

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

The Globalist Power Of Babel

**What Happened To
The Cherokees**

Catherine Deneuve

Linguistics And Evolution

Protestants And The State

Solzhenitsyn

British Crusader Zionism

No. 131

First Quarter, 2018

Editorial

The Modern Globalist Power Of Babel

"Hitherto, the world had only one way of speech, only one language.

And now as men travelled westwards, they found a plain in the land of Sennaar, and made themselves a home there: Here we can make bricks, they said to one another, baked with fire; and they built, not in stone, but in brick, with pitch for their mortar.

"It would be well, they said, to build ourselves a city, and a tower in it with a top that reaches to heaven; we will make ourselves a great people, instead of scattering over the wide face of the earth.

"But now the Lord came down to look at the city, with its tower, which Adams's children were building; and he said: Here is a people all one, with a tongue in common to all; this is but the beginning of their undertakings, and what is to prevent them carrying all they design? It would be well to go down and throw confusion into the speech they use there, so that they will not be able to understand each other.

"Thus the Lord broke up their common home, and scattered them over the earth, and the building of the city came to an end. That is why it was called Babel, Confusion, because it was there that the Lord confused the whole world's speech, and scattered them far away, over the wide face of earth" (*Genesis*, Chapter 11).

And so human existence in the mode of nationality came about instead of existence as mere race.

Freedom became an attribute of nationality. Without nationality there could only be the uniformity of race. But the yearning for uniformity remained and it contributed to the reality and the ideal of Imperialism.

In Ireland Hubert Butler (author of *From The Anthill*) yearned for a restoration of the disrupted uniformity of British rule, and he attributed to the Anglo-Irish hangover of British rule an inherited racial superiority in the matter of ruling.

The Irish, left to themselves—having insisted forcibly that they should be left to themselves—were doing things that, in the name of Progress, they should not have been allowed to do. They were doing backward things. They were doing the things they were inclined to do when freed from control. They had sport and music and dancing and children, and they did not keep the Sabbath, beyond dashing to Mass on Sunday morning. (In globalist London the Sabbath was strictly kept well within living memory. One was allowed to do hardly anything. Ulster Unionist insistence that children's playgrounds should be closed so that the atmosphere of the Sabbath should not be spoiled by sounds of pleasure was far from being un-British.

The direction of Progress is towards the Anthill. It is anti-national. Its ideal was declared to be post-nationalist by a philosophy group in Trinity College some while ago. But, when one sees through the nation, what does one see beyond it? Either nothing at all, or the closing down of humanity into

the universal uniformity of a race—a vast anthill or termite mound.

The sprouting of this ideal in Ireland seems to have resulted from a refusal to see what the actual cause of the 'Troubles' in the North was, and the seizing of an Oxbridge hint that it was "*nationalism*". Blaming it on "*nationalism*" brought rewards. Attributing it to the system of undemocratic government deliberately put in place by Britain in 1921 would not have brought rewards.

Irish Governments, unable to cope with the War in the North, which resulted from undemocratic British government, have, since about 1970, been whittling away the sense of nationality on which the Irish state was formed.

The state which they govern was brought into being by a strong force of nationality directed against British Imperialist government. The electorate in Ireland, leaving aside the British colony in the North-East, refused to participate in British politics from the mid-19th century onwards. The British political parties, Liberal and Tory, finding that they could not win any seats in the greater part of Ireland, decided not to contest those seats. But they continued to govern this part of Ireland in which they could not establish an electoral base. And then they fought a war against this region of Ireland with which they had failed to establish a democratic connection.

Irish statehood was equivocally recognised by Britain in the early 1920s, after British political morale was severely damaged by the strong resistance it met with in the War that it launched on Germany in 1914 and by the effective aggression launched by the Turks against the British-imposed Treaty in 1922.

In conceding independence to the part of Ireland in which it had failed to establish a democratic base, Britain made a political division of Ireland. It held within the British state the North-East region in which it had a strong democratic base. It kept the Six Counties within the United Kingdom. But, perversely, it then excluded them from the democratic political system of the state and set them up in a little system of their own called 'Northern Ireland'.

The British in the Six Counties were retained within the British state on the condition that they should be cut out of its political life.

The Northern Ireland system worked out as a system of communal government of Catholics by Protestants. There was no practical possibility that it could have been anything else.

The Northern Ireland system was called "*devolution*". Devolution was established in the Scottish region of the UK two generations later—but it was entirely different from the Northern Ireland system. Scottish devolution operated within the democratic political system of the state. The political parties of the state did not withdraw from Scotland after establishing the devolved system there. They remained active, in both state politics and devolved politics. If they had withdrawn, as they did from the Six Counties, it seems highly probable that Scotland would now be an independent state.

The declared purpose of Scottish devolution was to halt the growing support for Scottish independence by conceding something less. If it had been accompanied by the isolation of Scotland from British politics, it would have fed the independence movement.

There was no danger of this happening in the Six Counties.

There was no Six County independence movement. There were no Six County-ists as there Scots. There was no sentimental Northern Irishness. What there was was an antagonism of British and Irish nationalisms.

The only successful British colony in Ireland had developed over three centuries, largely through its own resourcefulness, into a distinct people—one of the historic peoples of the British Empire. It was met by a nationalist resurgence of the Irish, who had hung on over the centuries in the outer regions of the Six Counties, and had been drawn to the centre by the 19th century industrialisation.

Irish nationalism, as it got into its stride in the mid-19th century, refused to accept it as a fact that one segment of the British colonisation of the island had taken root and had developed as a nationality that was not Irish, and that could neither be seduced nor coerced into Irishness.

When the 26 County state was formed it felt itself to be deficient because it was not a 32 County state and it stunted itself through locking itself into a futile preoccupation with the lost Six Counties. That preoccupation was futile and self-destructive because it included nothing that could possibly alter the situation. And it could do nothing to alter the situation because it denied the social reality that lay at the heart of the Northern difficulty—the existence of a well-grounded national will that would not be Irish in either a Home Rule or a Republican form.

And that nationality had a substantial majority in the area it was allocated.

British propaganda, which sometimes took the form of 'Political Science', put out the notion that Ireland had to choose between unity and independence, implying that, if it held back on developing in substance the independence it achieved in form, unification might be possible. But unity was not on offer on any terms which included Irish government, however minimal. The *Home Rule Bill*, against which an Ulster Unionist Arm was raised in 1912-14, provided only for devolved government within the United Kingdom, with continued Westminster representation and under Westminster sovereignty. And later there was never any hint from Ulster Unionism that, if the Irish state was disembowelled by a Redmondite reform, it would consider joining it.

The Ulster Unionists let Whitehall dangle these illusions before Dublin, but it took care never to second them.

There was a great upsurge of Anti-Partitionism in the Dublin Establishment following the events of August 1969. Those events had a seriously de-stabilising effect on the structures put in place in 1921-2. Front-benchers in all the Dail parties, who could only understand Ulster Unionism as a concoction of Tory/Landlord reaction, saw an opportunity to undermine it by giving the Tory Government reason to act against Stormont in the hope of restoring order. They had apparently convinced themselves that Ulster Unionism was no more than a by-product of British party-politics. Their aim of bringing about a rupture of the relationship between the Tory Party and the Ulster Unionists was achieved in 1972 when the Tories abolished Stormont. But the effect was not the withering of Ulster Unionism but its resurgence in new forms.

Tory Unionism had never been more than wishful thinking on the part of Fine Gael and Fianna Fail. When this was

To page 4

Contents

	Page
The Modern Globalist Power Of Babel	
Editorial	2
Catherine Deneuve	
Cathy Winch	6
Culture of gender fluidity is a threat	
Owen Gallagher (Report)	8
Linguistics And Evolution (Review Of	
Tom Woulfe's 'Kingdom Of Speech')	
Jack Lane	8
The Question Of The Cherokees	
John Minahane (Part 13 of the Spanish	
Polemic on Colonisation)	9
A Hundred Years In The Life Of <i>The Cave Of</i>	
<i>Machpelah</i> . Manus O'Riordan	12
October Revolution	
<i>Reflections On The 500th Anniversary of</i>	
<i>Luther's posting his Theses on Indulgences</i>	
<i>on the Church door at Wittenberg. Part Three</i>	
Stephen Richards	14
Vox Pat: Pat Maloney	
(Address Of Loyalty; Clergy Of Raphoe;	
Catholic Unionists; Cornwallis; Conyngham;	
Lenten Pastoral; Davos; Housing; Prostitution	
In Cork; Donegal Under George III; Papal	
Decluttering?)	20,32
Daniel O'Connell (Part 4)	
Jules Gondon's Biography. 1847	
Cathy Winch (First English Translation)	22
Tribute. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	24
Solzhenitsyn And The Russian Question	
<i>Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin</i>	
<i>And The Russian Question. Part 8</i>	
Peter Brooke	25
And Now The Meadows	
Wilson John Haire (Poem)	28
'Paper Of Record' Celebrations Of The	
British Crusader Occupation of	
Jerusalem And Its Zionist Project	
Manus O'Riordan	29
Hebron—Holy City Of Sterile Streets	
Roger Cohen	31

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

demonstrated to be the case in 1972, Dublin lost its bearings completely. The North moved beyond its understanding, and it had made such a thing of the North that it could no longer understand itself.

When it joined the European system along with Britain it was in flight from itself, in the hope of losing itself in Europe. Thereafter only the Haughey aberration kept any sense of realistic national purpose alive in it.

Acting amidst hysterical condemnation, Haughey managed to do a few things. He gave the European states the impression that the Irish state was one of them. He dismissed C.C. O'Brien's "*liberalism*" as empty rhetoric. He noted the obvious fact that Northern Ireland was not a viable political entity. And he brought the economy into the era of finance capitalism. But he was reviled by the intelligentsia while doing these things and therefore his statesmanlike actions were not consolidated into a political heritage.

How might he have responded to Brexit? Certainly not as Varadkar and Martin are doing.

He must have had a fair degree of understanding of what Britain is to have acted towards it as he did. He would not have been astonished by Brexit, and been left floundering by it, hoping that it wouldn't happen, and that if it did Ireland would somehow remain within the British sphere without leaving the EU.

If the strong sense of Irish nationality that compelled Britain to mutilate itself by giving up part of what it considered to be its own to be formed into an Irish state—if that still existed, the prospect of Brexit would be seen as an opportunity. Ireland in the EU, with Britain out of it, would be obliged to do what it was also its ambition to do—conduct its public life independently of Britain as part of an alliance of states in conflict with Britain.

That is what happened a generation ago with the money system. The Irish pound was sterling painted green until the crisis in the European Monetary Union when Britain left and Ireland stayed in.

But that happened in the Haughey moment—and the Haughey moment has long since passed away.

Since then Ireland has become a self-denigrating state.

It is the only state in the EU which disparages itself, both as a nationality and as a political structure.

John Bruton wishes that the independent Irish state had never come into being. He lives in Redmondite nostalgia. Was there ever a head of Government in any other state in the world who deplored the historical development that created his state, as Bruton deplored the Republican break with Redmondite imperialism.

Bruton was head of the Irish Government but his mind was elsewhere. As European Ambassador he saw Britain acting as a drag on EU development. He was irritated by British behaviour and he described it vividly, but he did not understand it.

He could not see British behaviour as purposeful activity to prevent or misdirect EU development, ensuring that Britain was not drawn so deep into the EU that it could not extricate itself. He was in love with Britain, and he was also in love with the EU, and therefore he could not understand why Britain acted as it did in the EU.

There were plenty of signs, over a quarter of a century, that Britain was conducting a holding operation against the EU, biding its time until the moment came for leaving it. But Bruton was infatuated and where Britain was concerned he saw only illusions.

Was Bruton altogether to blame in this? He belonged to the social stratum of the rich-and-thick, that lives beyond the vulgar world of songs and music and dancing that is the actual political culture of Irish nationality. Irish national culture does not exist in the intellectual sphere. The Irish Universities were long ago hegemonised by Oxbridge—and it was a distinguished Irish academic, Professor Raymond Crotty, who, having looked around him and seen empty heads, appealed to Oxbridge to come and hegemonise.

Oxbridge was not going to enable Irish academia to see England coldly and dispassionately as the force that it has been in Irish and world history for half a millennium. English academia does not disparage the State which it serves. What it taught Irish academics to do was disparage the Irish nationalist movement.

Irish academia has produced nothing resembling a history of the English state. It could have been Ireland's role in Europe to present it with an idea of the English state that was not hostile but

was well informed and coldly dispassionate.

The founders of what became the EU, particularly Adenauer and De Gaulle, had a pretty good idea of what England was, and therefore they vetoed its first application for membership. But nationalist Ireland, academically, politically and diplomatically, hadn't a clue. What disabled it was the spurious 'Civil War' that Britain caused it to fight in order to damage it while letting go of it. Therefore the Irish presence in the EU, instead of acting as a *continuum* with the founders, helped Britain to sweep aside the values of the founders.

*

"*Post-nationalism*" was preached by anti-nationalist academics a generation ago. What was national existence to be replaced with? What else was there but *Cosmopolis*? The world as a political unit: a world state, without national differentiation, and with universal free trade in which each individual competes against all others in the interest of economic efficiency.

Is it possible to construct the world into such a system? Is it possible to deconstruct the languages that have sprung up all over the world—each of which is aware of the world differently from the others—and replace them with a language which is little more than a system of accountancy?

The ideal of a world of universal free trade is an Imperial ideal. Its source in modern times is the British Empire. And the financial means of realising it is the system of credit-money devised by Britain in its first Great War—the War of the Spanish Succession/Grand Alliance in the early 1700s.

Jonathan Swift, who was a Tory pamphleteer before he became Dean of St' Patrick's, played an influential part in bringing that war to a negotiated conclusion. His pamphlet, *On The Conduct Of The Allies*, influenced the very restricted public opinion of the time and enabled the Tories to bring a negotiated conclusion to the War that had been launched by the Whigs (Liberals)—an end which the Whigs considered premature.

Swift had two basic reasons for urging a negotiated peace. He saw a war waged to the destruction of the enemy, under the conviction that this would lead to a better and more peaceful world, as a delusion. And he saw that financing the War by the new method of

treating debt as money was increasing money economy in a way that was socially destructive

Post-national Ireland has claimed Swift as Irish, though he considered himself English, but it has taken no interest in this pamphlet, which is the most relevant of his writings to the position of nationalist Ireland.

About eighty years later Immanuel Kant (who was not a clergyman but was more in earnest about religion than Swift, who was) tried to give expression in the form of philosophy to what he saw as the substance of Christianity, and to locate it in the realities of the world, considered the Christian ideal of *Perpetual Peace* and set out conditions for it under six headings. The 4th heading is:

"National Debts Shall Not Be Considered with a view to the External Friction of States..."

Swift had considered it in its internal action on the society of the state. Today a national state is hardly conceivable without National Debt.

By the 1790s it had grown beyond the state that invented it and Kant treated it as a major cause of war:

"The expedient of seeking aid within or without the state is above suspicion when the purpose is domestic economy ... But as an opposing machine in the antagonism of powers, a credit system which grows beyond sight and which is yet a safe debt for the present requirements... constitutes a dangerous money power. This ingenious invention of a commercial people [England] in this century is dangerous because it is a war treasure which exceeds the treasures of all other states; it cannot be exhausted except by a default of taxes (which is inevitable), though it can be long delayed by the stimulus to trade which occurs through the reaction of credit on industry and commerce. This facility in making war, together with the inclination to do so on the part of rulers—an inclination which seems inborn in human nature—is thus a great hindrance to perpetual peace. Therefore to forbid this credit system must be a preliminary article of perpetual peace all the more because it must eventually entangle many innocent states in the inevitable bankruptcy and openly harm them. They are therefore justified in allying themselves against such a state and its measures..." (Translation of *Perpetual Peace* in Library of Liberal Arts collection, Kant *On History* 1963).

England mastered the technique of

fighting its wars on credit, greatly increasing the circulation of money beyond what was possible when money was itself a tangible commodity in the form of gold and silver, with its own independent value. This expansion of money accelerated its dissolving effect on traditional social bonds and created a new social bond in the form of National Debt.

To finance the National Debt the land tax on the gentry gave way to income tax around the time Kant was writing and, in the course of development of money economy, the population as a whole became payers of income tax. Everybody was then implicated in the National Debt.

The clearing of credit became a total impossibility. And people could not get their money back from the banks etc., because it no longer existed in tangible form, but had become imaginary. The days when banks were places that kept people's money safe for them had passed away. Banks had become creators of money as agencies of the State, and the existence of the money they created depended on the effectiveness with which the State power was used.

Half way through Britain's Great War on Germany and Turkey, when the expected walk-over had turned into a possible defeat, it was suggested to Balfour that it might be advisable to negotiate a settlement. He had an intuitive understanding of these things—whether any other kind of understanding of such a slippery subject is possible is open to doubt—and he replied that, in the circumstances, the position of sterling in the world would be undermined by a negotiated peace with Germany and they would be little better off than if they lost.

Britain did not lose, but it did not win either. The USA defeated Germany for it, but did not feel that the time had yet come for it to take over control of the world from the British Empire—which was the project set by Jefferson. It left the Empire in place as the World Super-Power—but the stuffing had been knocked out of it by the four years of German resistance and for the next generation it was little more than a drifting hulk.

Then it launched another war on Germany, but lacked the will to prosecute it in earnest. It put a small army in the field, waited for eight months for Germany to respond to the declaration

of war on it, lost the battle in a few weeks when Germany did respond, brought its little army home, denounced France for making terms with Germany when it found itself under occupation in the war that they had started, refused to withdraw its declaration of war on Germany though unable to fight and, by the use of its world-dominating Royal Navy, set about expanding the war with pin-pricks here and there. This tactic produced the German/Russian War.

When the Russian Front held against the German advance, and the German Army began to be pushed back to inevitable defeat by virtue of the greater Russian resources, it became clear that the outcome in Europe could be the replacement of Fascism by Communism. This was averted when the USA, which had been brought into the War by Japan, insisted that Britain should re-engage in Europe in 1944.

Germany was defeated by the Soviet Union but France, Italy, Benelux and western Germany were reclaimed for capitalism. This time round the USA did not leave the shredded British Empire to deal with Europe and repeat its punitive policies of 1919, as if it was dealing with naughty children. It restored the European states, including a German state with only a superficial (though showy) gesture of punishment for the Nazi period.

And it quickly restored functional capitalism in Europe, and in Britain too, with massive loans. It can be said that it did this out of self-interest because it needed a capitalist world to sell the produce of its booming economy into, but the fact is that it did it.

Post-1945 world capitalism was a Washington creation. Its money was the dollar with different pictures painted on. Washington asserted proprietorial rights over it, and reasonably so. Europe was made a mess under British hegemony after 1918. Under Washington hegemony after 1945 it has been a brilliant success.

But that is what "*globalism*" is—American Capitalism.

When President Obama acted against FIFA (Fédération Internationale de Football Association)—a body which had little organic connection with the USA—a couple of years ago, he based his authority on the use by FIFA of THE American credit system., and there was no audible protest against Obama's assertion that use of financial devices

Introduction to a translation of
Catherine Deneuve's intervention in the Sexism furore

Catherine Deneuve

connected with the dollar carries with it subjection to American sovereignty. And the same applies to the Internet, which is dependent on the US for its worldwide functioning.

Whether autonomous globalism—globalism which operates independently of all states—is possible is a moot point. But it is certain that what actually exists is not autonomous globalism but an American power system. And it seems that some recent acts of war—the destruction of the Libyan State for example—had the purpose of defending Dollar Globalism. President Gaddafi was trying to establish ways of transacting the oil business by financial means unconnected with the dollar. And he also had ideas about a Gold-based African currency.

There is sufficient reason to describe what exists as Globalism as the Imperialism of US Finance Capitalism.

It continues the process of dissolving organic social bonds that was described by Swift, carrying it to extremes that were unimaginable a couple of generations ago, and establishing what Thomas Carlyle called "*the nexus of callous cash payment*" as the only reputable social bond—only that it isn't cash any more, only a credit-card. Indeed, in the new globalist world, cash itself is becoming suspect!

The premier Irish "*globalist*" has just died: Peter Sutherland. His life's work was to destroy all traditional ways of life.

Sutherland was launched on his political trajectory from his base in Allied Irish Banks by Taoiseach Garret FitzGerald (some time after his AIB bank debts were written off). Appointed a European Commissioner, though not elected to the Dail, Sutherland went on to mould the World Trade Organisation into a Globalist force, before going on to make his fortune in the US Goldman Sachs finance house. Sutherland acted with the best of intentions and manifested his good intentions by promoting charities such as the St. Vincent de Paul! After all, one must be charitable towards the victims of Globalising Capitalism.

The modern Tower of Babel, in which the world has "*only one way of speech*", apparently is going from strength to strength, but there are signs that a different way of life may be about to assert itself.



