

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

England : Ireland : Popery

Irish Rights, Wrongs and Realities

Human Rights and Brexit

Arklow War Industry?

Solzhenitsyn

Sommetry

O'Connell Biography

Editorial

England : Ireland : Popery

It is only forty-five years since this magazine, at the outset of its career, gave offence by publishing a series of articles under the title, *The Rise Of Papal Power In Ireland*. It found favour with neither the Church nor the stratum of furtively anti-clerical journalists in Dublin. The Church Hierarchy did not wish to be subjected to historical understanding, and the anti-clerics had careers to attend to and they judged it best to maintain a public silence about matters on which they felt deeply in private.

The message of *The Rise Of Papal Power* was that it was a mushroom growth of the 1850s. It was new, brash and brittle. It has now collapsed—leaving what heritage behind it?

There is an English idea that Ireland is obsessed with its history. It would be a bad thing for England if Ireland was even moderately interested in understanding how it had come to be what it is. There is far too much English input of a certain kind into Irish history for England to be complacent about it now, in the era of the European Union and Brexit.

England lives in English history, while advocating cosmopolitanism for others. That is why there is Brexit. England does not intend to be nondescript European in a Europe of vigorously alive nationalities. It is not a nationality in the European sense. It sacrificed its national *joie de vivre* to the business of world conquest. It disciplined itself, Puritanised itself, re-constructed itself for the purpose of "*teaching the nations how to live*"—as Cromwell's Secretary of State, John Milton, put it. It set out to save the world from its abhorrent frivolities, most of which were generated by the idolatrous levity of Rome. And it came remarkably close to succeeding.

Its false step was its unnecessary war on Germany. But it was a step it had to take. It understood itself in racial terms and classified itself as being of German stock. But the Germans, from being fragmented in 50 petty kingdoms at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, had constructed themselves into a nation state in response to the French invasion of Prussia in 1870, and had become a rival by 1900—not a major rival yet, but one that needed to be dealt with soon.

But England dealt with the Boers first. It conquered the Boer Republics and was immensely proud of itself. The Boers were close to being of first rate stock. They were Dutch, and therefore almost German. There was great satisfaction in beating a people of the first rank after all those wars to subdue Fuzzy Wuzzies and the like. So England looked forward with confidence to the final war that would end war by making England supreme—and undermined itself because the Germans, with less than half a century of statehood behind them, proved to be all too German.

England did win the War, but it was not quite itself anymore after all that had been necessary to win it.

The world became complicated for it. It was not alone with its inexorable will any more, and it did not like not being alone.

Doubting itself in the chaotic world it brought about by the Great War, it resorted to a makeshift foreign policy in which it helped the Nazi regime to restore Germany to the status of a European Power, and then suddenly made war on it again. That second War brought about the end of the Empire within a generation. England was a spider without a web. And the shattered states of Europe formed themselves into an economic combination that was intended to become political. An element in that European will to combine was a determination that England should never again be able to play balance-of-power politics against European states.

Edward Heath, a petty-bourgeois Tory with experience in the winding up of the Empire, appears to have been genuinely of the opinion that Britain's future was to be a European nation state. Europe, disarmed by his manner, accepted his application for membership of the Common Market. His successor, after a period of Labour government that did not quite know what it thought about Europe, was Margaret Thatcher, who was gripped by the vision of separate English destiny. But the most striking thing in that line was the question asked by Roy Jenkins, a senior Labour Party leader: *Were the glorious thousand years at an end?*

Communist Russia, having been invaded by Germany, Italy and Finland, with contributions from many other countries, and having broken German power, took control of Eastern Europe in a form that has been described both as liberation and conquest. (The matter is delicate and has prevented the European Union from producing a historical account of its origins.) That set limits to the expansion of the EU until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990. And it was about then that the London *Times* reviewed the situation editorially and observed that European political development was endangering Britain's existence by depriving it of the possibility of the balance-of-power policy towards Europe on which it had oriented itself for so many centuries.

The message was that it was necessary to curb European political development and restore a national structure in Europe. And that is what the Tory Party has been working towards ever since.

Amidst all the bric-a-brac of current affairs, a national will has been operative in British politics. It grinds on relentlessly, periodically bringing the Tory Party to what seems to be the brink of disintegration. And political dispute has a long backward reach. As this is being written it hinges on the action of Robert Peel in 1848.

England lives in its history. It draws on it for purposes of the moment. It sometimes misrepresents it brazenly. But it is all kept there for use as a medium of thought. England mulls itself over. It knows itself. It is capable of purposeful action in the long term because it has memory.

There is living memory, and there is historical memory. In English culture the one blends in with the other. Living memory is historically shaded: there is no *tabula rasa* of a detached present.

In public life in Ireland today there is not even living memory. A short lifetime is too long to be remembered.

What use is memory anyway? All that needs to be known about the past—which is the whole of time up to yesterday, or the day before at most—is that it was dreadful and must be denounced, without being too mindful of what it is that is being denounced.

The past was a dreadful mistake, so why poison your mind with it?

Pleasant thoughts in the present are all that should occupy the mind.

Does Mary McAleese remember what she was yesterday? She is now intent on abolishing the religion in which she was an activist not long ago.

Viewing what she was then from the vantage point of what she is in this fleeting moment, should she not denounce herself for having been a spiritual terrorist?

She now condemns the normal Catholic practice of two thousand years—and they were not only Catholic practices—in terms that used to be reserved for Communist Russia or Nazi Germany. Infant baptism is enslavement to a cult.

The child should be allowed to grow up without religion so that he (it?) can discover what its religion is.

There is an anecdote about the Emperor Charlemagne. He wondered what the natural human language was and he arranged for some children to be brought up without having any language imposed on them in order to discover what language would come out of them. (Of course there was none.)

Human beings come about by being immersed in customary practices from the moment of birth. If customary practices were not imposed on them, they would not become human beings. And there is no ground to suppose that there is any particular variety of customary practice that is particularly in tune with the infant's potential to become human.

The Irish in the 1950s and 1960s baptised their children, ate fish on Fridays, went to Mass on Sundays, made secret Confessions once a year, and took Communion occasionally according to an impressive ritual. That way of life was not experienced as oppressive. But a culture has now been generated which requires that it should be experienced retrospectively as having been oppressive.

Granting that the Irish were intolerably oppressed for a century and a half by a misogynistic, authoritarian, human-hating Roman Church—contemporary intolerance obliges us to grant that—where did this dreadful Church get the power to invade us and terrorise us into submission to its abhorrent doctrines and practices?

Stalin asked: *How many Divisions has the Pope?* The answer, of course, was, *Not one!*

William of Orange had many Divisions. And he had the support of the Pope of Rome. And he imposed an authoritarian Church on us by force of arms: the Anglican Church; the branch of the Church of England that was called the *Church of Ireland*. And that Anglican Church saw us as idolatrous savages, and it took upon itself the burden of oppressing and tormenting us into becoming civilised. (There was nothing paradoxical in that. It was the way of the world, and of the Reformationist world, that became a world force in the form of the British Empire, most of all.)

The Anglican Church monopolised military, political and economic power in Ireland for more than a century. And it failed utterly to gain purchase on the population beyond the limits of its monopolies. It had Trinity College on the site of a monastic foundation, and Tithes, and Estates, and Livings galore, and commissions in the Army, and a vast propaganda apparatus, but its impact on the idolatrous Irish was negligible

To page 4

Contents

	Page
England : Ireland : Popery	
Editorial	2
The Atrocity Victims Pope Francis Forgot	
Tim O'Sullivan (Letter to the Editor)	6
A Change To Birth Certs	
(Report of Juliet Holmes Letter)	7
Irish Rights, Wrongs And Realities	
Brendan Clifford	8
Vox Pat by Pat Maloney	
Belloc; Irish Universities; Maureen O'Carroll; Gay Neighbours; Church for Sale; Deportations; Asylum-Seekers; 1786; If You're Irish . . . ; John Francis D'Alton; Evolution By Selection; Marian Anderson; Holidays!	
Spoiled Brats of Europe	15, 19,32
A Grieve Observed	
Stephen Richards (Part 2)	17
First World War Munitions Production	
—the Irish experience	
Eamon Dyas	20
Solzhenitsyn's Two Centuries Together	
The Derzhavin Memorandum	
<i>Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin</i> <i>And The Russian Question.</i> Part 10	
Peter Brooke	21
Daniel O'Connell (Part 6)	
Jules Gondon's Biography. 1847	
Cathy Winch (First English Translation)	27
Enthusiastic Sommetry!	
Manus O'Riordan	30
Re-Routing Old Injuries!	
Wilson John Haire (Poem)	31

Part 15 of John Minahane's
The Spanish Polemic on Colonisation
will appear in the next issue

Some web addresses for associated sites—

Athol Books:

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

The Heresiarch:

<http://heresiarch.org>

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

beyond the sphere of physical exploitation.

The liberation of the Irish from Anglican thralldom began when the English Parliament bought out the exclusive Parliament of its Irish colony in 1800. Shorn of its own independent political power in Ireland, the Anglican colony that had refused to act as a centre of Irish national development began to wither.

A system of strict religious sectarianism in the governing of Ireland began when the Glorious Revolution of 1688 imposed itself on Ireland in 1690. For more than a century thereafter the Anglican Church was an apparatus of the Protestant State in the Protestant Kingdom of Ireland.

Various Protestant monopolies remained in being from 1801 to 1829, but the demolition by the British Parliament of the separate and independent Protestant State in Ireland in 1800 increased the freedom of action of the Catholic population considerably.

Because Britain oppressed the Irish as Catholics, the Irish had to free themselves as Catholics. That was a necessity imposed by English sectarianising of politics.

Substantial Protestant monopolies remained in Ireland after Catholics were admitted to Parliament in 1829. These might conceivably have been tackled within British party politics if O'Connell—who had begun as an English Whig utilitarian—had taken the enfranchised Catholics into Whig politics. But he didn't. And it is not surprising, in the light of continuing Protestant saturation of English political rhetoric, that he didn't.

He transferred the momentum of the Catholic Emancipation movement into a national movement against the Union.

In the course of the next sixty years, tithes were abolished; the Anglican Church in Ireland was dis-Established, Local Government was made representative; and the Williamite land expropriation began to be phased out.

The Catholic Church—which was made a subversive institution of the populace by the terms of the Williamite/Hanoverian system—played a part in these developments, but it was not by any means the moving force in them.

And it was in common usage the Catholic Church, not the Roman Catholic Church. It was always 'Roman' to

Protestants because it was not nationalist like the Anglican Church. And yet, what made it most objectionable was that it actually was Irish nationalist and Whitehall attempts to get Rome to use its authority against its Irish nationalist tendency always failed.

The Anglican Church was a State institution directed by the Government. The Roman Church had no State to be an instrument of—not until it got the minuscule Vatican State in the 20th century. It was a cosmopolitan body made up of a great variety of peoples, bound by Treaties with many states, and having a great number of semi-autonomous Religious Orders within it. It was in no position to give instructions to its component parts and enforce them, as a State Church such as the Anglican might do.

In European states Roman spiritual authority over the local Catholic church was limited by Treaty (*Concordat*). In Ireland the Stuart monarchy was the political authority that was intermediary between the Church in Ireland and Rome. When the Stuarts were overthrown in 1688, Rome continued that relationship with the Stuart Pretenders.

It was really only in 1829 that the Catholic Church in Ireland became Roman, in the sense of coming directly under the authority of the Pope, without any intervening conditions imposed by the State.

In 1808 Henry Grattan, who had failed to persuade the Irish Parliament to be the centre of an authentic Irish national development, proposed at Westminster that Catholics should be admitted to Parliament, on the condition that the Government should have a veto on the appointment of Catholic Bishops. This would have meant that the Pope would not appoint priests to which Whitehall had political objections to be Bishops. There was nothing unusual in the proposal. It would have established normal relations between the Church in Ireland and Rome. The Irish Catholic Hierarchy had already agreed to it.

But the Dublin Catholic middle class rose up in protest against it. The measure was killed. The dispute amongst Catholics about it ran on into the 1820s. British politics became more aggressively Protestant with the development of the middle class franchise reform movement and would not soil its hands by having negotiations with Rome. And so, when it became necessary to admit

Catholics to Parliament in 1829, it was done unconditionally.

It was not until twenty years later, with the appointment of Cardinal Cullen, that systematic streamlining of the Irish Church in accordance with the Roman ideal began. And against this there arose an anti-Cullen literature, and the lax practices that had developed under the Penal Laws continued in many areas until Vatican 2 in the 1960s.

Now, what power had Cullen to enforce these changes? Nothing but the power of public opinion. The 'Famine' had removed half the population and shocked the remaining half into purposeful activity with a view to survival.

Survival required discipline, and Cullen's reforms were one of the means by which the population disciplined itself—and destroyed the great hopes that the Government placed on its engineered 'Famine'.

Strange as it must appear to Mary McAleese and Mary Lou McDonald, self-discipline can be a source of satisfaction.

Cardinal Cullen was not the agent of any external power. He brought no power with him, except the power of exhortation. His message was received more or less, here and there, according as the need of it was felt.

The social mechanism of Gaelic Ireland had been broken by repeated English conquest and then by the intentionally destructive action of the Penal Laws.

A writer in the Veto dispute, Theobald McKenna, who was Secretary of the Catholic Committee around 1790, when the Committee itself set limits to the authority of Rome, contributed some pamphlets in 1808 to the Veto controversy, as a Vetoist (meaning that he accepted that the British Government might veto Papal choices of Bishops). In one of them, *Views Of The Catholic Question*, he summed up in a vivid sentence the social condition to which the populace had been reduced by the action of the governing system: "*We multiplied like the cattle on the coast of South America, by neglect and plenty*".

The "*plenty*" was produced by the potato patch that kept body and soul together, and fed the pig who paid the rent.

"*The potato*", he wrote, "*is probably*

an inadequate diet for a healthy and hard working man, but it answers well for that period of life in which there is no obligation to labour". And what purpose was there in labour under the rack-rent system? So the Irish bred rapidly in short generations.

The "neglect" was ensured by social surgery. The Army of the merged Irish/Norman nobility, that defied the Glorious Revolution, was finally bottled up in Limerick by the Williamites, and it agreed to take itself off to France and Austria in exchange for guarantees, quickly broken, that the new regime would be tolerant.

The emergence of a Catholic middle class was prevented by law. The structure of the Church was criminalised. Land owned by Catholics could be "discovered" and seized by Protestants. Until 1760 there was an official presumption that the King had no Catholic subjects. In 1760 a new King agreed to receive a Catholic Petition of Loyalty but the Penal Laws continued to the ending of the Protestant independence of Ireland, and beyond.

Pearse, a century after McKenna, summed up the history of the 19th century as "*The desperate attempt of a mob to realise itself as a nation*". It was O'Connell who raised the social wreckage described by McKenna to the status of a mob.

England today does not want nationalist Ireland to have any historical sense of itself, and therefore it tells it that it is unhealthily obsessed with history and should drop it. And the demoralisation of Fianna Fail under the leadership of Jack Lynch, combined with a very effective English patronage system in Ireland, has made academia in Ireland comprehensively subordinate to English academic interest. (England is an effective democratic State of which its Universities form a part.)

The German philosopher, Schopenhauer analysed the world in terms of Will and Idea. He described music as an art which is a direct expression of the Will. And it seems today that Irish national will exists almost exclusively in music, and is bereft of ideas.

Intellect operates on national culture destructively. It is merely destructive. It does not modify what it criticises, leaving it still functional. The word "*Humanist*" is used, but the actual tendency is *Nihilist*.

There was a disagreement between Haughey and Conor Cruise O'Brien about Liberalism in the *Sunday Press*—a publication which has been destroyed Nihilistically. Haughey asserted that there could be no such thing as Liberalism as a general condition of social existence. He argued that O'Brien was presenting it as a substance when it could only be a mode of a substance. O'Brien's subsequent career bore out Haughey's criticism. It now seems to be conceded by the very few who think about such things in contemporary Ireland that O'Brien was a sham, though Haughey is not given the credit for seeing it when it was a live issue.

(Insofar as Liberalism ever existed as a substance it was as a name for *laissez-faire* capitalism. The Whig Party, after the 1832 Reform which enfranchised the capitalist middle classes, changed its name to the Liberal Party. And for about seventy years it stood, against the Tories, for unrestricted capitalist freedom.)

Erasmus is often referred to as a great European Humanist. But he was not a Humanist but a Catholic. His Humanism was a mode of his Catholicism, and it not deny that other modes were legitimate, and least of all did it try to detach the mode from the substance.

Humanism as a general system could only be a condition in which all impulses are given free play. That is not a practical possibility. And, if consistently applied to infants from the moment of birth, it would most likely put an end to the human adventure.

Humanism and Liberalism, erected into general systems, lead to Nihilism—to the Nihilism depicted by Turgenev, rather than that depicted by Oscar Wilde. Turgenev's Nihilist will take account of nothing but ascertainable fact. And there is very little of that in the cultures in which human nature—or human natures—have been created from time immemorial.

How does nationalist Ireland suddenly find itself on the brink of Nihilist emptiness—its ideologists do, at any rate? Is it all due to Charles Haughey?

Gene Kerrigan (a *Sunday Independent* columnist and a kind of Leftist), said a generation ago, when public opinion was still very much in tune with the Church, that there was no need to take issue with the Church because the development of globalist capitalism would overcome it. Well, he was right, wasn't he?

Advanced Capitalism requires abortion on demand, dissolution of the institution of marriage as it has existed throughout history, and the official abolition of the family as the basic unit of society and its replacement by the individual.

But that was predicted by Marx long ago, when the propagandists of Capitalism were accusing Socialism of undermining the family. He said that it was the spirit of Capitalism that would destroy the family, but he did not say it approvingly. The great change is that Socialists are now to the fore in driving this development.

In Ireland there was not a gradual adaptation over a long period to the requirements of advanced Capitalism. Finance Capitalism came suddenly, introduced by Haughey's minority Government, when the Taoiseach's Office became the State for a couple of years, while Haughey was being reviled by the media—especially venomously by the *Irish Times*—with the encouragement of members of all parties.

If Finance Capitalism is "*progress*", then Haughey brought Progress to late 20th century Ireland. And he did so amidst a hate campaign directed against him by the progressives. And then there was a lot of catching up to be done at breakneck speed.

The paragraph of the Constitution restricting abortion, which has now been repealed by referendum, was inserted by referendum not very long ago.

The Leader of Sinn Fein says that the paragraph that has now been repealed was wrong. Well, it was adopted democratically—and in fact rather more democratically than was its repeal.

It was democratically adopted, and then it was democratically repealed because a change of circumstances led to a change of opinion by the electorate. Was the electorate just as entitled to put it in as it was to take it out? Or is this a matter of absolute right and wrong, beyond the competence of a democratic electorate to decide?

In the North there is a national community that has been developing out of itself for four hundred years. This was possible because it began as a British colony, but was not part of the official Anglican Colony that was established as the Kingdom of Ireland by the Williamite conquest. It was not parasitic.

It did not wither away under the Act of Union as the Ascendancy did, but it has declined somewhat under the devolution that was imposed on it by Westminster in 1921. It does not want abortion on demand—but Sinn Fein says it must have it whether it wants it or not.

There is a demand that it should be introduced by the Imperial Government, because it is right. A suggestion that the matter should be put to referendum in the North has been condemned on the same ground. The voters would probably reject abortion on demand, and they have no right to be wrong.

If a national electorate wants free abortion and wants the institution of marriage to be dissociated in principle from reproduction it is entitled to do so. But, if these things are done as the implementation of Universal Right, with the implication that a state which refuses them is a rogue state, that is another matter. It is the modern form of Imperialism. Militant humanism has already been used in justification of destructive invasions. And what used to be nationalist Ireland seems to be shaping itself to act as a spearpoint in the business.

The Veto Controversy by *Brendan Clifford*.

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

203pp. €18, £15

Wolfe Tone: An Address To The People Of Ireland On The Present Important Crisis—1796. Also includes **Walter Cox's Supposed Speech Of Bonaparte To Irish Parliament (1811)**. Intro. by *B. Clifford*.

xx6, £5

The Origin Of Irish Catholic-Nationalism, Selections From Walter Cox's *Irish Magazine: 1807-1815*. Introduced and Edited by *Brendan Clifford*.

