

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

Thoughts For The Times

The BBC v. Gerry Kelly

Darwin and Mendel

Orwell, Ireland and the War

John Buchan and the Colonials

The Moynihan Brothers

Solzhenitsyn

No. 142

Fourth Quarter, 2020

Editorial

Thoughts For The Times (1)

What is the Culture of Western Civilisation?

In the most general form of culture, the one which is independent of the babel of national languages, music, it is German.

In the most specific form of culture, the governing of states, it is the political culture of British Capitalism.

British political power spread throughout the world. It *conquered* the world and imposed on it the dogma that the way Britain was governed was the only way that was in accordance with the essence of human nature, and was therefore the only right way. But most countries which, made uncertain of themselves by the destructive power of Britain, tried to remake themselves politically on the lines of the British system failed to do it successfully, and were obstructed in their attempts by Britain.

An essential condition of the development of the British political system in Britain was absolute sovereignty, maintained by the aggressive use of military/naval power against others. That made the British example difficult to emulate.

The Emperor Julian, the nephew of Constantine, who made Christianity the State religion of Rome and gave it the form in which it became part of the life of a great part of the world, is known as *Julian the Apostate* because he tried to undo what his uncle had done. He re-opened the Pagan temples, restored the Greek Goddesses and Gods under their Latin names, and demanded of the Stoic philosophers that they should impose some life into their philosophy, so that it could compete with Christianity. But it came to nothing.

While waiting for the opportunity to become Emperor, Julian governed Gaul and expanded the Roman province up to the banks of the Rhine. He heard the Germans across the Rhine singing songs that they had made up. He did not think much of them. We know nothing of the Roman songs he compared them with. Rome was military conquest and State administration.

The Romans failed to conquer the Germans—thus causing the First World War, according to the British propaganda of 1914. If the Emperor Augustus had won the Battle of Teutoberg Forest in the year 9, the Germans would have been Latinised and it would have been unnecessary for Britain to make war on them in 1914.

So the Germans kept on being German, living their lives outside the Empire, and making up songs. And it was Rome, whose march of Progress had been stopped, that fell apart. They kept on speaking German east of the Rhine, while some of them spread out into the fragmenting Empire and took part in the forming of new nations, and new states and new languages: French, Spanish, Italian. Those who remained east of the Rhine did not burden themselves with a State.

In the early 15th century, Poggio Bracciolini, Secretary

to a Pope, attended the contentious Council of Constance in southern Germany. There were a couple of rival Popes at the time, and the Council tried to take advantage of the situation to assert itself as the supreme authority. Bracciolini had to spend a long time in Germany. He looked around him and he sent a letter to an acquaintance back in Italy describing what he saw. He was particularly struck by the easiness of relations between the sexes:

“the name of jealousy, that plague, which is elsewhere productive of so much misery, is here unknown. How unlike the manners of these peoples is to ours, who always see things on the dark side... I envy the apathy of these Germans, and I execrate our perversity, who are always wishing for what we have not... But these people, content with little, enjoy their day of life in mirth and movement... Thus they are rich by the mere disposition of their minds. Their motto is, *live while you live*”.

Othello could not have been set in Germany. And the outstanding work of German opera could not have been set anywhere but in Germany. Its subject is about a wild, romantic aristocrat being brought within the sphere of bourgeois life, and contributing something to it in the process. It was produced before the German nation-state was formed, and the civilised world of the bourgeois towns continued to exist after the state was formed. That opera was *The Master-singers Of Nuremberg*.

It was around that time that Britain began to think of itself as the Roman Empire re-born. And it took up the task in which the Emperor Augustus had been defeated—the breaking of the Germans. Augustus lost his Legions in the Teutoberg Forest and after that Rome let the Germans be. Britain announced in 1914 that German singularity was a menace to the uniformity which it was imposing on the world as a good thing, and that it would take revenge on the Germans on behalf of Augustus, and there would be peace in the world.

Another attempt was made to finish them off in 1939. They are still there, in many respects being German in the old-fashioned way. But they are in a sense without national statehood in a Europe arranged in nation-states but which, in its attempt to form a Union, depends on German industry.

Nondescript cosmopolitan Globalism is failing. There is everywhere a reversion to what, from the cosmopolitan viewpoint is seen as primitive “*fundamentalism*”. So be it.

That means that the characteristics of peoples are becoming evident again, and that civilisation is not some general formula that can be injected into human material anywhere. There are civilisations, not civilisation. It is in large part an attribute of peoples. And the Germans are evidently the European people.

