamphlet argued that the experience of 1914-15 demonstrated that the socialist revolution had been misconceived—that it had been imagined in terms of the bourgeois revolutions. Socialism, being organised society, was different in kind from capitalist society. The bourgeois revolution could unleash capitalism by going to the barricades to pull down the feudal apparatus that was restricting it. Freed from restraint, the capitalists would then make Capitalism.

But Socialism was not there ready to be unleashed by barricade revolutions against the Capitalist State. The workers did not construct the elements of Socialism within Capitalism, as budding capitalists constructed elements of Capitalism under Feudalism. The distinctive thing about Capitalism is that respect was that it *proletarianised* the working class, wiping out the artisan component that was evident in the early socialist movement, and reducing it to utterly propertyless wage-labour.

Bourgeois Revolution

The bourgeois revolution in Irish society—or in society in Ireland—began with Gavan Duffy's encouragement of Tenant Leaguers, following the failure of John Mitchel's revolutionism in 1848. That development was aborted when Duffy's Independent Party was subverted by Sadleir and Keogh in the 1850s. It was taken up again twenty years later by Michael Davitt's Land League, and it was brought to fruition in the early 20th century by William O'Brien and Canon Sheehan's All-For-Ireland League.

Davitt, having set the Land League in motion, had the idea of founding a working-class movement on similar lines in England. But the workers in capitalist enterprises were in the irresistible grip of proletarianisation and could not conceive of themselves in any practical way as potential joint owners of the enterprises in which they were employed.

A strong Syndicalist development

might lay the basis for a workers' revolution of a kind with the capitalist revolution. Connolly advocated Syndicalism but with little success. In present-day Irish Socialism this aspect of the matter is only dealt with in *Labour Comment* by Pat Maloney, who has had extensive practical experience of the proletarianising influence of Capitalism on Trade Unionism.

The "*stages theory*" of socialist revolution, surprisingly brought up by *The Pensive Quill*, has a bearing on this. It has to do with the connecting of the socialist revolution with the bourgeois revolution. I don't know if there is an overt Trotskyist influence in the Pensive Quill group, but it was in association with Trotskyist groups that we had to do with "*the stages theory*".

The orthodox Social Democratic (Marxist) view in the 1900s was that the revolution that was on the cards in Russia was a bourgeois revolution, i.e. a political revolution to establish the capitalists in state power. Alexander Helphand suggested that Russian conditions were not suitable for the consolidation of a bourgeois state, and that, once the revolution against the Tsarist State was set in motion it would not stabilise in bourgeois democracy but would carry on to the establishment of Socialist Government. This idea was taken up journalistically by Trotsky as Permanent Revolution. (Helphand had the revolutionary pen-name of Parvus.)

Lenin held formally to the orthodox view that Tsarism would fall to bourgeois revolution. He took no notice of Trotsky's prediction that the impending revolution would be socialist, or to the theory of Permanent Revolution, but he prepared organisationally and theoretically for the destabilising of the bourgeois revolution when it happened by taking control of the bourgeois social revolution in its main substance, which was in landlord/peasant relations.

Before the Great War, when a Tsarist Minister seemed to be in earnest about substantial land reform, it seems that Lenin considered emigration. Neither his heart nor his intellect engaged with the project of bourgeois revolution as accomplished fact, and the possibility of using bourgeois revolution as a means towards something else lay in the inability or the unwillingness of the Tsarist State to do what the British State did in Ireland in alliance with William O'Brien and Canon Sheehan—discard landlordism and develop the peasantry into a rural bourgeoisie.

The Minister was assassinated. The State threw itself recklessly into the World War diplomatically organised by Britain, its aim being the destruction of the Turkish state and the incorporation of Constantinople (Istanbul) into the Tsarist Empire. Lenin forgot about emigration. From the safety of Switzerland he kept the core of his Bolshevik faction together and committed to a policy of defeatism in the War—that is, defeat of Tsarism. His policy had many similarities with that of Liebknecht and Luxemburg with regard to Germany, but was utterly different in substance—both because of the essential difference in social circumstances between Russia and Germany, and the essential difference between his idea of how one went about revolution and theirs.

I do not have any of the material to hand, but what I recall is that he praised them for their stance while pitying them for their naivete.

Party Machine

One of Luxemburg's last writings was a criticism of triumphant Leninism—of Leninism which had become the political power in the Russian state. What she condemned was the realistic means by which he had achieved power. She had, as far as I recall, made the same criticism of his method of party organisation before the War, when the Bolshevism (despite its name, which means Bigger, was a minority tendency in Russian Social Democracy) was apparently a lost cause.

Lenin had constructed it as a usable political instrument which he could direct, and had prevented it from becoming part of the general flow of things. The opportunity to use this instrument came in the Spring of 1917, when the Tsarist State structure fell apart, suddenly and unexpectedly, under the stress of the military effort to gain Constantinople (which Britain, having stymied that Russian ambition all through the 19th century, said it could have for the taking).

The Russian bourgeois revolution just happened. Nobody had made it, and therefore nobody could dominate it. What followed the collapse of Tsarism was a period of free political flux under a Government which was not the directing centre of an effective State apparatus.

Lenin was isolated in Switzerland when this happened. Alexander Helphand (Parvus), who had become a Socialist millionaire, involved in war industry, persuaded the German military leadership that it would be to Germany's

advantage to help Lenin to get back to Russia and implement Bolshevik policy. And so Lenin was transported across Germany in the "sealed train" and got to Petrograd through Finland.

Stepping off the train at the Finland Station, Lenin immediately dispelled the euphoria that had overcome even the Bolsheviks at the fall of Tsarism. Stalin, the leading Bolshevik in Russia at the time of the collapse, had adopted the policy of participating in the bourgeois democracy as an Opposition. Lenin said that the bourgeois revolution had happened and that the time for Socialist Revolution had therefore arrived.

Six months of intensive Bolshevik revolutionary agitation followed. In the olden times Bolshevik activity was financed by bank robbery, and Stalin had acquired some reputation as a bank robber. But bank robbery couldn't have financed the scale of Bolshevik agitation during the Summer and Autumn of 1917. Lenin had a much more adequate and reliable source of supply—the German State.

The bargain was that Germany would finance his bid for power, and that if he gained power he would take Russia out of the War.

The two effective Bolshevik policies, hammered home in a scores of newspapers, were an end to Russian participation in the Imperialist War, and The Land To The Peasants.

The latter was the core item of the bourgeois social revolution, but it was the means by which the Bolsheviks undermined the ineffectual bourgeois regime that fell into place with the collapse of Tsarism because of the War and that continued the War to its own destruction.

Lenin took no heed of Trotsky's "Permanent Revolution" prediction of 1905 that the bourgeois revolution would be skipped over in Russia. He held the orthodox Stages theory and prepared for the bourgeois revolution, but then he used the half-baked bourgeois revolution as a booster for socialist revolution.

It might be said that Lenin realised what Trotsky predicted. But Trotsky himself could not have realised what he predicted. He lacked the means of political action. For twelve years he had condemned the means of action being prepared by Lenin as a bureaucratic stifling of working class initiative, but in the Summer of 1917 he became politically effective as an oratorical instrument of Lenin's party.

It was neither prediction nor oratory

that brought about the "Permanent Revolution" between the bourgeois and socialist revolution; it was Leninist organisation plus German money.

Connolly & 1916

Connolly, a year earlier, took part in a bourgeois revolution with the intention of making the most of it for the working class. One can see why, half-a-century later, Greaves represented his approach as being similar to Lenin's. Insofar as there was a widely accepted manual of socialist revolutionary strategy, it was Lenin's *Two Tactics*. The only successful socialist revolution was still the one carried out by Lenin, and therefore his views on how to do it carried weight. Perhaps Greaves misquoted Connolly a bit to help his argument, and Connolly did not use the word "stages", but what Connolly actually did was enlist his Army in the bourgeois stage.

He had no patience with Sean O'Casey, who opposed participation by the Citizen Army in the bourgeois revolution being attempted by the Volunteers, any more than Lenin had any time for Trotsky until Trotsky placed himself under Bolshevik discipline in 1917.

The Irish situation in the Summer of 1916 was utterly different from the Russian situation in the Summer of 1917. There was no follow-on socialist revolution, because the bourgeois revolution had not happened, but had been suppressed.

I don't recall what, if anything, O'Casey had proposed doing. If it was to keep the Citizen Army intact as a socialist observer of the bourgeois revolution, I'm sure that would have been futile. In revolutionary situations the revolutionary spirit is insidious and a revolutionary group that tries to stand away from it is likely to be evaporated by it, except for the odd individual who is so bound up in a straitjacket of doctrinaire ideology that he is capable of political action.

Also, the bourgeois revolution in Ireland was different in its substance from the February Revolution in Russia. There was no oppressed peasantry in Ireland—or none worth speaking of as a force of social revolution. The peasant revolution had been accomplished around 1903 by William O'Brien and Canon Sheehan in collaboration with the Unionist Party. The Redmondite party done its best to preserve a peasantry oppressed by an alien landlordism as a force of national discontent, and failed. The peasants now owned the land in most

areas, and the landlords had been paid-off by a Unionist Government pursuing its ideal of a property-owning democracy, and many of them had gone away.

The content of the revolution was the establishment of a self-governing state for a society that had already become bourgeois—and the inclusion in this Irish national state of a large bourgeois community in Ulster that was strongly British in national orientation and had expressed its determination to resist incorporation into an Irish national state by force.

Considering the situation as it was in 1914-16, with relation to the Stages theory, the outstanding fact is that there was not an Irish working class that was capable of united political action. The great bulk of industrial wage-labour lay in the Unionist North and was thoroughly Unionist in outlook. As for the rest: the weaker, less organised, nationalist working class was hegemonised by Redmondism, whose patronage had been greatly increased by the Unemployment Insurance system, that was designed to be operated by Friendly Societies. The main Friendly Society was Joe Devlin's Ancient Order of Hibernians, which was also a Catholic secret society integrated with the organisation of the Home Rule Party.

In those circumstances, there was little Labour could do but wait. It was effectively accounted for by the system of bourgeois institutions. There was no great working class mass that did not feel it had some place in the system and was at a loose end.

Fifty years later, when Greaves was writing, the bourgeois revolution had been reduced to the ending of Partition. And the main social force upholding Partition was the industrial working class of Northern Ireland.

Greaves had a problem in the early 1960s with Republicans who had played some part in the 1956 IRA invasion of the North; whose enthusiasm for revolution had not been diminished by failure; and who turned to Connolly, and therefore to the Connolly Association, in search of revolutionary action of some other kind. They wanted to denounce Dublin Governments for half-heartedness or betrayal with regard to their national duty. He did not see what good that would do, and he did not allow any criticism of the Dublin regime in the *Irish Democrat*.

Some of them therefore turned to revolutionist Trotskyist organisations, which were then getting into their stride

in London. And the great Trotskyist theoretical issue with the Communist Parties was Permanent Revolution versus the Stages theory of bourgeois and socialist revolution.

Trotsky's Permanent Revolution prediction of 1905 was that the fall of Tsarism could not be stabilised by bourgeois revolution. The revolution would continue until it was socialist.

So far, so good.

But socialist revolution was assumed to be possible only in conditions of advanced capitalism. Russian society was pre-capitalist in many ways. But the socialist political revolution that would inevitably over-ride the capitalist revolution in Russia, would be enabled to continue to the construction of socialist society by socialist revolutions at the centres of capitalism beyond Russia's borders.

In Trotsky's view, the Russian phase of Permanent Revolution was only a preliminary phase. It was certain that the phase of capitalism would be skipped over in Russia—but it was no less certain that, without socialist revolution in Europe, the attempt to build socialism in Russia would fail. Permanent Revolution was International Revolution. The weight of European capitalist productive forces, enlisted in the socialist cause by revolution, would make socialism possible everywhere.

Socialist revolution must be undertaken in Russia, on the certainty that anti-capitalist revolution in Europe would follow. Only obscurantist hacks of a bureaucratised party system could fail to see that.

But then the unthinkable happened. And it happened very fast.

Brest-Litovsk

Germany presented the bill for the October Revolution. Lenin did not hesitate to pay it. But his Party had expanded, perhaps a thousandfold, and he had directed it very effectively into all the vast business of constructing a State which did not rest on an established social system but had the task of creating a kind of system that had never existed before.

It was a top-down Party—the kind of Party that Trotsky had spent a dozen years condemning Lenin for. But now it was a Party of hundreds of thousands of members, organised in committees, with each committee organising inchoate masses into purposeful activity. The centre had to be connected with the masses in order to be able to act—but that had to be a two-way system to a

considerable extent.