136pp. €14, £11.50

Postfree in Ireland and Britain

Tim O'Sullivan

Letter to the Editor

The Atrocity Victims Pope Francis Forgot

The Encyclical Letter *Laudato Si* (2015) ('Praise be to you' – Mediaeval Italian) was the first of its kind which was fully the work of Pope Francis. It signalled a new direction for the Catholic Church in that ecological concerns were to assume a new centrality in its teaching. For the positively disposed it represented new hope. For the cynical it meant a new virtual tropical rainforest of platitudes awaited their attention.

The subtitle is: *On care for our common home*. So it is indicated that problems which involve the planet as a whole, as a human habitat, are to be addressed.

Rather than a problem to be solved, the world is a joyful mystery to be contemplated with gladness and praise", says the Encyclical, so evoking a frame of reference belonging more to the domain of mysticism rather than of science. But this is a publication which does address issues, practical issues which require practical solutions. An ambitious overview of the ecological problems facing humanity as a whole is being attempted.

Water quality, loss of tropical forests, destruction of marine coral reefs and over-fishing are among the troubling questions addressed. Attention is drawn to the ongoing loss of biodiversity; the loss of so very many species of animals and plants; "*Because of us, thousands of species will no longer give glory to God by their very existence, nor convey their message to us. We have no such right.*"

Regarding animal rights the Pope writes: "*We have only one heart, and the same wretchedness which leads us to mistreat an animal will not be long in showing itself in our relationships with other people.*"

Regarding Genetically Modified Organisms or GMOs the approach is hedged and cautious, far too cautious—some would add; "*It is difficult to make a general judgement about genetic modification (GM), whether vegetable*

or animal, medical or agricultural, since these vary greatly among themselves and call for specific considerations."

World population control is a crucial issue in the minds of many who concern themselves with global ecology. Here, as might be expected, there is no enthusiasm shown for vigorous restriction of birth rates. However, it is allowed that: "*Still, attention needs to be paid to imbalances in population density ...*"

The most striking and newsworthy aspect of this historic Papal document is the way it has taken a stand in favour of Climate Change; the notion that the earth's overall temperature is gradually rising due to the scale of certain human activities, especially the combustion of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, and that this will bring about eventual catastrophic consequences unless action is taken.

"A very solid scientific consensus indicates that we are presently witnessing a disturbing warming of the climatic system. In recent decades this warming has been accompanied by a constant rise in the sea level and, it would appear, by an increase of extreme weather events, even if a scientific determinable cause cannot be assigned to each particular phenomenon. Humanity is called to recognise the need for changes in lifestyle, production and consumption, in order to combat this warming, or at least the human causes which produce or aggravate it" (*Laudato Si*, Paragraph 23).

"*Climate change is a global problem with grave implications: environmental, social, economic, political and for the distribution of goods. It represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day*" (*Laudato Si*, Paragraph 25).

"...There is an urgent need to develop policies so that, in the next few years, the emission of carbon dioxide and other highly polluting gases can be drastically reduced, for example, substituting for fossil fuels and developing sources of renewable energy" (*Laudato Si*, Paragraph 26).

Earlier in the Encyclical Francis talked about a new dialogue about how

the future of the planet was to be shaped; *"I urgently appeal, then, for a new dialogue about how we are shaping the future of our planet. We need a conversation which includes everyone, since the environmental challenge we are undergoing, and its roots, concern and affect us all"* (*Laudato Si*, Paragraph 14).

But has there been an inclusive conversation about Climate Change up to now? Has there been any sort of conversation? Has it been rather that powerful special interests have used their weight to push a certain agenda while marginalising those who have taken a dissident stance?

One thinks of David Bellamy, distinguished broadcaster and author, whose career suddenly nosedived after he had expressed his opposition to the science behind what used to be called Global Warming. What sort of *"dialogue"* can there be if there is an absence of openness which masks deceit? One thinks of the *"Climategate"* events of November 2009 where thousands of emails were hacked from the Climate Research Unit at East Anglia University, a nerve centre for the development and promotion of the scientific underpinning of Climate Change. These revealed collusion among scientists in the withholding and distorting of data.

How easy is it to talk of *"a very solid scientific consensus"*, as the Encyclical puts it, when a previous president of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, the distinguished Italian physicist, Antonio Zichichi, was a sceptic. However, change has been in the air and this has been before Francis became Pontiff. It was notable from 2011, a year when the Academy hosted a Conference on the fate of mountain glaciers.

The uses and abuses of nuclear energy used to be of prime concern to environmentalists. Many will recall the slogans from the 1970s and 1980s, such as; *Nuclear Power? No thanks*. Questions around the safe disposal of the waste from nuclear power stations used to provoke strenuous debate. Yet, the teaching Letter from Francis avoids any discussion around what is or is not legitimate use of nuclear energy. Nuclear power appears to be a non-issue. As far as the Papal document is concerned, Fukushima might as well be a holiday resort on the coast of Japan.

It is in relation to the effects of war

on the environment that *Laudato Si* gives cause not just for concern but also outrage. The subject is not tackled in any real and meaningful way. Yet, Catholics—lay and religious—have been involved in dealing with this grave matter. Sister Rosalie Bertell, an American nun, founded the International Institute of Concern for Public Health. She died in 2012. Sister Bertell was a biometrician, environmental epidemiologist, and cancer researcher. For a decade she was senior cancer research scientist at the Roswell Park Cancer Institute. Dr. Bertell wrote and spoke about Depleted Uranium. She summed it up as; *"you're basically throwing radioactive waste at your enemy..."*

Warheads made of Depleted Uranium (DU) are extremely heavy and burn on impact. This gives them great penetrating power which makes them very attractive for the military. While very effective as weapons they have a horrific downside. On impact they burn and transform into a searing hot aerosol which scatters into the surrounding environment. This forms a fine dust which gets into the air and soil. Ingestion by humans and animals has grotesque consequences marked by cancers and birth defects. The native populations of Iraq and Afghanistan have been those most tragically affected. US service personnel stationed in these countries have also fallen victim.

Something which not just inflicts horror upon non-combatants but their offspring and then succeeding generations is a monstrous evil.

There has been a news blackout in the western mainstream media. The Vatican, by failing to acknowledge environmental contamination from military action in this Encyclical makes its own contribution to this information blackout.

Yet, the Catholic Church, with its global network of educational and devotional facilities could contribute so much to getting needed information into the public domain. There is a movement to have all countries in the world sign up to a global ban on the use of DU munitions; the International Coalition to Ban Uranium Weapons (ICBUW). It receives no support in this document.

Laudato Si would not look out of place in the boardroom of a multinational company. It makes all the right noises in relation to Global Warming/Climate

Change. It says nothing which would cause embarrassment in relation to the nuclear industry or its spin-off; the manufacture and use of DU.

The Catholic Church is not a scientific institute, nor a debating forum. It has a message to deliver which is moral, spiritual and philosophical but not technical. It is not normally in its best interests to get involved in technical disputes arising between various parties. There can be exceptions when there is some grave moral concern or some imminent catastrophe threatens the world. But if there is a grave public matter which has a justified call upon the attention of the Church there is the problem of how is the Church to come and know what is right? A prayerful approach is required the theologians will say. But there is more needed than prayers and spiritual exercises. Discussion must be artfully and wisely structured such that truth can have a chance to come forth and win recognition. The secret lies in something which is altogether rare; true free and open debate. All points of view can be given a hearing and a chance to confront one another.

What has happened in the recent Vatican engagement with environmentalism is that the global high and mighty have been given a platform; people such as Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, chair of the German Advisory Council on Global Change or Jeffrey Sachs, the American economist. The God of the Establishment has been consulted and has spoken at the Vatican.

Report

A Change To Birth Certs

"Taoiseach Leo Varadkar informs us (Home News, June 25th) that children of same-sex married couples will have their same-sex parents' names on their birth certificates.

This will require not only a change in the law, but also a radical change to the Leaving Certificate biology syllabus.

The proposal is all the more remarkable given the recent strong criticism of a practice in the past of inserting adoptive parents' names in the birth certificates of babies being adopted."

Juliet Holmes
Irish Times, 2.7.18

Brendan Clifford

Irish Rights, Wrongs And Realities

Thomas Kinsella has been in the news recently. John Bowman featured him in his Radio Eireann programme on the occasion of his 90th birthday. And what he featured was the one poem of Kinsella's that made a bit of a public impact forty six years ago: the sectarian *Butcher's Dozen*.

The British Army performed an administrative massacre in Derry in 1972. The State needed to establish what the Civil Rights movement was made of, so the Army fired at random into a Civil Rights demonstration, killing thirteen. What the massacre established was that the Civil Rights movement was nationalist in substance, and that nationalism in Northern Ireland, after two generations of submission to undemocratic government, was determined to put up with it no longer.

The massacre strengthened the insurgency. But it did not cause it. The insurgency was well under way by 1972, and it was not going to give up without a result—though we were certain that it would not get the result it was aiming for: the ending of Partition.

An intellectual worthy of the title would have known that Northern Ireland was an undemocratically governed region of the British state, and that it was the British Parliament that established the undemocratic Northern Ireland system, for which there was no demand from either community in the Six Counties. Responsibility for the system in general, and for the massacre in particular, lay entirely with Westminster/Whitehall. Northern Ireland was not a state. It was a subordinate instrument of the British state, and its subordinate Government had no authority over the Army of the state.

But Kinsella responded to the massacre with a rhetoric of outrage which was directed most memorably against the Protestant community.

The British State has always been beyond the conceptual range of post-independence academia in Ireland, and therefore Kinsella abused what came within his range of understanding.

The poem begins by imagining the thirteen corpses rising up in ghostly form

to tell their stories:

"And one stepped forward, soiled and white:
'A bomber I. I travelled light.
—Four pounds of nails and gelignite
About my person, hid so well
They seemed to vanish where I fell'."

The innocent dead have their say. But the immediate killers, the soldiers, are blind instruments of the State—*"Their's not to reason why"*. And the will that ordered these random killings—the governing power in the state that set up Northern Ireland as its subordinate instrument—makes no appearance. Or it appears only by implication:

"My curse on the cunning and the bland,
On gentlemen who loot the land".

And this quickly morphs into an indictment of the scapegoat:

"The time has come to yield your place
With condescending show of grace
An Empire-builder handing on.
We reap the ruin when you're gone,
All your errors heaped behind you;
Promises that do not bind you,
Hopes in conflict, cramped commissions
Faiths exploited, and traditions.

...
You came, you saw, you conquered . . .
So

You gorged—and it was time to go.
Good riddance. We'd forget—released—
But for the rubbish of your feast,
The slops and scraps that fell to earth
And sprang to arms in dragon birth.
Sashed and bowler-hatted, glum
Apprentices of fife and drum.

...
Drilled at the codeword 'True Religion'
To strut and mutter like a pigeon
'Not An Inch—Up The Queen'.
Who use their walls like a latrine.

...
And though there's reason for alarm
In dourness and a lack of charm
Their cursed plight calls out for patience.
They, even they, with other nations
Have a place, if we can find it.
Love our changeling! Guard cod mind it,
Doomed from birth, a cursed heir
Theirs is the hardest lot to bear,

Yet not impossible, I swear,
If England would but clear the air
And brood at home on her disgrace.
—Everything to its own place.

...
Good men every day inherit
Fathers' foulness with the spirit,
Purge the filth and do not stir it.
Let them out. At least let in
A breath or two of oxygen."

That mixture of hatred, contempt and aggressive benevolence was a perfect expression of nationalist feeling towards the despised and cherished Ulster Protestant section of the Irish nation that I encountered in public debates in those years. These were not debates with the Provos. They were debates with Front-benchers of Fine Gael and the Labour Party and leading figures in the Official IRA (Eoghan Harris and Eoghan O Murchu).

Kinsella's poem was, as far as I recall, published in the *Fianna Fail* paper, the *Irish Press*, which was edited by a Treatyite Catholic-nationalist, Tim Pat Cogan, whose views were coherently Catholic-nationalist. A response to it, entitled *Kinsella's Oversight*, was written by Tommy Dwyer, a Falls Road Republican, a bricklayer, and a member of the IRA in the fifties and early sixties. It was published by Athol Books in 1972. And it dealt, in Kinsella's rhyme and metre, with Protestants killed randomly on Bloody Friday at the Oxford Street bus station and in other incidents:

"We five met close when we were dead,
An ambulance was our gory bed,
Certain, if complete before,
To finish with some parts left o'er.
Detonation, flash, and flame
Put an end to our sprite game.
And so five dangerous lives are done
—Judged, condemned and shamed in one."

"Once there lived a working-man,
A car came up: the driver ran.
Here lies one in blood and bone,
His only crime—he loved his own."

"Working busily, we binmen three,
Got no warning—no time to flee,
A flash, a roar: and here lie we."

An Introduction said:

"In the present conflict there have been very many innocent victims of both the British Army and the 'Republican' Army. Numerous workers going about their business have been maimed and killed by the latter. But it is clear that for Mr. Kinsella, and for the

nationalism for which he speaks, the Catholic dead are sacred and the Protestant dead are cold mutton".

"*Love our changeling!*" : what is a changeling? A bastard that has been foisted on us? What else could that statement mean? And that meaning is rubbed in. They are "*the rubbish*" of the British feast; the "*slops and scraps*" that Britain left behind after its partial withdrawal.

And yet they are at the same time a treasured part of the Irish nation—and as such they had bloody well better toe the line: or else . . .

In Belfast in the late 1960s, faced with this view of things which contradicts itself, I called one part of it Republican and the other Catholic nationalism.

By a very curious turn of events, the IRA was absent from Belfast at the critical moment in August 1969, and the B&ICO was present. And the B&ICO was a runner of guns, from here and there into Belfast for the defence of West Belfast. It was through experiences behind the barricades, on the Republican side, that the "*two nations*" view, that was being mulled over, was hardened, and was published in September.

This fact is bewildering to academics of a later generation in the South, who are trying to become effectively nationalist. They disbelieve it but cannot deny it.

The IRA had split early in 1969. Well, it had not split, exactly, but it had been purged drastically. The gunmen and the merely doctrinaire Republicans had been purged. Social Republicanism—a Republicanism of social concern—took the place of pure and simple political Republicanism. And the purged elements—too militant, too narrowly Catholic, too Second Dailish, with too little social vision—had not yet got themselves together as an unofficial IRA.

The assembling of the purged elements into an unauthorised IRA happened during the year following August 1969. I saw it happening around me in Belfast. But what was evident to me was not the Old Guard reassembling: it was social radicals, who had never been Republicans before, becoming Republican in earnest, and being given shape and form by the Old Guard.

The most unexpected people began to turn into old-style Republicans. Every day brought news of another transfiguration. It put me in mind of a play

by Ionesco called *Rhinoceros* that I had seen, in which people started turning into rhinoceroses and there was no telling who would be next.

Formally, it was bizarre. Everyone knew that the IRA was a spent force. Its existence was not compatible with the spirit of the new age ushered in by Captain O'Neill and Sean Lemass. It was modernised and socialised out of existence. It purged itself of its backward elements and it ceased to exist. In mid-August 1969 it was not there at all.

In 1970 a new, Provisional, IRA declared war on Britain, and it remained at war until it got a result in 1998.

The result it got was not the result it aimed for. But one must not be too fastidious in passing judgment on these affairs of war and peace, in which things never work out exactly. And I would say that, while the Provisionals' war effort did not achieve the formal *aim* that it set itself, it removed the condition of things that was the *cause* of the war.

The war was launched in 1970 on the basis of the defensive insurrection of August 1969. But the organisers of the insurrection were not the organisers of the war which it made possible—far from it.

The defensive insurrection began in Derry City with the effective barricading of the Bogside against the police. The barricades were constructed by a few British ex-Servicemen in Derry who were Catholics, with Republican assistance. As Catholics who had served the British State, they were affronted by the routine connected with the annual Apprentice Boys' event in the corner of the British state where they settled down, and they applied their military expertise to constructing a physical obstacle that would enable the police to be kept out.

The Battle of the Bogside went on for several days. Nothing like it had been seen before—certainly not in Michael Collins's Free State invasion of the North in 1922. The forces of the State were physically excluded from a region of the state. And it was world news—this was happening in what the world took to be the premier liberal-democratic state in the world.

Protestant Belfast began to feel uneasy. The Chief of State of the Official IRA announced that he had given marching orders to his non-existent Belfast Brigade. Catholic West Belfast was invaded by the regular and irregular forces of the local formation of the state (unionists). Defence was extemporised

by all and sundry until the Army of the state—the British Army—was deployed to restore order.

But the order that was restored by the central Army of the state could not be the order that was broken by the local forces of the state (unionists), because the political forces that governed the state from Westminster did not operate in the Northern Ireland region of it.

The Catholic populations in Derry and West Belfast had experienced the state going berserk on them, and *Is fearr ciall cheannuithé ná ciall an mhúinteora*. Sense bought is better than sense taught. The kind of normality that had, surprisingly, persisted in Northern Ireland for the Catholic population since 1923 was shattered by the action of the State in 1969, never to be restored.

The order that was restored by the Army of the State in August stopped the fighting but left the Catholic insurrectionary areas still in insurrection, but peacefully so. The subordinate Stormont Government, which had provoked insurrection, could not take them in hand, and the central Government decided to continue excluding the Six Counties from the political life of the state. West Belfast and the Bogside were free. And in that freedom a new Republican Army was organised for war.

Two Sinn Féin/IRAs came into active existence, in conflict with each other, during the Winter of 1969-70: the Officials with their class struggle, socially aware Republicanism; and the Provisionals with their doctrinaire 'Second Dail' leadership and their populist mass base created by the August events. The Officials, who were absent in August, activated themselves as the legitimate Republican authority in September and tried to discipline the Provisionals, and, as far as one could tell, received supplies from Dublin semi-officially. The Provisionals defended themselves, filled themselves out and prepared for war.

There was also a general nationalist, or Catholic, body: the CCDC—the *Central Citizens*, or Catholic, *Defence Committee*. The Dublin Government was in consultation with the CCDC until April 1970, when it suddenly laid conspiracy charges against Captain James Kelly, through whom it had been liaising with the CCDC, along with John Kelly (no relation) of the CCDC and others. This action provoked war, and cleared the way for it.

The 26 County state was in principle, according to its written Constitution, a 32 County state. The Constitution asserted *de jure* national sovereignty over the whole island, but suspended enforcement of that sovereignty in the Six Counties for the time being. What was the status of the temporarily suspended sovereignty?

The Constitution did not put a time-limit on the suspension, or set any conditions on it. And, while temporarily suspending enforcement of sovereignty, it did not temporarily recognise the legitimacy of an alien sovereignty in the North.

The *de jure* sovereignty was ongoing though its practical enforcement was delayed. The decision about when to enforce Irish sovereignty administratively in the Six counties lay with the Dublin Government. And, as no terms were set by the Constitution, the decision to enforce sovereignty would be made on the ground of practical expedience.

The Taoiseach (Jack Lynch) emphasised the sovereignty claim in a number of speeches after the August 1969 events in which he said that the cause of the troubles in the North was Partition, and that therefore there could be no lasting peace until Partition was ended.

In September 1969, on the strength of the August events, I published an argument that the source of conflict lay within the North, in the conflict of two national communities there. The Taoiseach in October, at the Fianna Fail Ard Fheis, denied that there were two national bodies in the North. There was, he said, an All-Ireland nation, and its political division by Partition was the cause of the trouble.

The Taoiseach made this speech after he had established a special relationship between his Government and the Catholic Defence Committees in the North. Defence against what? Not the British Army. The British Army had intervened in August to separate the combatants—which were the Catholic community and the Protestant community. It had stopped the assault of the Protestant community on the Catholic community. It was only after war was declared on Britain by an Army claiming to represent the Catholic community—and actually representing it, as was proved by events—that the Catholic community needed to be protected against the British Army.

The Taoiseach, denying that there were two national communities in conflict in the North, established a special relationship with one of them. In estab-

lishing that special relationship, with a view to enhancing Catholic defence capacity, he acted in accordance with the national reality which he denied. Then, in May 1970, he broke that special relationship by prosecuting his then liaison with the Catholic Defence Committee, John Kelly.