The only other form of European civilisation that has had continuous existence over many centuries is the Roman form preserved by the Roman Church. It combined with the Germans, in the shambles that Britain made of Europe by its second war on Germany, to launch the attempt to establish a European political union in defiance of Britain. President Mary McAleese, who made a career out of it thirty years ago, is now engaged in an attempt to demolish it, replace it with a dogmatically egoistic liberal sentimentality of the fashion of the moment, and complete the work of the Penal Laws. The same thing is being attempted by influential elements within the EU. *

Rainbow Bridges ?

The Duke of Wellington was a British Imperialist born in the British colony in Ireland. Whether or not he said that being born in a stable would not make a man a horse, there is no doubt that he was not Irish, and did not think he was Irish, or pretend that he was. He joined the Army because that was what young aristocrats who were not inheriting did, if they did not become clergy in the State Church. Because he could 'see' what was happening in a battle and give clear orders, he had considerable success with a small army in Spain, in the context of a nationalist guerrilla war against France, while Napoleon was being defeated by Russia.

He was the main allied commander at Waterloo in the war against the Army hastily assembled by Napoleon after his escape from exile. He held out during the day, because Napoleon had become dependent on his Chief of Staff, Berthier, for the translating of his wishes into clear orders, and Berthier was not with him at Waterloo. At the end of the day, the Prussians appeared and saved the day.

Wellington then became *The Duke*. He was a power in the state because of his role in the mystique of what was then called the *Great War*.

Ireland was at peace. The blundering colonial order, with its Irish Parliament, had been undermined by the Act of Union and a new order was gestating slowly. The new order became troublesome in the late 1820s. Catholics had been given the vote in the 1790s, but could not sit in Parliament. O'Connell got himself elected and dared the Government to keep him out of Parliament. He had built up a mass movement and things were on the point of civil war.

The Duke said: Let him in. This had nothing to do with national sentiment. The absolute anti-Catholicism of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 had long since worn thin, and the Duke had had Catholic chaplains in his army in Catholic Spain.

Fifteen years later O'Connell again carried things to the brink of war on the issue of Repeal of the Union. He had got nowhere with it in Parliament. He had barely been able to get a debate. So he acted outside Parliament by means of *Monster Meetings*. These were to culminate in a meeting at Clontarf at which O'Connell would reveal the names of a Council of 500 gentlemen of substance who would take over the running of the country. The Duke decided on war. This was rebellion against the state, where Catholic Emancipation had been a measure of enfranchisement by the state. Dragoons were deployed on the approaches to Clontarf. If it was bluff, O'Connell did not call it. He backed down. His movement disintegrated.

Young Ireland had developed under his influence. It then disowned him, and what is now called "*the tradition of physical force*" began. Its origin lay in Wellington's decision to dragoon a peaceful assembly.

Martin Mansergh is engaged in a dispute about Wellington in the Belfast *Irish News*, trying to present him as not just being colonial British in Ireland. He quotes him in the Lords in 1829 saying that:

Contents

	Page
What Is The Culture Of Western Civilisation?	
Editorial: <i>Thoughts For The Times</i> (1)	2
Rainbow Bridges?	
Editorial: <i>Thoughts For The Times</i> (2)	3
The BBC v. Gerry Kelly	
(<i>The Nolan Show</i>)	4
Darwin, Mendel And The Number Three	
John Martin	6
Orwell, Ireland And The War,	
<i>The View From Airstrip Three, Part 5</i>	
Martin Tyrrell	11
Sean Russell, A Fascist? Matt Doyle,	
National Graves Association	15
A Lodge In The Wilderness	
<i>John Buchan, Part Two</i>	
Stephen Richards	16
Famous Irishmen	
Donal Kennedy	20
The Moynihan Brothers	
AOH and AFIL	
Brendan Clifford	21
An Anglican Vicar's Diet	
Niall Cusack	25
Looting In The Foundation Of Israel	
Report	
Comment: Wilson John Haire	27
Israel: Letter To Simon Coveney	
Gillian Kingston (World Council of Churches)	27
La Fontaine On Class.	
Cathy Winch	27
Solzhenitsyn's <i>Two Centuries Together</i> (15)	
<i>Kishinev</i> (Pogroms, Part 4)	
Peter Brooke	28
Sir Michael O'Dwyer.	
Part 4: Articles in <i>The Times</i>	31
Vox Pat by Pat Maloney:	
Skeleton History? John Wayne;	
Gold; Irish Birth Rate	36, 35

Sales:

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

Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney

ISSN: 0332-3625

All Correspondence should be sent to:

P. Maloney,
26 Church Avenue, Roman Street, 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

“if I could avoid by any sacrifice whatsoever, even one month of civil war, in the country to which I was attached, I would sacrifice my life in order to do it...”