In order to generate enthusiasm for the socialist revolution against the revolution actually in place (bourgeois, but with some socialist pretensions), Lenin vastly over-simplified what was involved in the construction of Socialism (*State And Revolution*, produced during the Summer of 1917, has something of the character of an anarchist Utopia), and he also emphasised the certainty, the inevitability, of socialist revolution in industrialised Europe.

Then, in the Spring of 1918, he lost control of his Party. He was outvoted in the central directing body on the issue of making a settlement with Germany. The spirit in which the revolution was made favoured a rejection of making a Treaty with Germany that would enable it to shift its Eastern Army to the Western Front and possibly win the War and consolidate the Kaiser's regime.

Trotsky, in charge of foreign affairs, declared that there would be *neither war nor peace* with Germany. They would not make war on Germany, but neither would they make a Treaty with it. They would just walk away from the War. But Germany insisted that there must be either a Peace Treaty or it would treat Russia as still being at war with it.

Bukharin proposed that they should declare "*revolutionary war*" on the German State and by that means carry their revolution into Europe, and he got a majority against Lenin for it. But Lenin wouldn't have it. He had got his Communist State by means of his deal with Imperialist Germany and he was not going to risk it on a gamble of precipitating revolution in Germany by means of war. And he threatened that, if his colleagues in the leadership did not back down and let him have his way, he would resign from the leadership and appeal to the Party membership against them. Bukharin refused to back down, and he toyed with the idea of arresting Lenin. But he lacked the will to act on his own understanding of the situation against Lenin (who regarded him as a kind of very clever pet), and Lenin's will was relentless.

In the critical confrontation Trotsky deprived Bukharin of his majority by abstaining on the vote. Lenin had his way. Germany got its Treaty (Brest-Litovsk), which enabled it to concentrate on the West, and to try to foster a number of nation-states against the Bolshevik State, including the Ukraine, as far as I recall. The Bolshevik Revolution was isolated in Russia, under a single party

dictatorship: the Left Social Revolutionaries, who had acted with the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution and had formed a Coalition with them, parted company with them over Brest-Litovsk and went into revolutionary opposition and were suppressed.

A very long time ago I tried to make sense of the course of events in Russia in that period, and that is the sense I made of it. I set it out in a very long pamphlet which, as far as I know, was never disputed.

Permanent Revolution

"*Permanent Revolution*" was, in those times, always at the source of rejection of the "*Stages Theory*" of first bourgeois and then socialist. But PR itself also carried a Stages theory: first Russia, then Germany and France.

But what if Germany and France do not follow? It was inevitable that they would follow, but what if they didn't? Then the revolution in Russia must fail. But it was unthinkable that they would not follow! And yet they didn't.

Trotsky was the first Marxist I read—apart from Marx himself, who was rumoured to have denied being a Marxist. I read his defence of terrorism as a means of defending the state. Then I read Kautsky, who he was arguing against. Having grown up amongst people who had experienced the terrorism by which the British State tried to preserve itself in Ireland, I had no problem with that aspect of things.

The problem lay in Trotsky's Second Stage, which failed to happen, and with the way he dealt with the fact that it did not happen.

The postulate was that, in the absence of the second stage, the revolution in Russia would either be swept aside by whichever Imperialist Power won the World War or, if it survived, it would inevitably degenerate into a caricature of itself.

But, when the Bolshevik State did survive and tried to accomplish the development that Lenin had set for it, what Trotsky wrote was *The Revolution Betrayed*. What he had predicted as the inevitable consequence of isolation was now held to be a betrayal of the Revolution from within.

Lenin had isolated the Bolshevik revolution in order to protect it in 1918. In 1920 he tried to carry it into Europe, by means of war with Poland, but his invasion was defeated by the Connolly of Eastern Europe, Joseph Pilsudski,

who ended up enlarging the Polish state at the expense of Russia.

Though isolated, Bolshevism continued to present itself as International Socialism. In the early 1920s it was countered by National Socialism, which Churchill hailed, in its Fascist form, some years later, as the force that would save capitalist European civilisation. Lenin, nearing the end of his tether, noted the arrival of Fascism. And he adapted to the possibility of long term isolation by asking why the presumed historical order things could not be reversed. It had been assumed that the Socialist State would be constructed on an economic basis of advanced capitalism. Things were working out otherwise. The first socialist state had been established in a largely pre-capitalist society. But why could the socialist state and socialist culture not establish its own advanced form of economy without capitalism?

That is what was attempted. And that is what Trotsky, after his exclusion from the Bolshevik leadership, described as *The Revolution Betrayed*.

Germany is where the European Revolution failed to happen, because Germany was Lenin's ideal as well as Connolly's. Germany was where it ought to have happened, because Germany was the most socialist of the major capitalist states. A British Labour delegation, investigating the practicality of municipal socialism, visited some European countries and seemed puzzled that the Germans did not realise they already had it. And the way Germany, cut off from world trade and money markets by the Royal Navy in August 1914, constructed an effective war economy in isolation, seems to have greatly influenced Lenin's thinking about socialist construction.

If Lenin had read the signs, as Connolly did in August-September 1914, and concluded that the future of Socialism in the world would be greatly influenced by who won the war, and had taken sides accordingly, I'm sure he would have chosen as Connolly did.

The failure of the revolution in Germany was connected with the fact that the would-be revolutionaries were widely seen as being responsible for the defeat of Germany in the war, and they actually had been defeatists.

Germany

Lenin and Connolly had been defeatists too, and Connolly had openly supported the enemy. But the state whose defeat Connolly sought was an alien state in Ireland. And the Socialist movement

was not the major force in the Russian state as it was in the German, and was not a vital element in the democracy of the state, because the state was not organised democratically. But Germany was a democracy, and the Social Democratic Party was the biggest political party in it.

The joke used to be that Socialist revolution was impossible in Germany because Germany was too Socialist. But it was no joke. How can a majority make a revolution—which is the overthrow of a system—if it is heavily involved in the system?

What happened in Germany during the Winter of 1918-19 is called the *Revolution*—as what happened in Ireland in 1690 used to be called *The Revolution*. The situation was not suitable for a Revolution, but the Allies insisted that there must be a Revolution in Germany. Its war propaganda had demonised the German system that Connolly had admired, therefore the Germans were required to overthrow it.

The revolutionary Left of the Social Democracy wanted to overthrow it. And the British propaganda asserted that the German Government was centrally responsible for the War, as did the revolutionary Left of the German Social Democracy. There was thus a coincidence between the view of the major Imperialist victor and the views of the revolutionary German Left.

And the German Left had been defeatist in the War, and when Germany was defeated that fact was not forgotten.

German Year Zero

The policy of the Allies was to put the Kaiser on trial as a War Criminal. He left the country for Holland, which refused to hand him over. Government fell to the main body of the Social Democracy. The Social Democratic Government, under pressure from revolutionary agitation, declared the state to be a republic, though it would willingly have conducted its government under the monarchy. The revolutionary Left then had the task of conducting the socialist revolution against a Social Democratic Republic.

The abolition of the monarchy brought no access of power to the socialist movement. The monarchy was not the "*autocracy*" of *Entente* demonisation and Leftist imaginings. Its abolition increased the freedom of the Social Democratic Government only in the sense that it deprived the State of the familiar scenery of public life and gave the Republic the problem of establishing the vague indispensable thing called a

sense of legitimacy, and doing it against the monarchy which the bulk of the population had felt comfortable with.

Rationalism is not the medium of human life—it is not even the medium of the actual life of the rationalist sects, as one soon finds out. It could not be the medium of life because reason is an empty form. Without something to reason on, it is empty.

The conduct of government in a state symbolised by a hereditary Crown is no less, and no more rational than the conduct of government in a state symbolised by an elected President who has no power. It all depends on the circumstances. Republicanism was the necessary form of the Irish independence movement because the Crown was the instrument of a hostile British Parliament.

(That was the reason why Griffith's "*Dual Monarchy*" ideal was an illusion. The Hanoverian monarchy, established as an instrument of English Parliamentary power, and controlled by it, could never have functioned as the monarchy of an independent Irish Government too, as the Hapsburg monarchy did of the Hungarian as well as the Austrian Government.

When England had a Crown that was also acceptable to the Irish, and that was willing to foster an independent Irish Government, England made war on it.)

In German circumstances, it would have been advantageous if Social Democratic Government had been established under the Hohenzollern Crown. It would have saved Social Democracy from the legitimacy problem of having abolished the monarchy in response to *Entente* demonisation, and the consequent legitimacy problem of adapting to *Entente* requirements only to be slapped in the face in the Summer of 1919 with an ultimatum to sign a confession of German War Guilt or else prepare for a resumption of the War.

I don't recall that Connolly bothered his head with the issue of German monarchy—inflated into "*autocracy*" by British propaganda in August 1914. It had no practical relevance to the socialist development which he saw taking place in Germany. (Nor did he bother his head with Atheism, or Vegetarianism. The Irish Labour Party, which used to claim the distinction of having been founded by him, has given up Socialism but, now that the Church is down, it has been aggressively atheist in compensation.)

Rosa Luxemburg wrote an anti-War pamphlet in 1915 which was published

anonymously in Switzerland in 1916 as *The Junius Pamphlet*, echoing a famous British pamphlet of 1770. It was reviewed by Lenin, who praised its spirit, criticised its theoretical incoherence, and lamented the fact that the German anti-War Marxists had not split the Social Democracy and formed an illegal revolutionary organisation in preparation for the revolution.

A major part of the incoherence was on the national question in the War.

Luxemburg makes no reference to the Irish issue in the War. But Liebknecht had done as a Member of Parliament. He blew the whistle on Casement's mission to Germany to gain support for an Irish national insurrection.

The British Government was seeking out potential nations in the populations of the states it was making war on, with a view to encouraging them to damage the enemy by asserting their national rights against him. It had very little success. Its only success during the war that is worth mentioning was the Jihad against Turkey that it procured in 1916 in the Islamic heartland of Mecca—and when that Jihad had served its purpose, and tried to form itself into the Arab state in 1919, it was put down by the French and British Armies.

Ireland Opts Out

The Irish had asserted themselves forcefully without any Great Power encouragement, and when they prepared to make war on Britain, and looked for tangible help to Germany, on which Britain had declared war, German revolutionary Marxism blew the whistle on them, and condemned the German Government for receiving them, and for scheming in this underhand way, in the suspect medium of nationalism, against the enemy which had declared that its purpose was to destroy the German state.

Lenin, whose theories were rigorously reasoned, made scope for the multiformity of the world to participate in action against the handful of dominating Imperialist Powers. The German anti-War—or anti-Germany-in-the War—Marxists were theoretically slipshod, and they narrowed the world down to a Finance Capitalist uniformity in which nationalist action was futile at best.

(A streamlined concept of Imperialism as Finance Capitalism was theorised by Lenin's colleague, the intellectual *Wunderkind*, Bukharin. Lenin praised Bukharin's *Imperialism* when it was published in 1911, but subsequently he took no practical heed of it, and continued to treat Imperialism as the conquest

and exploitation of one people by another, against which the conquered and exploited remained entitled to national resistance.

(In the mid-1970s, when Lord Bew and Professor Patterson were aspiring to be rigorous Marxist-Leninists in their opposition to the Northern nationalist insurrection, they based themselves on stringent Bukharinism, imagining it to be Leninist.)

Nationalist Ireland in 1916 fought a war for its independence from Britain, which was fighting a World War for the rights of nations to self-determination. It was beaten. Then two and half years later it was given the opportunity to vote, and voted for independence. Then, in 1919, the British Prime Minister was asked in Parliament why he was making war on a people which had democratically availed of the right to independence given to it by Britain's victory in the War. He explained patiently that the right to national independence for which Britain had fought was exclusively on behalf of the peoples of the enemy Empires. (The peoples of the British Empire were presumed to be free already, by virtue of the freedom which was the hallmark of the Empire that held them.)

To sum up: Connolly and Lenin differed fundamentally about the War in August 1914. Connolly read the signs of the collapse of the Socialist International in the face of the War more realistically than Lenin did. The fact that his experience of public life had been entirely within states that were democratic, or close to it, probably explains his assumption that the War would be fought out to the end by the democratic states which were in it at the start.