The actress Catherine Deneuve co-wrote a letter with four others, which was signed by a hundred and published in *Le Monde* on 9th January. The following day, on Radio 4 news, the French correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* supported it as follows:

"We are French, we believe in grey areas. America is a different country and they do things in black and white, and they make very good computers, but we don't think that human relations should be treated like that."

There is a lot to say about relations between the sexes and much, it's true, not definable in black and white terms. The following is a brief summary of the letter.

In the context of professional life, some men abuse their power and this is wrong. But the campaign of denunciation has degenerated into a witch hunt on social media; in the real world some men are summarily disciplined or sacked without being able to defend themselves. They are invited to repent publicly, in a climate of totalitarian society.

Some expressions of male sexuality are unwanted but not criminal, and can just be seen as sad, or even reduced to the status of 'non events'. Sexual impulses are by nature on the attack and primitive. Women are perfectly able to deal with that. If they have the right to reject advances, men have the right to make them. Women are not victims, or defenceless prey, mere children with adult faces, who need protection.

Human beings are not monoliths: "*A woman can, in the same day, lead a professional team and enjoy being a man's sexual object.*"

The 'me too' form of feminism goes beyond the denunciation of abuses of power, and becomes a hatred of men and sexuality. Finally, women who defend unfairly accused men are accused of being traitors and accomplices of criminals.

A man on the '*Any Questions*', BBC Radio 4 programme the following Saturday said that the witchhunt may be going

too far, but men had got away with abusive behaviour for too long, and the pendulum had now swung the other way, but as a result things would eventually change for the better. You can't '*make omelettes without breaking eggs*', in other words.

The question is, will it make things better?

The starting point of the 'me too' campaign was the Weinstein affair. Hollywood is a highly special place. It's the fountainhead of American influence in the world, its soft nuclear power. Its grandees are decorated by the state. It's the source of global fame and fortune. That much power given to a few grandees rarely goes with great virtue. Hollywood has always been known as the place where people sell their body and soul for a place in the sun, the place where people sleep with people they don't like to further their ambitions. Note that this traditional way of presenting things, even if you replace 'people' by 'women', presents the situation not as abuse but as calculation, active rather than passive. The denouncers of Weinstein are now famous and powerful themselves.

Hence the '*me too*' campaign should have applied only to other famous and powerful women who slept their way to the top.

Instead it tried to include all women who have been on the receiving end of unwanted sexual attention. '700 000 women agricultural workers support the Hollywood '*me too*' campaign' was one headline.

In fact, the message of support emanated from an unrepresentative group of journalists and others who had at some time worked as agricultural workers. If there was such a thing as a united group of 700 000 American agricultural workers, they would constitute a Union, with Union representatives able to enforce workers' rights: female employees would have someone to complain to and procedures for redress in case of attempted abuse of power.

In Hollywood, on the other hand,

hundreds of marvellous beauties with acting talent compete with each other. There is little a Union could do to impose justice, if there was such a thing as justice in this context.

In the world of ordinary people, on the other hand, there is a lot Unions can do to impose justice. Powerful Unions, and women joining Unions, would make things better. That would constitute change and worker power.

The 'me too' campaign is reminiscent of 'Occupy Wall Street': here today, gone tomorrow.

Some feminists charmingly attack Catherine Deneuve for being old and out of date, ignoring the youth of other writers and signatories of the letter. But there is one old fashioned idea in the letter, that is, the belief that nature is a given that must be taken into account in one's behaviour.

The letter says that "*sexual impulses are, by nature, aggressive and primitive*". [*La pulsion sexuelle est par nature offensive et sauvage.*] 'Offensif/offensive' in French does not have the same meaning as in English. It means 'goes on the offensive, goes on the attack'. There is no notion of it being bad, only aggressive.

So, human nature is a given that has to be taken into account and worked round. Because it's there, it limits your freedom to act. That goes against two modern ideas, the first, that you should overcome nature as much as possible (same sex parents starting families for example, or men and women not being necessarily different because their biological make up is different). The second idea is the ideal of absolute freedom.

The liberation of sexual conventions since 1968 has met with its limits; there is now a backtracking: it is not *everything goes* any more. But it's very difficult to bring back limits once they have broken down. In the past women took it upon themselves to keep men in their place; they took precautions, which are now seen as intolerable restrictions on their freedom to act. Now the responsibility is placed entirely on men.

The Deneuve Letter could start an interesting debate, if debate was possible. But as the letter says, in this totalitarian climate, those who disagree keep their heads down for fear of victimisation; the writer Margaret Atwood for example has withdrawn from public debate, after ferocious attacks on her for defending a man proved innocent by the courts of a sexual assault.

Open Letter from Catherine Deneuve and Others

[The letter was co-written by five French women: Sarah Chiche (writer/psychoanalyst), Catherine Millet (author/art critic), Catherine Robbe-Grillet (actress/writer), Peggy Sastre (author/journalist) and Abnousse Shalmani (writer/journalist). It was signed by some 100 others.

Published in Le Monde 9.1.2018]

PARIS—Rape is a crime. But trying to pick up someone, however persistently, or clumsily, is not—nor is gallantry an attack of machismo.

The Harvey Weinstein scandal sparked a legitimate awakening about the sexual violence that women are subjected to, particularly in their professional lives, where some men abuse their power. This was necessary. But what was supposed to liberate voices has now been turned on its head: We are being told what is proper to say and what we must stay silent about—and the women who refuse to fall into line are considered traitors, accomplices!

Just like in the good old witch-hunt days, what we are once again witnessing here is puritanism in the name of a so-called greater good, claiming to promote the liberation and protection of women, only to enslave them to a status of eternal victim and reduce them to defenceless preys of male chauvinist demons.

In fact, #MeToo has led to a campaign, in the press and on social media, of public accusations and indictments against individuals who, without being given a chance to respond or defend themselves, are put in the exact same category as sex offenders. This summary justice has already had its victims: men who've been disciplined in the workplace, forced to resign, and so on, when their only crime was to touch a woman's knee, try to steal a kiss, talk about "*intimate*" things during a work meal break, or send sexually-charged messages to women who did not return their interest.

This frenzy for sending the "*pigs*" to the slaughterhouse, far from helping women achieve autonomy, actually serves the interests of the enemies of sexual freedom, the religious extremists, the reactionaries and those who believe—in their righteousness and the Victor-

ian moral outlook that goes with it—that women are a species "*apart*", children with adult faces who demand to be protected.

Men, for their part, are called on to embrace their guilt and rack their brains for "*inappropriate behaviour*" that they engaged in 10, 20 or 30 years earlier, and for which they must now repent. These public confessions, and the foray into the private sphere of self-proclaimed prosecutors, have led to a climate of totalitarian society.

The purging wave seems to know no bounds. The poster of an Egon Schiele nude is censored; calls are made for the removal of a Balthus painting from a museum on grounds that it's an apology for paedophilia; unable to distinguish between the man and his work, Cinéma-thèque Française is told not to hold a Roman Polanski retrospective, and another for Jean-Claude Brisseau is blocked. An academic judges the film *Blow-Up*, by Michelangelo Antonioni, to be "*misogynist*" and "*unacceptable*". In light of this revisionism, even John Ford (*The Searchers*) and Nicolas Poussin (*The Abduction of the Sabine Women*) are at risk.

Already, editors are asking some of us to make our masculine characters less "*sexist*", and to write in a more restrained manner about sexuality and love, or to write so that the "*traumas experienced by female characters*" be more evident! Bordering on ridiculous, in Sweden a Bill was presented that calls for explicit consent before any sexual relations! Next we'll have a smartphone app that adults who want to sleep together will have to use to tick precisely which sex acts the other does or does not accept.

Philosopher Ruwen Ogien defended the freedom to offend as essential to artistic creation. In the same way, we defend a freedom to pester as indispensable to sexual freedom.

Today we are educated enough to understand that sexual impulses are, by nature, aggressive and primitive—but we are also able to tell the difference between an awkward attempt to pick someone up and what constitutes a sexual assault.

Above all, we are aware that the human being is not a monolith: A woman can, in the same day, lead a professional team and enjoy being a man's sexual object, without being a "*whore*" or a vile accomplice of the patriarchy. She can make sure that her wages are equal to a man's but not feel forever

Linguistics And Evolution

This is a very readable and enjoyable book (as one would expect from the author who is known for his *Bonfire Of The Vanities*) on a topic that could hardly be more serious—the demolition of the Darwinian theory of evolution. It traces the history of the issue of theories on linguistics since the publication of the *Origin of Species*. Within two years of the publication of Darwin's book, a Leipzig-educated Professor of Linguistics, Max Müller, made the case that language was the crucial issue that distinguished man from animal and did so to such an extent that it defied the Darwinian case that man was simply another animal.

He summed up his case thus: "*Language is our Rubicon, and no brute will dare to cross it*".

As Darwin was a cosmogonist, and evolution was his theory of everything, he tried to refute Müller by seeking to show that, like everything else, language evolved from the sounds of lower animals to the higher, i.e., us. This enabled Müller to have great fun imagining how this might have occurred beginning with the *bow-wow* theory and it went on from there.

But, in a theory of everything, as with any cosmogony, it just cannot have inexplicable gaps and here was one that Darwin could not cope with. But it became worse—for him. If it was accepted that language was the crucial difference between animals and humans, then it was what made us human and was the key to human development—not the Darwinian mantras of natural selection, survival of the fittest etc.

If the origin of language could not be explained as part of evolution then evolution fell apart. And where did that leave Darwinism?

A worse blow (for Darwin), that coincided with this criticism by Müller, was the change of mind by Alfred Wallace who had originally articulated the Darwinian theory of evolution in the jungle of Malaya, sent it to Darwin who essentially stole a march on publication

of the idea as well as on some detail—and presented it as his—simply acknowledging help from Wallace—and the rest is history.

But now Wallace had come to reject the role of its/his basic assumption, *natural selection*. He realised that natural selection is limited to coping with the immediate competition for survival and no more; it does not allow for any adverse changes; but most important, it cannot account for the development of organs that are of no immediate use but which turn out to have faculties that would prove useful some thousands of years later—the primary example being the brain.

The loss of overall body hair he gave as an example of adverse evolution, with man having to use animal skins and much else to replace it, to make him less vulnerable to the elements which hair would cater for naturally—as it mitigates heat and cold, as thatch does for houses. He might also have asked—why survival in the first place? If he did, it might explain why he took up Spiritualism, which made his arguments easy to dismiss.

But it does not seem that it was Darwin or Darwinism that provoked Wolfe to write this book. That was down to Noam Chomsky, the grand old man of modern linguistics and progressive causes. Over half the book is devoted to him.

The study of linguistics, origin of language etc. was a non-subject for serious study for most of the 20th century, as it did not survive the dead end that it reached under the Darwinian theory of evolution. Chomsky revived the subject and argued language was not something that was learned, it came from an in-built '*language organ*'. He made Linguistics a sexy subject, though he became famous for his politics beginning with his opposition to the Vietnam War.

However, the innate language organ remained very difficult to define and locate, despite innumerable studies and University Departments devoted to the subject.

traumatised by a man who rubs himself against her in the subway, even if that is regarded as an offence. She can even consider this act as the expression of a great sexual deprivation, or even as a non-event.

As women, we don't recognise ourselves in this feminism that, beyond the denunciation of abuses of power, takes the face of a hatred of men and sexuality. We believe that the freedom to say "*no*" to a sexual proposition cannot exist without the freedom to pester. And we consider that one must know how to respond to this freedom to pester in ways other than by closing ourselves off in the role of the prey.

For those of us who decided to have children, we think that it is wiser to raise our daughters in a way that they may be sufficiently informed and aware to live their lives fully without intimidation or guilt.

Incidents that can affect a woman's body do not necessarily affect her dignity and must not, as difficult as they can be, necessarily make her a perpetual victim. Because we are not reducible to our bodies. Our inner freedom is inviolable. And this freedom that we cherish is not without risks and responsibilities.

Report

Culture of gender fluidity is a threat

What a strange world of of the children of today are growing up in. When it comes to play, the rough and tumble of school life is banned—no running in the school yard, no football, no water pistols or snowballs. Sugary treats aren't allowed and the joy of salt on your chips is anathema. The great outdoors is outlawed for fear of being kidnapped or stung. Interactions with other children are closely monitored lest they say a mean word or resort to this fisticuffs.

Yet, when it comes to choosing their gender to overhauling their complete identity from as young as five years of age, adults who promote this ideology have no problem. Aiding and debating are people like the Archbishop of Canterbury, Justin Welby who encouraged boys to wear tiaras and tutus and heels to school and Prime Minister Theresa May who wants to demedicalise transgenderism, ignoring experts like the American college of Paediatricians who published a comprehensive report in September 2017 pointing out the serious dangers of promoting transgenderism in children. The culture of gender fluidity is the threat to the teaching of the truth and a challenge to adults who should be taking responsibility in helping the young grow up stable and happy. We all have to resist these insidious ideals before hello fake ideology ruins generations of our children.

Owen Gallagher

Letter, *Irish News*, 17.12.17

Wolfe seems to support the argument that language is an artefact, something created and used by man like any other tool, as opposed to being something innate as Chomsky had argued. But neither case is convincing.

Wolfe notes that Chomsky and some of his acclaimed colleagues published a paper in August 2014 called "*How Could Language Have Evolved*". Evolution was a given, naturally, but they concluded "*The evolution of the faculty of language*

largely remains an enigma." This was some surprise from Chomsky after 60 years of seeming certainty on the origin of language and 150 years after Darwinism had appeared to have the key to explaining all human activity.

It was '*back to the drawing board,*' for the study of the origin of language as with many issues that take Darwinian evolution as the starting point for analysis and is found to lead to a dead end.

Only a secular faith keeps it alive.

John Minahane

The Spanish Polemic on Colonisation

Part 13

The Question Of Whether The Cherokees Should Go West—John Ridge

In the most recent articles in this series I described how the American Enlightenment, represented first and foremost by Thomas Jefferson, called on the American Indians to join it—to commit themselves to settled agriculture, modernity, progress, education, Anglo-Saxon-style civilisation; how the Cherokees in particular responded to this call; how they supported the United States in the war against the traditionalist Creeks (1812-4), where they made a crucial contribution to the US Army's victory; how they were rewarded for this by being treated, not as part of the winning side, but as a defeated people and forced to give up large areas of land; and how the demand for their complete removal from their territory in present-day Georgia was raised by the General under whom they had fought, Andrew Jackson.

This experience did not deter the progressive Cherokees. Their leader was a man known as Major Ridge. He had been a war hero both in the earlier Cherokee wars against the Whites (1790s) and the recent war against the Creeks. He worked with great determination to modernise the Cherokees, and one of his prime interests was education. Certainly he wanted the Cherokees to have a modern intellectual elite. At the peak of this elite was his son John Ridge and his nephew Elias Boudinot, who both got the best (Christian mission) schooling that was open to Indians.

John Ridge became a noted lecturer. The following is from a talk he gave in Charleston in the 1820s, during a tour to

raise funds for educational purposes. He was opposing Rousseau's idea (which even Jefferson had advanced in a milder form) that civilisation made people unhappy:

"Will anyone believe that an Indian with his bow and quiver, who walks solitary in the mountains, exposed to cold and hunger, or the attacks of wild beasts, trembling at every unusual object, his fancy filled with agitating fears... actually possesses undisturbed contentment superior to a learned gentleman of this commercial city, who has every possible comfort at home? Can anyone convince me that the degraded Hottentot in Africa, or the wild Arab in the desert of the Sahara, whose head is exposed to the piercing rays of a meridian sun, entirely dependent upon his camel for safety, enjoys more real contentment of mind than the poorest peasant of England? Will anyone compare the confined pleasures of the Hindoo, whose mind is burdened with the shackles of superstition and ignorance, who bows before the car of the Juggernaut, or whose wretched ignorance compels him to invoke the river Ganges for his salvation—Will anyone, I say, compare his pleasures to the noble and well regulated pleasures of a Herschel or a Newton, who surveys the regions of the universe—views the wisdom of the Deity in forming the lights of heaven with all the planets and attendant satellites revolving in their orbits, irradiating infinite space as they move around their common centres—and who demonstrates, with mathematical exactness, the rapid flights of

the comet, and its future visits to our solar system!

I have made this contrast to shew the fallacy of such theories, and to give you a general view of the wretched state of the Heathen, particularly of the aborigines of this country, who are gradually retiring from the stage of action to sleep with their fathers. It is on the exertions of the benevolent that their safety depends, and only the hand of charity can pluck them from final extermination."

To be sure, Lord Macaulay (who was just then getting into his stride) could preach the progressive doctrine even better than this. And so could a few young gentlemen fresh from Harvard or Yale, perhaps. But this was pretty impressive coming from a Cherokee.

John Ridge was the most accomplished progressive ideologue among his own people. However, this did not mean he was ashamed of being an Indian. He was proud to be an evolving, modernising Cherokee, as some of his white patrons noted to their disquiet. His earliest teachers complained that "with all his skill for learning he is real proud *to be a savage*". And he seemed to have accepted Christianity only intellectually, as a newspaper editor in Charleston observed: there was no reason to think—

"that his character and temper... have ever been regulated and softened by the influence of that Spirit upon his heart without which the native corruption will show forth, in spite of all the influence of philosophy or literature".

John and his cousin Elias both fell in love with their missionary teachers' daughters. They managed to marry these white middle-class girls from the northern, supposedly enlightened, United States, but in each case, only in the teeth of a mob outcry. Thomas Jefferson might have spoken publicly in favour of Anglo-Saxon miscegenation with civilised Indians, as had the current President James Madison, but the middle-class mob hadn't got the message. It did not bode well for the prospects of a modern Cherokee nation coexisting peacefully with the United States.

"What Is the Language of Objection This Time?"

In 1794 the United States, led by George Washington, had made peace with the Cherokees. But no sooner had peace been made than government agents were at work seeking to corrupt

the chiefs so as to get them to make extensive land sales. Even Jefferson, while he was urging the Cherokees to become modern, at the same time was checking out ways of getting their lands. The United States was always pressing for land, and central Government was being pressed by the individual states.

In 1802 an ambiguous agreement was signed between Georgia and the US Government. Georgia interpreted it to mean that the US Government committed itself to extinguish Indian title in the Cherokee territories and to include those lands in Georgia. The more progress the Cherokees made in white-type civilisation, the more aggressive Georgia became in its claims.

People wishing to justify what the white colonists were doing had earlier made much use of the Lockean argument that untilled land was empty land, therefore anyone had the right to take it. The Indians only hunted and they could perfectly well do that somewhere else, not on the land that the colonist took for his agriculture. But the Cherokees were no longer hunting. They too were farming. Having observed the modern fashion for boasting in statistics, they compiled some of their own: by the mid-1820s this community of about 20,000 people possessed tens of thousands of cattle, pigs and horses, and also 762 looms, 2,488 spinning wheels, 172 wagons, 2,943 ploughs, 10 sawmills, 31 gristmills, 62 blacksmith shops, 8 cotton machines, 18 schools, 18 ferries, and a number of good roads.

Besides all these, there was a stroke of native genius. One particular Cherokee called Sequoyah, who observed the missionaries' books and understood their principle, became convinced that he too could make a book. People told him he was wrong, that book-making was strictly for whites. But he went off and worked for years on his project, shutting himself up and writing on bark with berry juice.

"His corn was left to weeds and he was pronounced a crazy man by the tribe. His wife thought so too, and burned up his manuscripts whenever she could find them. But he persevered. He first attempted to form a character for every word in the Cherokee language, but was forced to abandon {that approach}. He then set about discovering the number of sounds {that is, syllables} in the language, which he found to be eighty-six, and for each of these he adopted a character... and these characters combined like letters formed

words. Having accomplished this he called together six of his neighbors, and said, "Now I can make a book". They did not believe him. To convince them, he asked each to make a speech, which he wrote down as they spoke, and then read to them, so that each knew his own speech, and they then acknowledged he could make a book."

Sequoyah's system was very efficient and anyone speaking Cherokee was able to master it very quickly. It spread through the country like wildfire, and soon the Cherokees' literacy rate in their own language was better than the whites'. The next step was printing. In 1828 the first issue of the weekly *Cherokee Phoenix* appeared, the first American Indian newspaper ever published. It was mainly in English but partly in Cherokee, using Sequoyah's script. Cherokee-language religious books were published also.

The Cherokees (encouraged by Jefferson) had also decided to adopt a system of laws like the whites had. In July 1827 they adopted a constitution, based on that of the United States, where they claimed to be "*sovereign and independent*". President John Quincy Adams warned that this did not mean they could have an independent foreign policy; otherwise, it seems that many people in the US Establishment praised them. But the Cherokees were going to get a horrible lesson on what Sovereignty and Independence really meant.

In December 1827 the Georgia legislature declared that the Cherokees were only tenants at will on their lands: they would have to vacate them and go west. If they had not begun doing so by the end of the following year, then Georgia would extend its own laws over the Cherokee country. A year later Andrew Jackson, the most able, ruthless and determined land-grabber of all, became President of the United States.