The Northern Catholic community, shocked and energised by the events of August 1969, and encouraged by Dublin for nine months to be self-assertive, was then abandoned by Dublin, and was given sufficient reason to feel betrayed by it. It was thrown entirely on its own resources. And it went to war. It was condemned by Dublin for doing so.

The Northern Nationalist community took its fate into its own hands—usurping the authority of the Dublin Government in that matter? The *de jure* authority to decide when there should be action against Partition and against illegitimate British government of the North, lay with the Dublin Government under the Constitution! This was never said. But it could not be denied if the Constitution meant anything. And, in the long run, the Courts in the Republic decided that it did mean something—though Governments continued to evade the issue—by refusing to meet extradition demands from the North

If there had been no sovereignty claim over the North, and if Dublin had recognised the British regime in the North as valid, it would still have had an obligatory interest in the North in the matter of the treatment of Irish nationals there—and it would perhaps have been better placed to exert pressure on Britain on behalf of the Irish national minority.

Under the sovereignty claim it could not act for its national minority because it could not recognise the fact of national difference within the North. It was committed to the view that the entire population of the North belonged to the same Irish nationality and therefore it could not officially admit to be acting for one part of the Irish nation in the North against the other part.

It was said, in proof of this official pretence, that nobody in the North voted for Partition. That was true in the sense that neither the Ulster Unionist Party nor the Nationalist Party voted for the 'Partition Bill', the 1920 *Government of Ireland Bill*. But the 1920 Bill included two quite distinct things. It was a Partition Bill and a Government of Northern Ireland Bill. The Ulster Unionist Party demanded Partition, but did not want

Northern Ireland devolved government. It wanted to remain part of the UK without any separate political institutions. It did not support the Bill, but it had to implement the Act in order to gain Partition. Westminster did not straightforwardly enact Partition, but it gave the Ulster Unionist majority in the Six Counties the authority to enact it if it operated the Northern Ireland system of devolved government.

This piece of chicanery had the purpose of complicating things for the Sinn Fein Government elected in 1918. It enabled Whitehall to say to the world (aka the United States) that it had given the Irish Home Rule in two parts and that the matter was now out of its hands. The Ulster Unionists agreed, under the stress of the times, to operate a Northern Ireland Government as a "*supreme sacrifice*" for the Empire.

The Northern Ireland device was not designed for good government. It did not lead to good government. It went through the motions of functioning under two Prime Ministers who knew what it was, and knew that it could bear very little political activity. And then it blew apart in 1969.

War was declared in 1970. It was launched in earnest in 1971. The Government brought in Internment. The B&ICO supported Internment as a measure appropriate to a war situation, as distinct from an outbreak of criminality. Internees were in effect Prisoners-of-War. Internees had political status as a matter of course.

Constitutional nationalism (the SDLP) opposed "*Internment without trial*" and by implication demanded criminalisation of the Republicans who were making war. (And when criminalisation was achieved, by means of legal short-cuts, they were obliged by pressure from their constituents to support the demand for political status for the criminalised.)

*

The Civil Rights movement was launched in 1968 under the slogan of "*One man, one vote*". The point at issue was that only ratepayers and their spouses had the vote: which meant that their adult children living at home and lodgers did not have a vote.

In addition, businessmen had a second vote in respect of their property. While these provisions affected Protestants as well as Catholics, the latter were disproportionately excluded. Of course Catholic businessmen got the extra vote,

as well as Protestant. And there *were* Catholic businessmen, and Local Authorities controlled by Catholics. Abolition of the business vote—which had been done in England some time previously—would have changed nothing of substance, but the slogan had a good ring to it—and carried the false message that Catholics were deprived of the vote and that, if they got the vote, the situation would be well on the way to being mended.

The Unionists did not concede this trivial demand because 45 years of ticking over in the comprehensive abnormality of Northern Ireland had made them apolitical, and because they knew that the feeling behind the slogan was about something else altogether and they imagined that conceding the demand would feed that other thing.

When the demand was met in the Fall of 1969 the event was scarcely noticed.

The substantial grievance in Local Government was the "*gerrymandering*" of Derry City. Catholic Local Authorities, encouraged by the Free State, had refused in the early 1920s to function within the new Northern Ireland system, and Stormont had responded by territorial rigging of the vote in order to get Councils that would work with it. And it abolished Proportional Representation.

The outrageous Derry gerrymander was abolished in 1969 in favour of the unelected 'Londonderry Development Commission'. (A reformed democratic structure was established in 1973.)

The main demands of the Civil Rights movement of 1968 were all conceded before the Derry demonstration of 1972. But those demands had been about inessentials—and the essentials had never been formulated into reform demands capable of being legislated for.

There was discontent with Northern Ireland. There was a feeling that Northern Ireland was *wrong*, but the structure of its essential abnormality was never specified. So what was to be done about it? Protest!

Gerry Fitt was then in his prime. He was both a British Labourite and an Irish Anti-Partitionist, and he demanded "*British Rights For British Citizens*". I put it to him in debate that the two things were not compatible. But he would not decide between them.

There was a whole range of British rights available to all in Northern Ireland

for which the Irish state had no counterpart at that time. T.K. Whitaker, the much admired adviser to Taoiseach Lynch in 1969, was acutely aware of this. He advised Lynch in 1969 that Northern Nationalists should not be encouraged to think about what unification would mean in certain respects—in health, education and unemployment benefit. (Of these Celtic Tiger Ireland has outstripped the North in welfare benefits and education: only in the health system does it lag behind the North.)

(The Professor of Irish History at Trinity College, David Fitzpatrick, on the other hand, was unaware that the post-1945 British welfare-state reforms had all been implemented in Northern Ireland:)

The British Rights that would have been an obstacle to unification, if unification had been even a remote possibility, were of no consequence within Northern Ireland, where they were just taken for granted. And the British Rights demanded by Gerry Fitt were not Rights at all but atmospheric effects of the British political system. Fitt wanted Northern Ireland to be social-democratic Britain in miniature, but to be outside the politics of the British state, in transition towards the Irish state.

Northern Ireland had all the British rights it could have without being part of the British political system. And the way to get those other rights was to become part of the political system of the state.

Those extra rights, beyond what Northern Ireland had as part of the administrative structure of the state, could not be legislated for by the state. Political atmosphere is created by political activity, not by law. And the British state in those times knew little about abstract Rights. It had to learn about them after being admitted to the European Union (in 1972, the EEC), but, even within the EU context, the thing that Gerry Fitt was demanding as a British citizen was not legislatable. And Fitt was demanding it "*without prejudice*", as lawyers say. He was a British citizen "*objectively*", against his wishes, and was therefore demanding British Rights of a highly intangible kind—a kind that was producible only by British politics—while opposing the including of Northern Ireland in British politics—in order to use those rights in the effort to get Northern Ireland out of the British state.

Fitt ended up in disgrace in the House

of Lords, but he was in all of this at that time a representative man of the Nationalist community.

*

Kevin McCorry has been looking back over all those years towards the Civil Rights origins of it all, and wondering how it went wrong. How could it be that such a good thing as Civil Rights led to such a bad thing as war. How did it all go wrong?

Well, it didn't go wrong. It was not the case that there was a flaw in the slogans that derailed the Civil Rights agitation at a bend in the track. It was that the Northern Ireland problem was not a Civil Rights problem at all. The CRA could not formulate a set of reformist demands whose concessions would satisfy the discontent to which it gave expression.

McCorry, who was a CRA organiser at the time, is now reported by Deaglán de Bréadún in his *Irish* column (June 18) as regretting that things were not done on a different basis. The title of the article is *Civil Rights Campaign A Missed Opportunity*. The blurb in the article says: "*It might have been possible to create common ground between civil rights and issues such as the threatened loss of 4,000 jobs at the time in Shorts*".

Because of the way things were done, McCorry writes that "*the sectarian temperature soared*".

De Bréadún writes:

"While acknowledging the good intentions and bravery of participants in the People's Democracy march from Belfast to Derry in January 1969, which was fiercely attacked by loyalists at Burntollet Bridge, he comments, 'the political effects were disastrous' because it sharpened the polarisation between the two communities.

"There was a subsequent disturbance at a PD march in Newry and McCorry writes that 'the sectarian temperature soared'. In due course, the Provisional IRA came on the scene, nominally to defend beleaguered Catholic areas in Belfast, although he asserts that many of its actions from an early stage were 'essentially offensive, not defensive'. He believes that, if cooler heads had prevailed, Nicra and the broader civil rights movement could, over time, have influenced 'at least a section of unionist opinion to adopt a more positive attitude towards a united Ireland'..."

The article is a comment on a chapter contributed by McCorry to a *Festschrift* for Tony Coughlan, which I have not seen yet. De Bréadún, who also has a chapter in that book, says that he was a

People's Democracy sympathiser at the time (a Trotskyist sympathiser?) but "*I would find it hard to dispute McCorry's analysis today*".

It is incomprehensible to me that any other analysis should have been made at the time. The most obvious thing about the population of Northern Ireland was that it consisted of two fixed social bodies of the kind that I understood to be national, not political. Their difference was not a difference of policy. It lay beneath, or beyond, policy. It had no existence in the sphere of policy.

And the other obvious thing was that Northern Ireland had no politics. It had elections—more elections than any other region of the state—but it had no practical engagement with the politics of the state, and it had no political life of its own. Its active electoral bodies were the Electoral Registration Societies, Catholic and Protestant, or Nationalist and Unionist if you prefer. The business of these Societies was to see to it that every Catholic and Protestant got on the list of voters on the instant of becoming of age, and were then got out to vote. And perhaps to feel out the possibility of a bit of personation. These rival activities were engaged in earnest, but there were never any surprise results.

Canvassing, in the sense in which it was done on 'the mainland', or in the Free State, had no place in the North.

At election time these two 'communities'—these two solid, all-class social bodies—asserted their existence against each other. They counted themselves. The only change to look out for was how many of the higher Catholic birth-rate managed to hang on in Northern Ireland.

It was not at all the case that these Protestants and Catholics had no interest in politics. It was that they had no politics to take part in. At the first British election I experienced in Belfast, I was very surprised by the interest that was taken in it. All knew that they would have no vote in it. Only the irrelevant Six County parties would appear on their ballot sheets—a fact that was then slightly concealed by the fact that Party affiliations did not appear on the ballot sheet. And yet there was avid interest in the Tory/Socialist party-conflict on the mainland, in which they could play no part. (John Bowman, who became a kind of State censor of Culture, ensured that this matter was never raised in his RTE Q & A programme.)

It was a kind of system. People

were accustomed to it. It ticked over for 45 years—until it was shattered by the Civil Rights Association. Well, not quite by the CRA, but by the breakaway Peoples Democracy march from Belfast, through Protestant territory, to Derry, and the action a few months later of a few Catholic ex-British Servicemen in barricading the police out of the Bogside, and the consequences of that insurrectionary action in Belfast.

De Bréadún tells us that "*left-wing trade unionists such as Betty Sinclair*" had, through the Belfast Trades Council, "*a mainly Protestant working-class body*", organised a Conference to discuss organising a campaign on civil rights etc., in 1965.

Betty Sinclair was 'the Communist Party, Northern Ireland'—i.e. not part of either the British or the Irish Communist Parties—and through tireless work in Trade Union committees the CP,NI had constructed a flimsy semblance of a cross-community cadre force. Motions drafted in carefully-phrased language with ambiguous meaning might be adopted by small committee meetings well out of harm's way. A progression of infinitely small steps towards a united Ireland was envisaged, but it was understood to be an exercise of treading on eggs.

The CP,NI, the CPGB and the Irish Workers' Party (as the Southern Ireland Communist Party was then called), all had understandings with each other under the guiding hand of C.D. Greaves of the CPGB and the Connolly Association. But they did live separate lives, and I found that of the three, the CP,NI by far the most interesting.

My first contact with it was through Eddie Spence, the brother of Gusto Spence—who became a very famous Loyalist a few years later. I had a number of discussions with Eddie and a few others. They were thoughtful people, whose minds were not bound by the intricacies of the Byzantine party-line. It was from them that I learned that Connolly was not a Leninist, not even remotely.

The party-line—the line of all three parties—was that Connolly had developed a political position that was in essentials very close to Lenin's. They told me that this was not so, and that he was not even moving in that direction, and that Greaves was entirely wrong on the matter. I went into it and found that they were right. But I imagine that

Greaves was not mistaken but was bending what he knew to be the facts of the matter in the service of the cause—which was not an unusual thing in practical politics, and Greaves took it that he was in practical politics.

(It was from Greaves that I got the idea that the operative social division in the Six Counties was a national division. In a pamphlet which was one of the first things I read on the matter he denied that it was a national division. I went with Pat Murphy to a talk which he gave on Northern Ireland in which he set out the religious composition of its various localities. Pat questioned him about the usefulness of the exhaustive sectarian analysis that he had set out. He did not like it being referred to as *sectarian analysis* but he did not give any other general characterisation of it.

All that was new to me at the time, which was around 1963. I looked up what was meant by "*nation*" in the two classic works on the subject, by Ernest Renan and by Stalin: the Anti-Communist and the Communist. They were in essential agreement. Then I went to look at Belfast, in 1965 I think. And it seemed to me that the division was what Greaves said it was not. And it occurred to me that the reason he said it was not a national division, in a situation where nobody was saying that it was, was that a strand in his own mind was whispering that it was.

It was not a difference about religion. The great division of religion at the Reformation four centuries earlier was a factor in its causation, but it was not in current reality a dispute about religion. The dispute about religion had been fought out in the distant past, and had been settled by an acceptance of division. Protestantism and Catholicism were elements in the social developments that followed, and might therefore serve as indicators of division, but the division was not about them any more.

The Protestant Reformation failed in Ireland in the 16th century. A viable Protestant colonisation was implanted in the North in the early 17th century and underwent an autonomous development, alongside the Protestant Ascendancy though not part of it, and became Ulster Unionism in the late 19th century. The Williamite/Hanoverian Penal Law failed either to squeeze out the Catholics or to convert them. That failure led to the dismantling by Britain through the Act of Union of the Parliamentary apparatus of Protestant Ascendancy

legislative independence after it had provoked Rebellion in 1798.

The Ascendancy, deprived of its apparatus of government, tried to secure its position after the Union by sponsoring a Second Reformation. Handfuls of Catholics were converted here and there but this had negligible effect on the national development of the Catholic populace that began soon after the Act of Union.

English Protestant Providentialism was certainly an influence on the Liberal policy of letting the Irish starve when the potato blight struck, but Providence failed to do its work thoroughly and, even though half the Catholic population was got rid of, it still vastly outnumbered the Protestant population in 1850, and it had gathered itself together for purposeful development.

The only religious event worth mentioning thereafter was the Great Revival within Protestantism, chiefly in Ulster, in 1859.

That might be regarded as an internal Protestant consolidation in recognition of the final failure of Reformationism. It was a remarkable political event, but it was exclusive to Protestantism, and it seems to have been enacted exclusively in the region of feeling with doctrine left aside.

It marked the end of the Reformationist assault in Ireland. It was also to a considerable degree in Ulster a retreat from politics to the safe haven of eternal truth. It washed away the complicated politics of the preceding century, and the ephemeral history of the temporal world along with it. Henceforward Ulster would *Stand Firm* on the Rock of Ages. It would be immune to the trickery of politics that would be practised against it by Catholics, who were tricky fellas.

Protestant Ulster did not in the Home Rule crisis conduct its own political affairs. It just *Stood Firm*. It was, a the critical juncture, taken in hand politically by the merger of the Tory Party with Joseph Chamberlain's social reform Liberals that called itself the Unionist Party, and it was given as leader of its local organisation a Dublin Liberal, Edward Carson.

John Redmond's Home Rule Party allied itself with the Liberal Party in an internal British political dispute in 1910. The Unionist Party—which might be seen as the last effective political formation of the ruling class—responded by

sponsoring the Ulster Protestant opposition to Home Rule, bringing the conflict to the brink of civil war, and then breaking the Liberal Party in the course of the Great War on Germany which had been its means of escaping the civil war.

Then the Unionist Party, faced with a Sinn Fein electoral rebellion that was making itself good as a Government, decided to make the Six Counties into a strange political device that could be sold to American opinion as a concession to Irish Home Rule. Carson opposed it, but his Ulster Unionist lieutenants were persuaded by Whitehall to accept it. It was a measure that could be represented either as consolidating the Union within the Six Counties within the Union or as eroding it.

Protestant Ulster in the main accepted it as a "*supreme sacrifice*" in the interest of the Empire, and it quickly settled down apolitically within it.

It was not clear at first that Northern Ireland was to be excluded from British political life. The measure could be understood as being merely devolved government within the political life of the state. There was talk at the time of "*devolution all around*" but that did not happen until about sixty years later. And, when Scottish devolved government was established, the political parties of the state did not withdraw from Scotland, leaving Scottish politics to Scottish Parties.

There was nothing in the 1920 Bill to indicate that the Six Counties were to be excluded from the politics of the state, and that British politicians ('mainland' politicians) would take no part in the devolved government. The exclusion was achieved by the decisions of the Unionist, Labour and Liberal Parties not to have Branches in Northern Ireland and not to contest elections in Northern Ireland—either elections to the devolved Parliament or elections to the 'Imperial' Parliament. I do not know how this decision was arrived at. Were there confidential discussions between the leaders of the three Parties that have never come to light? Were there even discussions of the matter *within* the leadership of each party. Or was the decision done, Kipling style—"in the argot of the *Upper Fourth Remove*".

All I know is that it was done.

In the case of the Unionist Party, the slithering away from the thing it had

created in the Six Counties was facilitated by a change of name that happened in practice. After the Great War Coalition of the Unionist Party with the Lloyd George Liberals was ended by a backbench revolt in 1922, the Unionist Party began to be called the Tory Party. I suppose this signified that the merger of the Tory Party with Joseph Chamberlain's social reform breakaway from the Liberal Party had been completed and that, in the post-War confusion of the world, it was advisable that the title of one of the great historic Parties of the British state should be restored.

I don't know that there was ever a decision about the name. But in use "*Unionist*" began to give way to "*Tory*".

Lord Londonderry, a Unionist, became a member of the first Northern Ireland Government. His cousin, Winston Churchill, thought he must have gone soft in the head to have gone to Belfast when he was in the running for a place in the British Government. But Londonderry, who was much more a member of the ruling class than Churchill, appears to have seen it as the natural thing to do as a Unionist in the interest of good government.

(He did later return to British politics and was a senior Cabinet Minister in Ramsay MacDonald's National coalition in the 1930s, and he kept the RAF in being as a viable instrument of war.)

The setting up of Northern Ireland into something that appeared to resembled a state, if you did not look at it closely, served a purpose of State for the British Government. The Act which set it up conceded Irish Home Rule in two separate bits. The six County bit was given the right to merge with the 26 County bit if it chose, but it was given that right in the absolute certainty that it would choose not to merge with the 26 County bit.

But the rhetoric could say, with no more falsehood than usual, that Britain had given Ireland Home Rule. And, if the Irish could not agree amongst themselves about how their Home Rule should operate, Britain could hardly be blamed for that.

Neither bit wanted Home Rule. The 26 Counties rejected it outright, having voted for and established independent government. The majority in the Six counties was browbeaten into agreeing to operate it as a means of establishing Partition, and remaining part of the British state—or, if not quite part of it,

at least connected with it. What Ulster stood for thereafter was "*the British connection*". Before 1921 the slogan had been "*Ulster is British!*"

During the Treaty negotiations Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith were told by their new friends, Lloyd George and Lord Birkenhead (Galloper Smith that was), that Whitehall would exert influence on Belfast to persuade it towards Irish unity. The major means of this influence would be the Boundary Commission, which would whittle away Northern Ireland. And Collins and Griffith bought that pig in a poke.

Collins seems to have thought that his understanding with Whitehall entitled him to begin whittling away Northern Ireland by direct action. He invaded the North and engaged in battle with the forces of Ulsterish Home Rule, until Whitehall ordered him to stop and start a civil war within nationalist Ireland instead.

The Boundary Commission was a diversion. It served a purpose in confusing the issue with illusory expectations. In the end, the Free State was relieved to pull out of it within the loss of a bit of Donegal.

Unification then came to depend on winning the support of a substantial number of Ulster Unionists for it—enough to raise the anti-Partition vote in the North from one-third to more than half. And, of course, the more the 26 Counties developed as an independent state, the more it differentiated itself from Britain, the less attractive it would be to Ulster Unionists.