Imperialising

The masses, including the organised working class, were nationalised, so to speak, by the democratic systems of those states. Those states were functional Imperialist democracies. They were Imperialisms with democratically consolidated home bases. The British populace knew very well that it lived as well as it did by exploiting helpless parts of the world. The popular Imperial poet, Rudyard Kipling, told them so, as did the brilliant and influential socialist writer, Robert Blatchford, who had reluctantly come to see that his ideal of the restoration of a self-sufficient Merrie England had become entirely impossible.

The standard of living of the British populace—the English democracy—became dependent, in the mid-19th century

at the latest, on Imperialist exploitation of a great part of the world, secured by the Royal Navy's world dominance. Yet there has been a convention that the democracy is innocent of responsibility for what the State does. That was perhaps well enough before the democracy, in the sense of the populace, started electing the Government. It makes no sense after the political system is democratised. Yet the convention continued.

The British political franchise was gradually enlarged from 1832 until 1928. By the end of the 19th century it was reckoned by those whose business it was to think about such things that Imperialist exploitation combined with a popular culture of Imperialism had made it possible to democratise the election of Parliament in Britain without disrupting the system. The conduct of the British working class, after war was declared on Germany, confirmed that it had been thoroughly nationalised within the system. Blatchford, the most influential Socialist writer there has ever been in England, had been explaining the facts of their life to them for a dozen years, and they acted as if they knew that, without Imperial dominance of the world, they would be in a bad way.

Blatchford, in Merrie England phase, had envisaged a revival of household life in the working class, with women recovering the household arts of peasant England that had been lost in the industrialisation. But if Merrie England was lost for ever, the future of women would be very different. And in 1915 the women of England embraced this different future.

There had been an apprehension that women stood for a distinct principle of social and political life which, if allowed to develop in politics, would tend to undermine the system that had been constructed since 1688, or 1715. But, in the second year of the War, when voluntary enlistment was decreasing and munitions were running out, the women of England showed that they had been at least as thoroughly nationalised and imperialised as the men. They "*white feathered*" reluctant men into the Army, and went into the factories to produce munitions for them. The Suffragette demand of *Votes For Women*, fiercely resisted until 1914, was conceded in the 1918 Reform Bill almost without debate.

The process of democratisation in Britain was also an incorporation of the populace into active participation in the functioning of the Imperialist system.

If almost everyone is implicated in the system, is that empowerment or disempowerment?

Connolly at least did not appeal to some great social force in England that was oppressed by the system to rise up against it and bring the War to an end.

He took both England and Germany as cohesive bodies and chose between them, using the Irish national interest, and a general concern with socialist development as standards.

A Sour Victory

Was Connolly wrong in saying that it would be better for the world if Germany won the War that Britain had declared on it?

An Italian Prime Minister, one of Britain's victorious Allies in the Great War, who had been Anglophile before the War, was shocked when he saw the British representatives at the Versailles Conference acting as if they believed their own war propaganda.

"The whole history of the European peoples is one of alternate victories and defeats. It is the business of civilisation to create such conditions as will render victory less brutal and defeat more bearable" (Francesco Nitti: *Peaceless Europe*, English translation, 1922, pvi).

"We should only remember our dead insofar as their memory may prevent future generations from being saddened by other war victims" (pix).

"After the victory of the Entente the microbes of hate have developed and flourished in special cultures, consisting of national egotism, imperialism, and a mania for conquest and expansion.

"The peace treaties imposed on the vanquished are nothing but arms of oppression. What more could Germany herself have done had she won the War? Perhaps her terms would have been more lenient, certainly not harder, as she would have understood that conditions such as we have imposed on the losers are simply inapplicable" (p17).

"History has not on record a more colossal diplomatic feat than this treaty, by which Europe has been really divided into two sections—victors and vanquished; the former being authorized to exercise on the latter complete control until the fulfilment of terms which, even at an optimistic valuation, would require at least thirty years to materialize" (p27).

"When our countries were engaged in the struggle, and we were at grips with a dangerous enemy, it was our duty to keep up the *morale* of our people and to paint our adversaries in the darkest colours, laying on their shoulders all the blame and responsibility of the War. But after the great world

conflict, now that Imperial Germany has fallen, it would be absurd to maintain that the responsibility of the War is solely and wholly attributable to Germany and that earlier than 1914 in Europe there had not developed a state of things fatally destined to culminate in war" (p33).

Nitti wrote as a disillusioned Anglophile, who had admired Britain's Imperial calmness until he saw it sunk in a fury of moralistic malevolence at Versailles, and who had been a Germanophile until he was cured of it by observing British Germanophobia in action at close quarters at Versailles.

The destructive British activity, in 1919-20, on a European situation already destabilised by the War, fed the influence of Bolshevism. It seemed for a moment as if the second stage of the Permanent Revolution was about to happen. But then the Fascist counter to Bolshevism emerged in Italy. And as far as I recall Lenin, no longer able to write, dictated a brief note recognising that Fascism in Italy was not the same kind of thing as the Whiteguard landlord reaction in Russia had been.

Weakest Link

On the doctrine of Permanent Revolution socialism is only viable as internationalism. The socialist revolution must be international, incorporating at least the main centres of capitalism, or must fail. Lenin, wary of excessive theorising, did not approve the doctrine formally, but neither did he dissent from it. He gave it tacit approval. And in 1920 he made war on Poland in an attempt to set off the revolution in Western Europe.

Two years earlier (to Rosa Luxemburg's disgust), he had defied the majority of his party, led by Bukharin and Trotsky, on the issue of launching "*revolutionary war*" against Germany while the World War was still raging, and he insisted on signing the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, one of whose clauses recognised the Polish nation state being established under German auspices. Now in 1920 he tried to undo Brest-Litovsk. But it was too late.

The Red Army advanced up to the gates of Warsaw. Then it was sent reeling back by Connolly's only Continental counterpart, Pilsudski, and part of the Russian state was conceded to Poland in the settlement.

The Bolshevik Revolution was isolated as the Russian Revolution. The second stage of the Stages theory of

Permanent Revolution failed to happen. What was the isolated first stage to do with itself?

The first Marxist political writer I read was Trotsky. And the first thing I read was his dispute with Kautsky. After that I followed him through to the 1920s, and traced him back to 1905. What I found was that, when Permanent Revolution came to an end in Russia, he did not say what should be done about it. He did not suggest that the Bolshevik Party, in which he had become the outstanding popular figure, should remake itself into the ruling party of a capitalist development, nor did he suggest that it should seek a bourgeois party to take its place when the course of development to which it had committed itself proved to be a *cul de sac*. (English Republicanism did that after Cromwell died, when it gave up the ghost and let General Monk restore the monarchy.) He simply did not address the issue—even though it was the fundamental issue on the terms which he himself had set with the doctrine of Permanent Revolution and the rejection of the idea of development by stages.

Basic to the idea of Permanent Revolution was the assumption that, once a revolution started at the weakest point in the system of capitalist imperialism, Tsarist autocracy, it could not be stabilised within capitalism. It was not an assumption that socialist revolution in Russia would compel Europe into socialist revolution by means of revolutionary propaganda and revolutionary war, but that there was an inherent weakness in European capitalism which would give rise to at least a substantial degree of spontaneous socialist revolutionary happenings. It was not an expectation that the power of state of a socialist revolution in Russia would be so great that it could overwhelm a capitalist Europe that was tending towards stabilisation. The central expectation was that capitalist Europe was irresistibly generating socialist revolution out of itself.

Trotsky

Trotsky had lived much of his life as a journalist in the capitalist West without acquiring any sense of its inherent stability. It seems that his understanding was shaped so comprehensively by a Marxist theoretical vision of revolution that it was incapable of forming a realistic idea of possibility through experience. He was very much a literary man with a journalistic talent that was grossly overdeveloped for political purposes.

My understanding of these things was shaped in the backwardness of Slieve Luacra, in the time of De Valera, when Ireland was beaten into ignorance by the whip of priestcraft—so I read later in the Dublin press—and so I saw Trotsky as a John Mitchell-type of revolutionist, whose commitment to revolution soared beyond circumstances. The alternative to Mitchell in the Young Ireland world, under the common inspiration of Carlyle, was Gavan Duffy, whose commitment to revolution was engaged with circumstances—with *"the bulks of actual things"*, as Pearse put it—and who demonstrated an ability for doing what was capable of being done.

Trotsky was an orator as well as a stylist in journalism. He disdained organisation. He had for a dozen years denounced Lenin as an organisation man—as the dogmatic bureaucrat of the revolutionary movement. Then, for five years, Lenin had laid everything on for him, so that he could orate mercilessly for the revolution and administer certain lines of it in broad strokes. When Lenin died, he was the outstanding popular figure in the party. He was Lenin's heir-apparent. But he could not be Lenin's heir because, when Lenin ceased to be the charismatic intermediary between him and the party, the Leninist party was hateful to him. In his descriptions of it after about 1924 he began to repeat what he had said about it from 1905 to 1916.

It was an organisation of committees, committed to a certain course of action by Lenin, and if the choice of leader lay between an exceptional orator and an exceptional chairman of committees, there was no doubt which the system would select. I believe that I wrote forty years ago—or was it fifty?—that Trotsky did not even contest the leadership because what was required for the conduct of the party in the circumstances was distasteful to him. And what he found particularly distasteful was contact with the representatives of the working class. The working class of his vision was a kind of algebraic symbol. The actual working class that existed in 1917—a minuscule segment of Russian society—had been used up in the course of the revolution (and had not always been compliant with the requirements of the revolution).

The working class which was the ruling class of the dictatorship of the proletariat was a raw creation out of the peasantry. It was under a continuous process of creation by Party committees which represented it. And they did

represent it, in the sense that they often became representatives sitting on the committees almost as soon as the committees created them. Trotsky found them unutterably vulgar.

Being unable to take part purposefully in this vulgarity, Trotsky found himself squeezed to the sidelines. On the sidelines he formed an Opposition. The Opposition criticised the building of *Socialism In One Country* for some years, on the ground that it was not being done quite right. Sometimes the new regime was deviating to the Right, and at other times it was deviating to the Left. In the end, the very project of attempting to build Socialism in isolated Russia after Capitalism failed to be overthrown in Europe was the deviation. It led inevitably to *"degeneration"*. But the inevitable degeneration was at the same time a betrayal.

Healy, Cliff & Grant

The founders of British Trotskyism were very active in London in the 60s: Gerry Healy, Tony Cliff and Ted Grant. Healy, though a powerful orator who could dominate a large meeting like nobody else I ever saw, was somehow regarded by the others as a virtual *"Stalinist"*. He did not engage in discussion.

Tony Cliff conducted some argumentative public meetings. His basic point, as far as I recall, was that the stage of capitalist development reached by Russia in 1917 was less than that of England in 1641, and the thing was hopeless. So what should the October Revolution have done with itself? I don't recall that he ever gave a hint of an answer to that essential question.

I once had a discussion with him in his own very comfortable house. He wanted to meet actual workers. I met him with Dave Laurie, who was a shop steward in the Barbican development. The discussion must have been about the isolation of Russia because I mentioned Lenin's secret military arrangements with Germany in the early 1920s, in breach of the Versailles restrictions on Germany. I was ordered to leave. He was not going to allow such things to be said in his house.

Ted Grant, the organiser of secret Trotskyist *"entryism"* into the Labour Party, was by far the most reasonable of the three. (The early meetings of the Irish Workers' Group, arranged by Pat Murphy with Liam Daltun, were held in Grant's offices at King's Cross.) But Grant was such a master of dialectics that the point could never be reached with him: how could the inevitable

degeneration of the socialist revolution in Russia, in the absence of the socialist overthrow of capitalism in Western Europe, be at the same time *The Revolution Betrayed* by those who tried to keep it going in Russia?

I concluded that evasiveness was the hallmark of Trotskyism in its London heartland, and then in the People's Democracy in Belfast in 1968-9, and I took little heed of it for a long while after that.

Volkoganov

Then the Soviet system collapsed on a wave of anti-Stalinism, and General Volkoganov emerged as its authentic historian. He had privileged access to the archives, and he set out in search of the Leninist democracy which Stalin had betrayed. He began with a biography of Stalin and worked his way back through Trotsky to Lenin. His search put me in mind of Albert Schweitzer's *Quest Of The Historical Jesus*. The object receded as it was approached. Like the rainbow, it was visible only at a distance.