In his first statement to Congress Jackson said that he intended to initiate a law for the removal of all Indians west of the Mississippi. US Government agents began putting intense pressure on the Cherokees to agree on a mass emigration and trying to manipulate factions, bribe individuals, and so on. But at that time the Cherokee leadership was firmly united in a determination not to give up any more land and not to go west. A statement written by John Ridge and published in the *Cherokee Phoenix* in March 1829 said:

"We have noticed the ancient ground of complaint, founded on the ignorance of our ancestors and their fondness for the chase, and for the purpose of agriculture as having in possession too much land for their numbers. What is the language of objection this time?"

The case is reversed, and we are now assaulted with menaces of expulsion, because we have unexpectedly become civilised, and because we have formed and organised a constituted government. It is too much for us now to be honest, and virtuous, and industrious, because then we are capable of aspiring to the rank of Christians and Politicians, which renders our attachment to the soil more strong, and therefore more difficult to defraud us of the possession. Disappointment inflicts on the mind of the avaricious white man, the mortification of delay, or the probability of the intended victim's escape from the snares laid for its destruction. It remains for us in this situation of the question, to act as free agents in choosing for ourselves to walk in the straight-forward path of the impartial recommendations of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, as most congenial to our feelings and knowledge of the means calculated to promote our happiness. We hereby individually set our faces to the rising sun, and turn our backs to its setting. As our ancestors revered the sepulchral monuments of the noble dead, we cherish the sacred spots of their repose, ... under hillocks of clay that cover them from sight.

If the country, to which we are directed to go is desirable and well watered, why is it so long a wilderness and a waste, and uninhabited by respectable white people, whose enterprise ere this would have induced them to monopolise it from the poor and unfortunate of their fellow citizens as they have hitherto done? From correct information we have formed a bad opinion of the country beyond the Mississippi. But if report was favorable to the fertility of the soil, if the running streams were as transparent as crystal, and silver fish abounded in their element in profusion, we should still adhere to the purpose of spending the remnant of our lives on the soil that gave us birth, and is rendered dear from the nourishment we received from its bosom."

John Ridge was taking the American Enlightenment at face value. He was wrong to suppose that the recommendations of Washington, Jefferson etc. were impartial. More important, he was wrong to believe that civilisation must always fraternally welcome civilisation: that those who were "*honest, and virtuous, and industrious*" must necessarily be

allowed to get on with their virtuous industry by their virtuous neighbours. Abstractly, maybe, "all men" had the right to *life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*. Nevertheless, those who were honestly and inoffensively pursuing their happiness, if they were at cross purposes with the United States, were going to be violently disturbed.

Georgian Terrorism

To make matters even worse, in the Summer of 1829 gold was discovered in the Cherokee country.

The Georgians held off for a couple of years, to see if the Cherokees would respond to the moral pressures (and some other pressures too: federal funds that were paid to the Cherokee Government were cut off). Then they made good their threat to impose their own law in Cherokee territory. What this meant was an explosion of lawlessness. Indians had no legal rights against whites—an Indian was not even allowed to testify in the Georgia courts. Therefore white thugs could rob and burn Indian property, occupy Indian lands and houses, injure and kill Indians, with legal impunity.

There were some determined acts of resistance, but those only inflamed the Georgians more. The Cherokee intellectual elite, without condemning them, said that they were highly impolitic. It was not possible for the Cherokees to defend themselves physically against Georgia, and so they must follow peaceful courses. For their part, the Georgians declared that any attempt to impose Cherokee law was henceforward a criminal offence.

"Soft power", as I suppose one might call it, was applied also. Enormous quantities of whiskey were brought into the territory, with a demoralising effect on the Cherokee population. (Incidentally, the long history of white American use of this weapon gives credibility to the allegations that in the 1960s and 1980s/90s the flooding of black American urban areas with heroin and crack cocaine was facilitated by State agents, who wanted to demoralise the black American population. In this field the United States has form.)

The Cherokees decided to appeal to enlightened public opinion, to the Federal Government, and to the Courts. Liberal opinion gave them a certain amount of encouragement. On the other hand, Jackson and his agents were implacable. There remained the Courts, where some very smart lawyers were presenting the Cherokees' pleas.

In their first appeal to the Supreme Court, the Cherokees said that they were appealing as an independent foreign nation which was suffering abuse from a part of the United States, the state of Georgia. But Chief Justice John Marshall threw out the case in July 1831. He said that, although he sympathised with the Indians' predicament, he found that they did not have the status which they claimed to have: they were not a foreign nation but "*a domestic, dependent nation... in a state of pupilage*". Therefore he could not consider the merits of their case against Georgia, since it was presented on a false premise.

Shortly afterwards, Jackson told a Cherokee delegation that their lawyers were fleecing them and their court cases were bound to fail. "*I have been a lawyer myself long enough to know how lawyers will talk to obtain their clients' money.*" He himself was sincerely a friend of the Cherokees, and he knew that they only had a wretched future if they remained surrounded by white people. "*You can live on your lands in Georgia if you choose, but I cannot interfere with the laws of that state to protect you.*"

The Cherokees then put their hopes in the US electoral system—Jackson would be defeated in 1832! They also felt that, by accepting the status of "*domestic, dependent nation*", they could still get redress from the Supreme Court against Georgia. And they didn't cease appealing to US officials. A Memorial addressed to Lewis Cass, the Secretary of War, in December 1831—

"inveighed against how Georgia had usurped the gold mines from Cherokee control; how Cherokees were arrested and driven from their homes in chains at bayonet point without legal process; and how the state had run preliminary surveys through the Indian country and proposed to divide it among Georgians by means of a gigantic lottery. It revealed how whiskey was sold by white traders contrary to both Cherokee and federal law, and how intruders were permitted to invade Cherokee land and despoil Cherokee improvements and harass the people".

Cass told them once again that President Jackson was their friend and he understood the problems they faced, and he was convinced that the only solution was "*a removal beyond the immediate contact of the white people*". They could stay where they were if they wished, and the United States would never use force to expel them:

"As to coercion none will be applied. Such a measure is not in contemplation. You are free to remain with the privileges and disabilities of other citizens. If you and your people are prepared for this, any further observations from me are useless. But, if as the President believes, and as all experience has heretofore shown, your people are not in a condition to resist the operation of those causes which have produced incalculable injury to the Indians, every dictate of prudence requires that you should abandon your residence, and establish yourselves in a country where abundance, peace and improvement are offered to you."

In all of this Cass was being "*honest*", "*conscientious*", "*forthright*" and "*realistic*", according to Thurman Wilkins, and he "*made a case that many thoughtful men deemed worthy of consideration*". As yet, however, he made no impression on thoughtful Cherokees. John Ridge accused Jackson of "*nefarious hypocrisy*", and he surely must have thought the same of Cass. ("You are free to remain with the privileges and disabilities of other citizens"—how else could one describe those words, since the United States was not prepared to uphold any Indian rights against Georgia?)

The Key Moment: the President Ignoring the Law

Ridge and Boudinot went on a lecture tour in the northern states. But around this time a large part of the "*philanthropists*", those who had argued that the Indians could and should adopt European civilisation, went over to arguing that the Cherokees ought to go west.

Writers such as Thurman Wilkins and Bernard Sheehan have taken enormous pains to portray these people as something other than hypocrites. They had not abandoned the policy of civilising the Indians, Sheehan says:

they simply wanted to pursue it differently in changed circumstances. Being realistic, one had to accept that if the Cherokees stayed where they were, they would be crushed by the Georgians and reduced to utter misery. Whereas if they went west... well, in time they would once again be able to boast of having two and a half thousand spinning wheels and three thousand ploughs...

[a paraphrase]

In fact, if those Jeffersonian realists are not to be thought of as hypocrites, then it's difficult to apply the idea of hypocrisy to anything. Instead of putting pressure on Jackson to uphold law and

"civilised standards", they lent their weight to the pressure put on the Cherokees to give the terrorist Georgians what they wanted. Their defenders treat this Georgian terrorism (as Jackson and Cass did) as simply a fact of life, which no one could possibly have done anything about. But President John Quincy Adams had once sent federal troops to Georgia, to prevent the Georgians taking over some disputed lands. It mattered quite a lot whether those at the top did or did not want to do things.

All of this came to a head with the Cherokees' second case to the Supreme Court. On this occasion they won a great legal victory. Chief Justice Marshall ruled that Georgia's Indian code was unconstitutional. In an earlier, precedent-setting case he had rejected the Lockean idea that American Indians lived in a state of nature, without laws or government. Now he maintained that the right to make laws in their own territory had been conceded to the Cherokees.

"The Cherokee Nation then is a distinct community, occupying its own territory... in which the laws of Georgia can have no right to enter but with the assent of the Cherokees... The act of the state of Georgia... is consequently void."

So then, the highest court in the United States had issued a ruling which meant that Georgia must release Cherokee prisoners and withdraw from Cherokee territories, stop importing whiskey, and generally cease to injure the Cherokees in their peaceful and civilised activities! The State must obey the law, and the Federal Government must if necessary compel the State to do so. That was the theory, which the Cherokee intellectual elite had learned and did not doubt. They were in raptures.

But in actual fact, the law had gone counter to the fierce genocidal drive that possessed the United States. It became a dead letter.

Firstly, Georgia refused to recognise the Supreme Court's decision (as contrary to "States' Rights") and would not release its prisoners. Secondly, President Jackson let it be known he would not enforce the decision. John Ridge went to Washington and got an audience at the White House, to determine if this was true.

"When he asked point-blank 'whether the power of the United States would be exerted to execute the decision and put down the legislation of Georgia,' the president brusquely replied that it would not. Jackson then pleaded

earnestly for him 'to go home and advise his people that their only hope of relief was in abandoning their country and removing to the West'. Ridge must have reacted visibly in Jackson's presence, for on April 9 the president wrote his crony, General Coffee, 'I believe Ridge has expressed despair, and that it is better for them... to treat and move'."

After years of probing, the ferocious Jackson had found a weak spot. John Ridge now learned that the President of the United States, so as to serve "the avaricious white man", was prepared to collude in breaking American law and in promoting lawlessness and disorder throughout a wide territory. And this was being done with an iron will and a fierce and unflinching conviction of righteousness, by an Anglo-Saxon puritan lawyer—a species that has never failed to make an impression. It must have been a devastating blow to John Ridge's understanding of the world.

Ridge drew the conclusion that there was indeed no alternative for the Cherokees other than mass migration to the west. For the time being this insight was confined to the elite intellectuals, Ridge and Boudinot. The great mass of the Cherokees remained solidly anti-

migration. Nonetheless, after years of trying, Jackson and the Georgians had achieved their first objective. There was now a Cherokee 'treaty party'.

Some thoughts on the further course of events, and on the Cherokees' mass migration in 1838-9 (which was actually the forced expulsion that Lewis Cass had solemnly declared would never happen), must be held over until the next issue.

Sources: Page references below are to Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy: The Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People* (Norman, Oklahoma 1988).

"Will anyone believe ...", pp. 135-6; "with all his skill ...", p. 106; "that his character ...", p. 135; 762 looms etc. (statistics of Cherokee progress), p. 194.

"His corn was left ...", p. 138; "sovereign and independent ...", p. 203; "We have noticed ...", p. 207.

"a domestic, dependent nation ...", p. 222; "I have been a lawyer ...", p. 223; "You can live ...", *ibid.*; "inveighed against how Georgia ...", p. 232; "As to coercion, ...", *ibid.*; "made a case ...", p. 233; "nefarious hypocrisy ...", *ibid.*

"The Cherokee nation then ...", p. 235; "When he asked point-blank ...", p. 236.

Bernard Sheehan on the Jeffersonian "philanthropists": Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Univ. of Carolina Press 1973), cf. p. 268.

Manus O'Riordan

A Hundred Years In The Life Of The Cave Of Machpelah

It is now just over a century since the British Imperialist occupation of Palestine. *Feather's from the Green Crow: Seán O'Casey 1905-1925* was a volume edited by an American academic Robert Hogan and published in 1963—but it has long since been out of print. Yet among the invaluable services performed by Hogan was his rescue of some marvellous satirical ballads by O'Casey from the archives. Most of them had been published by O'Casey himself in his 1918 collection entitled *Songs of the Wren*, and they represented a powerful propagandist contribution on his part to the nation's anti-Conscription campaign.

O'Casey mocked both Redmond's foolish belief in Britain's "promise" of Home Rule and the anti-German war hysteria to which Redmondism itself had so passionately subscribed. One of the satirical songs included by O'Casey in

this collection was prompted by a headline in *The Daily Mail* that had jingoistically trumpeted: "The British army has scored a great victory by the capture of Hebron, which contains the Cave of Machpelah, the tomb of Abraham". O'Casey mocked such British jingoism with the following song:

We've Captured the Cave of Machpelah

Air—*"The Ould Orange Flute"*

In the fight for Poor Freedom against
the Huns,
We've lost thousands and thousands and
thousands of guns;
But still in the struggle we're givin' them
tons.
An' we've captur'd the Cave of Mach-
pelah!

Chorus:

Hurrah! For John Bull and for Uncle
Sam—

We're losin' the war, but we don't care a damn,
For we've take the tomb of poor Abraham,
An' we've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

To triumph they'll carry the Union Jack—
Our warriors bold, brown, red and black
The Germans hit us, but we're hittin' them back—
An' we've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

With Joy an' with Pride, now, our bosoms thrill!
Tho' we're losin' each dale an' we're losin' each hill,
But we're givin' the bloodthirsty Germans their fill,
For we've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

Wirrastrue, Wirrastrue, we have lost Trieste,
An' the Germans are reignin' in Bucharest,
But these losses are now but a mighty jest,
Since we've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

We're proud, aye, we're proud of our British pluck,
That fought against Hope an' the hardest of luck,
We've won all we want an' we've settled Von Kluck,
For we've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

Mackensen may brag and the Kaiser may blow
About Russia's and Italy's overthrow,
But they'll soon change their tune when they get to know,
We've captur'd the Cave of Machpelah!

A century on from Britain's occupation and a half century on from the Zionist occupation of Hebron, amid all the misery of that occupation, sardonic humour could once again be found in respect of the Cave of Machpelah. Last July 15th, under the heading of "*Abe, Izzy and Bibi*", the Israeli columnist Uri Avnery penned the following satirical take on some of the more bizarre manifestations of Zionist hysteria:

"The whole thing could have been a huge practical joke, if it had not been real. All of Israel was taken in. Left, right and center. All the newspapers and TV networks, without exception. There it was: UNESCO has declared that the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron is a Palestinian heritage site. I admit that I was taken in, too. The news was so clear and so simple, its acceptance

so uniform, that I too accepted it unthinkingly. True, it was a bit strange, but stranger things happen."

"The '*Cave of Machpelah*' is no cave at all. It is a large building, which the Arabs call al-Haram al-Ibrahim, the Mosque of Ibrahim, in the center of Hebron, the town the Arabs call al-Khalil, the Friend of God (meaning Abraham). According to the Bible, Abraham, the forefather of the Jews, bought the place from its local owner as a burial plot for his wife, Sarah. When his time came, he was also buried there, as were his son Isaac with his wife Rivka and his grandson, Jacob, with his wife Leah. (His other wife, Rachel, is supposed to be buried on the way to Bethlehem.) And here comes UNESCO, the anti-Semitic cultural branch of the anti-Semitic UN, and declares that this is a Palestinian holy site! Is there no limit to Jew-baiting?"

"A tsunami of emotions surged over Israel. Jews were united in protest. Everybody vented their anger as loudly as possible. Rarely was such unanimity seen here. If I had stopped to think for a moment, I would have realized that the whole thing was nonsense. UNESCO does not assign places to nations. World Heritage sites are—well—the heritage of the entire world. As a detail, these declarations mention in which country each World Heritage site is located. The holy church in Nazareth is located in Israel, but it does not 'belong' to Israel. The graves of holy Jewish rabbis in Russia or Egypt do not belong to Israel. UNESCO did not say that the Machpelah-al-Haram al-Ibrahim site belongs to the Palestinians. It said that it is located in Palestine."

"Why Palestine? Because, according to international law, the town of Hebron is part of Palestine, which was recognized by the UN as a state under occupation. Under Israeli law, too, Hebron is not a part of Israel proper but under military occupation. I am grateful to an ex-Israeli called Idan Landau who lives in the US. He took the trouble to read the original text and sent us emails to correct our impression. The moment I read it, I hit myself on the brow. How could I have been so stupid! The UNESCO resolution is fair and correct. It remarks that the site is holy to the three monotheistic religions, as indeed it is. Because of this, a Jewish fanatic—a settler from America—once murdered dozens of praying Muslims there. Jewish fanatics have settled nearby."

"Is the place really holy? That is a silly question. A place is as holy as people believe it to be. Are Abraham and his progeny really buried there? Even that is irrelevant. Many people—

myself included—believe that the entire first part of the Bible, up to the Assyrian era, is fictitious. That does not make the Bible less wonderful. It is the most beautiful work of literature on earth. At least the (original) Hebrew version. If one believes that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were real persons, it would still be doubtful that they are buried there. An entire school of archaeologists believes that the burial place is somewhere else in Hebron, not the building now known as the Cave of Machpelah. The graves there are those of Muslim sheikhs. Be that as it may, millions believe that the Biblical forefathers are buried in the Cave. For them, the place is holy, and it is located in occupied Palestine."

"But if you take the Bible so literally, you should also read verse 9 of chapter 25 of Genesis: '*And Abraham gave up the ghost and died in a good old age... And his sons, Isaac and Ishmael, buried him in the cave of Machpelah.*' When I pointed this out to people who had attended Israeli schools, they were deeply shocked. Because this verse is never mentioned in any Israeli school. It does not exist. Why? Because Ishmael is the forefather of the Arabs, as Isaac is the forefather of the Jews. We learned that Sarah, our foremother, who is described in the Bible as a real bitch, induced her obedient spouse, Abraham, to send his concubine Hagar and their son, Ishmael, into the desert, there to die of thirst. But an angel saved them, and they disappeared, though the Bible gives a long list of his progeny. The revelation that the Bible in fact says the opposite is shocking. So Ishmael did not disappear, but somewhere along the line made his peace with Isaac. The two sons buried their father together. This changes the story completely. It means that the Bible makes the Arabs, too, rightful heirs of the Cave of Machpelah, side by side with the Jews and the Christians."

"I do not believe that Binyamin Netanyahu ever read this verse. He knows only what every Israeli pupil knows. The strict Orthodox line. This week, at the height of the UNESCO hysteria, Netanyahu did something bizarre: in the middle of a formal cabinet meeting he pulled a kippah from his pocket, put it on and started to read from the Bible (not the aforementioned verse, of course). He looked positively happy. He was showing the bloody Goyim up for what they are: anti-Semites all. Does Netanyahu really believe (as I think he does) that this part of Biblical legend is history? If so, he has the mind of a 10 year old. If he does not, he is a cheat. In any case, he is a very able demagogue."

"But he is not alone. Far from it.

The President of Israel, a very nice gentleman, reiterated Netanyahu's accusations against UNESCO. So did the speaker of the Knesset, an immigrant from the Soviet Union. It took about four days for some Israeli commentators to cite the true text of the UNESCO resolution. They did not apologize, of course, but at least they started to quote the actual text. Shyly and quietly some other commentators joined them. Most of their colleagues did not. Special mention is due to Carmel Shama Hacoheh, Israel's ambassador to UNESCO. He is not known as a pillar of wisdom. Indeed, he was only sent to UNESCO in order to allow a protégé of the foreign minister to take over his place in the Knesset. During the UNESCO meeting, Shama-Hacoheh—(his real name was just Shama, but that sounds too Arab, so he added the very Jewish Hacoheh)—got very excited. He started a shouting match with the Palestinian ambassador, rushed to the dais and shouted at the chairman, too."

"William Shakespeare might have called all this 'much ado about nothing', except for two points. One is that it shows how easy it is to send all of (Jewish) Israel—all without exception!—into a holy rage. Politicians and commentators from left and right, east and west, religious and secular, unite into one raging mass, even when the pretext is false. Such an eruption can have very serious consequences. It disables all inner brakes. The other aspect is even more dangerous. At the height of the tsunami, it suddenly hit me that everybody seemed to be enjoying themselves hugely. And then I realized why."

"For hundreds of years, Jews in Europe were persecuted, deported, tortured and killed. It was a part of reality. They were used to it. Anti-Semitism of all kinds, including the murderous one, was a part of reality. The sadism of the goyim was met with the masochism of the Jews. (As I have suggested in the past, this is a part of Western Christian culture, emanating from the crucifixion story in the New Testament. It does not exist as such in Islam, since the prophet admonished his believers to protect the two other 'peoples of the book'—Jews and Christians.) Since World War II and the Holocaust, the old vicious European anti-Semitism has disappeared, or gone underground. But Jews have not got used to that. They are sure that it is lurking somewhere, that it can return any minute. When it does, or when it seems to, Jews are apt to feel 'I told you so!' In Israel, this is even more complex. Zionism hoped to rid Jews of their 'exilic' complexes. To turn us into a

normal people, 'a people like other peoples'. It seems that this has not been quite successful. Or that the success is receding under the stewardship of Netanyahu and his ilk. This episode has made many Jews happy. They say to themselves: 'We were right! All the Goyim are anti-Semites!'"