But there was in fact no risk that independent and distinctive development in the 26 County state would alienate Ulster Unionists, because they were comprehensively alienated to start with. And, the more they were pestered about their United Irish ancestors, the more certain they were that they were British. (And this was in accordance with what the United Irish movement in Antrim and Down had actually been. It was directed against the corrupt Anglican aristocracy, of the Irish Parliament. It was the Orange movement that sought to preserve the Irish Parliament. The United Irish settled down very quickly within the Union.)

*

The infinitesimal steps of the Belfast Trades Council would have led to nothing. It was restrained by the careful influence of the CP,NI, which in its

actions took account of the fact that the operative social division in Northern Ireland was a national division, while denying in its 'theory' that this was the case.

The People's Democracy behaved recklessly and by its actions affronted the abnormality of the Northern Ireland situation. Perhaps it did not quite know what it was doing, and it certainly did not know where it was going, but it had its moment. And, having had its moment, and stirred things up, it began to break up. Much of it went to the revival of the old, discarded Republicanism. Some of it came to the B&ICO. And a trickle was taken into the *Irish Times*, whose effective owner, Major McDowell, was conducting it in consultation with Whitehall. De Bréadún, the Trotskyist 'sympathiser' with the PD, became a staid political commentator in the new Anglophile Establishment as evolving in the Free State with the *Irish Times* at its core. (The *Irish Times*, despite its minuscule circulation, was a major source of patronage.)

In recent times De Bréadún has moved beyond Establishment journalism and has published two histories, both on post-GFA Sinn Fein, anticipating that Sinn Fein will become a pillar of the state, and deploring Micheál Martin's antiquarian feuding with it.

But were those 28 years of unpleasantness really necessary? Could things not have been done peacefully, with infinitesimal steps of progress?

Was the War necessary? That is a question without a clear answer, because it is not a clear question. *Necessity* is not a clear idea.

Was the War possible? Clearly, it was. It happened. And possibility is a large part of necessity. Without possibility there is no necessity. Necessity is Will acting on Possibility.

The relevant question is: What conditions made it possible for there to be a War between 40 per cent of the population of Northern Ireland and the Government of the state of which Northern Ireland is part?

That is not a question that De Bréadún asks. And it is not a question that the *Irish Times* ever allowed to be asked in its columns.

De Bréadún writes:

"the author of the present book subscribes to the sentiments of the 19th century nationalist leader Daniel O'Connell, who said that freedom

should be 'attained not by the effusion of human blood but by the constitutional combination of good and wise men'. The only reservation I would have are in cases where the territory of the state is invaded by some foreign power and, of course, O'Connell's failure to include women among the 'good and wise'. Unfortunately, however, a vast quantity of blood has been spilled in pursuit of a 32 County independent Ireland. What makes Sinn Fein interesting these days is that it decided, as part of the Good Friday Agreement of 1998, to put an end to its support for violence in favour of peaceful, democratic consensual methods" (*Power Play, The Rise Of Modern Sinn Fein*, 2015, p6).

I did not know that Sinn Fein had repudiated violence in principle. I thought its position, stated very clearly, was that enough had been achieved by war to make further advance to its aims achievable without war. And I distinctly remember Gerry Kelly saying, as some of his colleagues were meeting the Queen, that, given the circumstances of 1969-70, they would go to war again.

As to O'Connell: the quotation given by De Bréadún seems not to be from O'Connell but from an Irish Ambassador to Britain (Mulhall) describing O'Connell's position. As I recall it, O'Connell's position was more bluntly stated: that *Irish* freedom was not worth a drop of blood. If Sinn Fein had applied O'Connell's principle in 1919, would there ever have been an Irish Ambassador in London?

Now, if military action is to be ruled out categorically in the case of national movements, with mass support, desiring statehood—or at least ruled out in the case of the Irish—then so should mass mobilisations in support of aims which are only achievable by war.

O'Connell gained admission to Parliament by organising a mass mobilisation and pushing it to the brink of war, relying on the Government to give way. But that was on an issue for which there was some support within British ruling circles, and which a Prime Minister had considered legislating for.

The matter was entirely different with regard to Repeal of the Act of Union. It was not a matter that was on the Parliamentary agenda awaiting a majority. It was a measure which all parties saw as being incompatible with the existence of the Empire. But O'Connell, with mass mobilisations, pushed it to the brink of war. There was to be a great assembly of the nation at Clontarf,

at which a Council of 300 would be introduced as the governing body of the nation. The Government, however, showed itself willing to go over the brink into violent action against the populace, so O'Connell called off the Assembly at the eleventh hour—demonstrating his mastery over the masses. His orders were followed obediently at the time. But the great expectations he had aroused, followed by the humiliating instruction that the people were to stay at home, demonstrated that Ireland was an Occupied country held by force, and that independence was not achievable by "the constitutional combination of good and wise men".

It was in that situation, aggravated by the Famine/Holocaust, that O'Connell made his speech against the Young Irelanders about Irish freedom not being worth a drop of blood. He had his way, but the doctrine grated. (And the blood lost in an independence bid would have been minute compared to the mass starvation and exodus caused by British policy.)

The 'Famine' delayed the working out of the consequences of Clontarf. Of the Young Irelanders, John Mitchel was deported and Gavan Duffy, who was not a hot-head, emigrated in disgust when Britain seduced elected representatives. But then the Irish Republican Brotherhood was founded, shaped to the lesson of Clontarf.

A generation later the Home Rule Party was made effective within its terms of reference by Parnell. But many MPs said they were Home Rulers only because they did not see how an Irish Army could be raised, under close British control, to contest the issue of independence with the British Army. They had been told authoritatively that Britain would only concede Irish independence to superior force, and they believed it.

That Redmondite position was that force would be necessary to achieve Irish national independence because Britain would not concede to anything but superior force, but that the possibility of raising an Army to fight the necessary war was lacking.

When an unexpected combination of circumstances in 1914-15 enabled an Army to be raised which could contest the military control of the Irish capital with Britain, the necessary war was attempted. But by then the Redmondites had in fact discarded the aim of independence without saying so, and the Army for which they had become

recruiters crushed the Irish Insurrection.

Less than three years later the overdue Election was held. The Irish electorate, asserting the right for which the Redmondites had purportedly joined the British wars on Germany and Turkey, elected a party whose policy was to establish an independent Irish Government. National independence was declared on 21st January 1919. The British Parliament, consisting of parties that had won only a handful of seats in Ireland, decided to take no heed of this act of national self-determination in Ireland.

(It was later clarified that the Great War slogan of *national self-determination* meant determination by the Imperial states.)

Whitehall carried on governing Ireland. Applying the standards used by the EU against Yugoslavia in the 1990s, Ireland became an Occupied

country when Westminster refused to recognise the 1919 *Declaration of Independence* by the elected Irish Government, and war became necessary.

Surely January 21st should be Irish Independence Day, and should be inscribed in the EU Calender of Events.

This becomes possible with Brexit. Only the will in Leinster House to do it is required to make it actual.

(De Bréadún somewhere cites the peaceful unification of Germany as proof that war is unnecessary. Germany, however, played no part in dividing itself. This will be dealt with in a future issue.)

What Is A Nation? by Ernest Renan & Joseph Stalin. Introduction Brendan Clifford . 32pp (A4).

€8, £6 post-free

V
O
X

Belloc
Irish Universities
Maureen O'Carroll
Gay Neighbours
Church for Sale
Deportations
Asylum-Seekers

P
A
T

BELLOC, Joseph Hilaire Pierre Rene (1870-1953)

An Anglo-French writer: the son of Louis Belloc, a French barrister. His mother, the wealthy Bessie Rayner Parkes, an early British suffragette (great-grand-daughter of Joseph Priestley and daughter of Joseph Parkes, a founder of the Reform Club), was over 40 at his birth.

A strong Roman Catholic, when H.G. Wells's *The Outline of History* was serialised he wrote a fortnightly attack on it in the Catholic paper, *The Universe*, claiming it was a religious tract.

A Liberal MP, he greatly admired Mussolini and met him (1924) and also supported Franco when Editor of *Weekly Review*. He was also anti-Semitic. When he stood for Parliament in 1906 he was conscious that his Catholicism might be a factor against him. Making a campaign speech at Salford, he told the audience gathered to hear him:

"I am a Catholic. As far as possible I go to Mass every day. As far as possible

I kneel down and tell these beads every day. If you reject me on account of my religion, I shall thank God that he has spared me the indignity of being your representative" (Mark Bryant, *Private Lives*, p.22, Cassell, 1996).

He was elected.

"A strong supporter of Britain's involvement in the First World War, Belloc was recruited by Charles Masterman, the head of the War Propaganda Bureau, to help support the war effort. This included writing *The Two Maps of Europe* (1915) for the WPB.

"Belloc had always been hostile to the German race but in wartime, his views became extremely popular. He told the readers of *Land and Water* that the war was a clash between pagan barbarism and Christian civilization. His estimates of German casualties were often highly inflated and he constantly made inaccurate estimates about when the war would be over. He confided to his friend, G.K. Chesterton, that 'it is sometimes necessary to lie damnably in the interests of the nation'..."

(www.spartacus-educational.com)

Irish Universities

have tumbled down the latest set of influential world rankings, sparking alarm among senior academics over the funding 'crisis' facing higher education.

Trinity College Dublin has lost its status as Ireland's only top-100 university, while six out of eight Irish top-ranked colleges have fallen down the rankings" (*Irish Times*, 6.6.2018).

University College Cork plummeted from a position of 283 in the ranking to 338th place.

However, when it comes to a top position, it would be hard to outdo the College President: Professor Patrick O'Shea is nestling in a penthouse apartment at The Elysian, Ireland's tallest building and one of the most expensive addresses in Cork city, at an annual cost of €36,000. He recently returned from the US to take up a 10-year contract, on a starting salary of €185,000.

Creating Together is the theme of a new eight-year partnership between UCC and Cork Opera House, which will see the two institutions work together to educate and inspire the next generation of arts managers, creative practitioners and professionals in an industry-first for Ireland.

What can you say:

**Quick, send in the clowns
Don't bother they're here**

Maureen O'Carroll

"Far from being a dark secret, illegal adoptions were openly debated on the floor of the Dáil in 1956 after being raised by comedian Brendan O'Carroll's mother.

Maureen O'Carroll, a Labour Party TD, was criticised by then justice minister Liam Cosgrave for handing 'yellow English Sunday newspapers' the opportunity 'to smear the name of this country'..."

In a 1956 exchange recorded on the Dáil record, Ms O'Carroll reveals that she travelled to Limerick to investigate the cases of Anthony Barron and Mary Clancy, of Camas in Bruff, who were given to families in the United States.

"I submit that not only was there something irregular about the manner of the removal of those children but

something definitely illegal,' she said. The Dublin North-Central TD claimed their removal from the State involved 'serious contraventions of Section 40 of the Adoption Act, 1952'."

Questions

Mrs. O'Carroll, had submitted a series of questions to the Justice minister but was told there was "*nothing irregular or unlawful*".

"I was given the information that in the last three years 523 such children have left this country with a view to adoption in the USA: 534 is an appalling figure in view of the circumstances," she said.

She had no objection to children being adopted by US families as they would "*not have to go through life in this country with the stigma they normally have to bear*".

"But I do not see why it should have to be done in an illegal manner", she said.

Fianna Fáil's Donogh O'Malley said he "*deprecated*" the manner in which she had chosen "*to bring publicity*" to a question:

"What has been stated in all sincerity by Deputy Mrs. Maureen O'Carroll will be splashed across many a paper, not only in Britain but in other countries, to the detriment of this nation" (*Irish Independent*, 1.6.2018).

Gay Neighbours—

"*are good for your house price*", the first research of its kind in Ireland suggests.

"Rents and house prices are surging faster in Ireland's top 10 'pride-filled places' than anywhere else in the country, [Daft.ie](#) said" (*Irish Examiner*, 29.6.2018).

Well, Well: a hundred thousand thanks from all 100,000 men and women on the Social Housing List and the rest of us who are being bled dry by avaricious landlords. No, we are certain Gay landlords would never bleed their poor old tenants. A beautiful and compassionate social strata like the Gays would never indulge in such social greed!

[Daft.ie](#) spokesman Martin Clancy said the data serves both as a celebration and barometer of social change in Ireland over the last number of years.

"Dublin house prices are increasing every month by more than the amount the average worker is paid" (*Daily Mail*,

26.12.2017).

Some celebration, some social change!

Church for Sale—

The former Church of a Christian community on South Main Street, Cork is to be sold. The Church of Christ, Scientist, of which the Christian Science Society is part, believes in healing through prayer; it was founded by a woman, Mary Baker Eddy, in the United States in the late 19th century. As well as the Cork chapel it has a church on Herbert Park in Dublin, with a reading room on South Great George's Street in the capital.

The faith, which began in Cork in 1924 has now decided to sell because it has very few members, and none lives within easy reach of the city. There are 400,000 students of Christian Science in more than 60 countries. There are no ordained clergy.

The reported sale price is €300,000. Profits from the sale will go to the mother church in Boston.

Deportations—

The number of people deported from the country fell significantly last year, according to new figures.

Data from the Department of Justice shows 140 deportation orders were carried out last year—down from 428 deportations in 2016.

The number of people denied entry to Ireland has also fallen dramatically. Figures show that, for the top 10 nationalities, the number of refusals to 'leave to land' in 2017 stood at 1,148—down from 3,951 the previous year.

The overall figure will be published shortly as part of the annual review by the Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service.

A deportation order requires the person concerned to remove themselves from the State; where they fail to do so, the State is forced to remove them.

Asylum-Seekers

A report from the Reception and Integration agency for February shows that Cork is once again housing the highest population of asylum seekers in the country, a total of 849.

"Dublin has 833 asylum seekers housed in the city at full capacity. Cork centres can take up to 905 asylum seekers" (*Eve. Echo*, Cork, 31.3.2018).

Stephen Richards

Part Two

A Grieve Observed

D. I. Y. In Moneyglass

Every time I drive past the Catholic chapel in Moneyglass (the remote townland near Toome where Willie John McBride was born), I marvel at the delicate, impossibly high steeple. It was erected probably around 1885, by the post-Famine generation, without any public subsidy. I honour the memory of those tenant farmers and labourers who gave sacrificially to something they believed in. If Irish language, or Ulster-Scots, or the bagpipes, or soccer, is such an vital part of our culture that we just can't do without it, then it's up to us to stop whingeing, get up off our backsides, and spend some of our own money to further our chosen activity. There is a stronger argument for public subsidy of orchestral music and opera but, to parrot the language of rights (human rights if you please!), in the context of discussion about funding priorities is disgraceful.

To give a further example, this time from the British Labour Party: the other day I heard a radio discussion about women-only shortlists. This is rapidly becoming a no-go area. But on this occasion there was a robust and indeed bitter debate between a person called Emily Brotherly (a former man who now identified as a woman) and a lady from some south London LGBT collective, about whether "trans" women should be eligible for all-women shortlists. The traditional LGBT view seemed to be that to open up these lists would discriminate against real women in favour of people who were to all intents and purposes men. But the expression of this view was denounced as "transphobic". Even with the wisdom of Solomon it would be impossible to distinguish on a rights-based analysis between these competing positions. No matter how it pans out, someone's perceived rights are going to be trampled on. And who's to say that all-women shortlists are themselves beyond criticism? What a Pandora's Box!

Just recently on *Any Questions?* the panel was being asked to comment on the proposal that men who identified as women (without or without any chemical or surgical adaptations) should be allowed to use women's changing rooms. It

was absolutely clear from the guarded, walking-on-eggshells, responses of the panel members that they all thought this was bonkers but were terrified of being shamed as transphobes.

Let's now take a look at one of the great jurisprudential advances that Dominic Grieve holds out as shining examples of the EU "*promoting the development of equality law and social rights*".

Same Sex Pensions

This is the Supreme Court case of *Walker v. Innospec*, decided on 12th July 2017, with the leading judgment being given by the increasingly influential Northern Irish Law Lord, Brian Kerr. Very briefly, this case was about a man who had been employed by Innospec since 1980 until his early retirement in March 2003. He had been in a gay relationship with the same man since 1993, entering into a Civil Partnership as soon as that was permitted by law, in late 2005, subsequently entering into a same sex 'marriage' ceremony. His argument was that on his death his 'husband' should be entitled to benefit from his occupational pension on the same basis as if he had been married to a woman. He lost in the Court of Appeal but was successful in the Supreme Court.

Ironically Lord Kerr, in reaching his conclusion, was obliged to disapply (supersede) one of the exemption sections of the 2010 *Equality Act*, not some obscure mediaeval statute about witches. The existing law, enacted by the Queen in Parliament just a few years previously, was partially repealed on foot of an EU Directive, which had not been passed by any democratically accountable body. We are supposed to celebrate this mix of judicial activism and legislative *diktat*.

The not insignificant point arose in *Walker* that the court was going to have to impose additional pension liabilities on the Innospec Pension Fund for the benefit of Mr. Walker and those in the same category, on a retrospective basis, an approach hitherto alien to English law. This was going to upset the actuarial calculations which had been worked out on the basis of clear rules, that he and

others had signed up to. He may have come out as a winner, but there were going to be many losers.

Rights, Fashionable And Otherwise

This is not to say that the decision is totally indefensible. But the liberal elites from all parties who govern us seem to operate on a rather skewed set of criteria when it comes to identifying the proper recipients of rights. The same sex marriage agitation in the UK and the Republic was just a fashion parade by various narcissistic politicians, each determined to show himself more enlightened than the last. None of them showed any prior concern over this yawning Rights deficit. In truth it's not a civil liberties issue at all. The "trans" campaigners, under the guise of a concern for Rights, are actually engaged in an attempt to establish that sex—sorry, gender—is just an artificial construct. We are assigned our gender at birth. Everything is fluid. From an early age children are going to be indoctrinated into a sexual free-for-all, contemptuous of any kind of modesty or restraint. The aim is to break up our "*patriarchal*" society, which is based on (heterosexual) marriage, family and kinship, and a shared vestigial respect for Christian norms. Civil society is the only thing that is strong enough to stand up to the State, so civil society must be destroyed and remade in the image of the cultural Marxists. Many Conservative politicians are complicit in this campaign, as for instance Justine Greening; and others have been duped by it, or lack the moral fibre to call a spade a spade.

I don't know if Dominic is in any of these categories, but he is obviously enlisting EU law as having been "*the principal driver in recent years in promoting the development of equality law and social rights*". Equality law is a vague concept at best: in practice it seems to be mainly concerned with gay and "trans" 'rights'. And I'm not sure how social rights might be defined. They don't seem to include the right of under-age girls in care to be protected from rape gangs in various English cities; nor any employment rights for agency workers, a disgraceful lack of equality before the law, which neither the domestic courts nor the European Court of Justice shows any inclination to put right; nor the right to free speech when political and other meetings are targeted by thugs; nor the right conscientiously to refuse a commission to inscribe a morally

questionable slogan on a cake; nor the right to protection from dismissal on the basis of comments opposing same sex marriage on Facebook; nor the right to make robust criticisms of the Muslim religion; nor the right to life of the unborn baby. I would have some more respect for Dominic's position if he showed some awareness of the very precarious state of civil liberties and human rights in the UK, for all the benign ministrations of the EU institutions.

I remember in the late 1970s when the domestication of the European Convention on Human Rights (which of course was not an EEC invention) was an exciting topic for discussion, the question came up, possibly in my Finals, in this form: *can we trust the judges to administer a British Human Rights Act?* The implication was that the High Court and appellate Bench was composed of fox-hunting, pheasant-shooting grandees, never happier than when roaming their ancestral acres with their Labradors, *"in clabber to the knee"* (W.F. Marshall), and reading the Book of Common Prayer in the evenings. How wrong we were! The salons of Bloomsbury proved a more enticing milieu.

Parliament vs. The People

I haven't left myself much space for what Dominic refers to as *"the process of Brexit"*. He gives a very rough summary of the Brexit argument, that the people have spoken and the Government was entitled, indeed required, to implement this decision by activating Article 50, bypassing Parliament in the process.