In the course of his investigations Volkoganov turned up this statement made by Trotsky, disclaiming Permanent Revolution as being of any practical relevance at a moment when the feasibility of Socialism In One Country was the all-important issue:

"In May 1924, speaking to newspaper workers, he said: "The comrades are asking what is the relationship of the theory of permanent revolution to Leninism? Personally, it has never entered my head to treat the question as one of practical relevance. The idea was merely the theoretical anticipation of the future course of events. The events which the theory anticipated took place: the October revolution was achieved. Now the question of permanent revolution was one of theoretical or historical interest, not current interest..." (*Trotsky: The Eternal Revolutionary*, p200).

That could only have meant to those who heard it that the October Revolution was sustainable without European revolution, and that Socialism In One Country was the realisable project in hand, instead of being what it became some years later—the heresy that betrayed the revolution.

There is somewhere an academic Trotskyist dismissive of Volkoganov as an untrained historian who did not consider documents in their documentary environment but referred them amateurishly to the political situation in which they were produced and made their effect.

CPGB

But it is not only Trotskyism that seeks to place history beyond the reach of vulgar understanding in this way, and to establish it in a transcendental sphere that has little connection with the sequence of political causation in which things are done. It appears to be the standard academic form. It seems to derive from a Marxist supposition that there is a kind of external determinant of human affairs, which leads to the conclusion that the humans engaged in those affairs can have no knowledge of them and it is a waste of time finding out what they thought they were doing.

This kind of history took root during an era, beginning in the 2nd World War, when English academia was dominated by Marxists, both Communist Party and Trotskyist, and when the great object was to construct an essential history of the "*English Revolution*" (1641-1660) that bore little resemblance to what the actors in it thought they were doing. And that was when Clarendon's *Great Rebellion*, which had been permanently in print since the 17th century, went out of print. Clarendon was a participant in the revolution of which he became the historian. He described what he was up to in it and what others were up to. And he was there after the end of it and played a prominent part in the construction of the regime which followed, which actually did lead to a revolution and not a mere rebellion.

There are a number of Irish histories written in a similar manner to Clarendon's, written by participants in the event which they record, which carry more information and a better sense of the period they cover than any academic history written in the revisionist style could do. They are not only kept out of print, but are mostly not even referred to by the academics. For the period of nationalist development in the 19th century I think particularly of Gavan Duffy's books on Young Ireland and William O'Brien's account of Parnell affair and the land purchase. Neither of these is written doctrinally, while doctrine rules in academia.

Greaves

Desmond Greaves was an educated Englishman, a member of the Communist Party and an associate of some of the Marxist intellectuals who were immensely influential in the shaping of English academic treatment of history. The CP was an elite without much of a following. In the chaos caused by British handling of

war and peace, it attracted some of the most purposeful intellectuals in the elite Universities between the Wars. During the alliance between Capitalism and Communism in the 2nd War these intellectuals entrenched themselves in influential academic positions, and exerted a lasting influence on academic life.

Around 1960, when I was becoming aware of contemporary English academic life, there were no bigger names in it than Maurice Dobb, Christopher Hill, John Lewis and Maurice Cornforth. (One of them was Master of Balliol, which I was given to understand was the top job in academia.) And, out in the world, but still intimately connected with this academic elite, and with elements in the bourgeois political elite because of the wartime alliance, was R. Palme Dutt, who had an extensive readership among thinking elements in the Trade Union movement with his *Labour Monthly*. And I understood that Greaves was a particularly close associate of Dutt, and that together they worked out a line on Irish history to support the Irish policy of the party.

During the two year between the British declaration of war on Germany and the German invasion of Russia, especially after the British defeat in France in May 1940, the British war policy was to spread the war—which meant bringing about a German/Russian War. During that period the Communist Party published a selection of Connolly's writings on the 1st War, bringing out the fact of his support for Germany. After the German invasion of Russia in June 1941 that selection was suppressed, and the fact of Connolly's support for the Kaiser's Germany was never again mentioned in CP publications—or in any academic publishing that I know of.

That is a major falsification of history. Greaves may have been the first major historian who did it, but it became a generally agreed falsification between Communist and bourgeois historians. I cannot imagine that Ruth Dudley Edwards could have written her book on Connolly without noticing his policy on the Great War, but she does not mention it any more than Greaves does. It seems that it is generally considered better by those who control contemporary academia that some quite important historical facts should not be communicated to the reading public.

Academic history is doctrinal, and doctrinalism is the essence of the kind of history that announced itself as revisionist thirty or forty years ago.

Stages Theory

On Greaves and the "*stages theory*"—Connolly was neither a Leninist nor a Trotskyist. His understanding of the Great War was utterly different from theirs. But to a practical politician dealing with things in stages comes naturally. Two different things cannot be done together, if the doing of one of them follows on the doing of the other. How quickly the one will follow on the other is a matter of speculation.

Connolly combined his small working class Army with a much larger middle class Army for the purpose of establishing an Irish national state as the framework of a socialist development. The national state might be established by socialist revolution if a strong socialist revolutionary movement existed. But the socialist movement was very weak and decided to act with the middle class nationalist movement in the formation of the national state. It could not simultaneously engage in national war in alliance with the middle class Army against the Imperial Power, and in class war against its middle class allies. It had to bide its time. That is "*the stages theory*".

Greaves applied it very narrowly in the *Irish Democrat*. His problem in the early sixties, in the era of mass emigration, was that people who were radicalised a bit by being forced to emigrate, and who had heard the Connolly Association condemned as Communist by the Bishops, came to it in order to be socialist against the Irish Government, and found that this was not allowed.

Others who had been involved in the 1956 Campaign, and resented the action of the Irish State in breaking up the movement, came to it in order to be revolutionary, and were not allowed. The disturbing influence of these elements on the small membership of the CA, was restricted by the influence of the Communist Party which instructed some of its members to attend CA meetings and support Greaves. This led the dissidents to turn to the Trotskyist organisations, where they learned about the reactionary, Stalinist "*stages theory*".

The CA Stages theory did not apply to the bourgeois Irish State, but only to the issue of unification. There was to be alliance with the bourgeois national State, which had interned them for national activities, and they found that particularly galling.

The North

Then there was the further issue of what Northern Ireland was. Greaves, as

far as I recall, held that the British State was completely responsible for what the Government did in Northern Ireland. But as he masterminded a kind of Marxist restructuring of Sinn Fein/IRA, one began to notice that the Northern Ireland Government was being treated as a sort of Irish state. This led to the Greaves-influenced Republicanism being lost in a theoretical maze when the North blew up in August 1969, and to the revival of the more straightforward Republicanism which had been excluded from the official movement around 1966-7. The Provisional movement was formed, and was denounced as bigoted and backward by the Marxist Officials.

The Officials regained some vigour and tried to suppress the Provisionals by force, and they even launched their own war against the British State, in rivalry with the Provisionals, for a couple of years—a revolutionary "national liberation" war, they said, unlike the "sectarian" war launched by the Provisionals. But, after a couple of years, and a couple of atrocities, they called off their war on the British State and concentrated on becoming a political force in the South and continuing their feud with the Provos from a position of State influence. That feud is still going strong, as can be seen almost any week in the *Sunday Independent*—whose last Editor, Anne Harris, was an open supporter of the terrorism of the Officials.

Greaves, as I recall, distanced himself somewhat from the feuding of the Officials, no doubt recognising that the substance of things in the North lay with the Provos. Nevertheless he played a crucial part in their creation.

An Encounter

I only ever spoke with Greaves once, for about ten minutes in the mid-1960s. He was a leader with a job to do and I was trying to figure things out, and there was no meeting of minds. The last indirect contact with him was during the Robert Lynd Conference in Belfast that I described in the last issue. A man sitting alongside me spoke to me as if continuing a conversation with me. I had never seen him before. He turned out to be Joe Deighan, of the CA and the CP. He was familiar with what I had written about Greaves and spoke in reply to it. What he said, in effect, was that Greaves had saved them from the wreck of the Communist movement by the complicated way that he had blended nationalism into it, enabling them to survive and have something to do in Belfast after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

We had a civilised conversation—a

thing not possible in London in the 1960s.

The CP in Belfast, a very small organisation, was heavily subsidised by the State. It had recently been given a grant of a million pounds to develop the Ulster Peoples College. Its line on things fitted in with Government policy, therefore it was patronised. I knew this, and he did not pretend to deny it. Such is the way of the world.

For old times' sake, I reminded him that, when I proposed the Two Nations approach, they said I had come under Orange patronage. I said that, until I came to Belfast I believed what the *Democrat* had said about the Northern Ireland system being kept going by active Orange patronage, but when I came to Belfast I saw that the Unionists didn't have a clue about patronage. There had been no attempt by the regime to bend nationalists from their ways by means of patronage. There were no carefully-funded opportunities for opportunism. The nationalist community was left to its own devices in that respect, with space to develop its own civil society without interference.

The Orange regime had been naïve with regard to statecraft. It brought enough Protestant hands to the polling booths to put the mark in the right square, and left it at that. Patronage began when Whitehall took over from the Unionist Party.

Deighan did not challenge the description of how things were. And, when I said we had never received a penny either from the Orange regime or the Whitehall regime, and had been harassed by the latter, he replied, as if that counted for more than all the patronage they had benefited from: "*But you write pamphlets!*"

Why could they, living in a major battlefield in the War within the United Kingdom, not write pamphlets? Because they were sealed from the surrounding reality by the theoretical maze through which their thought had to struggle.

It was not the "two-stage theory" that stopped them. If stages had something to do with it, it was the lack of a three-stage theory. What enabled the War to be ended advantageously in the nationalist interest was the envisaging of two-stages *within* the North.

Cathy Winch

Book Review

King of Bollywood, Shah Rukh Khan and the Seductive World of Indian Cinema by Anupama Chopra
(Warner Books 2007)

Shah Rukh Khan, a Christian Brothers success story

Shah Rukh Khan is one of the most successful film stars in the world, hugely popular among the Indian public, both at home and among 'non resident' Indians abroad.

He was born in New Delhi and attended St. Columba's School. This was established in 1941, next to the Sacred Heart Cathedral, by the Christian Brothers as one of 19 Christian Brothers Schools in India. Shah Rukh Khan, the *King of Bollywood*, is a Muslim; his father came from Peshawar, in what became Pakistan. Because of his pro-Independence political activities under British rule, his father was not allowed to return to visit his family until very late in his life.

Apart from being a biography, the book includes a history of Bollywood, and it gives an account of Indian political developments.

Shah Rukh started school as a six

year old in kindergarten in January 1972. The masters were known for their strict discipline; there was corporal punishment up to the late 1980s, and the school insisted on clipped nails and short hair. Shah Rukh was often sent by the school to the nearby barber to have his hair cut. The barber always asked him: "*What style haircut do you want, Dharmendra or Amitabh Bachchan?* {two great film stars}" Anupama Chopra adds, "*Years later, Shah Rukh knew he... attained stardom when hairstylists told him that clients were asking for the Shah Rukh Khan cut.*"

The budding actor thrived at the school:

"...cane-carrying priests and the lengthy roster of rules at St. Columba's didn't deter Shah Rukh. He was a master prankster. His best ricks were witty, audacious, and usually put his budding acting talent to use."

He tricked teachers into letting him off tests or into giving him their shoe for the day. On occasions his mother was summoned to the school, but Shah Rukh never went so far as to be expelled or suspended; his good grades and sporting prowess gave him leeway: "*He was a boundary breaker*", said his middle-school headmaster, Brother Eric d'Souza, "*but he was also smart enough to live on the edge and not get caught*"."

Brother d'Souza was the resident Rock Star at St. Columba's:

"He stretched the definition of both teacher and priest and was a seminal influence in Shah Rukh's life. Eric was only in his twenties, but being younger than the other teachers wasn't his only distinguishing feature."

He introduced computers to the school, writing a textbook himself. After school, he introduced the boys to Western music.

He was also very demanding and insisted on academic brilliance, punishing those who fell below what he felt was their potential.

In 1983 he cast Shah Rukh in a musical inspired by the *Wizard of Oz*; Shah Rukh lip-synched the songs sung by Brother Eric and by a boy who later became a famous singer.

At the age of eighteen (in 1984), Shah Rukh with some friends created the *C-Gang* (C for Cool) with a uniform of Nike trainers, blue jeans and white t-shirts.

"The dictatorial brothers allowed the C-Gang to thrive at St-Columba's, perhaps because it was mostly innocuous posturing. {...} The C-Gang's rebellion was confined to being cool."

Even though, because of stringent import rules, they only saw Hollywood films a year or two after they were released in the US, Hollywood was their role model; and the group looked down on Bollywood as "*opium for the unwashed masses*".

In 1985 Shah Rukh graduated from the school with the highest award; he was the star of the year.