The Israeli columnist Uri Avnery is the founder of Gush Shalom—the Peace Bloc. A child refugee from Nazi Ger-

many, he had been a member during the 1940s of the Irgun Zionist terrorist organisation, but later became disillusioned with Zionism.

See <http://zope.gush-shalom.org/home/en/channels/avnery/1504875705> for Avnery's reflections on his 93 years of life.

See <http://zope.gush-shalom.org/home/en/channels/avnery/1512137281> for Avnery's column: "Zionism is an anti-Semitic creed."

Stephen Richards

Reflections On The 500th Anniversary of Luther's posting his Theses on Indulgences on the Church door at Wittenberg
Part Three

October Revolution

In what is called Reformation Studies the adjective "*magisterial*" comes up quite frequently. The word has morphed somewhat in our modern literary parlance to mean something closer to majestic, as in: "*we are indebted to Joe Bloggs for this magisterial study of coming of age ceremonies among the Masai*". We are here in the realm of reliable, authoritative, painstaking, extensively footnoted (or endnoted as the case seems to be nowadays), and possibly slightly boring.

In an unthinking way I categorised the magisterial Reformers in this bracket: they were sensible, cognizant of the heritage of the preceding centuries and unwilling to rush their fences. To be sure, that is not unlike the Oxford English Dictionary definition, but when used in Reformation Studies the subordinate meaning is the one that we have to attend to: magisterial, pertaining to the office of magistrate or other civil authority. It doesn't equate to the Roman *magisterium*. The Germans in their straightforward way have hit the nail on the head with the wonderful *burgerlich*. The Austro-Hungarian soldiers had the logo "*K und K*" on their epaulettes: "*kaiserlich und koniglich*", imperial and royal. Add to that *burgerlich*, burgher-like, the kind of power that the local bigwigs exercise.

The Good Magistrate

The magistrate loomed large in the thinking of the Reformers and their seventeenth century successors in Holland and England, who found in the Old Testament their proof texts for a believing community governed either by judges like Samuel, or by godly kings.

For the Reformers the people of Israel under the Old Covenant constituted the Church in their day, a hermeneutic not without its difficulties. The primary inspiration for the Henrician Reformers like Cranmer and Hooper was King Josiah, one of the later kings of Judah, who came to the throne at the age of eight and embarked on the huge task of restoring authentic worship at the Temple in Jerusalem and eradicating the 'sex and religion' shrines dedicated to Ashtoreth (aka Astarte, Ishtar, the Queen of Heaven). This was a throwback to the ancient Canaanite religion, particularly the Phoenician. Interestingly there is a parallel with the story of Venus and Adonis, the latter being the son who was killed but came to life in the Spring of each year. There are Old Testament references to women mourning for Thammuz. We're getting into Golden Bough territory here. The interplay of this bloodthirsty barbarian type of religion and its more polished Greek development is also one of the themes of C.S. Lewis's *Till We Have Faces*.

Ultimately, and ironically for the magisterial proponents, the thing that put an end to these Canaanite practices was the Babylonian exile, which the English Puritans nevertheless often referenced. But for Cranmer the Boy King was Edward VI, the hope of Protestant Europe. His death at the age of 15 was seen as a judgment on the feeble, half-hearted nature of the English Reformation up to that point.

It should be said that the Old Testament wasn't exactly a one way street for the supporters of the godly magistrate,

who tended to ignore the main emphasis of the prophecy of Jeremiah: that the people of Judah should go peaceably into exile and pray for the prosperity of the state that had conquered them.

One Cheer For The State

The New Testament was a less productive quarry for suitable materials to support the united structure of Church and State. For one thing it's not possible to get any endorsement from the teaching of Jesus, whose remarks about the religious Establishment of his day ranged from the caustic to the contemptuous. As for the State, it seemed to be a necessary evil, representative of the power relations that his followers were to steer clear of. Yes, we should pay our taxes, but we shouldn't go running away with the idea that the State is a noble enterprise or that it is really to be trusted. We should just be thankful for whatever bit of law and order it provides. His teaching about unrelated matters enraged the religious authorities who handed him over to the State to be put to death, an early example of Church and State in total harmony.

In the rest of the New Testament we have plenty of exhortations to be honest industrious members of society, living quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness but the *locus classicus* is Romans 13, paraphrased here, for the sake of variety, by Eugene Peterson:

Be a good citizen. All governments are under [literally, ordained by] God. Insofar as there is peace and order, it's God's order. So live responsibly as a citizen. If you're irresponsible to the state, then you're irresponsible with God, and God will hold you responsible. Duly constituted authorities are only a threat if you're trying to get by with something. Decent citizens should have nothing to fear [a similar argument to that used by the supporters of the Surveillance State, a phenomenon that probably wasn't in Paul's mind, SR].

Do you want to be on good terms with the government? Be a responsible citizen and you'll get on just fine, the government working to your advantage. But if you're breaking the rules right and left, watch out. The police aren't there just to be admired in their uniforms [for he bears not the sword in vain]. God also has an interest in keeping order, and he uses them to do it. That's why you must live responsibly—not just to avoid punishment but also because it's the right way to live.

That's also why you pay taxes—so that an orderly way of life can be maintained. Fulfill your obligations as a

citizen. Pay your taxes, pay your bills, respect your leaders.

These apostolic directions seem to be pretty unambiguous, and their immediate context, the reign of Nero, gives them some added weight. We are to treat the State with a sort of wary respect, but we're not to sell our souls to it. It's something the *ecclesia*, the assembly of called-out ones, has to co-exist with, but the *ecclesia* isn't part of the apparatus of the State. Believers may be State officials as well as citizens, but the structures and sources of authority of the two entities, Rome and Jerusalem, as we might call them, are wholly separate. When the crunch comes (and it's a case of when, not if) the believer's loyalty to the State is conditional.

Scissors, Paper, Stone

Of course this scripture, like others, can be twisted. I've heard it argued that we don't owe any loyalty to a State that doesn't practice capital punishment. In other words, the *Powers That Be* are expected by God to wield the sword, and when they don't fulfil their God-appointed mission they forfeit our loyalty. Go figure.

The commoner approach, exemplified by the English rebels and regicides, and theorised upon by Samuel Rutherford in Scotland around the same time (*Lex Rex*, 1644), is that there may come a point when the King turns into a tyrant; and after all attempts to persuade him to mend his ways have failed, it's the right, indeed the duty, of active citizens to band together to overthrow him. This isn't just because the King may have interfered with the efforts of his people to set up pure gospel churches (and of course this begs the question as to precisely what level of interference in church government will justify rebellion), but also, and perhaps more fundamentally, because the King has been trampling over the rights of the people, whether such rights are defined in terms of God's law, natural law, or the pre-existing or customary laws of the people. These rights trump the royal authority.

It's key to the argument that the King's legitimacy doesn't derive directly from God, but is mediated through the people. Royalist contemporaries were in no doubt about the subversive nature of this treatise, which probably would have brought its author to the scaffold if he hadn't died in prison awaiting trial. Rutherford planted the seed that sprouted in Locke and in the American Declara-

tion of Independence. It's a far cry from Romans 13.

At the opposite end of the spectrum is the argument that says that the King, however objectionable, is still the Lord's anointed, and the sin of rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft. This would be where the non-juror Bishops of the early eighteenth century and their Caroline predecessors took their stand: passive obedience and non-resistance. While this seems at first blush to be closer than Rutherford to the Pauline and general New Testament stance, neither view is really compatible with NT teaching. For one thing, Rutherford was really agitating for civil institutions that would rubber stamp the ecclesiastical, in his case, Presbyterian, structure. So he was all for the new Presbyterian to take the place of the old priest. And the non-juring Bishops saw themselves as bound to the Lord's anointed, which isn't the kind of model Paul was promoting.

Default Setting

The Reformers we're most familiar with were more or less magisterial: not just Luther and Calvin but Zwingli (though he wavered), Peter Martyr, Bucer, Bullinger, Farel, Melancthon and Knox. The idea that the civil power should endorse and protect the Church, and punish any deviation from the Church's teaching, was so embedded in their world view that it went nearly without saying.

I've previously mentioned how the ghosts of Augustine, Aristotle and others were looking over the shoulders of the protagonists wrestling with the theological questions thrown up in the ferment of the 1520s. Complex as these were, they were nonetheless solvable, in some shape or form. The ghosts of Constantine and Charlemagne would prove even more troublesome, and in fact they're still hovering around. The scaffolding for the essential union of Church and State wasn't so much a biblical as a Constantinian construct.

I previously wrote about Crawford Gribben's *The Puritan Millennium* (Dublin, Four Courts Press, Dublin, 2000, rev. 2008). Gribben's approach as I recall is quite narrow, and is to look at the idea of the millennium through the eyes of the Puritans, for many of whom Constantine was the starting point in their calculations. I might have liked to see more discussion about the meaning of that starting point.

In a more recent instalment too I referred to E.H. Broadbent's *The Pilgrim*

Church, and mistakenly gave the impression that Broadbent's thesis was romanticised and eccentric. From a Dutch-American perspective comes *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*, by Leonard Verduin (Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964). Verduin didn't himself come from the Anabaptist tradition but argues a convincing case on their behalf. I must confess I have had this book for over thirty years, but until now haven't studied it as I should. The *Stepchildren* were of course the Anabaptists, which is just a shorthand way of referring to a multitude of awkward Christian groupings who, while welcoming the challenge posed by the Reformers to the all-pervasive reach of the mediaeval church, were reluctant to bind themselves to a different form of ecclesial uniformity, backed up by the State.

Hail Caesar

Verduin very persuasively locates the Anabaptist problem not at the Reformation but at the "conversion" of Constantine. It's easy to see why. This was the moment, in 312, when the Christians rose from their humble status as a despised and recently-persecuted sect, with no official standing, to a place at the right hand of the throne, partners in the Imperial mission. The closest parallel would be if Xi Jinping, aware of the growing influence of the Christians in Chinese society, were suddenly to announce that henceforth Christianity was to be the official religion of China.

One of the consequences would be that a gulf would open up between the mainstream Churches and many of the house Churches, which would distrust the embrace of the State which had until recently been persecuting them. That was indeed what happened at the time of Constantine. The dissidents, known as the Donatists, were based in North Africa, in and around Carthage. They pursued the idea of a pure church: not that it could ever be completely pure, but one made up of intentional believers who lived lives in keeping with their profession. This led them to adopt a fairly hard line in the case of Christians who had relapsed under persecution and subsequently applied to be readmitted to the Church.

Constantine's political brain may have told him there was no alternative but to go with the flow and draw on the dynamic and phenomenal growth of this new Messianic movement. It was the best way to restore the fractured body politic of the Empire. Inspired by Virgil, the Roman ruling class had seen itself as the *gens*, the holy race, with a divine

sense of mission, to which all sections of society would minister, bound by ritual observances in a common identity. Only the technological deficit prevented Rome from being a totalitarian state. So, argues Verduin, the origins of Christendom lie much further back than Constantine. The fact that the Pope took the title *Supreme Pontiff* from the *pontifex maximus* of pre-Christian days gives a flavour of this. Verduin revives a little-known adjective, "*sacral*" to define the sort of state he is talking about, a society bound by oaths, just as pagan Rome was, and indeed the feudal world:

"In pre-Christian society, that is, in sacral society, the religious cult is a public affair. It belongs to the tribe or the *Volk*; and the chieftain of the tribe, or the ruler of the *Volk*, is automatically in charge... In Roman society the church and the state were fused (to use the two terms is virtually to commit an anachronism for they were in actuality as yet undifferentiated...) As a consequence, and most naturally, the rituals of religion were public and the temples were public places, as public as the post office is to us."

The *res publica* indeed.

On early dissident in the camp was Hilary of Poitiers, saying of the Cathedrals that were starting to spring up in his day: "*We do wrong in venerating the Church of God in roofs and structures. Is it doubtful that the Antichrist will sit there?*"

As it happened, the Donatist controversy erupted just at the time of Constantine's conversion, with the appointment of a Bishop of Carthage, Caecilian, who had been ordained by one of the turncoat Bishops. The Church at Carthage refused to accept him, or to take the sacrament from any priest or bishop who was deemed to be not genuine, in the sense of not living a life in keeping with his profession of faith. It took the best part of a century before the Donatists were quelled, by fire and sword. Augustine, being himself a North African bishop, was one of their fiercest opponents, although some have argued that he was reacting against a position he had been attracted by.

What Is A Catholic?

This is the period when the idea of the Holy Catholic Church became central. I remember as a nine-year-old at Kells and Connor School being first taught the Apostles' Creed. Most of my (almost exclusively) Presbyterian classmates were as ignorant of it as I was,

and there were some murmurings in the ranks at the seemingly transgressive endorsement of the Holy Catholic Church. The Donatists would have sympathised. It was the Catholics, with the full backing of the Imperial power, who were defining them out of existence. If the Catholic Church was the universal Church, then to be outside of it was to be in a state of condemnation, a sentence which the civil power was only too willing to carry out.

Of course the word Catholic is multifaceted, meaning the Universal Church, also the Western Church, as well as the Roman Catholic Church. It has been argued recently (*Roman but not Catholic*, Kenneth J. Collins and Jerry L. Walls, Baker Academic, 2017) that at least from the Council of Trent onwards the Church lost the right to call itself Catholic.

The most readable book about Newman that I've come across is John Cornwell's *Newman's Unquiet Grave* (Continuum, 2010). Newman was apparently struck by Wiseman's use of the Augustine quotation, *securus judicat orbis terrarum*, which roughly translates as, "*it's safe to trust the judgment of the entire world, the voice of universal experience*". This was utilised by Wiseman in support of his contention that the Church of England was the successor of the Donatists. It's certainly a powerful idea, and we can see how Augustine manages to have the odd distinction, as remarked by B.B. Warfield, of being the intellectual father of both modern Catholicism (in his theology of the Church) and of reformed Protestantism (in his theology of grace).

What Is Europe?

The Constantinian shift, and indeed its Donatist minor theme, were part of the mediaeval DNA, the folk memory of Europe. An early jibe against the German Anabaptists was the epithet "*Donatisten*", and indeed the German word for heretic, *Ketzer*, was derived from the Cathars. The Waldensians of North Italy were also commonly lumped together with the Cathars.

The post-Roman sacral vision of Europe was enacted on Christmas Day 800, when the Pope placed the Crown on Charlemagne's head in a stage-managed manoeuvre that was apparently resented by the recipient. A further shift took place here, because the new western Caesar wasn't simply lending his power and patronage to the Church, but was himself being visibly ordained by God, his reign validated by Christ's representative on earth, to whom he was

in a sense answerable.

I don't think any of what I've said is really new or controversial. But it's useful to revisit it because it helps us to understand the horror with which the magisterial Reformers viewed the ungrateful dissidents in their midst. The role of the magistrate was to support and, as the need arose, to enforce the practice of the true religion. If it could no longer be presumed that the true religion would reflect the judgment of the entire world, it would at least be supreme in the territory ruled by a sympathetic prince. Throughout that realm the default position of the subjects would be membership of the Church. Any attempt to separate from it was bound to be arduous, and painful.

Remarkably, despite two shattering wars and a social revolution the Church Tax is an enduring feature of life in modern Germany, on all sides of the Reformation divide. To avoid it you have to opt out and, while people are doing so in greater numbers, most accept it as part of the Church/State compact.

Wiedertauffer

And this is where the baptismal aspect comes in too, because you got baptised into your religious identity willy-nilly as a small baby. Rather than baptise the Saxons at the point of the sword, as Charlemagne had done, it was more convenient to arrange it so that the subjects of baptism would be unconscious of their new status. The Reformed constituency then, as now, brought out the big hermeneutical guns: baptism is the sign of God's promise ("*to you and your children*") under the New Covenant, just as circumcision had been under the Old. The line of argument is convoluted, desperate at times, especially since there are no New Testament texts that can be cited in support. Early Church archaeology would also indicate that adult-sized baptisteries were standard for the first four centuries of the Christian Church.

But, according to Verduin, the arguments from scripture operated to give theological cover for a psychological need. This is what he says:

"We saw that those who promoted the Constantinian change had seized upon the Christian *agape* [the Lord's Supper], had made it over so that it might do for the new sacrament what the pagan *sacramentum* [the military oath] had done for the old. The Christian Supper had been changed into a sacrament-serving thing."

He goes on to say the same thing

about baptism:

"The protagonists of "Christian sacramentism" were interested in "christening" because they were interested in the same thing in which Constantine had been interested, namely a binder to give coherence to society... For the sacramentalist the "christening" of everyone in the realm is a thing of utmost importance, for in that way a homogenous society is made possible".

The Reformers had been so conditioned by a thousand years of seeing the nation as a sacral community, with Christian and civic identity being two sides of the same coin, that they simply had no other mental category. The new Protestant Churches, whether Lutheran or "reformed", had taken possession of the pre-existing church buildings, developed their own teaching aids, or catechisms, created their own liturgy, and installed their own ministers, who were to preach of the Word faithfully and teach the people of God in accordance with the catechisms. The ruling prince (or in the case of Geneva, Zurich etc. the city council) lent his prestige and protection (from external threat and internal dissent) to the whole endeavour. As Luther says, if a preacher comes along who isn't properly licensed by the authorities, and if he persists in making a nuisance of himself, then "*let the magistrate consign the scamp into the hands of his proper master—whose name is Meister Hans*" [the hangman].

So Christendom was a continuing city that transcended the Reformation divide. And there was something very attractive about it too. If you were a peasant in thirteenth century France or an artisan in sixteenth-century Augsburg, you didn't have to worry too much about what way to bring up the children in a mixed marriage. The Church was there for you at every step of the way. You belonged without having to make an effort. You and your fellow townsmen or fellow peasants were singing off the same hymnsheet (literally in the case of Lutheran Augsburg). And the leaders could rest easy, knowing that the people weren't being led astray by vagrant heretical preachers. "*The souls of the people*", to quote Mrs. Proudie in *The Last Chronicle of Barset*, were safe.

But in pre-Reformation times, while the general picture may have looked strong and stable, the heirs of the Donatists and the Montanists hadn't gone away. It took all the propaganda, intimidation and violence that the mediaeval Church

could muster to keep a lid on the protest movements that were bubbling away all the time. The Reformed Churches were equally troubled. Baptism was a crux issue, both for the persecuted and their persecutors. The heretics weren't content to be put through the same sheep dip and herded unwillingly into pastures not of their choosing, with their owners' marks branded on their backs. That sort of treatment was in fact doing nothing for their souls. To take the step of re-baptism as adult was at the one time to repudiate the initiation rite you had been subjected to, and to act out a totally different model of the Church, as a voluntary association of convinced believers, neither endorsed by the civil power nor asserting any dominance over it. The Church was a different sort of thing altogether.

That the Reformers, who had successfully wrestled free of that same sacral straitjacket in large parts of Europe, should try to use the same weapons against the Anabaptists that the Church had used against them, seems astonishing. But they did, with varying results. One might think that the Roman Church had some excuse for its behaviour: it was just acting in the only way it knew how. For the previous thousand years it had put down heretics with consistent savagery and had succeeded, more or less. For the Reformers it wasn't just a case of protecting their hard-won gains but of re-establishing the Constantinian consensus, a sort of mini-Christendom, with the civil power on hand to guarantee uniformity of belief, and more particularly, uniformity of church order.

The exaltation of the sacraments at the expense of the preached Word was one of the concerns of the Reformers, and Luther at the Debate in Leipzig, had ruefully admitted that the positions he was adopting were comparable to the views of Jan Hus, but it didn't prevent them from urging the severest treatment for recalcitrant Anabaptists.

Here is Luther on baptism:

"How can baptism be more grievously reviled and disgraced than when we say that baptism given to an unbelieving man is not good and genuine baptism?... What? Baptism rendered ineffective because I do not believe?... What more blasphemous doctrine could the devil himself invent and preach?"

The point was, however, that it was the Anabaptist *parents* who resisted the

baptism of their babies, not because they were unbelievers, but because they didn't believe in what baptism had become, or in a Church which compelled them to be members against their will.

As we noted, Zwingli had entertained doubts on the subject, but by his continued hesitation was going to get himself into serious trouble with the Zurich City Council, as it made very clear:

"It becomes no one, and least of all a preacher, to call ancestral deliverances and ordinances superfluous, foolish or vain... By so doing the holy Church, the ancient fathers, the Councils, the popes, the cardinals and bishops etc. will be made to look ridiculous, will be disdained and eliminated. And then there will spring up disobedience towards the magistracy, disunity, heresy, and the weakening and disunity of the Christian faith".

Cities like Zurich, Basel and Strasbourg were particularly stringent in seeking to bring Anabaptists to heel, which suggests there was a big problem in the southern German-speaking lands. The later exodus of the groups that became known as Amish and Mennonites was largely from these areas, as well as from Holland, where there was a similar type of "*bürgerlich*" municipal government.