"Now to me this was revolutionary. It ran entirely contrary to principles of constitutional law that in the words of Professor Dicey and as cited in the Miller case, 'the judges know nothing about any will of the people except insofar as it is expressed by an Act of Parliament and would never suffer the validity of a statute to be questioned on the ground of its having been passed or kept alive in opposition to the will of the electors.' It also runs counter to the key principle as set out by Sir Edward Coke [we can't get away from Coke, seemingly!] in the *Case of Proclamations* of 1610 that the 'King by his proclamation or other ways cannot change any part of the common law, or statute law, or the customs of the realm'—a straight echo of what Fortescue had said 150 years earlier."

This is a stirring rhetorical trumpet blast to be sure. But it's surreal too. Notice how quickly Dominic glides from

the will of the people as expressed in a referendum that was authorised overwhelmingly by Parliament, and the outcome—which the Government pledged to honour—to a 1610 case involving James I throwing his weight about. The question is, from what or whom is the legitimacy of Parliament derived? In relation to a parliamentary democracy, there's only one answer: the people. Parliament could theoretically pass an Act to restrict the franchise to white male Protestant householders. On the Grieve analysis this would be not open to criticism on constitutional grounds as Parliament is answerable to nobody, least of all to the electorate with their sweaty nightcaps. This is historical and political nonsense. And, not only is there the implied accountability of Parliament to the people, in the case of the Brexit referendum this was made explicit.

So, just to check I've got this right: it's a constitutional outrage to suggest that Parliament should defer to the clearly expressed will of the people as demonstrated by a referendum specifically called by the Government of the day to provide a final answer to the question of EU membership. But, when it comes to the ECA, whereby Parliament subjugated its own authority to that of an unelected, unaccountable, extra-judicial law-making body, namely the European Commission, and an extra-judicial tribunal, the European Court of Justice, this was a proper exercise of its function. What actually happened in 2015 was that, on a contentious matter of national importance, Parliament delegated its power so that the people could engage in direct democracy. Dominic later states that it was an advisory referendum. It's quite true that the constitutional theory of referendums has yet to catch up with the political reality, but the Government itself in its publicly-funded propaganda leaflet promised that it would implement whatever we, the people, decided. Otherwise what is the blooming point? Our youngest daughter, down at Trinity College Dublin, was complaining recently about how the Provost and Fellows had simply chosen to ignore the result of an undergraduate vote on supplementary fees. I pointed out to her that, since they hadn't called the vote, they weren't obliged to pay it any attention.

A substantial section of Dominic's speech relates to the problems raised by the EU Withdrawal Bill, *"an astonishing*

monstrosity" as he has elsewhere described it. He does a lot of tut-tutting about *Henry VIII powers*, but he nowhere sets out a superior blueprint by which the UK could leave the jurisdiction of EU law while still retaining with full force in domestic law *pro tem* all existing EU primary and indeed secondary legislation. It's surely more difficult for the lobster to get out of the pot than to find its way in. But, if it stays in the pot, its future freedom of action is somewhat circumscribed.

While I haven't gone into it, I think there would be an interesting comparison to be made with how the Irish Free State and later Republic managed to achieve its legislative independence. The great body of pre-1925 English land law, including the famous *Statute of Uses* of 1535 (in Ireland, 1634), a Henry VIII power if ever there was one, is still in force in both Irish jurisdictions, long after it has been repealed in England. Apparently Ireland and Western Australia were the two last redoubts of old English land law. Nobody has been greatly bothered by this.

According to Dominic, these Henry VIII powers, exercisable by Statutory Instrument, even if time-limited, have the potential to do a great deal of damage: *"...it does mean that important primary legislation such as the Equality Act could be amended by this method within the permitted period"*. *Quelle horreur!* But, wait a minute: isn't this the same Equality Act that Lord Kerr partially set aside in the *Walker* case, with the full approval of Dominic, as it was incompatible with an EU Directive and so had to be disappled?

Fudges Great And Small

In the final sections of his Address Dominic routinely raises various bogeymen:

"The issue of the UK-Irish border has at least in theory circumscribed the nature of our post exit relationship with the EU, unless we renege on the assurance we provided our EU partners that there would be no customs checks requiring a physical border. The fudge that enable stage 1 to be completed must be followed by a detailed Treaty on the assurances we gave in respect of the Border. I find it hard to believe how this will not mean staying in a customs union, making Liam Fox's work redundant. I detect growing acknowledgment in Government that this is the case."

Note the rather un-legal language about *renegeing* and *fudges*, and *"must*

be followed by", which last reminds me of Coriolanus and his "*peremptory shall*". Sez who? Nothing's as certain as that, in love, war, or politics. But who is it that's going to be imposing these customs checks anyway? It looks as if the UK Government is obliged to guarantee, not just that it won't put up Border controls but that there will be none put up on the southern side either! I have obviously failed to understand that EU Customs Controls are like the laws of the Medes and Persians. How dare anyone suggest, however politely, that there might be some practical accommodations applied, just as was the case from the formation of the Free State. But I forget: during the Foot and Mouth crisis of 2001 the Government of the Republic was able to apply very stringent customs checks to prevent the importation of cattle; and, five years before that, during the 'mad cow' disease scare, the other EU countries imposed a ban on British beef and maintained it for years, long after it had become clear that the problem had been massively overhyped.

Dominic has adopted the Labour Party language of "*staying in a customs union*". It's accepted by all that to leave the EU means leaving the Customs Union. There is no such thing as "a" customs union for the UK to stay in. It's indeed quite correct for him to state that Liam Fox, International Trade Secretary, wouldn't have much to do if the UK were to stay in the Customs Union, a prospect which Dominic appears to view with equanimity.

The chief business of the Customs Union is to protect EU markets by means of heavy external tariffs, the same policy for which Donald Trump is currently being excoriated by the EU mandarins. Thus it is that fledgling African economies are being stifled by high EU food import duties. Not much concern for equality there. It appears to be a cardinal sin to impose tariffs on China, a competitor whose huge commercial muscle arises from the exploitation of an poorly-paid and disenfranchised workforce, although tariffs are fine if imposed on weak African economies that are becoming increasingly dependent on aid agencies, as a direct result of our refusal to allow them to trade with us on level terms.

For the sake of space I have to skip over Dominic's musings on the impact of Brexit on data sharing, commercial litigation, child contact arrangements etc., save to say that among grown-up

neighbourly democracies the concept of close co-operation on matters of mutual concern isn't so extraordinary. We can think of the Foyle Fisheries Board, that continued to carry out its cross-jurisdictional functions admirably during a long period when the Republic of Ireland didn't even recognise the existence of Northern Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom. But these are his comments on the planned transitional arrangements:

"And finally there is that Transitional deal which is likely to be our short term destiny from March 2019. No change at all for a time, not even I now sense in agriculture and fisheries. Instead what Boris Johnson characterizes as 'vassalage'. It makes Mr. Farage's recent intervention in favour of a second referendum seem perfectly understandable. An attempt to return to the purity of his vision. The cliff edge followed by untrammelled sovereignty—at least for the length of time it takes for gravity or the sudden appearance of a pair of wings to determine where we are going."

Minute Particulars

Dearie me! One wonders how nations outside the EU manage to survive at all, or how the UK got along prior to 1973. That is exceptionalism indeed: Britain is the only state in the world that will fall off a cliff edge if outside the EU. The cliff edge is never a place anyone would choose to be, but the metaphor was a product of the imagination of *Remain* diehards, who are determined to make each hair stand on end, "*like quills upon the fretful porpentine*". If we're looking for scary metaphors, what about the one about the runaway train that we're all on, destination unknown, fare exorbitant, tearing through a landscape that looks less familiar with every mile (sorry, kilometre)—and, if you suggest pulling the communication cord to try to stop the train, you're threatened with a punishment that isn't spelled out but it's made clear that it's worse than you could ever imagine?

Does Dominic, do any of us, really know in what direction the EU is heading? Like most Brexiteers, I'd be content with compromise solutions, as long as the result of the referendum isn't neutralised. The "*pure vision*", the shining fanatic flame, is all on the other side.

The Address ends with a moving prayer for quiet government, "*which the United Kingdom has traditionally aspired to deliver to its citizens*". But how can the UK Government aspire to

deliver anything at all when the major decisions affecting the lives of the Queen's subjects are delegated to the EU Commission and the European Court of Justice?

I believe Dominic is as wrong as it's possible to be in most of what he says. But in one respect he has been proved to be absolutely right: when he predicts that there will be no changes to Agriculture and Fisheries policy during the transition period. Even doctrinaire Remainers like the SNP leader Nicola Sturgeon have accused Theresa May of betraying the fishing community, never mind that Sturgeon didn't want there to be any change in the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), ever!

I think it was Martin Luther who said of his fellow Christian pastors that they tended to be gentle where they should be tough, and tough where they should be gentle. This is my view of Theresa May. In the latter part of March we had to listen *ad nauseam* to a stream of invective poured out on Putin's Russia over the alleged attempted assassination of the Skripals in Salisbury. There are certainly legitimate concerns there that should be investigated, but we have turned Putin into a *Dick Dastardly* cartoon villain, when instead we should be doing our best to establish a harmonious working relationship with Russia, just as the UK is intent on doing with the far more sinister regimes in Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and China. But Theresa is incapable of opposing Michel Barnier and Guy Verhofstadt in a concrete negotiation, and telling them that the UK is leaving the Common fisheries Policy in March 2019. Courage, like every other virtue, is a matter of "*minute particulars*" (William Blake).

Vox Pat

1786

"Lord Kenmare, though himself a Catholic, hunted down the insurgents of Kerry, 'dragging them from the very altars of the Popish chapels to which they had flown for concealment and protection'..."

(Report of the Irish Viceroy, the Duke of Rutland, 26 September, 1786.—*The Pocket History of Kerry*, Gerald O'Carroll, 2007, Polymath Press, Tralee, 2007)

Eamon Dyas

A look back at a time when Ireland had an arms industry!

First World War Munitions Production —the Irish experience—

Some idea of the scale of the increase in domestic British military expenditure during the Great War is provided by an example taken from Ireland—which was to be excluded from munitions production after breaking free from Britain.

The reason why Ireland was so important to the production of war munitions was first explained during the First World War by Gilbert Thomas Morgan, an English chemist. Morgan (who was later knighted) had been appointed Professor of Chemistry at the Royal College of Science in Dublin in 1912 and remained in that post until 1916, when he returned to London to work for the British Chemical Warfare Committee. According to his entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, his work for the latter included developing "*organic arsenicals and antimonials that could be applicable to chemical warfare*". In 1916, prior to his departure from Dublin, he wrote of the importance of Ireland to the production of British munitions:

"Sulphuric acid is the starting point of all chemical manufacture; it is the fundamental chemical, the first link in the chain of materials leading to the modern high explosive. It is no exaggeration to say that the war might be lost or won on the sole question of supplies of sulphuric acid.

The raw material most generally employed in the manufacture of sulphuric acid is the mineral pyrites, a sulphide of iron, copper and other metals. As regards the supply of this mineral Ireland is better off than Great Britain. In the latter island there are no pyrite minerals of any commercial value; in the former there are considerable deposits in County Wicklow. Spanish pyrites must be imported continuously into Great Britain for the manufacture of sulphuric acid. A stoppage of this import would soon paralyse the output of explosives. The Irish pyrites, although inferior to the Spanish as regards percentage amount of sulphur, is richer in the important metal, copper. An improved pyrites kiln, the mechanical Herreshoff burner, has enabled Messrs Kynoch of Arklow, to avail themselves of the local pyrites"

(*Chemistry, the War and Ireland*, by Gilbert T. Morgan. Published in *Studies: an Irish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 5, No. 17, March 1916, p.34).

The Kynoch Explosives Factory in Arklow, County Wicklow was opened in 1895 as a branch of the main company based in Birmingham, directed by Arthur Chamberlain, younger brother of Joseph Chamberlain, the Liberal politician. Arthur Chamberlain had saved the parent British company in Birmingham from ruin in the 1880s and became Chairman of Kynoch in 1889. He remained Chairman until his death in 1913, when his son, Arthur Chamberlain jr. succeeded him.

In late 1894 Chamberlain snr. secured an order to supply the British Government with 600 tons of high explosive cordite over a three year period and in November 1894 he and his chief engineer, A.T. Cocking, visited two sites in Ireland with a view to establishing a production facility in the region of South County Dublin and Wicklow. They inspected sites at Brittas Bay and Arklow before settling on the Arklow site, which was less than half a mile from the harbour. Besides being less remote than Brittas Bay, the Arklow site contained a pre-existing chemical factory and, although the Arklow Chemical Works had not been in production for a number of years, it convinced Chamberlain that it was possible to use the local pyrites to produce the sulphuric acid component in the production of the cordite.

The Arklow Chemical Works was duly purchased by Kynoch and by July 1895 it was already producing cordite with a workforce of 260 people amid claims that it was the largest facility of its kind in the world. Almost immediately the dangerous conditions at the factory, combined with the low wages, ensured that it would generate industrial conflict. The first dispute occurred in October 1895, a mere three months after its opening, when an explosion resulted in the death of a workman. The workforce withdrew their labour as part of a demand for an increase in pay to com-

pensate for the dangerous work involved. Although the workforce eventually returned to work without gaining any increase in wages, the dispute set the tone for future industrial relations at the factory and over its subsequent 22 year history it witnessed numerous strikes and industrial disputes.

The Boer War provided the Arklow factory with much additional work but in 1907 the rejection by Government inspectors of a particular batch of cordite as of inferior quality brought its future existence into question. Having found proof that one of the inspectors, a Captain M.B. Lloyd, had passed a similarly flawed batch of cordite from another Government supplier, Curtis and Harvey—a company which the Captain had subsequently joined as a director—Chamberlain took the issue to court. The case lasted four years and went all the way to the House of Lords where blame was apportioned equally between the Kynoch factory in Arklow and the Government inspectors.

This effort to have the facility at Arklow closed down was viewed as evidence of the determination of an already hostile element within the British Establishment to hamper the development of any indigenous industry in Ireland. In fact the Government contracts with the Kynoch factory had been opposed from the outset by George Lawson, the Director of Contracts in the War Office, and Chamberlain only managed to overcome such opposition by using his family's political connections.

Chamberlain had also lobbied John Redmond of the Irish Parliamentary Party in order to muster support for the building of the factory in the first place. In the aftermath of the British Government inspectors' attempt to close it down in 1907, the factory received no further Government orders until the First World War and only managed to survive through orders received from private industry and supplying sporting munitions.

Then, at the start of the First World War, the dispute between the Government and the Kynoch factory was forgotten and the factory received substantial orders to supply munitions for the British Army operating on the western front. The impact of these orders was described in an article published in *History Ireland* in 2006 (much of the account of the Kynoch factory above is taken from this article). In order to meet

the Government orders for munitions—

"Kynoch constructed dozens of new buildings, and the site of the factory now extended over one and a half miles northward from the mouth of the Avoca River up the entire length of the north beach and beyond. The number of employees increased from a pre-war figure of 600 to almost 5,000. Special trains and charabancs were put into service to transport the new workforce coming from many of the surrounding towns and villages, even from as far south as Wexford town and as far west as Shillelagh. A garrison of 100 soldiers was brought in from county Cork to protect the factory. Employees, now working around the clock, were offered substantially more pay, with wages increasing to £2 per week...

When the factory went into war production all the workers were issued with a rulebook briefly outlining general safety regulations, but with the huge increases in production safety was obviously a secondary concern. The number of injuries increased to the point where it was necessary to open a hospital. Almost 900 cases were reported while the hospital was in existence, 135 of which were classified as serious, which is an average of almost one a week; many of the injuries would have been burns inflicted by acid. In 1917 the ministry of munitions produced an extremely comprehensive handbook with very detailed guidelines on safety in munitions factories. Ironically it was in this year that the Arklow factory had its worst accident. At four o'clock on the night of 21 September the town was rocked by a massive explosion. Tragically, 27 men died and six were seriously injured" (*Arklow's Explosive History: Kynoch, 1895-1918*, by Anthony Cannon. Published in *History Ireland*, Vol. 14, No. 1, January-February 2006, pp.34-35).

There were attempts to blame the explosion on a shell from a German U-boat—something which to this day continues to be claimed (see the Wikipedia entry for Kynoch Chemicals), despite the fact that the inquest on the deaths at the time concluded that it had been the result of an accident, probably resulting from the worker's practice of drying their handkerchiefs on the extremely hot pipes—a practice that may have caused one to ignite and set off the explosion.

During the period of the First World War, the Kynoch factory was probably the biggest industrial employer in Ireland outside Belfast but after the war ended it rapidly diminished. By 1918 it began to lay off large numbers of workers in

stages until by early 1919 only 100 remained employed. This was further reduced to a handful by the end of 1919 and then the factory was sold and its machinery dismantled and removed at the same time as most of the buildings were demolished.

While the end of the war was the main factor in its demise, the advent of the Anglo-Irish war at this time also undoubtedly contributed towards the rapid de-commissioning of the factory during 1918 and 1919—when production was removed to South Africa. As far as the British Government was concerned, it would not do to have the facilities for producing high explosives remaining in Arklow during the War of

Independence.

Consequently, not only did the end of the Great War mean the redundancy of the Arklow munitions factory work force, but the arrival of the Irish War of Independence on the heels of its ending ensured that the buildings and machinery had to be dismantled with unseemingly rapidity. Incidentally, the Kynoch company outside of Ireland continues to produce cartridge ammunition as part of the operations of ICI.

Volume One of Eamon Dyas's book on Britain's policy of Naval Blockades and its application to starve Germany during World War 1 appears in August

Peter Brooke

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin And The Russian Question
Part 10

Solzhenitsyn's *Two Centuries Together* — *The Derzhavin Memorandum*

The Story So Far

The main argument of Solzhenitsyn's *Two Centuries Together* is that the 'Jewish problem'—the problem Russia faced when it incorporated a large Jewish population with the partitions of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century—was a real problem, not just a fiction got up by anti-Jewish prejudice. That is to say that, without necessarily ascribing badness to either side (though without denying the existence and importance of badness), the two peoples had interests which, perfectly legitimate in themselves, brought them into conflict.

Something like this approach seems to have become generally accepted in the English language literature on the subject since the pioneering research of Hans Rogger in the University of California, Los Angeles and John Klier in University College London. Klier in an obituary for Rogger, sums up the approach Rogger (himself a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany) was challenging as follows:

"It is important to remember the overwhelming consensus that ruled the realm of Russian Jewish history in 1973 when Rogger published a short article in the *Wiener Library Bulletin* entitled 'The Jewish Policy of Late Tsarism: A

Reappraisal'. The established view was shaped by the work of the great Russian Jewish historian Shimon Dubnov, whose *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland* (3 vols, Philadelphia, 1916-20) was to be found in every academic and popular library. Dubnov's depiction of Russian rule over the Jews was a perfect illustration of what Salo Baron would later decry as the lachrymose interpretation of Jewish history. According to Dubnov, Russian policy towards the Jews had been hostile from the very start of Russian rule over the Polish Jews, who came into the Empire as a result of the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The initial begrudging toleration was no more than a cruel Muscovite face hidden behind the mask of 'enlightened St Petersburg'. Russian policy was dominated by 'traditional Russian religious anti-Semitism', which was intent on the destruction of Jewish religion and culture. The first objective was pursued by a concerted policy of coerced conversion to Christianity, exemplified by the recruitment law of 1827, which drafted under-age recruits into the Russian army and then, by force and guile, converted them to Christianity. The second objective—assimilation—was pursued through a policy of sham *Haskalah*, the Jewish enlightenment

movement which sought the rapprochement of Christians and Jews in a neutral society. The educational policies pursued by the Russian state sought to strip the Jews of any national feeling and—ultimately—to convert them."¹

This is also of course the consensus Solzhenitsyn was challenging.

According to a review of John Klier's own book *Russian Gathers her Jews*:

"Contrary to traditional assessments, Klier argues that the Jewish Question arose as a secular socio-economic problem and as relatively uninformed by religious intolerance or Judeophobia ... Klier concludes that the Russian tendency to attempt to reorder Jewish life, based on then modern ideas of reform and enlightenment, along with attempts to restrict Jewish activity to protect the peasantry were the animating force of Russia's Jewish policies in the years 1772-1825."²

Solzhenitsyn's old enemy Richard Pipes reproaches Solzhenitsyn with not knowing the English language literature—he never really got a command of the English language and so far as I know he never used Rogger or Klier as sources. But he might have found them interesting if he had known about them.