"The rigid Christian environment of St. Columba's and the friendships he cultivated over thirteen years set Shah Rukh in a Westernized mold. He was articulate, erudite, and in many ways already the yuppie he would play in films a decade later. But that was not the whole story. Shah Rukh's urbane sheen and sophisticated English was leavened by a rough earthiness. {...} Shah Rukh was equally fluent in the more uncouth culture that flourished outside the school. Hindi *gaalis*, or curse words, peppered his language. Fights were not uncommon. Shah Rukh saw knives pulled and blood flow. He followed {his father} Meer's golden rule. If the opponent is bigger, hit him on the head with a rock and run."

These contrasts were instrumental in his success as an actor. Shah Rukh Khan remains the superstar boy next door. "*He wasn't an inaccessible celestial being, but simply the most charismatic member of the family.*" And a Christian Brothers success story.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin And The Russian Question
Part 2

Confronting The Soviet Regime

Solzhenitsyn— Moral Appeal To Soviet Leadership

The near unanimous support which Solzhenitsyn had among those who were not supporters of the Soviet regime began to break up about the time of his expulsion with the publication of his *Letter to the Soviet Leaders*. Previous to this, Solzhenitsyn was known as a novelist, short story writer, playwright, poet, causing offence because he specialised in exposing the dark aspects of Soviet life. His novels—especially *The First Circle*—were full of political ideas, but these were expressed by his characters and, if Solzhenitsyn's own sympathies were clear enough, they didn't amount to a political programme. His more direct political interventions were mainly demands for more freedom in Soviet literature. The publication of the *Letter to the Soviet Leaders* coincided with the publication in Paris of *The Gulag Archipelago*, but even this was simply an accumulation of facts. Given the devastating nature of those facts, one might reasonably conclude that such a monstrous system should be overthrown, by whatever means might be necessary. But no policy recommendations are made. Policy recommendations were made in the *Letter*. But they were not quite what one might have expected.

For a start, Solzhenitsyn is not calling for an overthrow of the regime:

"Having proposed a dialogue on the basis of realism, I too must confess that from my experience of Russian history I have become an opponent of all revolutions and all armed convulsions, including future ones—both those you crave (*not* in our country) and those you fear (*in* our country). Intensive study has convinced me that bloody mass revolutions are always disastrous for the people in whose midst they occur. And in our present-day society I am by no means alone in that conviction. The sudden upheaval of any hastily carried out change of the present leadership (the whole pyramid) might provoke only a new and destructive struggle and would certainly lead to only a very dubious gain in the quality of the leadership."

One might think that this is a reason-

able precaution, given that Solzhenitsyn was still living in the Soviet Union and had no intention of leaving it. But we have every reason to believe that his opposition to a revolutionary overthrow of the regime was more than just a tactical adaptation, or a realistic assessment of the likelihood of achieving it. Solzhenitsyn's study of the revolution of February 1917 had indeed left him with a horror of revolution of any kind. Solzhenitsyn never to my knowledge expressed admiration for Thomas Hobbes, but he seems to have shared Hobbes' basic idea—that any State is better than no State.

His recommendations to the Soviet leaders are made on the assumption that they would continue to be the leaders—indeed, although he hardly conceals the contempt he feels for them, the letter seems to have been seriously intended. It was not in the first instance an open letter. Solzhenitsyn did not publish it (in *Samizdat*) until it was clear that he wouldn't have a reply. And here is a second surprising thing about it, calculated to offend those who might have expected to be his supporters. He doesn't suggest to the Soviet leaders that they should introduce 'democracy'—at least not at the sovereign, national level. He defends the principle of 'authoritarian' government. Ideally he argues that this authoritarian government should have a moral character but it is still clear that, in the first instance at least, he expects the authoritarian government to be exercised by the people he is addressing, the people he regards with contempt, people who, we can be sure, possess not the slightest shred of moral authority:

"Here in Russia, for sheer lack of practice, democracy survived for only eight months—from February to October 1917. The émigré groups of Constitutional Democrats and Social Democrats still pride themselves on it to this very day and say that outside forces brought about its collapse. But in reality that democracy was *their* disgrace: they invoked it and promised it so arrogantly, and then created a chaotic caricature of democracy, because first of all they turned out to be ill-

prepared for it themselves, and then Russia was worse prepared still. Over the last half-century Russia's preparedness for democracy, for a multi-party parliamentary system, could only have diminished. I am inclined to think that its sudden reintroduction now would merely be a melancholy repetition of 1917 ...

"So should we not perhaps acknowledge that for Russia this path was either false or premature? That for the foreseeable future, perhaps, whether we like it or not, Russia is nevertheless destined to have an authoritarian order? Perhaps this is all that she is ripe for today?

"Everything depend upon *what sort* of authoritarian order lies in store for us in the future. It is not authoritarianism itself that is intolerable, but the ideological lies that are daily foisted upon us. Not so much authoritarianism as arbitrariness and illegality, the sheer illegality of having a single overlord in each district, each province and each sphere, often ignorant and brutal, whose will alone decides all things ...

"The considerations which guide our country must be these: to encourage the *inner*, the moral, the healthy development of the people: to liberate women from the forced labour of money-earning—especially from the crowbar and the shovel: to improve schooling and children's upbringing; to save the soil and the waters and all of Russian nature: to re-establish healthy cities and complete the conquest of the North-East. Let us hear no more about outer space and the cosmos, no more historic victories of universal significance, and no more dreaming up of international missions ...

"What have you to fear? Is the idea really so terrible? You will still have absolute and impregnable power, a separate, strong and exclusive party, the army, the police force, industry, transport, communications, mineral wealth, a monopoly of foreign trade, an artificial rate of exchange for the rouble—let the people breathe, let them think and develop!"

Solzhenitsyn's central political idea could be summed up in a single, albeit hyphenated, word—'self-limitation', which he regards as inseparable from the need to renounce "*ideology*", specifically of course the world embracing, world conquering ideology of Marxism.

Ideology obliges the leaders to waste enormous resources on military adventures overseas, on policing the near abroad (Eastern Europe), on the grandiose prestige-building trips into outer space, on a fruitless confrontation, which he sees as entirely ideologically driven, with China. At the same time the simple

means by which life could be enhanced—an emphasis on agriculture, small towns and villages on a human scale—are disregarded. And here again we may be surprised and understand how shocking this might have been to people who would otherwise have been his supporters. Behind Marxism, Solzhenitsyn sees the whole ideology of "*progress*", going back through the '*Enlightenment*' to the '*Renaissance*':

"They {the "progressive publicists"} hounded the men who said that it was perfectly feasible for a colossus like Russia, with all its spiritual peculiarities and folk traditions, to find its own particular path; and that it could not be that the whole of mankind should follow a single, absolutely identical pattern of development.

"No, we had to be dragged along the whole of the Western bourgeois-industrial and Marxist path in order to discover, at the end of the twentieth century, and again from progressive Western scholars, what any village greybeard in the Ukraine or Russia had understood from time immemorial and could have explained to the progressive commentators ages ago, had the commentators ever found time in that dizzy fever of theirs to consult them: that a dozen maggots can't go on and on gnawing the same apple *forever*: that if the earth is a *finite* object, then its expanses and resources are finite also, and the *endless, infinite* progress dinned into our heads by the dreamers of the Enlightenment cannot be accomplished on it ...

"Society must cease to look upon 'progress' as something desirable. 'Eternal progress' is a nonsensical myth. What must be implemented is not a 'steadily expanding economy' but a *zero growth economy*, a stable economy. *Economic growth is not only unnecessary but ruinous*. We must set ourselves the aim not of *increasing* natural resources but of *conserving* them. We must renounce, as a matter of urgency, the gigantic scale of modern technology in industry, agriculture and urban development (the cities of today are cancerous tumours). The chief aim of technology will now be to eradicate the lamentable results of previous technologies. The 'Third World' which has not yet started on the fatal path of Western civilisation, can only be saved by 'small scale technology' which requires an increase, not a reduction, in manual labour, uses the simplest of machinery and is based purely on local materials."

In all this, of course, Solzhenitsyn—while insisting that he is addressing the Soviet leaders as "*realists*"—is also

appealing to their better natures:

"I am writing this letter on the *supposition* that you too are swayed by this primary concern {"the good and salvation of our people, to which all of you—and I myself belong"}, that you are not alien to your origins, to your fathers, grandfathers and great grandfathers, to the expanse of your homeland; and that you are conscious of your nationality. If I am mistaken, there is no point in your reading the rest of this letter."

Panin & Solzhenitsyn On The Russian Working Class

This becomes the central point of contestation in a polemic launched against Solzhenitsyn by his old friend Dmitri Panin—the 'Sologdin' of Solzhenitsyn's novel *The First Circle*. I have already said some words about Sologdin/Panin's religious view of the world in my article in the last *Church & State*. In *Soljénitsyne et la réalité* (I don't think it exists in an English translation), Panin insists that the Soviet leadership is irredeemably evil and incapable of reform. The only possible option is revolution. Who will conduct this revolution? Well, one of the possible candidates is ... the working class:

"If the intellectuals have lost the habit of conversing with simple mortals at the bottom of the pyramid I would suggest they go to the Moscow metro around Volkhonka-ZIL {"new working class area in the Moscow suburbs"—footnote} at the time when the workers are going to work or returning home. You just have to look at their faces to see their embittered, if not malevolent, looks, to listen carefully to the sort of gross language they use, to understand this new type of man. They have no illusions; they see the rottenness of the regime, they know what the Soviet con-trick is worth. Their soul is well seasoned, their thought is dynamic and their judgements sound. Anyone who can win their trust will quickly learn that they dream of a popular revolution which will give power to their own representatives and that they despise any arrangements made with the leaders above their heads ..." (pp.106-7)

I quote that because one of the most striking things about the collapse of the Soviet system, and of the Communist Governments in Eastern Europe, and indeed the reforms introduced in China, has been the apparent absence of the working class. After all, the whole structure was premised on the idea that the working class was the ruling class and that the State existed to serve their interests. Yet elements easily identifiable

as working class seem to have played hardly any role either in demanding reform of the system or in defending it. An obvious exception was 'Solidarity' in Poland. Yet the end result of Solidarity's action as an independent Union with a powerful working class base in the Gdansk Shipyard was (as the Communist Government warned them it would be) the closure of the Gdansk Shipyard.

In one of the few scenes in the four volumes of Solzhenitsyn's account of the February revolution—*Mars 17* (also not available in English translation)—which feature the working class *en masse*, Alexander Guchkov, almost immediately after receiving the abdication of the Tsar, goes to address a meeting of workers in Petrograd—St Petersburg was renamed during the War because of the German sounding '*burg*'. Guchkov was the leader in the Duma of the *Octobrists*, the tendency that supported and wanted to give substance to the 'October Manifesto', signed reluctantly by Nicholas II in the wake of the 1905 Revolution. The Manifesto established a representative parliament—the *Duma*—and marked the beginnings of a constitutional monarchy. Guchkov had been largely instrumental in the reorganisation of the armaments industry that restored Russian fortunes after the failure in the early stages of the war, during the invasion of East Prussia (the subject of Solzhenitsyn's *August 1914*). He had planned to oblige the abdication of Nicholas in 1916—one of the themes of *November 1916*. Solzhenitsyn on the whole likes him but felt that, by 1917, when he became Minister of War in the Provisional Government, he was too ill and tired to bring about the reform of the army that he had long wanted. His visit to the Petrograd workers is described as a descent into Hell:

"In the enormous shed with its glass roof, metallic, barred, a huge black crowd of workers was gathered certainly not for the purpose of working—no work was being done these days. A locomotive should have been there being repaired but it wasn't, it had been removed. All that was left was a platform, very high up, narrow with a projecting angle obviously meant for the repair of the engine's superstructure. And that was where Guchkov saw himself constrained to climb. The ladder had no steps, only rounded metal bars, absolutely unsuited for feet wearing rubber soled shoes, above all with a bad leg and hands clutching dirty railings, sticky with tar. Not to mention Guchkov's enormous overcoat which

trailed over the steps and twice slid under his feet—the effect must have been comical.

"The platform was very narrow and Guchkov was afraid of falling—happily he was closed in by a little steel bar balustrade. But the sight of the dark, murmuring crowd below him was all the more disagreeable. Everyone was chattering with everyone else but it all blended together and rose like a menacing sea. This crowd pressed together with its uncontrollable machine-like roaring, forced upon him the conviction that the revolution had broken through. Too late! He had obtained the abdication too late. He had prevented nothing. This mass, whose awakening he had always feared, was now well and truly awake."