In Württemberg in the late sixteenth century the ruling council was sufficiently ecumenical to commission a report from a committee of four, made up of two Lutherans, one Reformed and one Roman Catholic, to come up with a report on the rights and wrongs of forced baptism. There was remarkable unanimity on the conclusion, if not the reasoning. In accordance with the mode of scholastic debate (and in the absence of real opposition) there was a straw man set up to make objections. One of the objections was, since it wasn't customary to subject the children of Jewish parents to this procedure, why should it be done to the Anabaptists? The answer of course was that, while the Jewish children were not part of Christendom, the Anabaptists were! Forced baptisms were recorded in Protestant parts of Germany as recently as 1863.

Big Fleas Have Little Fleas

A big problem for the magisterial Reformers was that the recovery of gospel truth wasn't sufficiently evidenced by transformed lives among the greater part of the adherents of the new *national churches*. By contrast the

Anabaptists were for the most part modelling the Christian virtues in their social and family lives. This is what led Luther in the early years to flirt with the concept of *ecclesiola in ecclesia*. The image here is of a core of committed believers meeting separately from the penumbra of the half-hearted shuffling majority, in additional meetings for prayer and Bible study. But it raises the question again of what and where is the Church. If the spiritual life of the Church is concentrated in these small gatherings, then what's the point of all the huge lumbering structure of the 'official' Church?

But if the State Church is the true apostolic Church then, in the words of Harold Wilson in 1974, referring to the Ulster Protestants, "*Who do these people think they are?*" Do they think they're better than the rest of us?

Which is a reasonable question. Is the committed nucleus to be self-selecting? If so, the most suitable candidates would probably hang back, considering themselves not worthy to be numbered in the group of more godly Christians, while their smug thick-skinned neighbours would press forward. If selected by the clergy then there would soon develop a type of formal admission process, making normal Church seem second-best. And then what happens if the *ecclesiola* itself is perceived to be sinking into a formalistic rut? Or if the *ecclesiola reformata* abandons the *raison d'être* of its founding fathers, as in the case of the liberal Protestant denominations from about the 1880s on?

Something like this happened with Methodism, which started off as groups of believers and awakened sinners organised into class meetings under the umbrella of the Church of England before the Methodist wing formally separated itself off; and then the process repeated with Primitive Methodists, and (especially in Fermanagh) Independent Methodists. I believe that at one stage in Coleraine there were two rival Independent Methodist congregations, giving ballast to the Roman Catholic critique about the inherently fissiparous tendency of Protestantism. On the other hand, one could say, *let a hundred flowers bloom*.

A Place At The Table?

Luther was half-resentful, half-jealous, of the Anabaptists. Most of them, by their lives, were a standing reproach to the general herd of Lutherans. But until the mid-1520s he hankered after incorporating them somehow, so

that their enthusiasm wouldn't be lost, but directed into safer channels. It was the Diet of Speyer in 1526 (not to be confused with the Diet of Speyer in 1529, against the Decrees of which the Lutherans protested, hence Protestants) that probably proved decisive in moving Luther's thinking towards the idea of a territorial Church protected by the Prince. For the theologian who emphasised the role of faith this was perhaps revealing a lack of faith in the ability of God to protect his people. But, looked at from where Luther was, the prospect held out by the 1526 Diet wasn't to be despised. Never in the previous thousand years had there been a possibility of a dissenting Church having a legitimate place in West European society—not exactly peaceful co-existence but the next best thing.

In a centralised kingdom such as France the Reformation was a much more precarious business. By the time the Edict of Nantes came into effect, under Henri IV in 1598, the Wars of Religion had already nearly neutralised the Huguenots. They retreated into fortified towns which unfortunately for them weren't fortified enough. With the fall of La Rochelle in 1628 they ceased to be a significant force in terms of resistance to the increasingly intolerant regime of Louis XIII. In 1685 when the Edict of Nantes was revoked the government's first step was to demolish the huge Protestant temple at Charenton in the Paris suburbs. The crowds gathered to cheer on the work.

The common denominator of the previous movements was that they had either been snuffed out or were in constant danger of that fate: "*for thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are counted as sheep for the slaughter*" (*Ps. 44:22*). To be continually on the lookout for your predators may be something that the herds of impala on the African plains have had to get used to, but for the rest of us there's something peculiarly wearing about it. So the achievement of the magisterial Reformers in creating safe spaces was a substantial one, even if their orderly sub-Christendoms were established at the expense of their own dissidents.

Signs And Symbols

However oppressive we may now judge their approach to have been, the sacralists were maybe wiser than they knew, in sociological terms anyway. With the demise of organised religion in western Europe, we're struggling to find any better glue to hold society together.

Like Union shop stewards, the Anabaptists might exclaim, "*that's not our job!*" And they'd be right, and I'm right there with them, but social cohesion is still a pretty powerful by-product.

It's ironic that even those groupings that set no store by the Church Calendar, theologically speaking, still celebrate Christmas in their domestic lives—Christmas being, calendrically speaking, the most dubious of the Christian feasts. The fact that Christmas, Easter and, arguably, Whitsun, are still public holidays is a dim relic of the Sacral State. It's thanks to those Holy Days and the Protestant Sunday that we have holidays at all. One endeavour of the Scottish Reformation was to promote the New Year at the expense of the Popish Christmas, almost in a Leninist way, and it has stuck. But this mid-winter festival, shorn of the mystery of the Incarnation, is, for me anyway, almost unendurable. It's kind of thin gruel. I'm reminded of the story Peter Brooke told me once about one of the huge Nazi pageants, taking place at the dead of winter. Hitler is supposed to have turned to Goring or Goebbels and remarked, "*it still doesn't beat Silent Night*".

Jeux Sans Frontieres

Much of post-Enlightenment European history has been taken up with the search for a meaningful substitute for Christendom, that sacral world of lost content. The most successful, or least toxic of these, has been the post-War Christian Democracy movement. For all their dissimilarities, the Christian Democrat parties in Germany, Italy, France and the Low Countries had identifiable common features, with their attachment to Catholic education and social teaching, to generous State provision for the less well-off, to liberal democracy, to pan-Europeanism, and to the idea of a gradualist, consensual approach to social and political change. Even the seating arrangements in the new parliament buildings reflected their distaste for the raucous, febrile, abrasive style of British political discourse.

As it happens, western Europe post-1945 looked uncannily like the Europe of Charlemagne. Instead of the heathen Saxons and Slavs there were the heathen Communists on the margins. Rampant Nationalism, Imperialism, Nazism and Communism had all shown themselves to be dead ends. Free Market capitalism too was going to have to be restrained in the interests of social harmony, and in obedience to Papal Encyclicals, starting with Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* in 1891.

While the Catholic Church still exercised considerable social influence, especially in Germany, Belgium and Italy, if not so much in France, Christian Democracy was not at all a dogmatic doctrinal Catholic phenomenon. The idea was to construct a durable socio-economic polity that was based on some Catholic cultural norms.

I would argue that Christian Democracy, though still healthy in Bavaria, is on its last legs. The factors behind this have been, first, the remorseless attrition of a sort of utilitarian secularism that has hollowed out whatever there was in it of authentic Catholic identity; secondly, the waves of immigration from North Africa, Turkey, and other Muslim-majority countries, which have introduced a new and wholly incompatible set of cultural and religious norms; thirdly, the rise of indigenous nationalist movements by way of reaction to this threat; and finally the stupidity of the European political class itself. Quite apart from its encouragement of mass migration for its own short term reasons, in its adoption of the single currency and its push towards ever more powerful pan-European institutions it has emasculated the representative framework on which the post-War consensus was founded, and has created a class of under-states, alienated and resentful.

Be Very Afraid

I have no idea how all this will play out, but in my youth I was exposed to a lot of teaching in the Gospel Hall which, to summarise it very crudely, sought to demonstrate that in the last days the Common Market (as it was then) was going to turn into the Beast of the Book of Revelation, equating to the fourth beast of Daniel 7, a godless monster, trampling over the remnant of true believers as the Roman Empire had done in its heyday. Unless you had the mark of the Beast imprinted on your forehead or your hand you wouldn't be able to buy or sell, an image that's all too believable in the age of the microchip. The writer of Revelation painted the graphic picture of the woman (presumably the false religious system) riding on the Beast (the pitiless, anti-God, politico-religious system), but the Beast would eventually turn on the woman, who, like Jezebel, would be torn limb from limb. The Beast, it will be recalled, goes on to make war on the Lamb. Now I don't want to cause undue distress to anyone, but is it a coincidence that the symbol of Europe is the woman riding on the bull (as in ancient Crete too): Europa who was abducted and raped by Zeus? This

is the statue that can be seen outside the offices of the Council of Ministers.

As for the EU Parliament building, it was deliberately designed, by Louise Weiss, to look like Peter Brueghel's painting of the unfinished Tower of Babel: "*and the whole earth was of one language and one speech*". The EU Parliament motto is "*many tongues, one voice*". In a 2004 speech Michael, now Lord, Heseltine remarked: "*The nation states have had their day as powers. The world must be more ordered and centralised.... it's unstoppable and irreversible*". I for one would like to get off that moving walkway.

Deep in my Anabaptist bones I have a fear of this European behemoth. Christianity has been formally repudiated as a foundation of European society. The supposedly distinctive European values (free speech, democracy, the rule of law) have not ultimately been salvaged from the wreckage but have themselves been thrown overboard. The only answer to the existential question, what is the point of Europe, is "more Europe". What is coming down the track is tax harmony (I wonder how long the Irish Corporation tax rate will last), centrally controlled budgets, and a common defence and foreign policy. The EU has made a complete horlicks of its foreign policy initiatives to date (in the Balkans and Ukraine). The euro has degraded the economies of southern Europe, with all the attendant human misery. Only German productivity is keeping the show on the road at all, even if this has become a mixed blessing in itself.

But in a sense none of this matters to the supranational unelected *nomenklatura* who call the shots. The residual spasms of the sweaty electorates, in Holland, France, Ireland and the UK, they treat with disdain. Like the man in Whitehall, they know best. The centralisation of power in the EU institutions has become an end in itself. People like Tony Blair and Lord Heseltine, and their Irish and continental equivalents, are behaving like members of some weird cult, impervious to reason (maybe a case of pot calling the kettle black, some may think). Nothing must be allowed to derail the project, which is of literally unquestionable virtue. This is the sacral state but shorn of its Christian content, like the Roman Empire of the pre-Constantinian era.

This indeed may be the rough beast that Yeats saw, slouching towards Bethlehem to be born. ❀

V
O
X

Address Of Loyalty Of Bishop And
Clergy Of Raphoe, 1799
Catholic Unionists!
Cornwallis
Conyngham
Lenten Pastoral
Davos
Housing

P
A
T

Address Of Loyalty Of Bishop
And Clergy Of Raphoe, 1799

In SPO, Rebellion Papers, 620/49/6, there is a copy of a document addressed by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Raphoe [Anthony Coyle] and a number of his clergy to the Lord Lieutenant (Charles, Marquis, Cornwallis), and dated 3rd December 1799:

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY, the Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland. The humble address of the Roman Catholic Ordinary and Clergy of the Diocese of Raphoe, [Donegal] in behalf of themselves and their respective flocks.

Pursuant to our unalterable and loyal attachment to our most Gracious King, George the Third and his Government, at all times, and our exertions, especially since the baneful seeds of the French rebellion have been brought over to this then, peaceable, loyal and happy country, we beg leave to renew, our uniform duty of allegiance, which we have incessantly proved, in public and private life, in the face of the world, by word and deed, as our encyclical letters, and printed publications shew : being no less than our incumbent duty.

Imprest, therefore with just horror and indignation at the woful infatuation of those that rose up in rebellion against the best of Kings, and especially such of our religion as have ungratefully and in direct opposition to the principles of our holy religion enlisted under the Labarum, or standard, of the most unnatural, and ever to be reprobated rebellion; and that, when their prayer, and petition for relief, had been graciously heard and recommended from the royal Throne to the Parliament of Ireland, and these attended, and granted.

We, therefore humbly trust, that your Excellency will accept this test of our gratitude and affection towards your Excellency's person, by whose fortitude and wisdom, blended with the sacred attributes (*sic*) of mercy and humanity, have saved and rescued this Kingdom from the horrors and eminent (*sic*) ruin inseparable from the most unnatural,

and unprovoked rebellion, and restored peace and security, at a period the most alarming and big with terror and dismay. Yes, my Lord, when no less than the wisdom and virtues of a Solomon appeared requisite (*sic*) to undergo the arduous task and discharge the duty of it, with that ability and impartial Justice by which you have brought it to pass.

What, then can more ostensibly show the wisdom and paternal care of the royal father of his subjects, and the prudential sagacity of this grand Council, than that of entrusting the perilous task to a Noble Man equal to surmount all the danger and difficulties inseparable from the dismal complexion, of that terrific disorder of this Kingdom, at that very conjuncture, and increasing so long since, like the Hydra's heads, which all honest and faithful people of every denomination admire, with heart felt joy, which words are unequal to express. But fortitude and wisdom are the gifts of God; but *ne too tempora morer*:

Heroic gifts, by which the monster lyes; Accurs' by fate; and self condemned dies. By Cornwallis, who might Providence Ordain'd for this day; and lay the pride of France...

Being called upon to give our assent, as if necessary, to a Union between great Brittain (*sic*) and Ireland, We, not only consent to that measure, but also wish for it, and hope it will answer the great and important ends wisely expected from it. Signed by us, for our selves and respective flocks, 3 December, 1799." (Signed by Anthony Coyle, Roman Catholic Bishop of Raphoe and 14 other clergy.)

Catholic Unionists!

"The document is at once a declaration of loyalty of King George III, an expression of gratitude to Cornwallis for saving Ireland from the horrors of rebellion (1798) and 'an affirmation of support for a legislative union between the two countries'. The address was entrusted to Francis Mansfield of Killygordon, a former high sheriff of County Donegal (1788), for delivery to Henry

Conyngham, Earl and first Marquis of Mountcharles, an extensive land owner in the Rosses and elsewhere in Donegal and Co. Meath. Mountcharles sent the document on to Cornwallis, the Lord Lieutenant, forwarding it from Slane, Co. Meath on the 19th January, 1800.

It is clear that the government of Ireland rather took for granted the loyalty of the Roman Catholic diocese of Raphoe; and there was a reason for this. Despite the fact that Wolfe Tone and General Tandy had both landed in Donegal, activity by the United Irishmen was not greatly in evidence in this county. True, the rector of Clondavaddock (Dr. Hamilton), stern towards the United men, had been murdered in March of 1797 (Lecky 1892, iv. 10-12), but this was an isolated incident.

The movement in Donegal mainly a Protestant, or rather a Presbyterian one, and the perpetrators of the 'Sharon murders' (together with Hamilton, his host's wife died) seem to have been mostly Presbyterians.

Government had good reason to be assured of the loyalty of the Catholic clergy. Coyle's address breathes that respect for monarchy that was ingrained in so many of the French educated clergy... Catholics believed that emancipation would follow the Union, but were disappointed.

There exists no proper study of Catholics and the Union, but the reader is referred to an extensive treatment by Lecky, iii, 1-198, dealing the events of 1790-93 which led up to the Catholic Relief Bill of 1793. Also T. D. Ingram, A history of the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland (London, 1877), 147, shows the entire Catholic episcopacy, consisting of four Archbishops and 19 Bishops (three Bishoprics being vacant), was favourable to the Union..."

(*Raphoe Miscellany 1* by Rev. John J. Silke and Mrs. Moira Hughes, 2012.)

Cornwallis

Charles Cornwallis, 1st Marquess (1738-1805): Defeated at the Battle of Yorktown, Virginia ending on October 19, 1781. It was a decisive victory by a combined force of American Continental Army troops led by General George Washington and French Army troops. He was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from 1798 to 1801. He suppressed the 1798 Rising and defeated General Humbert led French-Irish forces at Ballinamuck, Co. Longford on 9th September 1798. He supported Castlereagh in carrying the Act of Union. Resigned his Office on the refusal of George III to sanction the promised Catholic emancipation.

Conyngham

Henry Conyngham was born in London, the elder twin son of Francis Conyngham, 2nd Baron Conyngham, by his wife Elizabeth Clements, daughter of Nathaniel Clements. He was the elder twin brother of Sir Francis Conyngham and the nephew of William Conyngham.

Conyngham succeeded his father in the barony in May 1787, aged twenty. In May 1789 he was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. In December of the same year he was created Viscount Conyngham, of Slane in the County of Meath, in the Peerage of Ireland. He was further honoured when he was made Viscount Mount Charles, of Mount Charles in the County of Donegal, and Earl Conyngham, of Mount Charles in the County of Donegal, in the Irish peerage in 1797. In August 1800 he was elected as one of the twenty-eight original Irish representative peers to sit in the British House of Lords. In 1803 he was appointed Governor of County Donegal, a post he held until 1831, and *Custos Rotulorum* of County Clare in 1808, which he remained until his death. In January 1816 he was created Viscount Slane, in the County of Meath, Earl of Mount Charles and Marquess Conyngham, of the County of Donegal, in the Irish peerage. In July 1821 he was created Baron Minster, of Minster Abbey in the County of Kent, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom. In December of the same year he was sworn of the Privy Council and appointed Lord Steward, a post he retained until 1830. From 1829 until his death in 1832 he served as Constable and Governor of Windsor Castle.

His wife, Elizabeth Denison (died 1861), was the mistress of George IV, both before and after he came to the throne, and an English barony was bestowed upon the husband.

A descendent, *The Most Hon. Henry Vivien Pierpont Conyngham*, 8th Marquess Conyngham (born May 25, 1951), styled as *Earl of Mount Charles* from 1974–2009 and predominantly known as *Henry Mountcharles*, is an Anglo-Irish nobleman who holds titles in the Peerages of Ireland and the United Kingdom.

He unsuccessfully contested the Louth constituency for Fine Gael at the 1992 General Election. In 1997 he stood for election to Seanad Éireann for Trinity College, again without success.

Lenten Pastoral

"In the course of his Lenten Pastoral, Most Rev. Dr. Mageean, Bishop of

Down and Connor, points out that if the social planners for the future succeed, as they hope, with their schemes, they will finish by imposing a condition of universal serfdom. The State, with an absolute lordship over all, will become a huge octopus stretching out its tentacles to every citizen and fastening its grip on the whole field of human life and conduct.

"That is the strange irony that is unfolding itself at this historic moment; the fruit of a victorious war against totalitarianism is to be the imposition of a still wider and more acute form of totalitarianism on the victors themselves; the conquerors will be doomed to the fate from which they sought to save the vanquished", says his Lordship ...

The new social philosophy assumes that the State is responsible for the welfare of each person in the community and it argues that the State should take steps to shoulder this responsibility by guaranteeing work and wages for all. When the Beveridge Report was published some months ago, it was said that it caught the imagination of the country. Why shouldn't it? People began to have visions of a golden era under a system of State Insurance and unlimited benefit with peace and plenty just around the corner. Demands were made for a special Ministry of Social Security whose function would be to assess the needs of the whole community in respect of each commodity and service, and forthwith to organise industry and labour to meet those needs.

Such schemes will no doubt appeal to the imagination of people, but they surely require more than that to commend them. The man of average intelligence wants to know more about them. What would be their effects on industry and on the lives of citizens? If the State assumes responsibility for an industry, and takes upon itself to underwrite its losses, will it not demand a greater control over that industry : and will it not also seek to exercise a greater control over the citizen, for whose subsistence it takes responsibility and his activities? The greater the assistance the State gives to industry and workers, the greater will be the control demanded by the State over both. So much can be taken as certain.

If the social planners for the future succeed as they hope, with their schemes, they will finish by imposing a condition of universal serfdom. The State, with an absolute lordship over all, will become a huge octopus stretching out its tentacles to every citizen fastening its grip on the whole field of human life and conduct. That is the strange irony that is unfolding itself at this historic moment : the fruit of a

victorious war against totalitarianism is to be the imposition a still wider and more acute form of totalitarianism on the victors themselves; the conquerors will be doomed to the fate from which they sought to save the vanquished." (*The Irish News*, Belfast, 21.2.1944).

Davos

On his doctor's advice, Robert Louis Stevenson spent two winters in Davos in Switzerland. He finished *Treasure Island* there, but didn't like the place:

Shut in a kind of damned Hotel,
Discountenanced by God and man;
The food? –Sir, you would do as well
To fill your belly full of bran.
The company? Alas the day
That I should toil with such a crew,
With devil anything to say,
Nor anyone to say it to.

"So", according to E.S. Turner, "*RLS took to tobogganing, alone and at night, which he found strangely exalting*" (*London Review of Books*, 22.1.2018).

Housing

"*Dublin house prices are increasing every month by more than the amount the average worker is paid*" (*Daily Mail*, 26.12.2017). The average wage is €38,000 year or €3,166 a month.