Solzhenitsyn's ambition is to give due expressions to both sides in the conflict but, as might be expected, he understands the Russian side better, a feeling strengthened by the fact that in terms of Russian society itself, he has more sympathy for the peasant farmer than for the businessman. With regard to the Jewish interest he seems torn between an admiration for Jews who identify fully as Russians of the hebraic faith, and for Jews who remain faithful to their religious idea in all its integrity, awkward as that might be for a host nation. The solution is to be found in the distinct Jewish state, in Israel. His enthusiasm for Israel (and apparent absence of any sympathy for the native Arab population) is a redeeming feature in the eyes of those who, as we have seen in previous articles, were keen to accuse him of anti-semitism.

The last article in this series discussed the position of the Jews in Poland, prior to their incorporation into the Russian Empire. In Poland, they had a recognised status as a distinct people with its own law, culture and principles, a system perhaps analogous to the '*milliyet*' system in the Ottoman Empire. To a large extent they ruled themselves, organised in distinct communities—the *kahals*—under the direction of the richest and most

influential members of the community acting in conjunction with the Rabbis. They also had an economic function that was recognised and appreciated, at least by the ruling class, the aristocracy. It was essentially the role of a middle class, of a bourgeoisie, without pretensions to political power. The economic functions, supply of goods and services necessary to the functioning of the society, were in the gift of the aristocracy who leased them out. The literature I've seen seems to suggest that, improbable as it might seem, they were leased almost exclusively to Jews. To quote Hans Rogger:

"When the Russians in 1772, 1793 and 1795 took from Poland the provinces that were later to form the bulk of the Pale of Permanent Jewish Settlement, they found large numbers of Jews living as merchants and traders in the countryside, playing a part in nearly every transaction that peasant and lord had with the outside world and with one another. Only thirty per cent of Polish Jews in the eighteenth century were engaged primarily in trade and commerce, but nearly all retail trade was in their hands, as was buying up of agricultural produce and the sale of liquor in the countryside. They were the nobles' agents and sometimes the managers of their estates; and so frequently did landowners lease or farm out to them the subsidiary branches of the manorial economy—fish ponds and grain mills, distilleries and taverns, dairies and orchards, forests and ferries, the sale of salt, vodka, and other gentry prerogatives—that in some regions the word leaseholder, *arendator*, had become synonymous with Jew."³

This system may have suited Catholic landowners and Jews but it hardly suited the mainly Orthodox peasantry. There may be a comparison to be made between the Orthodox peasantry in Poland and the Catholic peasantry in Ireland, both having being out of religious sympathy with their own landowning class. The mid seventeenth century Khelmnitsky rising, a Cossack-led Orthodox revolt, took the form of a massacre of both Poles and Jews and resulted in the incorporation of Kiev and a large part of what is now Eastern Ukraine—after a spell as a 'Cossack hetmanate'—into the Russian Empire. As I argued in my last article it also saw a degeneration of the position of the Jews in Poland itself, including the areas taken by the Empire in the late eighteenth century. Essentially they had lost control of what might be called the 'commanding heights' of the capitalist economy. The commun-

ities were much poorer than they had been and consequently more anxious to exploit what resources remained to them to the utmost.

First Encounter

The traditional Russian policy with regard to Jews, at least since the late sixteenth century (Ivan IV), was simply not to tolerate their presence. From the moment when Kiev was taken from Poland, Jews were expelled from the city. In 1727, Catherine I, Peter's wife and successor, expelled them from Ukraine and in 1742 Elizabeth I, Peter's daughter (very early in her reign, which began in 1741) expelled them from all her territories. Solzhenitsyn argues that these were shortlived and ineffective measures but it is nonetheless obviously significant that this was the policy. With regard to Elizabeth I, one of the greatest of Russian rulers, Poliakov says:

"In 1743, the governing senate submitted to Elizabeth Petrovna, Peter the Great's daughter, a detailed report pointing out the profits that the imperial treasury could gain if Polish Jews were admitted to the fairs in Kiev and Riga. The Empress's response was brief and peremptory: 'From the enemies of Christ I do not wish to draw either interest or profit' she wrote with her own hand on the margin of the report."⁴

Even after the Polish partitions, when the Russian Government had to accept responsibility for a large Jewish population, Jews continued to be excluded from Russia itself, albeit with increasing exceptions through the nineteenth century to 1917. This needs to be borne in mind when we come to the pogroms of the late nineteenth century. Often called 'Russian' pogroms, they in fact occurred in Ukraine, Byelorussia and Moldova (Bessarabia). There is a question here which I think Solzhenitsyn doesn't sufficiently discuss. The 'Jewish problem' faced by successive Russian administrations in the early days was largely a matter of the triangular relationship between landlords, peasants and Jews, the latter playing the role of middlemen between the other two. But what sort of landlords? Still Catholic Poles? And what sort of peasants? Presumably Orthodox, but could they be described as Russians?

In his book *The Education of a True Believer*, Solzhenitsyn's friend Lev Kopelev (the model for Lev Rubin in *In the First Circle*) describes his upbringing as a Russified Jew in Kiev in the pre-revolutionary period, and his own liking

for Ukrainian culture and the celebration of all things Ukrainian that marked the Komsomol in the 1920s. But the differences among the different peoples of the area were still very much alive:

"My brother and I spoke to each other in German. But out in the yard and on the street and at school it was known that we came from a Jewish family. Unfriendly boys yelled at us: 'German, German, sausage man/ride a horse as fast as you can./He got on a horse without a tail/ and rode it backward as fast as a snail.' Or 'Lousy yid, caught alive, number five,/ on a rotten post crucified.' 'Yid dope,/ he runs on a rope!."

Picking on others of different nationalities, the kids would holler: 'Dirty Uke, dirty Uke,/ good for a poke, good for a joke!' And they would hear the answer: 'Russky, Russky, you're the joke,/ why don't you go and climb an oak./ Go down the road—puff up like a toad!' Or 'Polack, Polack,/ ate a toad under a rock!'"⁵

And later:

"In the terrible, famine-stricken spring of 1933 I had occasion to be in several Ukrainian villages and in several Russian villages during the course of one week. They were all in the Volchansky district, several kilometers apart. For over a hundred years, since the time of the Arakcheyev military settlements, they had been each other's neighbours. And yet, among the many oppressive and sad memories of those days, such conversations as these stuck in my memory:

A peasant woman, no longer young, but even in her pallid, edema-swollen face you could see that she had been very handsome, was saying that she would not permit her son to marry a young woman from the neighbouring Ukrainian village.

'I won't let that Uke girl in my cabin—she's unkept, unkept, unclean. It's all a show with them: they white-wash their huts and dress up on holidays. Just like the gypsies. But take a look under their ribbons, their beads and what do you find? Lice, and nits besides [...]'

She spoke with conviction, certain of her righteousness.

But the next day in the Ukrainian village, I listened to the same elderly, commonsense wives and mothers. In every family there were swollen bellies, people dead of starvation, but neither enervation nor grief could weaken in them the bias, the suspicion, the ill will toward their neighbours.

'If my son takes a Russky girl, he can go live in the home of his father-in-law. I swear I won't live under the same

roof with her. Those Russkies live like pigs: their huts aren't whitewashed, never swept, cockroaches everywhere, bedbugs' ..."⁶

It could be that in the late eighteenth century the Ukrainian or Byelorussian peasant was as foreign to the Russian administrator as the Polish landlord.

The first instinct of the Russians taking charge of the new territories seems to have been to want to change as little possible. John Klier writes:

"A decree issued to the inhabitants of the newly established Russian province of Belorussia, over the name of Z.G.Chernushev, governor general of the new province, singled out the Jews, promising them freedom of religion, the confirmation of their existing property rights, and the continuation of their own courts and tribunals."

But he continues:

"Significantly the *kahal* itself was not even mentioned. The Russian government seems to have had very little understanding of exactly what it was confirming and guaranteeing. On future occasions, and as late as 1799, the central government, in the person of the Senate, would admit that it did not know the legal basis upon which Jews were still exercising important prerogatives such as the administration of internal justice and civil litigation, in various parts of the empire."⁷

The assumption then was that the Polish principle that the Jews were to be treated as a single, self-governing legal entity administering its on affairs through the *kahals*, would continue. In 1781, however, as part of a general policy of encouraging the development of a commercial middle class, Jews were first allowed and then required to enrol in the official urban classes concerned with such matters as foreign trade, banking, artisan activities. Klier comments:

"Increasingly, however, the government began to impose a new unitary concept by viewing *all* Jews as urban dwellers, enrolled in the appropriate urban class. But the majority of Russian Jews could not be placed within these classes. They failed to meet the necessary residency requirements, which assumed residence in the municipality. While all Jews were indeed enrolled on the census books of the nearest urban centre, they frequently lived in the countryside on the estates of noble landlords, engaged in leaseholding, stewarding and middleman activities connected with the estates and with the attached peasant villages. Specifically,

they leased out the numerous prerogatives that accrued to a noble estate—for example, the monopolies on the sale of products such as salt, the control of vital resources such as grain mills or fish ponds, and the right to collect tolls on roads. Many Jews leased the important right of distilling alcohol, and often served as village tavernkeepers. (It should be noted, however, that despite Russian literary stereotypes, not all Jews were tavern-keepers, nor were all tavern-keepers Jews.) To this occupation was joined the ancillary function of village moneylender. None of these pursuits was associated with the customary activities of the Russian *kupechestvo* or *meshchanstvo*" (p.509—Klier explains that *meshchanstvo* "comprised those city residents who had a yearly income of less than 500 rubles and who were engaged in trade or handicrafts in the broadest meaning of these terms." The *kupechestvo* or 'merchants' had an income of more than 500 rubles and were further divided on the basis of income in three 'guilds' with differently defined rights).

Finally (with regard to the policy of Catherine II, "the Great"): in the 1790s special arrangements, favourable and unfavourable, were made for the Jew. Although still officially designated as town-dwellers, a passporting system was introduced to allow them to continue their activities in the countryside. As members of the official urban classes, their right to take part in urban administrative structures was confirmed but, unlike other members of the urban classes, they were not allowed to move outside Byelorussia without a special imperial permission. The 1906 *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, frequently used as a source by Solzhenitsyn, sees this as the beginning of the 'Pale of Settlement' which was to become a major source of grievance throughout the nineteenth century:

"The Pale was first established in 1791, when the White-Russian Jews, who had passed under Russian rule (1772) at the first partition of Poland, were forbidden to join merchant or artisan guilds in governments other than those of White Russia... With the successive partitions of Poland the Pale was enlarged by the addition of governments wherein Jews lived in great numbers. In 1794 it included those of Minsk, Izyaslav, Bratzlav, Polotzk, Moghilef, Kiev, Chernigov, Novgorod-Syversk, and Yekaterinoslav, and the territory of Taurida. To these were soon added the Lithuanian governments of Wilna and Grodno; and in 1799 the Pale was further augmented by the addition of Courland."⁸

Rather than being a new principle, however, this looks to me like a simple continuation of the old principle of restricting the Jewish presence in the Russian heartland.

The 1790s policy of distinct legislation concerning the Jews was continued when in 1794 they were required to pay double whatever the normal tax rate was for their particular estate. They were also required to pay a separate tax in lieu of military service. This latter is ambiguous. Klier says—

"the motivation of the law did not reflect favourably upon the Jews. Rather, it probably derived from the assumption, common at that time in Western Europe as well, that the Jews could not be trusted to serve with loyalty or efficiency in the armed services" (p.516).⁹

But in another article, he says "*During the same period (the 1790s—PB) the Jews were granted special privileges such as exemption from personal performance of military service*". When later (in 1827) conscription was imposed it was a very hard burden, given the importance of being part of a community bound together by a very demanding religious discipline.

Solzhenitsyn, always anxious to sweeten the pill, points out that the double tax was also imposed on Christian 'Old Believers' and, also as usual with his accounts of legislation unfavourable to Jews, that it wasn't very rigorously applied, a view confirmed by the account on the Orthodox Jewish website, www.chabad.org: "*Fortunately these measures were not always put into strict practise*".¹⁰ As we shall see, it was lifted in 1804.

Protecting The Peasants

None of this implies any particular concern with the wellbeing of the peasantry. This—the perceived need to protect the peasantry against Jewish exploitation—was to become a major theme in Russian-Jewish relations throughout the nineteenth century. Its first major expression was the report submitted in 1800 to the Tsar Paul I by Senator Gavril Derzhavin.

Paul had succeeded to the throne after Catherine died unexpectedly in 1796 following the second and third partitions of Poland (1793 and 1795), which brought a large further influx of Jews into the Russian Empire. Soon after Paul's accession, a devastating famine

broke out in Byelorussia and Derzhavin (who had previously been asked by Catherine to look into the condition of the Jews) was commissioned to report on the causes.

D.S.Mirsky's *History of Russian Literature* ("first published in London in 1927 and which has been a bible for student generations ever since"¹¹) calls Derzhavin—

"the greatest poet of the century, one of the greatest and most original of all Russian poets... His philosophy is a joyous and avid epicureanism that does not deny God but admires Him quite disinterestedly. He accepts death and annihilation with a manful thankfulness for the joys of ephemeral life. He combines in a curious way a high moral sentiment of justice and duty with the resolute and conscious decision to enjoy life to the full. He loved the sublime in all its forms: the metaphysical majesty of a deistic God, the physical grandness of a waterfall, the political greatness of the Empire, of its builders and warriors ..."¹²

The Jewish website chabad.org, on the other hand, not questioning Derzhavin's greatness as a poet, says:

"Unfortunately for the Jews, Derzhavin was no friend of the Jews. He was altogether a proud and hard man, with a bad temper. He was extremely selfish and was interested in his career and success more than in anything else. For the Jews he had nothing but contempt... It was in June, 1800 that Derzhavin was ordered on his new investigation [of the famine in Byelorussia] and after several months he came to Vitebsk to write his report. In October he returned to Petersburg with his report, which he called 'Opinion' (in Russian *Mnenie*).

Although the original complaints about the famine were directed against the estate owners, and the emperor's order mentioned nothing about investigating the Jews, Derzhavin had immediately decided that it was the Jews' fault and he was determined so to report. He only needed certain 'facts' to make a case against the Jews, and his main purpose was to collect such information as would be most damaging to the Jews...

Derzhavin blamed the famine on the Jews and recommended that the Jews be expelled from the rural areas, should not be allowed to rent inns, make and sell spirits, and other measures restricting Jews."

The interest of chabad.org is that it is the website of the Lubavitch Jews. Solzhenitsyn generally avoids discussion

of specifically religious matters but it is surely interesting to note that the formation of this most important movement of hasidic Jews coincided with the Polish partitions. The first *Rebbe* of the *chabad* movement was Rabbi Scheur Zalman, *Maggid* (preacher) of his home town, Liozna, near Vitebsk, incorporated into the Russian Empire in the 1772 partition.¹³ According to the chabad.org account, Derzhavin's nefarious project was defeated by Rabbi Schneur Zalman, largely through his connections with people in high places:

"Rabbi Schneur Zalman had seen to it that Derzhavin should receive good opinions about the Jews. Many estate owners and members of the local authorities had promised Rabbi Schneur Zalman to be fair, and to speak favourably of the Jews. But Derzhavin ignored almost all the favourable things he had heard about the Jews. He made only one exception, mentioning in his report that Prince Lubomirsky, a prominent nobleman and estate owner in White Russia, declared that the Jews were very helpful to him in the management of the estates and were generally useful to the population at large. (Prince Lubomirsky was an admirer of Rabbi Schneur Zalman and after Rabbi Schneur Zalman's second arrest and acquittal¹⁴ invited the Rabbi to settle in the town of Liadi, which belonged to the Prince)."

A Fanciful Parenthesis?

Paul I was assassinated in 1801. His son and successor, Alexander I, was present in the building where the assassination occurred and the assassins were never punished. Paul was said to have been mad, but a Russian Orthodox website, arguing that he should be recognised as a Saint, gives this alternative explanation for the murder which, although not strictly relevant to the subject under discussion, I can't resist sharing:

"The forces of dark feared the influence of God's anointed king on the fate of nations. A conspiracy arose, at the head of which stood several high officials and embittered officers who dreamed of liberties. The Emperor's orders began to be distorted to the point of becoming unrecognisable. The conspirators very cunningly influenced the society of the capital city against the monarch. The headquarters for the conspiracy became the salon of Zhrebtsova, sister of the three Zubov brothers who would be the future murderers, while at her back stood her 'friend', English Ambassador Sir Charles Whitworth.¹⁵ Lopukhin testifies that the participants in the murder

received two million pounds in English gold through Zherebtsova. The Tsar's treaty with Napoleon for a march on India, which would have undermined British colonial power, was his death sentence. The conspirators openly declared that the interests of England were dearer to them than the interests of Russia.

By March 1801 the conspirators' exacerbation reached a high point, and they decided to commit regicide. Tsar Paul I was brutally murdered in the night of 11th to 12th March 1801. Napoleon commented on the event thus: 'Without the death of Tsar Paul, England would have been lost.'¹⁶

Derzhavin's Memoir

Following Solzhenitsyn's account:

"The famine, as Derzhavin confirmed, was unimaginable. He writes 'when I arrived in White Russia, I personally convinced myself of the great scarcity of grain among the villagers. Due to the very serious hunger—virtually all nourished themselves from fermented grass, mixed with a tiny portion of meal or pearl barley—the peasants were malnourished and sallow like dead people. In order to remedy this, I found out which of the rich landowners had grain in their storehouses, took it to the town centre and distributed it to the poor; and I commanded the goods of a Polish Count, in view of such pitiless greed, to be yielded to a trustee' ...

Derzhavin discovered that the Jewish schnapps distillers exploited the alcoholism of the peasants: 'After I had discovered that the Jews from profit-seeking use the lure of drink to beguile grain from the peasants, convert it into brandy and therewith cause a famine, I commanded that they should close their distilleries in the village Liosno [Rabbi Schneur Zalman's town—PB]... I informed myself from sensible inhabitants, as well as nobles, merchants, and villagers, about the manner of life of the Jews, their occupations, their deceptions and all their pettifogging with which they provide the poor dumb villages with hunger; and on the other hand, by what means one could protect them from the common pack and how to facilitate for them an honourable and respectable way out... to enable them to become useful citizens.'

[...]

Derzhavin begins by establishing that the agricultural economy was in shambles. The peasants there were 'lazy on the job, not clever, they procrastinate every small task and are sluggish in field work.' Year in, year out 'they eat unwinnowed corn: in the spring, *Kolotucha* or *Bolotucha* from eggs and rye meal', in summer they content them-

selves with a mixture of a small amount of some grain or other with chopped and cooked grass. They are so weakened, that they stagger around.'

The local Polish landlords 'are not good proprietors. They do not manage the property themselves, but lease it out, a Polish custom. But for the lease there are no universal rules protecting the peasants from overbearing or to keep the business aspect from falling apart... Many greedy leasers, by imposing hard work and oppressive taxes bring the people into a bad way and transform them into poor, homeless peasants.' This lease is all the worst for being short-term, made for 1-3 years at a time so that the leaser hastens 'to get his advantage from it... without regard to the exhausting' of the estate.

The emaciation of the peasants was sometimes even worse: 'several landlords that lease the traffic in spirits in their villages to the Jews, sign stipulations that the peasants may only buy their necessities from these leasers [triple price]; likewise the peasants may not sell their product to anyone except the Jewish lease holder... cheaper than the market price.' Thus 'they plunge the villagers into misery, and especially when they distribute again their hoarded grain... they must finally give a double portion; whoever does not do it is punished... the villagers are robbed of every possibility to prosper and be full.'

Then he develops in more detail the problem of the liquor distilling. Schnapps was distilled by the landlords, the landed nobility [*Szlachta*] of the region, the priests, monks, and Jews. Of the almost million Jews, 2-3,000 live in the villages and live mainly from the liquor traffic. The peasants, 'after bringing in the harvest, are sweaty and careless in what they spend; they drink, eat, enjoy themselves, pay the Jews for their old debts and then, whatever they ask for drinks. For this reason the shortage is already manifest by winter... In every settlement there is at least one, and in several settlements quite a few taverns built by the landlords, where for their advantage and that of the Jewish lease-holders, liquor is sold day and night... There the Jews trick them out of not only the life-sustaining grain, but that which is sown in the field, field implements, household items, health and even their life.'