Guchkov expects to be invited to speak but instead finds that one of the men who has climbed up with him, has taken the stage:

"And who, comrades, have they put in the new government? Now, when the tide of the people's anger beats more and more furiously against the palace walls, do you think they've called a representative of the working people?"

... "Prince Lvov! His lands are scattered through at least ten provinces. A prince! And the other Lvov is a prince, him too, might be his cousin. And the textile king, Konovalov! He has half the textile industry in his pocket and behold, he's going to be the minister of the whole of industry ... And the Finance Minister is none other than Mr Tereshchenko! Well, who is this Tereshchenko, anyone here know him? Everyone knows him in Ukraine. He's very big in the sugar business, owns about twenty refineries and thousands of acres of land ..."

And so it goes on. How is Guchkov going to address them? "*Gentlemen*"? Can he possibly say '*comrades*'? He settles for "*fellow citizens*" which doesn't go down very well. He announces the Tsar's abdication but immediately spoils any effect that might have had by adding that he has abdicated in favour of his brother Michael. He narrowly escapes with his life.

In another scene featuring workers *en masse*, Timothy Kirpichnikov, the NCO whose refusal to fire on unarmed demonstrators was one of the sparks that lit the February revolution, sees a demonstration of armed workers supporting the Bolsheviks:

"A black crowd, not less than a thousand strong, carrying red flags and placards, some with only one pole, others with two—still impossible to

read the inscriptions—with, leading them, several rows of workers armed with rifles and, flanking the column, marshals, also armed. Even before they had come close enough to see why they were marching, Kirpichnikov, spitting on the ground, whispered to Martov:

"That's where they've gone, our rifles. All this time we haven't had them and headquarters wouldn't supply them. No-one has the right to be carrying rifles except the army" ...

"In the front row and at the sides the armed men were displaying their bayonets to great effect but those in the middle were marching peaceably, advancing like soldiers doing their job, and some of them were waving their caps at the public without it being very clear if they meant "hurrah" or "down with ...". They watched them pass: not very gay, their bearing, they'd been working since morning, they were already tired, their faces were dirty, covered with black dust or soot, their clothes stained and greasy.

"Timothy went up to them:

"Who are you?"

"We're from the New Lessner factory, Vyborg quarter."

"Who else is with you?"

"All the factories are marching behind us. And the bourgeoisie won't stop us!" ..."

"The whole length of the procession there were women, very excited, and teenagers. They raised their fists and, when the band was a long way off, one could hear:

"Down with the Provisional Government! Down with that pig, Miliukov. Down with the fat cat bourgeoisie, bloodsuckers!"

"Kirpichnikov certainly resented the workers for demanding an eight hour day {in wartime—PB} and not wanting to produce the shells the army needed—but their life wasn't easy, you could see that, and this Lessner, he was certainly one of those fat cat bourgeois ..."

The point here is that this is a world that is alien to Solzhenitsyn, despite his own experience in the camps. It is a class of people he feels, in his dislike of large-scale industry, ought not to exist and who live outside the exchange of ideas which is his delight and the strength of his novels, a delight in ideas that embraces even the Social Democrats. Yet, as he well knows, it was the existence of this world, and the ability of Social Democrats to move in it, that largely accounts for the continual leftward pull that is a main theme of *The Red Wheel*.

Two examples from the recently pub-

lished biography of Stalin by Stephen Kotkin:

"The Georgian branch of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party assigned him to Chiatura, a hellhole in western Georgia where hundreds of small companies employed a combined 3,700 miners and sorters to extract and haul manganese ore. Witte's father, the midlevel tsarist official, had opened Chiatura's manganese deposits around the middle of the nineteenth century. By 1905, thanks to Sergei Witte's integration of Russia into the new world economy, the artisanal, privately held mines had come to account for no less than 50 percent of global manganese output. Tall piles of the excavated ore dominated the 'skyline', waiting to be washed, mostly by women and children, before being exported for use in the production of German and British steel. With wages averaging a meager 40 to 80 kopecks per day, rations doused in manganese dust, and 'housing' under the open sky (in winter workers slept in the mines), Chiatura was, in the words of one observer, "real penal labor (*katorga*)"—but the laborers had not been convicted of anything. Even by tsarist Russia standards, the injustices in Chiatura stood out. When the workers rebelled, however, the regime summoned imperial troops as well as right-wing vigilantes, who called themselves Holy Brigades but were christened Black Hundreds. In response to the physical attacks, Jughashvili helped transform Social Democratic agitation 'circles' into red combat brigades called Red Hundreds. By December 1905, the worker Red Hundreds, assisted by young radical thugs, seized control of Chiatura and thus of half of global manganese output" (p.76).

"The waves of militancy that Durnovó and Stolypin had crushed erupted again in a remote swath of deep Siberian forest in late February 1912. More than 1,000 miles north and east of Irkutsk on the Lena River—the source of Lenin's pseudonym from his Siberian exile days—gold-mine workers struck against the fifteen-to-sixteen-hour workdays, meager salaries (which were often garnished {sic—PB} for 'fines'), watery mines (miners were soaked to the bone), trauma (around 700 incidents per 1,000 miners), and the high cost and low quality of their food. Rancid horse penises, sold as meat at the company store, triggered the walkout. The authorities refused the miners' demands and a stalemate ensued. In April, as the strike went into its fifth week, government troops subsidized by the gold mine arrived and arrested the elected strike committee leaders (political exiles who, ironically, wished

to end the strike). This prompted not the strike's dissipation but a determined march for the captives' release. Confronted by a peaceful crowd of perhaps 2,500 gold miners, a line of 90 or so soldiers opened fire at their officer's command, killing at least 150 workers and wounding more than 100, many shot in the back trying to flee. The image of workers' lives extinguished for capitalist gold proved especially potent: among the British and Russian shareholders were banking clans, former prime minister Sergei Witte, and the dowager empress. Word of the Lena goldfields massacre spread via domestic newspaper accounts—overwhelming, in Russia, news of the Titanic's contemporaneous sinking—and spurred empirewide job actions encompassing 300,000 workers on and after May Day 1912. The vast strikes caught the beaten-down socialist parties largely by surprise. "The Lena shots broke the ice of silence, and the river of popular resentment is flowing again", Jughashvili noted in the newspaper. "The ice has broken. It has started!" The *okhranka* {*internal intelligence*} concurred, reporting: "Such a heightened atmosphere has not occurred for a long time. ... Many are saying that the Lena shooting is reminiscent of the January 9 {1905} shooting" (Bloody Sunday). Conservatives lashed out at the government for the massacre, as well as at the gold company's Jewish director and foreign shareholders. A Duma commission on the goldfields massacre deepened the public anger, thanks to the colourful reports provided by the commission chairman, a leftist Duma deputy and lawyer named Alexander Kerensky" (p.125).

Panin On Khrushchev

But to return to Solzhenitsyn's *Letter*. Panin, hoping for a working class revolution against the Soviet regime, mocks a passage in which Solzhenitsyn says:

"My proposals are of course made with a hope that is infinitesimally small but not entirely non-existent. What gives me some reason for hope is, for example, the 'Khrushchevian miracle' of the years 1955-1956, that unforeseen, unbelievable miracle of the liberation of millions of prisoners, together with the miserable beginnings of a humane system of law ... This sudden initiative of Khrushchev's went beyond the level of political acts he couldn't avoid doing, it was, unquestionably, a movement of the heart ..."

The passage as it happens does not appear in the English translation of the *Letter*—all that we have is the remark: "Look back and contemplate the horror:

from 1918 to 1954 and from 1958 to the present day *not one person* has been released from imprisonment as a result of a humane impulse." Which does imply that "*a humane impulse*" was at work between 1954 and 1958. Panin, however, insists that, far from being a movement of Khrushchev's heart or a humane impulse, Khrushchev's actions were indeed imposed on him:

"Solzhenitsyn doubtless hasn't understood what caused the events he refers to. In reality, from 1952 to 1955, a wave of insurrections broke out in the camps. There were many places in which real, organised battles took place: the authorities brought in tanks. The regime was no longer able to impose forced labour on 15 million prisoners and keeping order would have required entire regiments of soldiers in each camp. Not even Stalin could have allowed himself such a luxury. That is precisely why the population of the archipelago around 1957 was reduced to approximately one tenth of what it had been. From 1917 to 1957 in the 'Workers' and Peasants' state', only the class of party bureaucrats, above all the upper crust, benefitted from all the dwelling apartments that had been built. The sudden appearance of thirteen million newly freed prisoners demanded a quick solution for their support and lodging."

It should be said that the third volume of *The Gulag Archipelago* does give a history of the revolts in the camps. The first English translation of this, done by Solzhenitsyn's favoured translator, Harry Wilets, appeared in 1978. I am not clear when it was published in Russian but a copyright for the Russian edition is dated 1976, after the publication of Panin's book in Russian in 1975 (in French translation in 1976).

Panin goes on to make a passionate case against Khrushchev:

"Each action of Khrushchev's was conditioned by circumstance and above all, after Stalin's death, by the menace posed by millions of men {presumably the insurrectionaries in the labour camps—PB}. In his personal struggle for power, Khrushchev had to take account of the needs of the ruling class. That is how all the noisy propaganda about Khrushchev's liberalism took off in a market place full of dupes.

"The "unquestionable movement of Khrushchev's heart" was a movement towards the violent persecution of religion. Precisely during his period in office over 10,000 churches and nearly all the monasteries were closed. The church was undermined from within by the system of 'twenties': from then

onwards each parish was ruled by twenty lay representatives appointed by the government.

"The *cordial* Khrushchev ordered the slaughter of all the cattle belonging to people living in the suburbs. In the kolkhozes and sovkhoses he hugely reduced the area set aside for individual pasturing and by the same token reduced the stocks of hay for the winter. So the kolkhozians were forced to slaughter the animals they could no longer feed. Listening to "his great heart" he reduced in a catastrophic manner the bits of land that were attached to the houses of kolkhoz members and he covered them ruthlessly with insane plantations of maize."

He concludes:

"That is why Khrushchev is hated by the people at least as much as Stalin. In the West it wasn't by chance that the idea of the supposed liberalism of Khrushchev putting an end to Stalinism was spread about. But for someone who himself has had experience of the regime, these false ideological paths traced out artificially for the Westerners are all the more unforgivable."

Revolution Or Moral Transformation?

Solzhenitsyn, as I mentioned in my first article, was highly critical of what he called the "*third emigration*"—those who, wanting to escape the Soviet Union, took advantage of the permission given to Jews to emigrate to Israel and who then didn't go to, or stay in, Israel but took advantage of their exile to denounce the country they had abandoned. Panin of course almost exactly fitted this description (though Solzhenitsyn does make something of an exception for those who, like Panin, had done time in the camps). He managed to leave because his wife was Jewish, though she converted to Roman Catholicism. He explains, incidentally, that the permission to emigrate to Israel was the price extracted by the US Congress for giving the USSR 'most favoured nation' trading status.

Solzhenitsyn was furious at his own expulsion. His whole strategy was based on remaining in the Soviet Union and using his international position—which he thought would be unassailable once the *Gulag Archipelago* had been published in English—to speak freely. His last major essay before the expulsion was *Live not by lies*, calling on ordinary Soviet citizens, even if they could not speak out as freely as he could, to at least refrain from saying things as writers, endorsing them in votes at public

meetings, what they knew to be false. The call to refuse '*lies*', the attack on ideology, the call for '*repentance*', combined with an acceptance that the regime would continue in existence, were all based on an idea that a distinction could be drawn between the people—in this case even including the leaders—and the ideology. And that in turn was based on the central idea expressed in one of the most often quoted passages in the *Gulag Archipelago*, that the line between Good and Evil does not run between particular categories of people but through the heart of each individual person. The human person was always a mixture of good and bad impulses. The ideology was an unmixed evil.