Father Peter McVerry, the housing activist claims:

"In 1975, this country built 8,500 social houses; in 1985, we built 6,900 social houses, and in 2015 we built 75" (*Evening Echo*, Cork, 16.12.2017).

"In the greatest housing drive ever known in Ireland 132,220 houses were built or reconstructed between 1932 and 1942—over 100,000 more than in the Fine Gael decade.

"...from 1st April, 1947, to 31st March, 1960, a total of 167,868 houses were built or reconstructed or improved with State aid under the Housing Acts" (*The Story of Fianna Fail, First Phase*, Dublin 1960, a Fianna Fail publication).

"We have a crisis in the private rented accommodation sector because the Government is in the pockets of landlords. It allows a free reign to rack-rent at a rate that would make even the landlords' 19th century predecessors blush with shame, such is the level of exploitation and profiteering."

So wrote Cllr. Noel Collins in the *Evening Echo*, Cork (18.9.2017). Cllr. Collins is one of a small number of public representatives in this state who has the courage to think a problem out.

"Swedish furniture giant, Ikea, is₂₁

Jules Gondon

First English Translation

by

Cathy Winch

Part 4

Biography of Daniel O'Connell (1847)

[Jules Gondon has just described the Catholic Association: its financing by the Catholic population (the 'two penny contribution' collected by Parish Priests), its powers (for example it defended farmers threatened with jail for debt, prevented evictions) and its influence (stopping drunkenness and violence especially at election time). Among other activities, the Catholic Association met to debate the Bills presented in Parliament and vote on them. For the first time, the Courts hesitated before handing down unjust sentences, knowing that any injustice would be fought by the Catholic Association.

Gondon quotes an Orangeman asking in Parliament: "*The question is this: who holds the supreme authority, the Parliament of England, or the Catholic Association?*" However it wasn't just Orangemen who were worried by the power of the Catholic Association, some Catholics thought it went too far.]

Mr. [William] Plunket and Mr. [George] Canning, Irish Members of Parliament, took part in these debates [on the Catholic Association]. The former thought that "*the excesses and the madness of the Association would do more to delay the success of the Catholic cause than the combined efforts of its worst enemies*".

According to Mr. Canning: "*All these abnormal institutions are generally harmful, and particularly so to the particular cause they claim to be serving*". These are typical reactions to the efforts of men through history who, by legal means, have attempted to topple despotism and win their freedom.

The Government was not slow to respond to the suggestions of the enemies of Ireland. At the end of 1824, O'Connell was for the first time prosecuted personally. He was accused of *sedition*, and tried before a jury. In a speech to the members of the Association, he had said:

"If ever Ireland is reduced to the level of the colonies of South America, I hope this country will produce a man who, like Bolivar, is capable of shaking off the chains of oppression and freeing Ireland from the degradation of slavery!"

This sentence served as ground for the accusation. Mr. Plunket, up to then a supporter of Catholic Emancipation in Parliament, but also Attorney General, had to prosecute the hero of Ireland. The Government of Lord Liverpool counted on the goodwill of an Orange jury to secure a condemnation. The jury was chosen very carefully, and a Guilty

verdict would most definitely have been reached if Mr. Plunket had not had charge of public prosecution. The hatred of Orangemen for O'Connell was indeed strong, but that against Mr. Plunket was even stronger, as he had on several occasions prosecuted them, resulting in heavy sentences. In the judicial battle between their persecutor and O'Connell, the one they resented the least had to be favoured.

Nevertheless anxiety reigned on the 31st December 1824, when O'Connell appeared before the judges, assisted by Mr. Sheil, Mr. O'Lochlen and several other friends. The population of Dublin was prey to gloomy reflections. It knew from experience how sheriffs, on important occasions, succeed in assembling juries that will do the Government's bidding.

That very morning the accused had gone about his daily occupations; he had dispatched his clients' affairs with his habitual calm and attention. Then, changing roles, from defender to accused, he came to sit before his judges, in his lawyer's robe. Fully confident of his rights and the justice of his cause, he looked around him with evident pleasure, occasionally signalling his approval of the words of his opponents. The proceedings concluded, the jury retired to consider their verdict. They deliberated no less than four hours; at the end they pronounced the wonderful phrase *ignoramus*, which, soon repeated outside, started a concert of acclamations and applause which spread through all the streets of Dublin. The exaltation of triumph followed the depression of the morning. The defeat of the Government increased the prestige of O'Connell.

The Government was determined to have its revenge; it had not been able to strike the heart and head of the Association, so it resolved to strike the body as a whole. The announcement was made in the King's Speech which opened the 1825 session. A Bill dissolving the Catholic Association was soon put before Parliament. Its Committee Members came to London to beg to be heard, but their request was rejected by 128 votes in the Commons, and 46 in the Lords. The Bill was passed in both Houses, and received the Royal Assent on 9th March. It was to be implemented 10 days later and remain in force for two years.

Hoping to weaken the resistance to this *algerine act* [in English in the original in all occurrences, meaning 'this Algerian law'] was bound to create, the Government promised emancipation, subject however to two conditions. The first was that the Catholic clergy accept a State Salary, and the second that the 40 shilling freeholders be sacrificed [i.e. lose their voting rights]. The *algerine act* had very carefully enumerated all the domains in which the Catholic Association was involved, in order to strike every act and ramification.

The reader probably expects to hear that the work of the protective genius of Ireland now collapsed altogether under the blow, but that was not the case at all. The activity of the Association was only suspended for a time. On 13th July O'Connell presented to Ireland a report containing the constitution of a *new* Catholic Association. Agitation had only diminished in order to reappear, more active and more imposing than before. O'Connell, with his customary subtlety, cleverly passed through the net of the *algerine act*. Meetings started up again in towns and in the countryside. The Association was up, strong and glorious after its new victory, won by the clever thinking of its leader.

The Bill of conditional emancipation, put forward by the Government, was rejected by the House of Lords, where the Duke of York declared that "*no such concession would ever be granted while he was alive*". This rejection delayed the enfranchisement of the Catholics, but this cannot be regretted, when one considers with what conditions it was granted.

While the discussions of the Bill to destroy the Association were taking place in Parliament, several Irish Bishops were in London, called there by the Government. The House of Commons as well as the House of Lords had each

formed a Commission of Enquiry into the state of Ireland. Several Catholic Bishops were heard, as well as O'Connell himself. The prelates accepted the dotation [endowment] of the clergy, and O'Connell agreed. The famous orator was very impressive in his contributions to the Commissions. It was surprising to hear this tribune, whose language when he harangued the people was always violent and often vulgar, now use the finest language to express ideas of peace and conciliation, explaining with simplicity and modesty, but forcefully, the miseries endured by his country, at the same time mentioning all the issues that concerned Ireland, and suggesting for all a practical solution.

His prominent position made his task difficult, as the Parliamentary Commissions were made up of enemies of his people, who tried to trip him up, interrupted him and asked him any number of unexpected questions. O'Connell acquitted himself in this trial as in so many others, gaining the admiration of those who heard him. Let us not be surprised if he agreed to the payment of the clergy, in the particularly delicate circumstances in which he was placed; he did no more than agree with the opinion expressed by the members of the episcopate. Besides, it was understood that this salary did not entail the right of *veto*. The responsibility which weighed on him forced him to be conciliatory; but the machinations of England came to nothing. The Bill as we have said was rejected, consequently the Bishops and O'Connell were no longer bound by their expressed opinion.

Having tried Parliament, the friends of Emancipation now appealed to the people. The General Elections of 1826 gave them the opportunity to exercise, in the interest of their cause, the rights that were given back to them in 1793. Previously they had on every occasion voted following the wishes of the landlords. Now, feeling protected by the Association, they voted boldly against the candidates hostile to the enfranchisement of Catholics. The Orangemen were beaten on all points. It was in 1826 that O'Connell stood for the first time for election. He told electors they were forbidden to drink beer or spirits from the moment he made his first speech in the *hustings* [in English in the original] to the moment the election was over. He was obeyed completely. On this occasion O'Connell shook the hereditary power of the Beresfords, who were the tyrants of the electors of County Water-

ford. In England the partisans of Emancipation were less fortunate, but Providence took care to overthrow the obstacles which stood in the way of men.

The Duke of York, the royal enemy of the Catholics, died on 5th January 1827. The following month, the Cabinet of Lord Liverpool fell. On 5th March Sir Francis Burdett presented a motion in the Commons, asking the House to turn its attention to the laws hostile to the Roman Catholics, with a view to abrogating them. The debate lasted two days, and the motion was rejected by only four votes. The cause of Emancipation was going forward; it was soon to win a first parliamentary victory.

Expressions of sympathy came to the Irish from all parts of Europe and from the other side of the Atlantic. The defeat of the motion made the Association bolder than ever before, if that is possible. Mr. Canning was soon asked to form a Government. Catholics have acknowledged the goodwill of this statesman, who always seemed eager to do them justice, even if he never really did anything for them. Mr. Wyse says of him in his history of the Association: "*Catholics have always taken his intentions for actions, and they wept on his grave as on that of their liberator.*" Mr. Canning put his talents and his courage at the service of their cause; he fought for the defence of the principles of the Catholic Association, and succumbed, exhausted, under the blows of his enemies. Lord Goderich took up the mantle of Mr. Canning, but he had neither his firmness, nor his talents nor his elevated sentiments. He was not able to fight successfully or to advance the cause. He presided over a brief Ministry, which soon fell, bringing the Duke of Wellington to office. Two days before the formation of the Tory Cabinet, Ireland had held simultaneous meetings, at a fixed day and time, in all its parishes. The idea of this demonstration had been suggested by Mr. Sheil.

Ireland regarded the assumption of power of the Duke of Wellington as a declaration of war. The noble Duke is Irish; he had administered the country as Under Secretary of State and given his name to a *bill of arms* against the freedom of the citizens.

As soon as O'Connell learnt that the Duke of Wellington headed the Government, the Association informed its members that they would have to refuse their vote to any partisan of this Government, and to anyone who accepted its favours.

At the same period in England the Dissenters were fighting for their emancipation. O'Connell held on principle that everyone should worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; he helped them loyally and Ireland joined her voice to that of the Dissenters of England to demand their enfranchisement. He said to them in an admirable speech:

"Brothers in Jesus Christ, you are engaged in a constitutional struggle for the defence of your rights. We have for a long time had a similar endeavour. I think the man who doesn't do everything in his power to gain freedom, the highest good we can enjoy in this world, is not worthy of it.

You want the abrogation of laws which punish you for not being hypocrites, which deprive you of your rights because you are sincere and refuse to give up religious beliefs deeply held in your conscience.

We are fighting to reach precisely the same objective. Like you, we could be rid of every limitation if we consented to profess opinions which we do not believe to be true. The betrayal of our faith, like yours, would be rewarded with the concession of all civil rights, and if we were despicable enough to take no account of the sacred obligation of an oath, we could gain immediately our complete emancipation."

After inviting the Protestants to unite and make common cause with the Catholics, O'Connell proved to them that the Catholic religion favours civil liberty and liberty of conscience. The Association circulated petitions throughout Ireland demanding freedom for the English Dissenters.

In the month of May 1828, a new motion invited the House of Commons to discuss the rights of Catholic subjects. The motion was discussed over three sittings and passed at last with a majority of *six votes*; however the House of Lords rejected it with a majority of forty-six. Sir Robert Peel, speaking against the motion, said:

"I am certain that the abrogation of the laws which limit the freedom of Catholics would expose the Protestant religion to a danger against which it would be impossible to protect ourselves as strongly as we are protected by our Protestant Constitution."

The Duke of Wellington was no less explicit: according to him, "*The interdiction of Catholics was indispensable to the safety of Church and State*". The noble Duke kept up the hostility to Catholics which he always professed.

It is in these circumstances that the Prime Minister took it upon himself to name Mr. Vesey Fitz-Gerald, then Treasurer for the Navy, Minister for Trade. Mr. Fitz-Gerald was an Irishman devoted to the cause of emancipation, which he had always defended. His promotion made a bye-election necessary. [At that time MPs accepting an Office of Profit under the Crown had to resign their seats and stand again.] That put the Association in a quandary: what to do? It had committed itself to oppose any candidate who accepted a post in the Government, but here it found itself faced with one of its defenders in the House. It resolved to contest the election of Mr. Fitz-Gerald. The next question, no less delicate, was, who was to stand against him. Several Protestants had been, in vain, asked to stand, when the name of O'Connell came up, in rather peculiar circumstances.

The Agitator did not think of it himself. Curious to say, the idea came from Sir David Roos, an Orange Protestant, Grand Sheriff of Dublin. Apart from their political differences, Sir D. Roos liked O'Connell, as did everyone who knew him. While the Catholics were busy looking for a candidate who might agree to stand in Clare, Sir D. Roos met an intimate friend of O'Connell, Mr. P.V. Fitz-Patrick, and told him his idea, asking for his opinion. The suggestion seemed to Mr. Fitz-Patrick absolutely providential, all the more because, since childhood, he had always heard Mr. John Keogh, the most zealous Catholic of his time, say that his co-religionists would never be emancipated until they elected a Catholic representative who would force an entry into Parliament.

O'Connell seemed favourably struck by this unexpected overture. Eminent Dublin Catholics were consulted and all applauded the idea of sending their leader to Parliament. O'Connell went to the offices of the *Dublin Evening Post* and hastily wrote a letter announcing to the Clare electors that he was going to ask for their vote. This news electrified Catholic Ireland, which felt that O'Connell's triumph would preface the triumph of the great cause for which it fought with such laudable perseverance.

The indefatigable creator of the Association and of constitutional agitation was to wrest the glory of Office from Vesey Fitz-Gerald, the servant of Government, the President of the Board of Trade! The representative of England and the representative of the Irish people would face each other. The contest

between England and Ireland became a trial by combat. Both champions prepared for the fight. One commanded troops, police, Government money, means of seduction as a Minister of State; the other, on the contrary, drew his support from a ragged multitude; his only friends were the ministers of a persecuted religion. The priests ensured the discipline of the ragged army coming to vote for the agitator. The most perfect order reigned among peasants who in the past could not gather together in tens without coming to blows. As in Waterford in 1826, there were no instances of intemperance. O'Connell arrived in Ennis after addressing the people who rushed to salute him in all the localities he passed through. The election started on 1st July 1828 and lasted five days. It is very regrettable that only rare fragments of the speeches made by the agitator in this solemn and decisive occasion have been preserved. He explained at length to the electors the powerful reasons that should induce them to vote against his opponent and ended the most magnificent of his speeches by this call to the people:

"They assure you that I do not have the right to be elected: this assertion is false. It is true that, as a Catholic, I cannot and I do not want to make the oath demanded today of Members of Parliament; but the authority which imposed the oath, that is, Parliament, can also abrogate it, and I trust that if you elect me, the most vehement of our enemies will soon see the necessity of removing the obstacle that prevents the elect of the people from doing his duty to his king and country.

The oath at present required by law is, *'That the sacrifice of the Mass and the Invocation of the blessed Virgin Mary and other Saints, as now practised in the Church of Rome, are impious and idolatrous'*. Of course, I never will stain my soul with such an oath; I leave that to my honourable opponent, Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald. He has often taken that horrible oath; he is ready to take it again, and asks your votes to enable him so to swear. I would rather be torn limb from limb than take it.

Electors of County Clare, choose between me, who abhors that sort of blasphemy, and Mr. Fitz-Gerald, who has already it repeated it twenty times. Send me to Parliament, and I promise you that this sacrilegious oath will soon be abolished."

In vain did Mr. Fitz-Gerald, who enjoyed a certain popularity, speak of the services given by his ancestors, or invoke the memory of his father, who

was on his death-bed. Catholic electors seemed to think they would be committing a mortal sin if they did not vote for their dear Daniel. A dramatic incident reinforced this feeling. On the eve of the last day of voting, a priest walked up to the hustings, called for silence and uttered these words: *"Irishmen, my brothers, an impious Catholic has been wretched enough to vote for Fitz-Gerald. (Cries of Shame! Shame! from an indignant populace.) Silence!* continued the orator severely. *The indignation of men is weak compared to the wrath of God! The almighty God has punished him: I tell you, he has just been struck by a fit of apoplexy. A prayer for his soul!"* Immediately the crowd bows, kneels and prays for heavenly misericord for the soul of the unfortunate who voted for Fitz-Gerald.

The next day O'Connell was declared *duly elected* and he struck up the hymn of deliverance as he thanked the electors:

"The men of Clare know that the only foundation of freedom is religion. They have triumphed because the voice which is raised for its country is first raised in prayer to the Lord. Now songs of freedom are heard in our vast countryside; these sounds fill the valleys and the hills; they whisper in the waters of our rivers and our torrents, and, with their voice of thunder, they cry to the echo of our mountains: *'Ireland is free!'*"

But how will the member for Clare force entry into Parliament?

(To be continued)

Wilson John Haire

Tribute

What is it with Mayakovsky
 since those 100 years
 always here
 always the future
 his work
 holy ground
 untouchable
 free
 some might sneakily dig there
 but can't
 bury the past
 being lovelorn
 was the rasp
 that wore his life
 down fast
 but on other issues
 not so forlorn
 he knew his wars
 one to make change
 one to abhor
 Russia had its '16
 his Call-to-Account
 his great salute
 to '17

15 October 2017

Solzhenitsyn And The 'Russian Question'

Solzhenitsyn, Igor Shafarevich and the 'Jewish Question'

Solzhenitsyn started work on *Two Centuries Together* in 1990.¹ His biographer, Ludmila Saraskina, quotes his wife, Natalia Dmitrievna, saying it was "a large, difficult, complex work, like the *Gulag Archipelago* in its construction. Impossible to say how long it would take, doubtless not less than two years, though it had already involved reading thousands of pages and a great deal of thought".²

A Preface to the book by Solzhenitsyn is dated 1995, which suggests he might have thought it was finished then but, in the event, it was only published in 2001 (first volume) and 2002 (2nd volume). In an introduction dated 2000 he says: "Let us not fool ourselves: these last few years the situation in Russia has evolved in a way so catastrophic that the problem here studied has faded into the background and doesn't have the urgency of the other problems Russia faces today".

But we are still faced with the question: why did he think it was important in 1990, the moment when Gorbachev's attempt to save the Soviet system through liberal reform was beginning to fall apart, a period of huge opportunity and huge danger, the same year in which, having decided he could do nothing more with *The Red Wheel*, he wrote his own 'What is to be done?'—*Rebuilding Russia*.

The Vexing Case Of Igor Shafarevich

We have already seen in previous articles the difficulties Solzhenitsyn had with what he called the "third emigration", his contemporaries, often Jewish dissidents more concerned with the dangers of 'Russian chauvinism' than with Communism as such.

And we have seen how Solzhenitsyn's concerns in this respect overlap with those of his close friend and collaborator, the internationally famous mathematician, Igor Shafarevich. But Shafarevich, unlike Solzhenitsyn—or perhaps we should say more brutally than Solzhenitsyn—had declared that the problem of 'Russophobia' was a Jewish

problem. The Jews (taken collectively) were a "little community" who had set themselves the task of subverting the Russians as a "large community".

Shafarevich's biographer, Krista Berglund, tells us that his *Russophobia* was written between 1978 and 1982, going through many drafts.³ She quotes Shafarevich as saying "It is necessary to say the truth, eventually say the fearfully silenced words. I could not have died in peace had I not attempted to do this". It was launched into *samizdat* in 1982-3. But this was the period (Nov 1982—Feb 1984) when Yuri Andropov was in power and there was a heavy crackdown on *samizdat*. It wasn't until 1987-8 that *Russophobia* began to attract attention. It was published in 1988 in the Munich based paper *Veche*, edited by Evgenii Vagin, who had been a member of VSKhSON (All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People), described by Yanov⁴ as "The only relatively large underground organisation in the post-Stalin period to set itself the task of armed overthrow of the existing state structure" (very relative. A footnote in Yanov's book says that in 1967, at the moment of its destruction by the KGB, it had twenty eight full members and thirty candidate members. Whatever else can be said about the KGB it was pretty effective in suppressing potentially dangerous oppositions).

According to Berglund, the article was given to *Veche* by the prominent 'village prose' writer, Valentin Rasputin. Shafarevich first knew of it when he was congratulated by Lev Gumilev, son of the poets Anna Akhmatova and Nikolai Gumilev and himself well known as a historical geographer arguing for 'Eurasia'—a Russia looking Eastward rather than Westward. The early chapters, which only touch lightly on the Jewish theme, were published in the mainstream journal *Nash Sovremennik* in June 1989—the later chapters appeared in November. Grigori Pomeranz, whom we met in the last article in this series, complained that it had been circulated in large numbers in *samizdat* by the militant anti 'zio-masonic' movement

Pamyat ('Memory'). It was published in a hostile context in Tel Aviv and New York.