[...]

In the second part of the Memorandum, Derzhavin, going out from the task given by the Senate, submitted a suggestion for the transformation of the life of the Jews in the Russian Kingdom, not in isolation, but rather in the context of the misery of White Russia and with the goal to improve the situation. But here he set himself the assignment to give a brief overview of Jewish history,

especially the Polish period in order to explain the current customs of the Jews. Among others, he used his conversations with the Berlin-educated enlightened Jew, physician Ilya Frank, who put his thoughts down in writing. 'The Jewish popular teachers mingle "mystic-talmudic" pseudo-exegesis of the Bible with the true spirit of the teachings... They expound strict laws with the goal of isolating the Jews from other peoples and to instil a deep hatred against every other religion... Instead of cultivating a universal virtue, they contrive... an empty ceremony of honouring God... The moral character of the Jews has changed in the last century to their disadvantage, and in consequence they have become pernicious subjects... In order to renew the Jews morally and politically, they have to be brought to the point of returning to the original purity of their religion... The Jewish reform in Russia must begin with the foundation of public schools, in which the Russian, German and Jewish languages would be taught.'

[...]

To Ilya Frank, Derzhavin once said, 'since the providence of this tiny scattered people has preserved them until the present, we too must take care for their protection.' And in his report he wrote with the uprightness of that time, 'if the Most High Providence, to the end of some unknown purpose, leaves (on account of His purposes) this dangerous people to live on the earth, then governments under whose sceptre they have sought protection must bear it... They are thus obligated extend their protection to the Jews, so that they may be useful both to themselves and to the society in which they dwell.'

[...]

As a critical difficulty Derzhavin saw the instability and transience of the Jewish population, of which scarcely 1/6 was included in the census. 'Without a special, extraordinary effort it is difficult to count them accurately, because, being in cities, *shtetl*, manor courts, villages, and taverns, they constantly move back and forth, they do not identify themselves as local residents, but as guests that are here from another district or colony.' Moreover, 'they all look alike and have the same name', and have no surname; and 'not only that, all wear the same black garments: one cannot distinguish them and misidentifies them when they are registered or identified, especially in connection with judicial complaints and investigations.' Therein the *Kehilot* [the *kahals*—PB] takes care not 'to disclose the real number, in order not unduly to burden their wealthy with taxes for the number registered'.

[...]

On the inner ordering of the Jewish congregation: 'in order to place the Jews under the secular authorities just the same as everyone else, the *Kehilot* may not continue in any form.'

Aftermath Of Derzhavin's Memoir

After the assassination of Paul I a committee was formed to examine Derzhavin's findings, resulting in 1804 at the first attempt at a comprehensive body of legislation designed to address the Jewish problem—a problem largely defined following Derzhavin's account. It repealed the double tax and opened all educational institutions to Jews. But it forbade them from keeping taverns or distilling alcohol or living in the Byelorussian villages. However, following the usual pattern of legislative attempts to address the Jewish problem, the 1804 laws proved to be quite inoperative. The Jews of the time were hugely resistant to any form of education other than the specifically Jewish Talmudic schools. The project of expelling Jews from the countryside was cancelled—or postponed—in 1806. The right to sell alcohol was restored in 1808. The right to distil in 1811.

But, very important, the 1804 legislation also launched a project that was to become central to ideas about the 'Jewish problem' throughout the nineteenth century and indeed well into the twentieth century—the idea of the agricultural colony. Large subventions and an exemption from paying tax were offered to transfer to the 'virgin lands' of Novorussia, the area on the Sea of Azov above the Crimean Peninsula, taken in the course of the eighteenth century from the Cossack hetmanate and from the Turks. This is the scene of the Russian/Ukrainian conflict at the present time. The establishment of Jewish colonies in Novorussia had also been one of Derzhavin's proposals but it may also have been a simple continuation of Catherine's policy of seeking colonists for Novorussia wherever they could be found. The Wikipedia account mentions "*Romanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Greeks, Albanians, Germans, Poles, Italians, and others*"—hence the famously cosmopolitan character of the port of Odessa.

Initially the transfer to Novorussia looked like a success, excessively so, since, according to Solzhenitsyn, the administrative arrangements set up to welcome them were overwhelmed and further emigration was stopped in 1810. This was probably due to the great poverty of many Jews. Solzhenitsyn portrays the experiment as a disaster,

largely because of the difficulty of developing the necessary skills and habits in a single generation. He acknowledges that by the 1820s some of the Jewish colonists who had persevered were beginning to make a success of the venture.

In 1814, following the Congress of Vienna, the Duchy of Warsaw was incorporated into the Empire, bringing with it a further 400,000 Jews. The area had previously been taken in the partitions by Prussia but had then fallen successively to Napoleon and then to Alexander I. In 1814 it theoretically enjoyed a large degree of autonomy but increasingly came under Russian domination, prompting a Polish revolt in 1831, which I think goes unmentioned by Solzhenitsyn. And yet its defeat, and the campaign of 'russification' which followed must have had some importance. Insofar as Jewish interaction with the peasantry was an important part of the problem, the Jews in all their activities, including those concerned with the drink trade, were exercising prerogatives passed on to them by the landholding class. Was there a great difference between the Polish landholding class in the pale of Settlement and the Russian landholding class using intermediaries who were less exploitative than those used by the Poles?

Priests and monks are often mentioned as competitors with the Jews in this respect. Was their behaviour significantly different from that of the Jews? Was there a significant difference between the behaviour of Catholic priests and monks and that of Orthodox priests and monks? Was there a process by which Polish landholders, well-disposed to the Jews, were replaced by less well-disposed Russian ones? And were the Russians better disposed to their serfs and was there a distinction between Russian and Ukrainian or Byelorussian serfs? And how did the situation in Byelorussia and Ukraine compare with the situation in 'Congress Poland' where, presumably, a Catholic landholding class was faced with a Catholic peasantry?

Leaving all those questions—I think unaddressed by Solzhenitsyn—hanging in the air, I will try in the next article to say something about the continuing Russian-Jewish tensions following the emancipation of the serfs in 1861.

NOTES

¹ John D. Klier: *Hans Rogger, 1923–2002*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501670208577968>.

² Review by Lynne Viola, *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 62, No 1 (March 1990), pp.211–214.

³ Hans Rogger: 'Government, Jews, Peasants and Land in Post-Emancipation Russia: The Pre-Emancipation background: stirrings and limits of reform', *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, Vol 17, No 1 (Jan-Mar, 1976), p.5.

⁴ Léon Poliakov: *Histoire de l'antisémitisme* t.1, Calman-Lévy, n.d. (the text of this edition was originally published in 1981), pp.420–1.

⁵ Military-agricultural colonies established under Alexander I as an inexpensive reserve of trained military forces. The first was established in 1810 under Count Alexei Arakcheyev in Belarus. In 1817 Count Arakcheyev officially became the head of all the military settlements in Russia. They were very unpopular, provoking a major mutiny in 1831. They were eventually abolished in 1857.

⁶ Lev Kopelev: *The Education of a true believer*, London, Wildwood House, 1981, pp.100 & 108.

⁷ John Klier: 'The Ambiguous legal status of Russian Jewry in the reign of Catherine II', *Slavic Review*, vol. 35, No 3 (Sept 1976), p.506.

⁸ The 1906 Jewish Encyclopaedia is available online at <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/>

⁹ Review of Raphael Mahler's *History of Modern Jewry*, in *The Review of Politics*, Vol.36, No 4 (Oct 1974), p.614. Derzhavin argued that Jews shouldn't be allowed in the armed services because they couldn't be relied on to fight on the Sabbath.

¹⁰ Nissan Mindel: Senator Derzhavin and the Jews, https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/112300/jewish/Senator-Derzhavin-and-the-Jews.htm

¹¹ <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v23/n05/Neal-ascherson/baleful-smile-of-the-crocodile>

¹² D.S.Mirsky: *A History of Russian Literature from its beginnings to 1900*, New York, Vintage Books, 1958. pp.49–51. Mirsky, after living in London as an emigré, returned to Russia in 1932 and died in captivity in 1939.

¹³ It was his son and successor, Rabbi Dovber Schneuri, who settled in the town of Lubavitch, giving the movement its name.

¹⁴ This was a consequence of the inter-Jewish quarrel between the *hasidim* and the *mitnagdim* ('opponents'), followers of the *Gaon* of Vilna (Vilnius), Elijah ben Solomon Zalman, still regarded as an authoritative figure in Talmudic studies. The difference was between the traditional Jewish emphasis on exegesis of the law in the light of the Talmud, an essentially intellectual exercise, and the new emphasis on mystical experience and charismatic leadership (though the *Gaon* was also a noted exponent of the Kaballah). The 1906 Jewish Encyclopaedia gives his experience of the *hasidim/mitnagdim* confrontation as a major cause of Derzhavin's dislike of Jewish culture.

¹⁵ Possibly Pyotr Vasilyevich Lopukhin (1753 – 1827) whose daughter, Anna, was Paul's mistress. Paul did in fact enter into an alliance with Napoleon for a joint invasion of India, a project aborted by his assassination - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_March_of_Paul

¹⁶ http://www.holy-transfiguration.org/library_en/royal_paul.html



Jules Gondon

First English Translation

by

Cathy Winch

Part 5

Biography of Daniel O'Connell (1847)

[This instalment takes up the allegations in Continental newspapers of O'Connell's supposed irreligious talk, and goes on to the year 1843 and the Monster Meetings.]

Calumnies and unfair comments by the press produced their pernicious effects even in Rome, where O'Connell was no better known or appreciated than elsewhere. In 1837, this man—who had rendered such eminent service to the cause of the freedom of the Church—solicited a slight favour from the Sovereign-Pontiff. He would have liked, when travelling with an ecclesiastic approved by his diocese, for the ecclesiastic to hear his confession, within certain limits, without having to refer to the diocese authority. The Sovereign-Pontiff refused. The friend who solicited this privilege on his behalf did not dare let him know of this refusal. He only wrote to him saying that newspapers had sometimes attributed such strange language to him, that Rome did not know what to think of him. O'Connell replied, his eyes bathed in tears. His letter ended as follows:

"I revere in all things the authority of the Holy See. I really believe (if I know myself) that no one practises more sincerely than I do, and with all my heart, submission—in the widest sense of the word—to the Holy See which the Catholic Church demands of her children. I have never said and shall never say a single word which I would not subject to her authority with profound obedience. I am attached to the centre of unity with the most ardent desire never to separate myself from it either in thought, word or deed, and should I ever deceive myself in the opinions I express, I hope that they will be interpreted according to my sentiments because my submission to the authority of the Church is complete, whole and universal." (The letter from which we have copied these admirable lines has been communicated to us by O'Connell's friend to whom it was addressed. He has allowed us to make

public the parts which could be useful to our work.)

These lines, written in confidence, seemed to the friend to whom they were addressed worthy of being shown to the Pope—who, after reading them, remembered the earlier request and granted Daniel O'Connell, his son and faithful servant, the privilege he had solicited some time before. Even if the services of the illustrious champion of the liberties of the Church have long remained unrecognised, he had, before he died, the sweet satisfaction of seeing justice rendered to him. The expressions of admiration and sympathy coming from France and Italy, along with honours rendered to his memory in the Holy City, can be regarded as glorious, if belated, reparation.

At the opening of the 1841 session, Ireland again became the jousting ground of the contest against the Cabinet. Lord Stanley had announced he would be representing his Bill on the registration of electors. Lord Morpeth, on behalf of the Government, presented a counter-Bill which, despite its faults, Ireland and its representatives had to prefer to the Tory measure. The Parliamentary debate in 1841 was as animated, sharp and dramatic as it had been in 1840. O'Connell, with indefatigable ardour, held the breach through which the Tories sought to gain power. However, despite the efforts of the Irish representatives, the *Scorpion*, with his numerous amendments, left many traces of his sting on the Government Bill, which then had to be abandoned, with time wasted.

The Melbourne Cabinet was no longer governing. It had to regain popularity, rebuild its parliamentary majority or abandon power. John Russell sought to save the Government by means of vast reform plans; but the General Elections (June 1841) gave the Conservatives a majority of more than a hundred, leading to the loss of Free Trade. The new House, faithful to its mandate, defeated Lord Melbourne in a No Confidence vote, and Sir Robert Peel was

elevated to power by a party hostile to commercial reforms—the very reforms which eventually were to be his greatest claim to fame. In Ireland, Orangemen fought the electoral contest with so much vehemence and so many intrigues, that in Dublin, for example, O'Connell was beaten by the machinations of the old Corporation, which was living out its last days. The Tory triumph revived Irish ardour for the break up of the Union. O'Connell, leaving Parliament to return to agitation, publicly thanked the Whigs for their moderation.

"The Whigs, he said, have not done enough for Ireland, but with a few exceptions they have kept it perfectly peaceful. I want the House to know that at the Assizes of a single city in England, that of Liverpool, there were more criminals than in the whole of Ireland."

The accession to power of Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Stanley made the English fear that, as a consequence, the agitator would gain such power as to force the Tories to make concessions, as in 1829. O'Connell, however, wisely restrained his compatriots. He wanted to wait and see how the new Government would act before attacking too vigorously.

On 1st November 1841, Ireland benefitted by the Bill reforming its Municipal Corporations. O'Connell, elected Lord Mayor, made his way in great pomp, and amidst an immense throng, to hear High Mass in the metropolitan Church. It was a great day for Ireland when the champion of popular rights could wear scarlet and ermine, signs of the authority which two hundred thousand citizens of Dublin had conferred on him. No city or town in Ireland had had a Catholic at the head of its administration for the past two hundred years. The *Irish Municipal Act*, by virtue of which the administration of Irish towns and cities was reorganised, had been profoundly modified by the House of Lords; but, nevertheless, it was one of O'Connell's most important victories, as this law tore the sceptre of municipal power from the hands of the Protestants.

Political necessity compelled the Tories to exercise some moderation, and we must admit that the Orangemen did not exercise the exclusive domination they had at first expected. The agitator did not lose sight of his life's work just because he was pursuing it less actively. He went each week to the *Corn Exchange*, wearing the insignia of Office;

he presided the meetings of the Association; and he invited the Irish to enrol under the Repeal banner.

Government policy was to spread the idea that it was favourably disposed towards Ireland, even though its actions absolutely gave the lie to this pretence. At the opening of the 1842 Session, the Lord Mayor went over to take his place in the House of Commons on the Opposition benches. He reappeared in Dublin during the Easter break, to tell Ireland what she had to fear from Sir Robert Peel's Government.

The Liberator only tore himself away from his parliamentary work to renew his campaign of agitation. When he was not in the House of Commons, he was to be found in Dublin, fulfilling his obligations as first magistrate and leading the work of the Association. He presided the Council meetings of the Municipal Corporation; he dispensed justice; he sat three or four hours daily to hear the inhabitants of Dublin claiming burgess status. Finally, as was his wont, he aimed to attend every meeting where religious or national matters were discussed.

The year 1842 passed without the call for repeal bringing a satisfactory revival of constitutional agitation. But, at the start of 1843, the Agitator decided to strike a blow. He gave up parliamentary activity. Instead, he put the question of the Repeal before the Municipal Council and won a vote to petition in favour of the break up of the Union. The incidents of this great agitation and of the monster meetings of 1843 are present in everyone's memory. The English Cabinet, on the pretext of some isolated instances of disorder, got Parliament to pass the *Irish Arms Bill*, destined to restrict the freedom enjoyed by Irishmen to bear arms. O'Connell showed the enemies of his country how little their repressive measures intimidated him by proposing a subscription to raise the funds necessary for the construction of a palace destined to receive the House of Commons of Ireland. Until the day of revocation should come, this palace would serve for the meetings of Repeal supporters.

This *Repeal Association* continued the activity of the *Catholic Association* throughout the country. The explanation we have given of the organisation and the power of this first Association, serves also for the precursor *Society of Ireland*

and the *National Association*. The name changed with changing circumstances, but the institution remained the same, with slight modifications and improvements brought by time and experience.

At the beginning of 1843, the *Times* wrote as follows on the subject of the agitation:

"Never before had populations gathered in favour of the repeal in such formidable demonstrations. O'Connell has become a giant. Starving wretches send 15 000 Francs a week to the Repeal fund. Repealers of low origin are joined by respectable men devoted to the throne, and a faction that was deemed insignificant is becoming a powerful party. What is in question here is not Whigs fighting radicals, or Catholics fighting Protestants. *The danger is greater, it is national movement that is in preparation.*"

Parliament was putting pressure on the Ministry to put an end to this agitation, representing as dangerous. O'Connell calmly carried on with the plan he had decided on, and seemed to draw new strength in the midst of the most strenuous exertions. The old tribune, oblivious of his sixty-seven years, found again all the vigour of his younger self to harangue the floods of people come eager to hear him. The meetings held in various parts of Ireland gathered around him 200,000, 300,000, 400,000 and up to 500, 000 men whom he excited or calmed at will with the sound of his voice.

The Government, until then full of threats, had done no more than send a few thousand soldiers to Ireland. Soon it proceeded to remove from their posts all magistrates in charge of the public peace who had joined the Repeal movement. This measure stoked the fire of agitation. The income of the Association rose from 50 to 75, 000 Francs per week. Meetings attracted more than half a million men, and O'Connell, whose voice had a more sinister echo in England than cannon on the battlefield, never made a speech that did not fail to cause a fall in the London Stock Exchange. The United States of America sent money to Ireland, and the agitator used all these events to feed the inextinguishable source of his harangues.

It may be argued that the taste of his improvisations was not always beyond reproach. However it must be agreed that they rarely missed their mark. The tribune spoke every day, several times a day, in all circumstances, in the midst of

the most unexpected incidents. He spoke only of the ills of his country, the means of redressing them, and the obstacles he met with. He had spoken thus for fifty years, always saying the same things, and always in novel ways, thus charming even persons hearing him for the thousandth time. A guiding thought inspired all his harangues: the resurrection of his country, and this thought, each time he expressed it, was renewed by the ardour of his patriotism and the richness of his imagination. The Repeal of the Union was the varied theme of all the mass harangues of 1843.

"If at other times in the past, he cried, Irishmen had been united as they are today, victory would not have deserted their flag. Oh, it will be a glorious day when the streets of the capital are strewn with leaves and flowers, when the Lord-Lieutenant, escorted by all the nobles of Ireland, makes his way from Dame Street to College Green. This is when the representatives of the people of Ireland and the States of Ireland, under the direction of their president, will salute Ireland liberated and will bless the day when the Union is trampled in the dust!"

The agitation of 1843 was especially remarkable by the active part taken by the bishops and the clergy. The Bishop of Killaloe, replying to the enemies of Ireland who blamed the clergy for their involvement in politics, declared:

"It has been claimed, I know, that it is not appropriate to the sacred status of Catholic ecclesiastics to take an active part in political struggles. We have been preached moderation, invited to concern ourselves exclusively with the exercise of our spiritual functions. Whether this doctrine is proclaimed by our most moderate friends or by men who are hostile to us, I reject it and I consider it despicable with all the energy of my soul... We understand our duty. The people can count on its bishops and its clergy..."

The Bishop of Wexford added:

"My ministry, some may say, calls me to the altar and to the duties relative to religion; but I maintain that I have other obligations to fulfil towards society and toward my country... God preserve me from giving support to an agitation aimed at establishing Catholic supremacy! I detest, I hate the word supremacy, and, if it were possible, I would wipe it from the English language... All we want is liberty!"

The Government had removed from their posts the magistrates who enjoyed

the confidence of the people; the Association organised Tribunals and nominated Judges to decide on cases. In less than six weeks these improvised Tribunals adjudicated more than four thousand cases. O'Connell even went so far as to publish an *Outline of a Constitution of Irish Houses of Parliament*, and the people were getting ready for elections when a proclamation of the vice-Roy suppressed the meeting at Clontarf, which was to take place near Dublin.