For Panin, all this was an impossible and unreasonable demand. He quotes what he says was one of the 'commandments' necessary to survival in the camps: "*be a slave on the outside and a warrior in your heart*". It was very necessary that people who knew what life was like in the Soviet Union should be present in the West to correct Western misapprehensions and it was right and proper to take advantage of whatever opportunities presented themselves for doing it. . Solzhenitsyn himself, he observes, after treating the Soviet leaders in his *Letter* as people who could be reasoned with, had insisted in speeches condemning the policy of *détente* that they were not people who could be reasoned with. To call on the Soviet leaders to separate themselves from their ideology was like asking them to cut off the branch on which they were all sitting, or to go to the dentist to have their teeth drawn. As for not living by lies as a sufficient tactic for confronting the regime: *The oppressing class can only thank Solzhenitsyn. Naive seekers after the truth are not dangerous and nothing is easier than to chuck them into a psychiatric home.*

How Panin hoped to achieve his revolution, however, remains unclear to me. The clearest statement I could find in *Soljénitsyne et la réalité* was this:

"In the first place the people must be prepared. The whole truth must be revealed to them—the crimes of the regime, life in the free world, they must be shown the perspectives that would be opened to them after the ruling class was removed from power. Little by little the people would feel its strength, gain confidence, be definitively persuaded of its rights. And it is in the micro-fraternities that the forces of liberation

will rise that will start the revolution and conduct it to victory over the tyrants."

The "*microfraternities*"—existing in clandestinity and on the surface conforming to the lie. In Panin's view it was only after the overthrow of the regime that the moral transformation wanted by Solzhenitsyn could take place.

There is a dialogue in *the First Circle* in which Sologdin (Panin) mocks Nerzhin's (Solzhenitsyn's) desire to read the complete works of Lenin in order to understand the Revolution (basically part of Solzhenitsyn's lifelong ambition finally realised at least partially in *The Red Wheel*). Sologdin says it would be a total waste of time. As far as he is concerned Lenin is evil and that is all that needs to be said about him—his thoughts, his ideology are neither here nor there. From the point of view of achieving a revolution, Sologdin/Panin may be right—as the Bolsheviks were hardly interested in the inner thoughts and feelings of the bourgeoisie. But Panin could never have written *The Red Wheel*, or even the *First Circle*.

Panin died in 1987 so he didn't witness the collapse of the Soviet Union—neither the moral transformation wanted by Solzhenitsyn, nor the revolution wanted by Panin, though there were perhaps elements of both. It started with a change of heart, or at least of policy, in the regime and it produced the sort of chaos that Solzhenitsyn on the basis of his studies of February 1917 had feared. I hope to say something about this in the next article.

January 2016

Eoghan Rua

Two of Eoghan Rua's Songs, with translations, have been placed on the Church & State Internet site. A file of commentaries on the two poems by Séamas Ó Domhnaillís also available. These appeared in the series, *The Life & Work Of Eoghan Ruadh*. Both are free to download.

Go to : <http://www.atholbooks.org>
Click on 'editorials and articles from current magazines'
then click on 'magazine search'
and choose 'church and state'.

Pat Muldowney

Excerpt from article to appear in March issue of Irish Foreign Affairs

The Irish and Habsburgia: Hidden History of the World *A Poetic Commentary on Maria Theresa and the Seven Years War*

Ireland has had relations with many foreign countries; for instance Britain, America, France—proper, modern countries who count for something in the International Community. But the Habsburg realms? Isn't that just light-opera-Ruritania, Blue-Danube-Waltz-land, Prisoner of Zenda stuff, with a little bit of Transylvanian creepiness thrown in? Even their most famous military music, the *Radetzky March*, is so light and cheery you could dance to it.

Surely you can only have real, serious foreign relations with a real, serious country. Like Britain or France, important countries with grown-up leaders, history, politics and conquests. Countries with very big guns which they are ever ready to use. Not some children's fairytale joke of a country; a hold-out from the Middle Ages which by some freakish accident made it into the twentieth century.

Apart from England, with which Ireland's connection was largely antagonistic, arguably the strongest Irish foreign connection was with Spain, in circumstances where the conquest of Ireland was still incomplete and Spain was the dominant world power, so the Irish-Spanish alliance had a realistic chance of breaking the British connection.

The conquest of Ireland produced the "Wild Geese" emigration to Spain, and to Austria-Hungary. And particularly to France, which became Britain's main Imperial rival as Spanish power declined.

After the horrors of the Thirty Years War, the Ottomans pressed up the Danube to the gates of Vienna. They were stopped by the Holy Roman Empire which, in defensive and unifying mode, brought the peoples of the Danube Basin together in resistance. (Peter de Lacy from west Limerick participated in this war. Afterwards he went into the service of Tsar Peter the Great, where he was credited with transforming Russia's military fortunes. His son Franz Moritz von Lacy served in Maria Theresa's army in the Seven Years' War, becoming second-in-command under Field-Marshal Daun and successfully fending

off the invasion by Prussia's Frederick the Great.)

Defensive war against the Ottomans appears to have generated a loyalty by the Danube countries to the Kaiser-and-King of the Holy Roman Empire, loyalty which endured for centuries against Prussia, Russia and France.

It is possible to speculate in this vein on the sources of this unique central European civilisation. Whatever produced it, it was criminally destroyed by the Great War aggressors.

The centuries-old *Treaty of Dingle* ensured a kind of common citizenship between Ireland and Habsburgia—until 1918.

In the 17th century Wexford-born William Lamport was one of those who claimed Habsburg citizenship in Spain. Now honoured in Mexico for being their first advocate of independence, he subscribed to the humane ideas of the Dominican monk Bartolomé de Las Casas ("Protector of the Indians"), and in 1659 was executed by burning at the stake for fomenting revolution by the indigenous people against the Spanish colonial settlers.

In Austria-Hungary, in addition to Franz Lacy, Irish involvement included Field Marshal Maximilian Ulysses Browne who kept Prussia's Frederick the Great out of Bohemia in 1756. A few years later Arthur O'Leary from Kerry served as Captain of Hussars in Maria Theresa's army. Art O'Leary is the subject of a famous Lament (*Caoineadh Airt Uí Laoghaire*) by his wife Eibhlín Dubh Ní Chonaill, an ancestor of Daniel O'Connell.

So, apart from Edelweiss/the Sound of Music—and Semmelweis/public hygiene, and Polanyi/*The Great Transformation*, and etc. etc.—what has the Holy Roman Empire ever done for us?

There is an Irish window on Habsburgia as it was in the year 1757. This takes the form of a series of poems by Liam Inglis OSA (Order of St. Augustine), 1709-1778.

Liam English is Liam/William Ryan, probably from Tipperary where there

are so many Ryans that they get various nicknames, one of these being "English". He is best known for a poem in praise of irresponsibility, usually sung to a lively tune, which starts as follows:

Ólaim punch is ólaim tae
Is an lá 'n-a dhéidh sin ólaim todody,
Ní bhím ar meisce ach uair sa ré,
Mo ghrá-sa an déirc is an t-É do cheap í!

{I drink punch and I drink tae
And the day after that I drink todody (= hot whiskey),
I am drunk only once a month –
I love alms (= begging or mendicancy), and
Him who invented it!}

After various adventures Inglis joined the Dominican Order in Old Friary Lane near Shandon Street in Cork. Not liking the Dominican vow of poverty, he went to the Augustinians in Fishamble Street. The jargon of the Butter Market is in some of his verses. The Augustinians sent him to study in Rome around 1744-49, where he encountered Habsburgia.

The Seven Year War (1756-63) was fought on all the known continents of the time, and in America is called the French and Indian War (i.e. the war fought against the French/indigenous alliance.) This was the "First World War", which laid down the geo-political structure of the modern world, leading directly to the American and French revolutions in the first instance.

Here are a few lines from Inglis's extensive commentary on the Seven Year War.

A Éadbháird aoibhinn uasail álainn {to Charles Edward Stuart} A.D. 1757

...
Le confadh triallfaidh Iarla an Chláir
ghil
Scoilfidh a sciatha, a gcliabhradh
gearrfaidh,
Is follus sin gur obair shuilt don iaith-
seo tráighte
'S is binn linn Byng is an bás 'n-a bheól!

...
{Bright Lord Clare will attack fiercely
He will split their shields and lacerate their
breasts
Joyous work for this abandoned land
Byng at death's door is sweetness to us!}

Clare's Regiment, formed by Daniel O'Brien Viscount Clare, was part of the Irish Brigade of the French Army. Byng is the English Admiral who, for displaying too much caution, was executed *pour encourager les autres*. The third, fourth and fifth words of the fourth line are pronounced *bing ling Byng*.

Thomas Davis's poem *Clare's Dragoons*, celebrates an Irish Brigade victory for France:

When on Ramillie's bloody field,
The baffled French were forced to yield,
The victor Saxon backward reeled
Before the charge of Clare's Dragoons.

...

More from Liam Inglis:

Leastar an bhráthar
{The monk's butter-vat}
A.D. 1757

...
Is cuir chum Pruise cuid i dtráth dhi,
An dá ríogain choidhche sásaimh,
Ríogain Rúise is crú Almaine

...

{O God,} give Prussia the punishment due to her
And always reward the two queens
—The Empress {Elizabeth} of Russia, and
the Royal Blood of Austria {Maria Theresa}.

Mo ghearán chruaidh l
e huaislibh Fódla
{My harsh complaint
to the nobles of Ireland}

...

Do fuaireas faisnéis, fionnaidh go fóill
mé,
Gurab é rí na Pruise agus uireasbha
mhór air
Do chuir teachta agus feasa le fórsa
Le Pandúir go dúthaigh Eógain;

...

Adeir cuid eile, agus creidim-se dhóibh-
sean
Nach é Pruise do rinn na gnótha
Acht mac ár dtríath-na Uilliam mac
Sheóirse
Atá fé chiach i ndiaidh Hanóibher!

...

{I received information—understand me still—
That it was the king of Prussia in dire straits
Who sent an expedition to reconnoitre in force
With Pandours to the territory of Eoghan {=
Eugene?};

...

Others say—and I give them credence –
That it was not Prussia that was behind this
But the son of our ruler, William son of George
Who is in desperation over losing Hanover.}

Pandours were Hungarian Cossack-type frontier fighters, normally associated with the Habsburgs rather than Prussia. Eoghan/ "Eugene" could be a reference to the great Habsburg general of that name. The Hanoverian George II was king of Great Britain, Ireland and Hanover. His son William was Duke of Cumberland, the butcher of Culloden.

An eól díbh-se a dhaoine i bhfionn Fáil?
{Do ye know, ye people of the land
of Ireland?}

...

Geallaimse díbhse nár gabhadh Prág
'S go mairid a mílid 's gur teann táid,
Do fearadh go fíochmhar
An deabhaidh le fír-nimh
'S do greadadh an Rí anois le Count Daun.

Is tapaidh an t-amas tug Brown áigh
'San taca nár mheathta, an prionnsa árd,
Do gearradh na mílte
Do glanadh an trínse
Do scaipeadh 's do scaoileadh a bhfann-
námhad.

...

{I guarantee you that Prague was not taken
That her soldiers live and that they are powerful
Fiercely fought was
The battle with real venom
And the King {of Prussia} was smashed by
Count Daun.

Swift was the (counter-)attack of valiant Brown
Likewise his worthy adjutant, the noble prince,
Thousands fell
The trench was cleared
The demoralised enemy was scattered and
killed.}

These verses are in the "limerick"
metre which apparently originated with
Filí na Máighe, the school of Limerick
poets associated with the Mangaire
Súgach, with whom Inglis is also linked.

The Seven Years War began with the 1756 invasion of Bohemia (modern Czech lands) by Prussian Enlightenment superman Frederick the Great who, after his success in the earlier War of Austrian Succession, wanted another slice of Silesia. In a Stalingrad-style *tour-de-force*, in which Croat irregulars and French-speaking (Walloon/'Belgian') Netherlanders played a significant part, Frederick's *blitzkrieg* was stopped outside Prague by newly promoted Habsburg-Irish Field Marshal Maximilian Ulysses Browne. With other Irish officers such as de Lacy, Browne was supported by the rather less impressive Prince Charles of Lorraine—who may be the "noble prince" mentioned by Inglis. After Browne had done the heavy lifting, the equally competent Field Marshal Count Leopold Joseph von Daun, who was in overall command, came to his aid. Though Frederick never recovered the initiative, Browne/Daun/Lacy did not push for the destruction of Prussia. That was not the Habsburg way; and this policy of restraint worked for a couple of centuries, until 1918.

Crucial to her campaign of defense was Maria Theresa's brilliant network of alliances with France, Sweden and Empress Elizabeth of Russia. Her Chancellor Kaunitz seemed to foreshadow Bismarck, a century later, in the arts of

political diplomacy and military restraint. Also crucial were Maria Theresa's Bohemian artillery manufactures, in which Austria-Hungary maintained a lead until 1918. Hitler, who despised Austria-Hungary, got those weapons into his hands courtesy of Britain. Also worth mentioning are Maria Theresa's medical reforms, initiated by a Dr. Brady, the Irish head of the Habsburg army medical corps, which put the University of Vienna at the forefront of this field for centuries.