Although never to my knowledge translated into English, *Russophobia* was reviewed in 1990 in the *London Review of Books*, by John Klier, specialist in the history of Jews in Russia prior to the Revolution. Klier provides a useful summary of Shafarevich's main conclusion:

"He concedes that Jews played no role in Russian public life before the 1880s, isolated as they were in their closed religious communities. At the end of the century this communal structure began to disintegrate and Jews flooded into Russia's economic, political and cultural life. In numbers quite unrelated to their percentage of the total population, they played a preponderant role in movements hostile to the existing order, as liberal critics of the autocracy, as Marxists, or as active exponents of revolutionary terrorism. This process accelerated after the Revolution, and Jews were closely involved in the destruction of Russia's traditions: they commanded the firing-squad which executed the last tsar and his family; they dominated the Cheka as well as its successor the OGPU; they played a part in the destruction of the Russian peasantry; and they provided the leaders who established the Gulag system.

"While Russian revolutionaries carried a deep love of Russia in their hearts, the attitude of the Jewish revolutionary was best exemplified by the curse, 'Rot, Damn you!' This contrast between Russian and Jew was understandable, for it is a painful operation to separate a person from his roots, and few Russian revolutionaries could ever make a clean break. Jews, having no real ties to the Russian people, had no trouble making the break. What did they care if Old Russia was degraded and destroyed? Jews had never lost their feeling of superiority, their sense of being a chosen people, destined to dominate the rest of mankind. The *Talmud* and the religious traditions of Judaism inculcated in the Jewish mind the belief that gentiles were not even human. The Jews had developed a 'saving hatred' toward the outside world which preserved them as a people for two thousand years, and this made them a relentless and implacable enemy. It was precisely this spirit which the Jews brought into Russian life and which they continued to nurture. The Jewish 'little nation', Shafarevich demonstrates, is, after all, unique: it has existed for two millennia, surpassing in durability and malevolence all other variants of the 'little nation' phenomenon..."⁵

In the Spring of 1990 a proposal to award Shafarevich an honorary degree in Cambridge University for his mathematical work was withdrawn after the Vice Chancellor had read about Russophobia in an article by the Zionist cold warrior, Walter Laqueur. In 1992, 430 distinguished mathematicians, mostly North American, published an Open Letter to Shafarevich condemning his views. Also in 1992, the National Academy of Sciences of the United States issued an unprecedented request that he resign from the membership they had given him in 1974. The request was approved by the American Physical Society, the Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry, the American Mathematical Society, the New York Academy of Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The conditions of membership of the NAS prevented them from simply dismissing him, hence the request to resign voluntarily which of course he refused. There is some satisfaction in learning that in 2003 he did resign voluntarily—in protest against the US invasion of Iraq.⁶

Solzhenitsyn And Shafarevich

Solzhenitsyn never to my knowledge refers to *Russophobia*. Nonetheless I think this provides the context for his decision to write *Two Centuries Together*. Himself already accused, as we have seen, on relatively weak grounds, of Anti-Semitism, his closest associate had now blurted out a much more aggressive critique of the role of Jews in Russian and Soviet culture, a critique that covered much the same ground, aiming at the same targets, as his own criticisms of the third emigration. Berglund (p.358) quotes both Pomeranz and Andrei Sinyavsky as saying that Shafarevich was revealing Solzhenitsyn's true thought. The article by John Klier begins by saying "*Andrei Sinyavsky may dismiss his [Shafarevich's] ideas as 'ridiculous' and suggest that he has no significance except as a stalking-horse for the ideas of Solzhenitsyn*".

I may not have said enough in earlier articles about Sinyavsky. He was arrested in 1965, together with Yuri Daniel, and accused of publishing "*anti-Soviet lampoons*" abroad. The protest against their trials and conviction in 1966 is often seen as the beginning of the Dissident movement. Sinyavsky was not himself Jewish but wrote under the Jewish pseudonym *Abram Terz* and, in his period in the Camps, he was particularly struck by the intensity of anti-

Jewish feeling among his Russian fellow prisoners. His essay '*The Literary process in Russia*', published in the emigré journal *Kontinent* in 1974, included the words (talking about the third emigration): "*one day, Mother Russia, you bitch, you will have to answer for these children of yours, whom you brought up and then shamefully flung onto the rubbish heap*". Both Solzhenitsyn and Shafarevich saw him as an archetypal example of 'Russophobia'. Shafarevich, it might be noted, first appeared as a sympathiser with the Dissident movement when he signed a collective letter in support of 'the four', imprisoned for supporting Sinyavsky and Daniel. The four included Alexander Ginzburg, who became the manager of Solzhenitsyn's 'Russian social fund' supporting political prisoners. Shafarevich was much more involved with the mainstream Dissident and Human Rights movement in the Soviet Union than Solzhenitsyn, who tended to keep himself apart, concentrated as he was on his ambitious writing projects.

Obviously Solzhenitsyn felt the nettle had to be grasped and that he was well placed to do it because of the wealth of material he had already assembled for *The Red Wheel*. But Berglund quotes Shafarevich saying Solzhenitsyn had written an essay on '*The Jews in the Soviet Union and the Future of Russia*' while he was still in the Soviet Union. She says the manuscript was discovered and published against his wishes. An article on the internet, '*The anti-Semitism of Alexander Solzhenitsyn*' by Cathy Young, includes the following:

"An even more devastating critique of Solzhenitsyn's oeuvre appeared in the U.S.-based Russian Jewish weekly *Vestnik*. The author, émigré journalist Semyon Reznik, analyzes a curious work self-published in Moscow in 2000 by one Anatoly Sidorchenko, a collection that includes two essays by Sidorchenko himself and one attributed to Solzhenitsyn, 'Jews in the USSR and in the Future Russia'.

"In a June 2000 interview in *Moscow News*, Solzhenitsyn dismissed the publication as 'a vile stunt by a mentally ill person'. Yet he failed to explicitly disavow his authorship—and a comparison between the essay (dated 1968) and *Two Hundred Years Together* reveals astonishing similarities, including entire paragraphs that are virtually identical"⁷

Attitudes To Israel

Berglund broadly agrees that Solzhenitsyn's views are very close to

Shafarevich but there are, I think, two quite striking differences. Shafarevich is very hostile to Israel, seeing the Israeli treatment of Palestinians as an example of a viciousness, a contempt for the non-Jew, that he regards as intrinsic to Jewish culture. The French edition of *Russophobia* includes a '*Letter of Marque against the calumniators of Russia*', published in March 1990 and signed by seventy four writers including Rasputin, the editors of *Molodaia Gvardia* and *Nash Sovremennik* as well as Shafarevich, attacking in particular "the joint efforts of all the official press to characterise the 6th Plenum of the Union of Writers of the USSR as an 'anti-semitic sabbath'. The letter complains against a "*straightforward idealisation of Zionist ideology*":

"These days this idealisation concerns not only personalities of Jewish origin in the cultural and political circles of the USSR but also those at the centre of the aggressive, fascist-type state of Israel. This idealisation—purely racist as it is—regards with scorn the whole international community and the sober, well-thought-out judgements it can make. So in the Soviet press, the Zionists and their supporters are busy disguising the face of Zionism, whitewashing it; and already they affirm, in defiance of their own conscience, that Zionism has been 'calumniated by the UN' which, ever since 1948, has condemned through many resolutions, Zionist aggression in the Middle East and given a definition of Zionism which likens it to a form of racial discrimination. These pharisees of the 'democratisation' of our national politics sometimes aim to characterise Zionism with the status of a 'spiritual' or 'religious' movement. and sometimes they give it the heroic character of a movement of 'national liberation' (for whom? the Arabs in Palestine, or the Russians in Russia?) ...

"Under these conditions, even the many honest, straightforward Soviet Jews are not at all sure of being able to escape accusations of 'antisemitism' nor the sometimes painful consequences of such accusations. Under these conditions, for all practical purposes, even sympathy for the Arab Palestinian people fighting to defend their legitimate right is interpreted as a 'provocation to national discord among the peoples of the Union'."⁸

The comment on the 'Soviet press' is interesting, given that only five or six years earlier the Soviet press would have been unanimously anti-Zionist, supporting the Palestinians as a national liberation movement. And it is perhaps

Solzhenitsyn's instinct to regard anything said in the Soviet press as necessarily a lie that led him to become a strong supporter of Israel. Solzhenitsyn evokes this period in *Two Centuries Together*:

In the 1960s—

"It was necessary to launch a campaign against Israel. The convenient, ambiguous and vague term 'anti-Zionism' was invented and this took the form of 'a sword of Damocles hanging over all the Soviet Jews'. A savage press campaign against 'Zionism' was launched. How could it be established that this wasn't quite simply a matter of antisemitism? But the danger was real: 'Zionism is the weapon of American imperialism'. The Jews were forced 'to furnish, directly or indirectly, proof of their loyalty, to persuade, one way or another, those about them that they maintained no relationship with their own Jewish identity nor, certainly, with Zionism'..." (p.462).

"But with the 'thaw' of the Khrushchev years, then without him during the sixties, Soviet Jews began to raise their heads again and to assume their identity.

"In the late fifties 'the growing sense of bitterness which had been felt by many layers of the Soviet Jewish population' had the effect of 'reinforcing the feeling of national solidarity'".

"But it was only in the late sixties that a small group of Russian intellectuals, mostly scientists... undertook to restore a national Jewish consciousness in Russia'.

"And it was at that moment that the Six Day War—sudden, rapid, victorious, a true miracle!—broke out. The prestige of Israel reached its highest point in the eyes of Soviet Jews who felt drawn to it by the heart and by the blood.

"But the Soviet power, exasperated by Nasser's shameful defeat, immediately launched a devastating campaign against 'Judaism-Zionism-Fascism'. From now on, it was almost as if all Jews were 'Zionists'; the Zionist 'world conspiracy' was considered to be 'he necessary and inevitable culmination of the whole of Jewish history, of Jewish religion, marked by its national character'; 'Judaism is a religion that suits very well those who aspire to a universal domination because it has elaborated systematically an ideology of racial superiority and apartheid'."

"To the press campaign was added the dramatic break in diplomatic relations with Israel. Soviet Jews had good reason to be afraid: 'We had the impression we were on the verge of a call to a pogrom'.

"But this fear was only superficial and what was in fact produced was a

new, irresistible affirmation by the Jews of their national identity ...

"The process of national renaissance got under way..." (pp.468-9. Sources are given for all the passages in quotation marks but it would be too cumbersome to repeat them here).

Michael Scammell, quoting a press conference Solzhenitsyn gave in Paris in 1975, says "*He also expressed his admiration for Israel as a state with a guiding idea—'It is the only religious state in the West (!—PB), a model that is difficult to attain for Western countries' and he praised the Israelis for 'their courage and firmness in the face of the dangers that surround them'...*"⁹ At the conclusion of a rambling article on *The Terrible Question of Alexander Solzhenitsyn*, the father of US Neo-Conservatism, Norman Podgoretz, says "*In my opinion, Solzhenitsyn's bitterness at seeing the role so many Jews played in the introduction of Communism in Russia is less important than his constant, ardent support for Israel*".¹⁰

According to Saraskina it was through Shimon Peres, who met Solzhenitsyn during a visit to the USSR in 2001, that the world learned of the existence of *Two Centuries Together*. She quotes him saying "*I was agreeably surprised to learn that he was writing a book on relations between Russians and Jews*".¹¹

And To The 'Metaphysics' Of Judaism

The other substantial difference from Shafarevich is that Solzhenitsyn deliberately avoids discussing religious doctrine. Despite the importance he attaches to his own religious faith, a reticence on the subject of religion is typical of his work as a whole. He has surprisingly little to say about the fate of priests in *The Gulag Archipelago* or, in *The Red Wheel*, on the trauma undergone by the Church in the February Revolution.

He says in an introductory comment in *Two Centuries Together* (vol 1, p.11):

"What should be the limitations of a book like this?

"I'm quite aware of the complexity and enormity of the subject. I understand that there is also a metaphysical side to it. It is even said that the Jewish problem can only be understood from a mystical and religious viewpoint. I certainly acknowledge the reality of this point of view, but although it has already been discussed in many books, I think it remains inaccessible to men, that by its very nature it is outside the reach even of experts.

"Even though all the important finalities of human history involve interventions and influences of a mystical nature, that does not prevent us from considering them on a concrete historical basis. I doubt if we have to appeal to these higher considerations to analyse phenomena that are immediately within our grasp. In the limits of our earthly existence we can assess Russians and Jews alike on the basis of earthly criteria. The heavenly ones, let us leave them to God.

"I only wish to deal with this problem in the categories of history, politics, daily life and almost exclusively in the limits of the two centuries in which Russians and Jews have been living in a single state. Never would I have dared to touch on the depths of Jewish history, covering three or four millennia and sufficiently represented in numerous works and meticulously assembled encyclopaedias..."

It seems to me that in writing this Solzhenitsyn is confusing two different problems—the problem of understanding the Jewish/Russian or Jewish/Christian confrontation theologically; and the problem of understanding how theological ideas (what Christians thought about Jews; what Jews thought about Christians) affected the course of events. The former may well not be within the grasp of the historian, the latter has an obvious historical importance, but Solzhenitsyn still tends to avoid it.

Shafarevich, on the other hand, seems to have no such inhibitions. In 2002 (the year the second volume of *Two Centuries Together* was published) he published a book called *The Three Thousand Year Old Enigma: History of the Jews from the perspective of contemporary Russia*, making use, so Berglund tells us, of Israel Shahak's book, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion. The weight of three thousand years*. Shafarevich's book has not to my knowledge been translated into English or French but it is clear from the title that, like Shahak's book, which is easily available, published by Pluto Press, he is trying to go into the substance of the Jewish religious tradition, with a view to explaining what he sees as a wickedness intrinsic to the Jews. This is very much not Solzhenitsyn's approach.

Revisiting Richard Pipes

Solzhenitsyn's support for Israel and his refusal to go into any detailed examination of Jewish (or Christian) religious thinking may explain something that otherwise appears a little puzzling—the

fact that Richard Pipes, who had done so much to foster the notion of Solzhenitsyn's anti-semitism, declares, in a review of *Two Centuries Together*, that—

"Solzhenitsyn's book is a notable achievement in its attempt to place the 'problem' of Russian Jewry in political and social perspective, and one that does credit to its author's reputation. If Solzhenitsyn does not quite succeed in exonerating pre-revolutionary Russia of responsibility for subjecting its Jewish citizens to uncivilised discrimination—after all it was the only Christian country that in the nineteenth century still subjected its Jewish citizens to medieval disabilities—and even if he does not fully understand the latter's predicament, at least he absolves himself of the taint of anti-Semitism."¹²

His praise is highly qualified: "*One cannot but marvel at the intellectual energy of a novelist who in his seventies undertakes research on a vast and tangled theme with which he has only the most superficial familiarity*" and he repeats his own earlier criticisms of what he regards as the anti-semitic caricatures of the revolutionaries Alexander Parvus-Helphand (in *November 1916*) and Dmitri Bogrov, the assassin of Stolypin (in *August 1914*). Nonetheless it seems to me that anyone wanting to make a case for Solzhenitsyn's anti-Semitism would find much more material in *Two Centuries Together* than in *The Red Wheel*.

But alas once again I find I'm not in a position to launch into a consideration of the actual detail of *Two Centuries Together*. It is, to say the least, a large undertaking.

I would like to finish here by indicating two important events that have occurred in relation to Solzhenitsyn at the end of 2017. First, the final instalment of *The Red Wheel—April 1917* part two—has at last been published in the French translation, nine years after part one. At last a non-Russian reader who reads French (me, for example) can get an overview of the whole undertaking and see if it really does have a beginning, a middle and an end (in that order) and if it really does make sense of the eventual seizure of power by the Bolsheviks (although it doesn't reach October/November, except in summary form, Solzhenitsyn claims that by May 1917 no other outcome was possible and that he therefore felt free to finish his account at that point). A brief look at Amazon.de suggests that even less (indeed far less)

has been done for Solzhenitsyn in German than in English. That could easily be a product of the fatal charge of anti-semitism.

The second important event is that the first volume of *March 1917* (the first of four) is now available in English, over thirty years after it first appeared in Russian, in Paris, in 1986. Once again Pipes surprises us. On the Amazon entry for *March 1917* we read this review:

"In his ambitious multivolume work *The Red Wheel* (Krasnoe Koleso), Solzhenitsyn strove to give a partly historical and partly literary picture of the revolutionary year 1917. Several of these volumes have been translated into English, but the present volume appears in English for the first time. The translation is very well done and ought to give the reader a better understanding of the highly complex events that shook Russia exactly a century ago" --Richard Pipes, emeritus, Harvard University.

To be continued.

¹ According to his own account—Alexandre Soljénitsyne: *Deux siècles ensemble*, tome II, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 2003, p.567

² Ludmila Saraskina: *Alexandre Soljénitsyne*, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 2010, pp.811-2. Interesting to note that the Russian original was published (in 2008) by Editions Molodaia Gvardia (Young Guard), whose role in promoting a Russian patriotic view of the world even in the Soviet era has been discussed in earlier articles in this series. In 1991 Shafarevich published an article called *Ten Years Later*, which suggests that he felt he had finished *Russophobia* in 1981.

³ Krista Berglund: *The vexing case of Igor Shafarevich, a Russian political thinker*, Basel, Birkhäuser, 2012, pp.233-4. Although this has been published in English it still doesn't seem to be available in the British Library, or in the National Library of Wales, which is also a copyright library. It is available in several University libraries. It is very expensive, though the opening pages can be read free in Google Books.

⁴ Alexander Yanov: *The Russian New Right—Right wing ideologies in the contemporary USSR*, Berkeley, Institute of International Studies, 1978, p.21. *Veche* ('Assembly'—not to be confused with the early twentieth century collection, *Vekhi*—Landmarks) in Munich claimed to be a continuation of the Russian journal of the same name edited by Vladimir Osipov, imprisoned in 1974.

⁵ John Klier: 'Russophobia', *London Review of Books*, 19th April, 1990.

⁶ Berglund op cit, pp.339-345.

⁷ Berglund (pp.349-50) and <http://www.controversyofzion.info/>

[Solzhenitsyn_on_jews.htm](#) Cathy Young is a journalist associated with the *Boston Globe*. Although she is writing from a pro-Zionist perspective, *Controversy of Zion.info* is an anti-Zionist, 'revisionist' website. Young's original article was published in *Reason*, 36.1 (May 2004), pp.20-25. Reznik is the author of a collection of essays in Russian: *Seduction by hate: blood libel slander in Russia*, Moscow-Jerusalem, Daat-Zanie, 2001). See Zinaida Gimpelevich: 'Dimensional spaces in Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *Two Hundred Years Together*', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Vol 18, No 3/4 (September-December 2006), pp.298-300.

⁸ Igor Chafarévitch: *La Russophobie*, Eds Chapitre Douze, 1993, pp.262-4. My translation from the French translation.

⁹ Michael Scammell: *Solzhenitsyn*, London, Paladin Books, 1986, p.907, quoting *Le Monde*, 12 April 1975.

¹⁰ *Esquisses d'exil*, t.2, p.428, quoting the article in *Commentary*, 1 Feb 1985. My translation from the French. The original is available in English in the internet at the *Commentary* website behind a pay wall.

¹¹ Saraskina, p.888.

¹² Richard Pipes: 'Solzhenitsyn and the Jews revisited', *New Republic*, 25 November, 2002.

Wilson John Haire

(Reminder: *Las Vegas* is Spanish for The Meadows)

And Now The Meadows

the prairie
the everglade
the desert sand
the mountain
the orchard of fruit
and berry
Indian hunters
raid
in bands
red the hot spring
as fountain
born
the weaponised mind
blind
the retailer framed
mentally ill
triumphant
the wholesaler
as
president
shrill
in his son-of-a-bitch
trill

October, 2017

Manus O'Riordan

'Paper Of Record' Celebrations Of The British Crusader Occupation of Jerusalem And Its Zionist Project

The Lisa Richards Agency—self-described as "*Ireland's leading talent agency*"—promotes one of its "*star*" clients as follows:

"Ronan McGreevy is an *Irish Times* journalist and videographer. He is the author of *Wherever the Firing Line Extends: Ireland and the Western Front*. He is the editor of *Was it for This: Reflections on the Easter Rising*, an anthology of commentary on the Easter Rising from the pages of *The Irish Times*. It was published by *The Irish Times* and *Ireland 2016*. He is the editor of *Centenary*, the forthcoming official State book on the Easter Rising commemorations. He is the editor of two eBooks based on *The Irish Times* archives: *'Twas Better to Die: The Irish Times and Gallipoli 1915-2015* and *The Mad Guns: Reflections on the Battle of the Somme 1916-2016*."