The plan of the Liberator was admirably thought out and, some weeks later, England was to find herself *vis-à-vis* Ireland in the same position as after the Clare election. In 1829, she had to choose between civil war and emancipation; in 1843, she could, under the influence of the same fear, give back to Ireland its law-making powers. The agitator was thoroughly convinced that the same causes would produce the same effects, when he proclaimed and repeated each day that, within six months Ireland would have her Parliament. He was mistaken as regards the time; but who would dare say the bishops, the clergy and the people of Ireland will not be faithful to their promise to be satisfied with English concessions only when their Parliament is returned to them?

We remember the incidents of the monster trial which brought O'Connell, his son John and the leaders of the Association before the jury. We know the demonstrations of sympathy bestowed on this king-prisoner in Richmond: he held *levées* where the whole of Ireland appeared in succession, her bishops, her priests, and deputations sent by the municipalities. The Primate of Ireland, who after 1829 had abstained from politics, publicly protested against the insulting exclusion of Catholics from the list of those eligible to serve on the jury. And it was the bishops that O'Connell asked to maintain peace and tranquillity in the country during his captivity. The prelates answered his appeal; but they wanted to do more. Meeting in synod in Dublin, they formulated a prayer that was recited in all the parishes of Ireland, which said:

"Almighty God, grant your servant Daniel O'Connell, at present kept captive, the necessary grace to bear with resignation this terrible ordeal; and in your misericord, let him return safe and sound to freedom, for the direction and protection of your people."

No one has forgotten the spectacle

of Dublin on the day O'Connell was set free by a decision of the High Court, and the loud expressions of joy and sympathy to be heard both in Ireland and in England.

The years 1840, 1841 and 1842 had been employed in sowing the elements of agitation, in preparing the solemn and glorious demonstrations of the year 1843, so justly called *the year of the Repeal*. It is in that year that the agitation acquired the force which rendered it unshakable at the time of the terrible ordeals of 1844; and the triumphs that are still to come will be traced to that year.

We have reported the important concessions that O'Connell, himself never a party man, wrung successively from the Tories, through the fear he inspired, and from the Whigs, through his support. It remains for us to say a word of what he did not gain, that is to say, the repeal of the Union. It has been claimed that the agitator used the repeal as a flag of circumstance to amuse Ireland, flatter her hopes and worry his enemies, while having no faith himself in the cause he preached.

This accusation is totally gratuitous; it rests on nothing: not a single word can be found to support it.

The public career of O'Connell began with a protest against legislative union and his commitment to toil to reconquer the parliamentary independence of his country. Let anyone follow O'Connell from those first days, study him, read the immortal speeches in which he proclaimed the rights of Ireland, and then answer the question! Granted a lot is hyperbole and enthusiasm; nevertheless it remains firmly established that O'Connell was profoundly convinced that Ireland has the right to govern herself, and that the re-establishment of the national Parliament was the only measure capable of ensuring the permanent prosperity of his country. From this conviction was born the duty to work with the ardour he deployed at different periods to liberate his country from the yoke of a foreign legislature.

The break up of the Union was never in Ireland itself as generally popular as the cause of emancipation. It was always rejected in England. This is why, in 1843, the English Government did not yield as it did in 1829; nevertheless, who would dare maintain that the question so firmly pursued to a conclusion

by O'Connell will not very soon receive a solution? The Irish aristocracy is beginning to appreciate the consequences of legislative union, as the ruin of Ireland leads to their own ruin. England has tasted, especially for the past two years, the bitter fruit of its confiscation. Providence, by forcing the British Government to feed two or three million Irishmen, will help public opinion to understand that it would be advantageous to let Ireland administer herself and provide for her own needs, rather than let the resources of the empire be without profit spent in that country. Has not the *Times* put forward the idea of giving the Irish a few millions sterling to rid England of them?

O'Connell's great idea has the future on its side. His efforts, uncrowned with success in his lifetime, will not be sterile. The great things he leaves unfinished are in the process of being realised. Besides, however far in the future this event might be, the re-establishment of the former legislature is perfectly compatible with the British constitution. O'Connell has always been on this question deeply convinced of everything he said, and he has himself replied to his detractors:

"I am accused of lacking in sincerity; it is claimed that I started this movement with the sole purpose of intimidating the English Parliament: Irishmen, do not believe this. I want the flag I have raised in my lifetime to be planted on my tomb. I will not cease to fight until we have a national Parliament in Dublin; yes, I swear it before my country!"

At the very beginning of the Catholic agitation he said to his compatriots:

"My mind is fixed—I trample under foot the Catholic claims, if they can interfere with the Repeal; I abandon all wish for emancipation, if it delays that Repeal. Nay, were Mr. Perceval [the PM], tomorrow, to offer me the Repeal of the Union, upon the terms of re-enacting the entire penal code, I declare it from the bottom of my heart, and in the presence of my God, that I would most cheerfully embrace his offer."

Yes, no matter what may be said, Ireland can boldly write on the tomb of her great citizen, as was his often expressed wish: "*He lived and died for the break up of the Union.*"

Publishers: Sagnier et Bray, Rue des Saint-Pères, Paris.

Manus O'Riordan

"Go on fighting and kill Germans"

Enthusiastic Sommetry!

So, you thought that the battle of the Somme occurred during July 1916, and that was that! Yet the killing fields of the Somme Front were to reap their deadly harvest up to the concluding year of Britain's Imperialist War, 1918.

The Times' *History of the First World War* involves an "On This Day" feature that reproduces in each current issue a War Report from its issue 100 years previously. The issue of this 27th March carries a report from 27th March 1918, headed "THE FORCING OF THE SOMME". The sub-heading on the online edition reads: "(German) prisoners tell us of the immense losses their units suffered, and nearly all say freely that this is Germany's supreme effort, and that she is putting all her strength into it because she must have peace."

The print edition concludes, with reference to the British Army, that "men come out of the line clinging to the last to the one definite notion that their business is to go on fighting and kill Germans". The following extract from the report gives context:

"The battle continues to rage along the entire front, where, on the whole, the Germans still make headway and we fall back... Here, writing from the spot and finding words incapable of expressing all one wants to say, one has an uncomfortable feeling that perhaps you people at home will think that a correspondent talks too much of the valour of our men when that valour ends always in withdrawal. Yet history, I believe, when all is known, will be amazed at what British troops have done here in the last five days... The mere physical strain has been enormous, but men come out of the line clinging to the last to the one definite notion that their business is to go on fighting and kill Germans."

There was hardly a family in Ireland left untouched by the War that Britain had launched on Germany in August 1914. As I wrote in the *"Irish Times"* on 28th November, 2002:

"Two years after the murderous Battle of the Somme it was still a front

being fought over. It was there that John Sheehy, a first cousin of my maternal grandfather Larry Keohane ... was killed on February 15, 1918. There was indeed much heartbreak and sorrow among his family, not least because he had died as British cannon-fodder".

The role of D. D. Sheehan, the North Cork MP who recruited such cannon-fodder, became the subject of a debate in the columns of *"The Corkman"*, extending from late 2002 into early 2003. It was a debate during which I dealt in greater detail with my own family history in the issue of 7th November 2002:

"There are no Republican martyrs in my family tree. Those of my Cork relatives (from Ballingearry on my father's side and Clonakilty on my mother's) who fought for Irish freedom in the IRA all survived our War of Independence. The only war casualty in the family had fought in quite a different cause—Britain's Imperialist War against Germany—John Sheehy of Barryroe, Clonakilty... There was, of course, considerable family mourning and sorrow at his death. But what was mourned no less was the fact that he had died in a British army uniform. With some family members this no doubt was with the benefit of the hindsight acquired in the brief period following the 1916 Rising. Hindsight certainly had no right to be smug in evaluating the mistake of historic personalities... (but) to make a virtue of that mistake... would be most unfair to the memory of those who, unlike D D Sheehan, did allow the scales to drop from their eyes in the wake of Britain's post-Easter Rising vengeance ..."

There were other people again for whom the scales had never been there in the first place. John Sheehy's sister, Máire Ní Shíthe, a colleague of P.H. Pearse who proudly described herself as a "Gaelic authoress" in the 1901 Census, had drawn far different lessons than her brother from the family circumstances of being native Irish-speaking children of a tenant farmer evicted during the Land War. A founder of the Gaelic League in the Clonakilty area and Irish-language Editor of the *"Cork Sun"*, she was responsible for organising the very successful *Feiseanna* in the early years

of the twentieth century that for a time were held in conjunction with the Clonakilty Agricultural Show. That is, until the year the Show organisers also invited a British Army band to provide additional entertainment. In the *"Cork Evening Echo"* on 1st August 1971 my maternal aunt and godmother Máire Bean Uí Shíocháin completed the story of her cousin's stand:

"When the Feis committee arrived at the venue they found the then army of occupation, the Redcoats, had taken up positions in the fair field. Máire Ní Shíthe refused to go in until the Redcoats came out. They refused to do so and the result was that no Feis was held".

The army of occupation would of course, go on to do its worst in the shape of the Black-and-Tans and RIC Auxiliaries. Under the title of his 1932 memoirs, *"The Men I Killed"*, selected writings of the Auxies' founding commander, Brigadier General Frank Crozier, were reprinted in 2002 by *Athol Books* of Belfast, associate publishers of Millstreet's *Aubane Historical Society*. These are most revealing and of particular interest because Crozier actually resigned from that position when British atrocities, carried out primarily in the Cork area, became too much even for him.

But this was only a few years after blood-lust had already been unleashed by Britain's War on Germany, in which Crozier himself had been no less ruthlessly efficient as a Major in the Royal Irish Rifles. Sometimes that blood-lust could get out of hand, as in an incident involving Crozier's own men during the Battle of the Somme:

"Their nerves are utterly unstrung. The enemy falls like grass before the scythe. 'Damned...!' shouts an officer, 'give them hell'. I look thorough my glasses. 'Good heavens,' I shout, 'those men are prisoners surrendering, and some of our own wounded men are escorting them! Cease fire, cease fire, for God's sake,' I command. The fire ripples on for a time. The target is too good to lose. 'After all they are only Germans', I hear a youngster say. But I get the upper hand at last..."

Crozier had nonetheless been proud of his efforts to nurture a more controlled blood-lust:

"The first half of 1915 is spent by us in perfecting our military machine for war... I, for my part, do what I can to alter completely the outlook, bearing,

and mentality of over a thousand men in as short a time as possible—for blood-lust is taught for purposes of war in bayonet-fighting itself and by doping the minds of all with propagandistic poison... The process of 'seeing red' which has to be carefully cultured if the effect is to be lasting, is elaborately grafted into the make-up of even the meek and mild, through the instrumentality of martial music, drums, Irish pipes, bands and marching songs..."

"The British soldier is a kindly fellow and it is safe to say, despite the dope, seldom oversteps the mark of barbaric propriety in France, save occasionally to kill prisoners he cannot be bothered to escort back to his lines. In order that he shall enter into the true spirit of the show, however, the fun of the fair as we may call it, it is necessary to corrode his mentality with bitter-sweet vice and to keep him up to the vicious scratch on all occasion... (so) that they (British soldiers) will be able to joke lightly among themselves in these matters, fortified by the fact that they are giving more gashes, ripping up more bodies and causing more suffering generally than the other side. By September 1915, everything we do is faultless, everything the Germans do is abominable..."

In its report of 20th February 1915 the *"Cork Examiner"* had already entered into that spirit of the show: *"Sergeant Michael O'Leary, who received the VC for having killed eight Germans, has become the hero of the hour in London"*. It quoted the following from Michael O'Leary himself:

"We captured a machine gun, killed the gunners and took some prisoners. The Huns lost terribly... On the 6th inst. we attacked them again with the bayonet and took all their trenches... When the Irish Guards charge, they do charge, and the Huns knew that too. You would laugh if you saw us chasing them, mowing them down by the hundreds... We have not yet properly started on them. God help them when we do, for there will be some slaughter, they will beat it back to Berlin, any of them that is left..."

War and its accompanying slaughter is indeed a terrible thing. The official history of O'Leary's regiment was to be written by no less a person than Rudyard Kipling himself, whose own son John had fallen in its ranks in September 1915. Published in 1923 as *"The Irish Guards in the Great War"*, and emblazoned with Kipling's own personalised swastika emblem, it related Michael O'Leary's 1915 exploits as follows:

"February 1st—The Germans were too well posted to be moved by bomb or rifle, so our big guns were called upon to shell for ten minutes, with shrapnel, the hollow where they lay. The spectacle was sickening, but the results were satisfactory... It was here that Lance-Corporal O'Leary... won his V.C. He rushed up along the railway embankment above the trenches, shot down 5 Germans behind their first barricade in the trench, then 3 more trying to work a machine-gun at the next barricade fifty yards further along the trench, and took a couple of prisoners. Eye-witnesses report that he did his work quite leisurely and wandered out into the open, visible for any distance around, intent upon killing another German to whom he had taken a dislike... Our guns and our attack had accounted for about 30 dead, but had left 32 wounded and unwounded prisoners, all of whom, with one exception, wept aloud. The hollow was full of mixed dead—Coldstream, Irish, and German".

Kipling's suggestion that O'Leary could not be bothered to escort back more than a handful of prisoners, and that he had proceeded to kill another German, to whom he had taken a dislike, makes for chilling reading. And I cannot bring myself to share Eoghan Harris's enthusiastic endorsement in the *"Sunday Independent"* of 8th August 2004: *"But what really took my breath away was the bald strap under O'Leary's picture in the 'Daily Mail': 'Killed Eight Germans'. If he did that today he'd be attacked by Amnesty International..."*

See http://ballingearryhs.com/journal/2004/michael_o_leary.html for the full text of my article, **"Michael O'Leary, Kuno Meyer and Peadar Ó Laoghaire"**, published in the **Ballingeary Historical Society Journal, 2004"**.

General F.P. Crozier: *The Men I Killed* (1937), *Irish Memoirs* and other writings. Introduction by *Brendan Clifford*. 152 pp. €14, £11.50, postfree

Wilson John Haire

Re-routing Old Injuries

If you deny your life
deny those things that made you
those unpleasant things
when violence was rife
and the very waters turned a reddish
hue

and whinge
and cringe

about those frightening nights
you're saying sorry
sorry for your freedom
not remembering you were the quarry
and they
being on the Somme
wasn't it time to harry
now you deny all this

as if you had no father
as if you had no mother

Jesus had at least one
leaving Joseph a mere legation
but why bother
with such personal details
when the miraculous seed

carried out the operation
from colony to Free state
to Republic
not even God could flout
such coordination
without a battlefield
and what about
old England
enjoying the bubbly
celebrating all
the past and present calendar yields

yes, there was Henry the wife-killer
yes, there was Elizabeth his daughter

whose Catholic corpses
became the nation's pillars
but without it all there would be
nothing but blanks
a tree can't dismiss its roots
and then decide to live
and be made into planks
into coffins for a nation's memory
for still buried in the earth are the
patriots
and their armoury

10th July 2018

If You're Irish . . .
John Francis D'Alton
Evolution By Selection
Marian Anderson
Holidays!
Spoiled Brats of Europe

If You're Irish, come into...

"From these and other references it is clear that the MacSweeneys had begun to establish themselves as incomers from Scotland to Ireland in the second half of the thirteenth century, that is, at the time of the coming of the Mac Donalds and at the outset of the period of **galloglach** [foreign warrior-Galloglass-Hebridean] ingress. Although the Mac Sweeneys appear to have been of **Gall-Gaedheal** [mercenary-non Hebridean] origin, an effort similar to that which we have considered in the case of the MacDonalds was made to provide them with a fictitious descent when they became a family of importance in Ireland. An imposing series of ancestors was produced for the original Suibhne, [Sweeney] among them Anradhan and his father, Aodh Athlomhan, the latter King of the O Neils in the direct descent from Nial Glundubh. This mixture of truth and falsehood led to the statements that the MacSweeneys were originally Irish, that their Scottish connections were due solely to the fact that Anradhan left Ireland, formed an alliance with the King of Scotland and settled in that country—to fit the known fact of Mac Sweeney presence in Cautyre [Kintyre]—and that some of his descendants returned to Ireland in the thirteenth century and were responsible for the various branches of the MacSweeney family in that country. To this view O Cleirigh [Four Masters] gave credence. From, we must suppose, the same vague rumours of extra-Irish connections Spenser produced this rarity : that the MacSweeneys were not Irish in origin but ancient English! The origin of both the MacDonalds and the MacSweeneys was Irish to this extent only, that the *Gall-Gaedheal* [mercenary-non Hebridean] were an intermixture of Dalriadic Irish settlers in Scotland and Scandinavians" (Gerard A. Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland (1565-1603)*, p.31, Dublin by Edmond de Burca for Edmund Burke Publishers, 1996).

John Francis D'Alton (1882-1963)

—was the only Archbishop of Armagh and Cardinal to hail from west of the Shannon. He was born in his father's public house in Claremorris, Co. Mayo

in October, 1882.

"He suggested a federal solution as one of the ways of ending the problems caused by partition. He had six proposals:

- (1). Each of the Six Counties should be allowed to decide whether it wishes to remain in the Northern Parliament or whether it would prefer to 'go to Dublin'.
- (2). The Northern Government should agree to enter with the south as a federal unit.
- (3). Ireland should then associate itself with the Commonwealth on an independent republic basis as India.
- (4). A re-united Ireland should offer bases to NATO. A united-Ireland too could make useful contributions to the projected new free European market.
- (5). As pre-requisite for a satisfactory solution of the problem of partition the Cardinal regards as essential 'the ending of the present system of gerrymandering and of unfair discrimination against the minority which are the source of such bitterness and irritation.'
- (6). Under the new constitution the representatives of the minority in the Northern Parliament would give their fullest co-operation..." (Rev. Bernard J. Canning, *Bishops of Ireland 1870-1987*, p.48, *Donegal Democrat*, Ballyshannon, 1987)

Evolution By Selection

"My nominee is the concept of evolution by selection—which encompasses natural selection, sexual selection, and the selective processes that generate cultural evolution. It offers the best explanation for what we are, where we came from, and the nature of life in the rest of the universe. It also explains why we invent and why we believe the inventions described in this list are important. It is the invention that explains invention"

Paul W. Ewald, who wrote these lines, is an evolutionary biologist and a Professor of Biology at Amherst College (*The Greatest Inventions of the Past 2000 Years*. Edited by John Brockman. Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2000.)

Marian Anderson (1897-1993)

On 9th April, 1939, African-American contralto, Marian Anderson, sang to an

Easter Sunday crowd of 75,000 at the Lincoln Memorial after the Daughters of the American Revolution refused to allow her to sing at Constitution Hall in Washington DC.

Holidays!

Today, schools in Ireland are obliged to open for 183 days per year at primary level and 167 days per year at post-primary level.

Back at the beginning of the century, children attending Coomhola and Borlin Valley schools, up in that mountainy region west of Bantry town, Co. Cork, had holidays as follows:

- A month off (twenty school days) for Christmas;
- Seven days in January;
- Six days off at Easter from Good Friday;
- All Election days off;
- Two weeks off beginning July

In all, 48 days with a bit of luck!

And there was never a fool came out of either school!

Spoiled Brats of Europe

The Balearic island has been a popular destination for several years for Irish students who have just finished their exams. The many who stay in Santa Ponsa also make night-time forays to Magaluf, the resort, just under 10km away, where the rest of each summer's Irish student visitors stay, usually in the TRH apartment complex.

"Although they are only a short distance apart, the two beach resorts are profoundly different. 'You're only going to meet farmers and people with GAA jerseys in Santa Ponsa', says James Corcoran from Westport, in Co Mayo. It's about 1 a.m. in Magaluf, and he's eating a slice of pizza in a restaurant named Poonma with his friend Tom O'Donnell, from Bantry, in Co Cork. They both attended the boarding school of Cistercian College, Roscrea.

"There were 35 in our class, and 25 of us are out here', says O'Donnell. 'It's a rite of passage to come out here.'

'If you come from a private school it's more accepted to come to Magaluf', Corcoran says. 'You're going to meet English people here, and other people from private schools. Santa Ponsa is full of Irish.'

'In the two days I shuttle between Magaluf and Santa Ponsa I do indeed see a lot of GAA jerseys in Santa Ponsa and none in Magaluf'..." (Rosita Boland, *Irish Times*, 30.6.2018)

Not even a Rugged jersey, Rosita, where would the Irish middle-class be without one of those!