Other verses by Inglis feature von Daun, Contades, Brunswick, Boscawen, Senegal, Ticonderoga, Du Quesne. Admiral Edward Boscawen fought the French Atlantic fleet. He signed the execution order of Admiral Byng. Ticonderoga and Du Quesne were military forts in the Great Lakes area of New France, the events/location of the book/film *Last of the Mohicans* in which the French forces were led by General Montcalm. The war saw military and naval engagements in West Africa where Britain and France competed for colonies. Both the West and East Indies were major theatres of war. Thomas Arthur Comte de Lally fought with Irish Brigade forces against Britain in south India. Stranded without military or naval support, he lost. As prisoner-of-war in England, he returned voluntarily to France to face charges for the military defeat, and was beheaded. Louis XVI exonerated him in 1778. Britain is blamed for the carnage that followed their conquest of India, when customary social precautions against famine were smashed by the new regime.

Atá an báire imeartha réidh
{The Game is Up!}
A.D. 1757

...

In Americie siar tá an diabhal ortha ar
fad,
Do fágadh 'san nglíadh iad fá chiach is
fá cheas,
Ní tháinig leath a dtrian as, ach iarmhar
beag lag
An lá san do bhíodar ag Ticonderoga;
Ag Fort Dhu Quesne ní léire bhí a mbail
Do túrnadh gach n-aon ar an gcléir
Senegal
Atá a dtóin leis an ngréin ag baoltaigh
na mbrat
Is fagfaimíd siúd mar atá sé!

{In America out west they {the British} are
in devil's own trouble,
The war has left them in sickness and
affliction,

Less than one in six of them escaped, a pitiful remnant,
That day they were at Ticonderoga,
At Fort Du Quesne they were no better off
Every last one of them was trounced by the
{company from Senegal (?)}
The daring {French} heroes of the banners
(?) have their rear-ends to the sun {"wind in
their sails", perhaps},
And let us leave it at that!}

This one is in the voice of King George:

Is ró-dhian a screadann
A.D. 1757

Fonn: Óró, a shean-duine leatsa ní gheóbhada
Is ró-dhian a screadann an sean-duine Seóirse
"Ó, a Dhia, cá rachad? Níl agam Hanóber
Ná fós Hesse-Cassel, mo bhaile beag cómhgair,
Ná fód mo shean-athrach, táid airgthe dóighte!

...
Níl suan im ghoire 's ní tirim mo chaoineadh,
'S is cruaidh an choingeal 'n-a bhfuilim ag Laoiseach,
I dtuath na Ruiseach 's a loingeas go fíochmhar
Do buadhadh ar na Pruisigh is briseadh a gcroidhe istigh!

Do b'aerach ádhmhrach áluinn mo choróin seal,
Mo léan mar do tháinig an lá so 'n-a dheóidh sin –
Na Swedes le dásacht ag cárnadh mo shloighte
'S an tréan-trup san Mháire tug naire go deo dham!

Ni dion dam Breatain ná fearann Fódla,
Ní díleas dam Alba ó ghearras a scórnach,
Ní díreach dam danair—ní cara dham cómhursa—
Sínidh im bheathaidh mé is caithidh féin bhfód mé!"

{In desperation oul' Georgy-boy shrieks out: "O God! Where will I go? I've lost Hanover, and even my little refuge of Hesse-Cassel; and my forefathers' domains—they are shrivelled and burnt! I have no peace, my lamentations are tearful; Louis {King Louis XV of France} has me in his tight grip; in the Russian expanses—and their fearsome naval forces—the Prussians were defeated and their spirit broken! At one time my crown was blissful, blessed and beautiful; alas! this new day has dawned—the Swedes are brazenly slaughtering my armies, and the brave soldiers of Maria {Theresa} have disgraced me! Britain is no protection for me, nor is Ireland; Scotland rejects me since I cut their throats {at Culloden}; the Danes are untrue

to me, my neighbour is not my friend,—Just throw me underground and bury me alive!"}

The Hidden History of the World?

In 1763 a relatively humane future for mankind was scotched in favour of the Enlightenment savagery we currently endure. Who has heard of the Jesuit Reductions of South America? Why is Habsburg civilisation now a mere comic opera? What is being concealed from us, and why?

As envisaged and planned by the Elizabethan poet Edmund Spenser in the sixteenth century, Irish-Ireland was clinically lobotomised in the seventeenth century, to prepare it for death-camp resolution in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the early 1600s Geoffrey Keating (*Foras Feasa*) and the Ó Cléirigh's (*Four Masters' Annals*) saw what was coming and, like the Reduction Indians salvaging their orchestral scores, wrote up the last will and testament of that world, in preparation for oblivion. In the nineteenth century John O'Donovan and Eoghan O'Curry re-opened the dusty obituary, and reminded some people of what used to exist; including Thomas Davis who started to breathe life back into it.

But it was Habsburgia that miraculously kept the Irish mind on life support for centuries in its Irish Colleges. The ballads of Liam Inglis are testimony to this.

Note on Art O'Leary:

O'Leary's grave memorial reads:

"Arthur Leary Generous Brave Handsome Slain in his Bloom lies in this humble Grave Died the 4th May 1771 aged 26 years Having Served the Empress Maria Teresa as Captain of the Hungarian Hussars he returned home to be treacherously shot by order of the British Government his sole crime being that he resisted to part with a favourite horse for the sum of £5."

Here is a piece of the famous Lament (*Caoineadh Airt Uí Laoghaire*), in a format usually extemporised by professional keening women, but in this case by his widow, Eibhlín Dubh Ní Chonail:

...
Mo chara go daingean tu!
is cuimhin lem aigne
an lá breá earraigh úd,
gur bhreá thiodh hata dhuit
faoi bhanda óir tarraingthe;
claíomh cinn airgid,
lámh dheas chalma,
rompsáil bhagarthach –
fír-chhritheagla

ar námhaid chealgach –
tú i gcóir chun falaracht
is each caol ceannann fút.
D'umhlaídís Sasanaigh
síos go talamh duit,
is ní ar mhaithe leat
ach le haon-chorp eagla,
cé gur leo a cailleadh tu,
a mhuirnín mh'anama. ...

It is part translation by Eleanor Hull:

Rider of the white palm!
With the silver-hilted sword!
Well your beaver hat became you

With its band of graceful gold;
Your suit of solid homespun yarn

Wrapped close around your form;

Slender shoes of foreign fashion,

And a pin of brightest silver
Fastened in your shirt.
As you rode in stately wise
On your slender steed, white-faced,

After coming over seas,
Even the Saxons bowed before you

Bowed down to the very ground;

Not because they loved you well
But from deadly hate;
For it was by them you fell,
Darling of my soul.

**Highlights of the
December issue of *Irish
Foreign Affairs*:**

* Philip O'Connor writes a vigorous obituary of the German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt who died this year.

* Popular history has caught up with the role of the Committee of Imperial Defence in WW1, and Manus O'Riordan reviews one conference on the subject.

* Pat Walsh continues his pioneering work (Lord Esher, James Bryce).

* A far reaching editorial throws a fresh light on the history of Europe in the twentieth century, for example, Europe after 1945:

Irish Foreign Affairs—is produced quarterly at €5, £4. It carries historical analysis and reviews international events from an Irish perspective (ISSN 2009-132X).

Subscriptions: 4 issues. **Electronic €10 (£8). Postal Euro-zone and World Surface: €24; Sterling-zone: £15**

V
O
X

The Bantering 'Father Prout'
Toibin
Dominicans
Syria

P
A
T

The Bantering 'Father Prout'

The Deanery—

"When a young man I used to frequent a club called the Deanery, on account of its situation in Dean Street, Soho. It had been kept by a brother of Morland, the painter. Thackeray, Charles Dickens, Douglas Jerrold, Hepworth Dixon, Father Prout, Stanfield, Charles Landseer, and Frank Stone were amongst its members.

There were often animated conversations on the events of the day. Father Prout, whose real name was Francis Mahoney, a Jesuit, took the lead. He was a highly cultivated man, and a witty one. His critical power and humour were shown in *Fraser's Magazine*. His political papers in that monthly so pleased Lord Palmerston that his Lordship nominated him Head of the College at Malta. Pope Gregory XVI. refused to ratify the nomination. For the Reverend Father had not been very conservative, nor sufficiently strict, in his profession of faith.

In his latter days, Father Prout was correspondent of the *Globe* newspaper at Paris. There, after rambling all day either in the Louvre or Luxembourg, I used to meet him on the Boulevard des Italiens, when his animated face and clever talk used to refresh me after the fatigues of the day.

A proficient in the art of banter, he was tolerant himself, when he fell in with an antagonist. Once at the Deanery, the conversation being political, I upheld the maintenance of our existing institutions. Father Prout exclaimed, "Our country is 'Syriac'", thereby insinuating that, being a member of the Ancient Race, I could have no strong feelings of patriotism. Thereupon I retorted that I was an Englishman, and that I had a right to dwell in England as long as it suited me; but that there were certain religionists who, by Act of Parliament, were debarred from living therein more than six calendar months without a renewal of permission to do so. This answer was approved of by all present, and Father Prout so enjoyed it that he walked away with me, arm-in-

arm, although he had been cautioned by some of the company never again to make such an observation" (*Reminiscences of Solomon Alexander Hart, RA*—Wyman & Sons, 1882, 144 p.p.— See *Vox Pat* 122, last issue).

* *Syriac is a Middle Aramaic language and, as such, a language of the Northwestern branch of the Semitic family. It is written in the Syriac alphabet, a derivation of the Aramaic alphabet.*

Solomon Alexander Hart (1806-1881) was a British painter and engraver. He was the first Jewish member of the Royal Academy in London and was probably the most important Jewish artist working in England in the 19th century.

Toibin

According to the Dublin media:

"Colm Toibin has excelled in many forms of writing: the novel, the short story, the essay and journalism. And now there's Colm Toibin the poet, as recently evidenced in the *Times Literary Supplement*" {London} (*Irish Independent*, 18.6.2011).

Church & State magazine would like to contribute to Colm's development as a poet and are delighted to publish a contribution he made to a Capuchin publication in 1971, when he was a student at St. Peter's College, Wexford

REJECTION
(For Inspiration)

Your name is circling in my mind
Like a leaf in a whirling pool
I have followed you through summer
It was then I wanted you most
Now you choose to fall
When the pool overflows on this paper
And seasons are cold
If you stay there faithful
on the tree
And not fall with Autumn's wind
And come on a Summer night to me
But no!
Now you choose to come
When pools are overflowed

And there's no room left for love
in Autumn's change.

Colm Tobin,
St. Peter's College, Wexford.

(*Eirig*—A Magazine of Christian Optimism, A Capuchin Franciscan Publication—November, 1971)

Dominicans

"*We Can't Blame Cromwell*", say parting Dominicans—Addressing a congregation of up to 1,000 well-wishers and amid tears shed by friars and parishioners alike, Fr. John Harris said it was the first time in 791 years of the Irish Dominicans' history that they were voluntarily closing one of their foundations.

"*We can't blame Henry VIII or Cromwell this time*", Fr Harris quipped, a reference to the forced closures in times of religious persecution in the past.

He explained that the Dominican friars had made this decision with "*heavy hearts*" but they had to face the "*realities of today*".

He outlined how the fall-off in vocations had left them without the personnel to run all their houses.

In 1965, there were 425 Irish Dominicans, but now there are just 162. In 1972, the average age of the friars was 44, now it is closer to 74.

This is the first of five closures announced by the Dominican provincial Fr. Gregory Carroll in September 2014. Other centres in Dublin, Drogheda, Waterford and Limerick are also due to be closed. (*Irish Independent*, 23.11.2015)

Syria

Back Assad and his army—The atrocities in Paris and elsewhere have increased the pressure on the leaders of the Western democracies to place 'boots on the ground' to ensure the defeat of Isil. There are such boots on the ground already—namely the Syrian army.

It is imperative to provide logistical and military support to that army rather than to put in jeopardy the lives of troops from those Western democracies.

This would be tantamount to a tacit admission of the folly of the attempt to replace the autocratic President Bashar al-Assad.

At this stage there is no realistic option other than to allow Assad to continue to rule his country, or rather what is left of it.

J. Anthony Gaughan,
{Priest & Historian}, Blackrock, Co. Dublin. (Letter, *Irish Indep.* 19.11.2015)