On 4th December 2017, the *Irish Times* published McGreevy's *Irishman's Diary* / British imperialist celebration of the capture of Jerusalem in December 1917, with the following opening paragraphs typifying his mindset:

"One hundred years ago this week, Gen Edmund Allenby of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force entered the captured city of Jerusalem. It was the culmination of a month-long campaign known as the Third Battle of Gaza. Allenby entered the holy city on foot, an act of humility and in contrast to Kaiser Wilhelm II who had entered the city on a white charger almost 20 years previously. For the first time in 400 years, Jerusalem was in Christian hands. Everybody understood the momentous and potentially delicate nature of the occasion. British newspapers, the British War Office and Allenby himself were warned not to describe it as a 'crusade', given the pejorative nature of that word in the Muslim world. Nevertheless, the British press referred to it as that. Conscious of the need not to be seen as an invader, Allenby promised 'every sacred building, monument, holy spot, shrine, traditional site, endowment, pious bequest, or customary place of prayer of whatsoever form of the three religions will be maintained and protected according to the existing customs and beliefs of those to whose faith they are sacred'."

"The capture of Jerusalem stunned a weary British public. For them 1917 had been a dreadful year culminating in the debacle of Passchendaele. The battle of Cambrai which followed afterwards had early successes, but ended ultimately in failure. Italy had almost fallen. The Bolsheviks had begun the process of withdrawing Russia from the war. The French had mutinied. Little wonder the British prime minister David Lloyd George called the capture of Jerusalem '*an early Christmas present for the British people*'. **A month previously the British government had issued the Balfour Declaration pledging its support for a homeland in Palestine for the Jewish people—a decision which is as pertinent today as it was then.** (My emphasis—MO'R). Neither the Ottoman Turks nor the British wanted to be responsible for shelling a city sacred to half the world's population at the time. The 10th (Irish) Division were among the vanguard of the force that captured Jerusalem. After the debacle of Gallipoli in 1915, the division was sent to Salonika where it had a relatively quiet time. That ended in September 1917 when it was sent to Alexandria in Egypt in preparation for the coming offensive in Palestine. This mixed division, evenly divided between Catholics and Protestants, was united by the piety of all the men who were conscious that they were now in biblical lands.

"In late October and early November 1917 Allenby's troops captured Gaza and Beersheeba, the latter being a town founded by Abraham, the father of the Jewish faith. The capture of Gaza was assigned to Dublin man Gen Edward Bulfin the commander of XXI Corps and the highest-ranking Irish Catholic in the British Army during the war. Previous offensives in Gaza had foundered on the lack of the most basic commodity—water. The capture of the wells at Beersheeba by the Irish was a vital logistical exercise. The way was then clear for the assault on Jerusalem. The city, which has been fought over for millennia, fell after a single day. Instead of attacking Jerusalem, Allenby's men surrounded it, and its Ottoman defenders fled north. Two days later Allenby entered Jerusalem..."

"JERUSALEM IN OUR HANDS" was the headline in the *Irish Times* on 11th December 1917, and its editorial, entitled "*Jerusalem Delivered*", began:

"In the year 1517 the Sultan Selim captured Jerusalem; the year 1917 has redeemed it from the Turk. Mr. Bonar Law (leader of the Conservative and Unionist Party) announced in the House of Commons yesterday that General Allenby's masterly operations in Palestine have been crowned by the occupation of the Holy City... On Sunday '*the Holy City, thus isolated, was surrendered to General Allenby*'. In these bald words is recorded not merely the successful conclusion of a most daring and skilful use of arms, but the closing of an old chapter and the opening of a new chapter in the history of European civilisation... The whole Empire will endorse the King's congratulations to the gallant soldier who has succeeded David, Antiochus, Titus, and Selim as conqueror of Jerusalem. We cannot claim General Allenby as an Irishman, but we may be proud that he owes his training to the Inniskilling Dragoons and the 5th Royal Irish Lancers..."

The editorial in the London *Times* on that same December 11th was similarly entitled "*The Deliverance of Jerusalem*". Its reproduction online by the *Times* this past November 2nd came with the subheading "*Today General Allenby makes his entry into the city, and his entry means that the yoke of the Turk is broken for ever.*" It was quite extravagant in its ecstatic expression of Crusader zeal:

"The deliverance of Jerusalem, though its influence on the war may be relatively remote, must remain for all time a most memorable event in the history of Christendom. Wherever the Gospel has been preached it has been in all ages the most sacred spot upon earth to countless millions. There the Divine Author of their faith taught the great truths which are the well-spring of all that is holiest and best in civilization, and there He suffered and died. For well-nigh thirteen centuries it has remained, with relatively brief intervals, in Musulman hands, and for 400 years Turkish Sultans have been its lords. To Moslem, too, it is a holy place, though the tradition of its sanctity is no longer a living force among them in India and in the outer world. For the Jews, on the other hand, whatever may be the land of their exile, its memories are imperishable. To them it has always remained the providential home of their race and the earthly centre of their

ancient and venerable religion. Today General Allenby makes his entry into the city, and his entry means that the yoke of the Turk is broken for ever. The Sultan will dominate the Holy Places no more; the scattered Jews will have a prospect of returning as a free people to their national home, and a new order will be established, founded upon the ideals of righteousness and of justice..."

"The fall of Jerusalem, whatever its military importance, marks the latest stage in a singularly brilliant and successful campaign. It is a sign that the tyranny of the Turk is doomed and that the dawn of a new freedom is rising over his dominions. To all whom he oppresses—to Greeks and Armenians, to Arabs, Jews, and to Syrians—it is an augury of deliverance. The commanders of the French and Italian contingents and the head of the French political mission will accompany General Allenby in the ceremony of to-day. Their presence is a symbol of the unity of the Allies, but it also recalls with particular appropriateness one aspect of the struggle which they jointly wage. It has often been said that this war is in truth a crusade for human liberties, and France and Italy of all countries were the lands of the old Crusaders. We, too, played a brilliant part in that wonderful and complex contest between East and West. The countrymen of Richard Coeur de Lion and of Edward I dealt many a stout stroke in the struggle. It was France who furnished the largest number of efficient warriors; it was her sons chiefly who founded and maintained the Latin kingdoms; it was she who oftenest renewed the struggle, and it is her children who have left us the best contemporary accounts of its more striking episodes..."

"The Crusades did much to renew the intercourse between East and West which had been interrupted by the rise of the Mahomedan power. But Jerusalem was performing that function in other ways from the first Christian centuries. It has been for Christians as for Jews the city of pilgrimage. The Mahomedans themselves made pilgrimages to it instead of to Mecca, when that place had been seized by the Karmathians... But the 'City of David' was venerable and famous long before the birth of Christ. Egyptian Pharaohs, Assyrian kings, and Persian monarchs laid it desolate, but it was always reared anew. Alexander, Pompey, Titus, and Hadrian all made war upon it. Saladin entered it in triumph as General Allenby enters it today. In Christian literature and art it has been the type of the '*urbs caelestis*', of the '*new Jerusalem*' of the '*City of God*', of '*The wondrous fane*

angelical Whose only bounds are Light and Love'."

Two days later, on 13th December 1917, the London *Times* editorial was entitled "*The British in Jerusalem*", and its online reproduction this November 2nd came with the subheading "*Unlike the bombastic and spectacular entry of the German Emperor—who rode into the city in the theatrical guise of a conqueror—General Allenby and his companions were on foot*". It opened:

"The dispatch from General Allenby which was read yesterday by the Prime Minister to the House of Commons is an earnest of the spirit in which the British occupation of Jerusalem and the control of the Holy Places will be organized. The British Commander made his entry accompanied by the Commanders of the French and Italian detachments and the Military Attaches of France, Italy, and the United States. Unlike the bombastic and spectacular entry of the German Emperor—who, though in reality a Cook's tourist, rode into the city in the theatrical guise of a conqueror, and proceeded to preach a political sermon in a German church—General Allenby and his companions were on foot, and made no effort to impress the imagination of spectators. No effort was needed... In its essence it is a vindication of Christianity. At a moment when Christendom is torn by strife, let loose through the apostate ambitions of those who have returned in practice to the sanguinary worship of their 'Old German god', it stands forth as a sign that the righteousness and justice that are the soul of Christian ethics guide Christian victors even in the flush of triumph."

"*General Allenby's Entry*" was the heading of the *Irish Times* editorial that same December 13th, which waxed enthusiastically about King Henry II's previous occupation of Jerusalem, in the wake of his earlier, 1169, invasion of Ireland:

"On St. Patrick's Day, 1185, the Patriarch Heraclius gave the keys of Jerusalem to King Henry II, with the words: 'In thee alone, after God, do the people of the land put their trust'. Once more, after seven hundred years, an English king holds the keys of Jerusalem. General Allenby entered the city at noon on Tuesday. His account of the ceremony, which the Prime Minister read in Parliament yesterday, shows that the captor of Jerusalem is not only a brilliant soldier, but a great gentleman. In 1898 the Emperor of Germany, visited Jerusalem, with the nominal objective of opening a new

church, but really as a commercial traveller in the interest of German trade. He wore the mantle of a Crusader, adorned with a large red cross... He caused a portion of the city's ancient wall to be destroyed in order that his carriage might have free passage. He preached a sermon on the Mount of Olives. In a word, the Kaiser, when visiting the most sacred spot on earth, behaved with the taste of a Nero and the folly of a Caligula. His conduct will help us, perhaps, to understand the German explanation of the Turkish evacuation of Jerusalem. '*No nation which believes in God*', we are told by the sackers of Louvain and the wreckers of Rheims, '*wishes the sacred soil to be the scene of bloody battles*'. General Allenby's entry into Jerusalem was the simplest, as it was surely the noblest, that a conqueror has ever made into that city of many conquests. It was humble, as became Christians in passing through gates that had been darkened by the shadow of Christ. It was made without pomp by men who were bringing to the remnant of an ancient people not a sword, but peace. Jerusalem had been won by British valour, but General Allenby was careful to show that Britain holds its traditions and its treasures in trust for the whole of civilisation. The procession was made on foot. The British General was attended by representatives of France, Italy, and the United States. The guard at the Jaffa Gate included soldiers from Ireland, New Zealand, India, France, and Italy. We are told that the population gave the conqueror a good reception, and, indeed, he had taken the utmost pains to deserve it... While, as a military incident, the capture of Jerusalem is not very important, its political importance is great and far-reaching. At Jerusalem, as at Bagdad, the British entry is the triumphant vanguard of a new civilisation. Everywhere the Turk is reeling under our blows... The little Army which entered Jerusalem on Tuesday has written a great chapter in the history of the world."

At this point I should return to the *Irish Times* editorial of two days previously, of 11th December 1917, with its unabashed and enthusiastic exposition of British Imperialist plans for the Middle East:

"The occupation of Jerusalem by British troops is an event of the highest importance not only for the historian, but for the statesmen of all the belligerent Powers... Today there will also be a movement of spiritual exaltation among millions of Jews, bond or free, English or German, throughout the

globe. Only on a few occasions in the last two thousand years have the Jews of all countries thought and felt in unison, and on all those occasions it has been a unison of sorrow. Today it will be a unison of hope and joy. An event which inspires Christians and Jews with a common and profound emotion is an event of the utmost spiritual moment; and since that event is a British victory the common emotion is not only confirmation of the righteousness of the Allied cause, but an augury of its success... **The fall of Jerusalem is not only important, but supremely important. In the words of Colonel Sir Mark Sykes, 'a great positive' in a war which, hitherto, has resulted chiefly in negatives. The British Government has given its official approval and sympathy to the reconstitution of a Jewish State in Palestine. Lord Robert Cecil has said that a Jewish Palestine will be the first constructive effort in the new settlement of the world after the war. Out of three thousand years of life Jerusalem can claim only five hundred during she was a free, independent capital, and the centre of a national religion. Today she is again free, and has England's promise—which implies the promise of all England's allies—that she shall be the capital of an independent Palestine and a spiritual centre for the whole of Jewry. The words which we have quoted from Sir Mark Sykes were used in a speech at Manchester, on Sunday, to a gathering of Jews who had met to thank the British Government for their new charter of nationality.** It was a speech of such breadth and vision as proclaims him one of the ablest of our younger statesmen. He pointed out that a Jewish Palestine postulates a Jewish, Armenian and Arab *Entente*. Between them these three races, emancipated by the downfall of Turkey, will 'possess manpower, virgin soil, petroleum, and brains'. In 1950 the Mesopotamian canal system will have been reconstructed; Syria will be the granary of Europe; Bagdad and Damascus will be as big as Manchester. This is the British plan of freedom for Turkey in Asia. The German plan is the maintenance on the necks of **superior races** of the brutal yoke of the Turk, vulgarised by the grim mechanics of German industrialism. The capture of Jerusalem is a symbol of the coming victory of liberty over slavery throughout the immemorial East. It strengthens that faith in the greatness of our human destiny which was given to mankind by the ancient message 'from the direction of Bethlehem.'

The emphases above are all mine. Mark Sykes had been co-author of the infamous *Sykes-Picot Agreement*—that secret 1916 agreement between the United Kingdom and France to which Tsarist Russia assented. The agreement defined their mutually agreed spheres of influence and control in Southwestern Asia. The agreement was based on the premise that the Triple Entente would succeed in defeating the Ottoman Empire during World War I. The negotiations leading to the agreement occurred between November 1915 and March 1916 and it was signed 16th May 1916.

Following Russia's Bolshevik Revolution the dirty deal was exposed to the public in *Izvestia* and *Pravda* on 3rd November 1917, and reported in the British *Guardian* on 26th November 1917. It laid the foundations for chaos and conflict in the Middle East.

The agreement allocated to Britain control of areas roughly comprising the coastal strip between the Mediterranean Sea and the River Jordan, Jordan,

southern Iraq, and an additional area that included the ports of Haifa and Acre. France was to get control of southeastern Turkey, northern Iraq, Syria and Lebanon. Tsarist Russia was to get Istanbul, the Turkish Straits and Armenia. The controlling Powers would be left free to determine state boundaries within their areas. Further negotiation was expected to determine international administration in the "brown area" (an area including Jerusalem, similar to and smaller than Mandate Palestine). But, of course, Britain conquered the whole of Palestine, and in November 1917 it issued its *Balfour Declaration* in favour of Zionism.

In his address to that Manchester Zionist audience, Sykes made explicit what was implicit in British Imperialism's Balfour Declaration—the creation of a Zionist State over the whole of Palestine, with Jerusalem as its capital. And with its own belief in "superior races", the *Irish Times* cheered Sykes on.

Report

Roger Cohen visited the Palestinian city of Hebron

Hebron—Holy City Of Sterile Streets

"The Israeli soldier stands at the entrance to Shuhada Street. The street is deserted, its stores shuttered, doors welded shut. The old center of Hebron has been a ghost town for many years. The Israel Defense Forces refer to "tzir sterili", or sterile roads, because no Palestinian is allowed on them, whether in a car or on foot.

The occupation of the West Bank is a half-century old....

If there's an endpoint to the terrible logic of an occupation driven in part by a fanatical settler movement abetted by the state of Israel, that place is the historic center of Hebron. Once home to the souk and jewelry market, a bustling maze of commerce, it is now a stretch of apocalyptic real estate. Wires trail down crumbling walls. Garbage accumulates. Mingling is obliterated. Security demands separation....

I was last here in 2004. It's gotten worse. I wrote then: "Every loss is nursed, proof of the irremediable barbarism of the enemy. The past is pored over, an immense repository of spilt blood that justifies more bloodshed." Hebron, home to about 215,000 Palestinians, and about 8,000

settlers between adjacent Kiryat Arba and the city itself, festers. The status quo is not static. Everybody knows there will another explosion. Nobody knows when.

There's the boom of stun grenades in the distance. Palestinian kids have been throwing stones; the Israel Defense Forces respond. The soldier is waiting for a call from his commander. Until he gets it, we cannot pass.

I stand at the checkpoint with Yehuda Shaul, who served in the infantry in Hebron and later became a founder of *Breaking the Silence*, an advocacy group that collects testimonies from former Israeli soldiers troubled by their service. Shaul's a well-known figure in Hebron. He calls a lawyer for his organization. A half-hour later, we are allowed to proceed.

Abraham is buried in Hebron. He is the first patriarch to the Jews. For Muslims, he's a prophet called Ibrahim and a model for humankind. To settlers, this is the first Jewish city in the biblical hills of Judea. To the Palestinian majority, this is their centuries-old home under relentless Israeli military occupation.

Shaul says. "The view is that between the river and the sea there is room for one state only, so it better be us." Inevitably, the settlers, however extreme, become a vehicle of this strategic aim.

New York Times, extract, January 20

V
O
X

**Prostitution In Cork
Donegal Under George III
Papal Decluttering?**

P
A
T

Prostitution In Cork

"In February, 1848, I visited Ireland, and spent several weeks in the city of Cork. Richard Dowdon, the late Mayor, kindly gave me a note of introduction to the officials of all the principal public institutions in the city, and thus rendered the visits not only more pleasant but useful. After calling at the Police Office, the City Jail, the County Prison, the Union Workhouse, the Lunatic Asylum, and the Foundling Institution, I had a brief interview with the Catholic Bishop of Cork. [Bishop David Walsh] The reverend gentleman received me very courteously, and cordially granted me permission to visit St. Vincent's Magdalene Asylum.

This institution is under the patronage of the Bishop, and is entirely managed by the Sisters of Charity—a class of ladies who visit the sick, relieve the poor, &c. The Sister to whom I was introduced, by an obliging priest, evidently took a deep interest in the restoration of unfortunate females, and a more intelligent lady I never conversed with on the subject. Speaking of the causes of the evil, she referred particularly to intemperance and love of dress, and spoke in strong terms against late dancing parties, some of which were occasionally held in the temperance rooms in the city. After leaving St. Vincent's, I visited the Cork Refuge and Penitentiary. This institution is chiefly, if not wholly, supported by Protestants.

Before leaving the city, Alderman Roche introduced me to a philanthropic gentleman, who furnished me with a valuable paper on the subject of prostitution. There is, perhaps, not one in the county more favourably situated for obtaining authentic information on this question. He thus writes—

"It appears by the census returns, taken by the constabulary in 1841, that the city of Cork contained within the borough bounds, a population, in round numbers, of 80,000 persons, 35,000 of

whom were males, and 45,000 females. There were 85 regular brothels in the city, in which there were 356 public prostitutes. In addition to the 356, there are at least 100 which are termed 'privateers', who have not yet turned out to the streets, but are living in private lodgings. The class of persons from whom prostitutes are supplied, are generally low dressmakers and servants; manure collectors, who are sent very young to the streets for the purpose, have also furnished their quota; poverty, vicious habits, idleness, ambition for dress, together with the seductive arts of what are termed 'procuresses', are the great causes of prostitution.

A large number of procuresses abounds in this city, without any visible means of subsistence but that of betraying innocent virtue into the hands of vile seducers; and, for which services, they are generally amply remunerated by their employers, who feel no remorse for the miseries they entail upon their innocent victims, but rather glory in their shame, and publicly boast of their triumphs.

In many instances sisters reside together, and mutually support their parents and relatives by the wages of prostitution. Individuals have also been known to tender their daughters and other relatives to brothel-keepers for money. A man, named M., residing at C., in 1841, voluntarily offered his daughter for £3.

There is scarcely an instance in which virtuous females *first* resorted to the streets, but were almost invariably previously seduced; they afterwards, for some time, continued what termed 'privateers', but eventually become degraded and turn to the streets. Prostitutes are not received into the superior brothels, except upon a sort of recommendation from another of the same class. If it is known that any of them had been on the streets, they are never afterwards received into these houses. They pay their mistress about 8s, a week for their board; their surplus earnings are appropriated to their own use. Some of them are known to have saved

money, and the keeper of one brothel is at this moment supposed to be possessed of a sum exceeding £500.

The age of prostitutes in this city varies from sixteen to thirty years; although one individual, seduced at the age of eleven, turned to the streets immediately after, has continued so since, and is now twenty-five years of age. Few, however, if any of them, reach the prescribed term of human existence. Violent deaths, disease, and constitutions prematurely worn out generally consign them to an early grave'...." (*The Great Social Evil: Its Causes; Extent, Results, and Remedies* by William Logan, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1871)

Donegal Under George III

Of the Irish Catholics Charles O' Connor wrote:

"The constant degradation lowered them in their own estimation, and rendered them crouching and pusillanimous. Sorrow and dejection were stamped in their foreheads; their timid gait and cautious reserve marked their abject condition. They did not dare to look a protestant in the face, they avoided the side of the street he walked, just as the slave evades the countenance of the master" (Charles O'Connor, 1764-1828).

Charles O'Connor (1764-1828), was grandson of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare. Educated at Rome, where he was ordained a priest. In 1792 he was appointed Parish Priest of Kilkeevan, four years later he published a memoir of his grandfather, *Memoirs of the life and writings of the late Charles O'Connor*. This edition was suppressed as being dangerous to the family, and the Manuscript of a second volume was burned by the author.

Papal Decluttering?

Pope Francis in his New Year's Day message has recommended jettisoning life's "*useless baggage*" in 2018, including what he called "*empty chatter*" and banal consumerism, and focusing instead on building a peaceful and welcoming world, particularly for refugees and migrants.

Francis said we should—

"...keep our freedom from being corroded by the banality of consumerism, the blare of commercials, the stream of empty words and the overpowering waves of empty chatter and loud shouting".

The poor man spends too much time watching RTE!