That was an issue where war would have made no sense as a measure of Imperial statecraft. Fifteen years later he had no qualms about dragooning “*the country to which I was attached*” (see letter, *Irish News*, 9.10.20).

The letter concludes with this convoluted sentence:

“If political unity involves, as John Hume repeated, uniting people before

territory, it is difficult to fathom how an implacable ideological hostility, with an un-nuanced view of history to figures like Wellington whose lives have bridged the Irish Sea, will assuage the part of the NI population that wants to keep the British political connection...”.

John Hume repeated that mantra *ad infinitum* but insofar as he acted effectively he did not act on it. His mode of speech invariably aggravated one of the peoples who were there to be united. His actions gave priority to establishing institutions with some semblance of all-Ireland reality. His effective action

helped to end the War by a drastic re-arrangement of the Northern Ireland structure which de-valued the Unionist majority.

The people, like Wellington, whose lives *bridged* the Irish Sea were British aristocrats.

With Brexit imminent, Ireland needs to rediscover the European cultural dimension that was once an important part of its life, but which was lost completely in the course of the 20th century.

Re-nuancing is certainly needed, but it should be a European re-nuancing, which Europe itself now needs no less than Ireland.

The BBC vs Gerry Kelly

[We give below a transcript of a BBC discussion with Gerry Kelly of Sinn Fein, a member of the Policing Board of Northern Ireland, on the occasion of the publication of his book about a prison escape. The discussion was first broadcast, presumably, in 2013, the year the book was published. Part of it was re-broadcast on 29th September 2020. The date of the original broadcast was not given and we don't know what was excluded from the re-broadcast.

The interview was conducted by Stephen Nolan, a very highly paid interviewer, who has a programme on 'mainland' BBC radio most evenings, and a regular morning programme on BBC Radio Ulster (i.e., Radio Six Counties Of Ulster).

An interview broadcast live might possibly be off-key, due to some quirks in the mind of the interviewer, but an edited repeat, broadcast many years later, must be presumed to have the full authority of the BBC—the British State broadcaster—behind it in its interviewing techniques and bias.]

Nolan Show, Tuesday 29th September 2020-10-03:

“Yesterday we discussed the reaction to the Sinn Fein MLA Gerry Kelly's tweet, marking the anniversary of his escape from the Maze Prison [on 25th September 2013]. Mr. Kelly posted the following on Friday. He said: “*37 years ago 38 Irish Republican prisoners were getting into a lorry at 8.7, heading to the front gate of Long Kesh and freedom. One of Big Bob's [Storey] best Ops. I had the privilege of the front passenger seat: well, someone had to check we were taking the right route out.*”

The Secretary of State, Brandon Lewis, labelled that message as disgraceful, shameful, and a gratuitous incitement. In 1983 38 paramilitaries used smuggled guns and knives to take over their Block before escaping. Prison Officer Jim Ferris died of a heart attack after being stabbed while attempting to stop the breakout. Prison Officer John Adams was shot in

the head during the jailbreak.

I interviewed Gerry Kelly some years ago about a book that explained what had happened that day [*The Escape* published October 2013]; and we've decided to repeat it, some of it, today again, to let you hear some of the context, since this is being talked about again. I asked Gerry Kelly why he wanted the story told.”

Gerry Kelly: I suppose, because it was an interesting story. I suppose because it was a huge event in history. I mean it was 30 years ago. You have to realise that. Sometimes I even think about it. I can remember it like it was yesterday, but for other people there, it is an historical discussion. Now, you haven't as yet read the book, and I'm the author: I suppose you would expect me to say it's a good yarn. But it is a good yarn. An escape from the most secure prison in Europe is a book in which I think many

people are interested in. I don't want to over-play it, but very many people are interested—

BBC: —But, Gerry, it's not a yarn. This is an incident in which Prison Officers were threatened with their lives. That's not a yarn.

GK: Well, it is. I mean, to be frank with you—there's no point in my trying to jump around—I'm not hiding from anything that happened on the day. There was two Prison Officers shot. There was a prisoner shot, and, in the scheme of the events, in the context in which it was taking place, within two years after the Hunger Strike—within two years after something like five to six years of systematic brutality in the Prison regime, and I don't say that in any way lightly, that's what was happening.

BBC: But you wouldn't call that a yarn either, would you.

GK: Well—

BBC: —That brutality. You first need to surely be careful with your language.

GK: You've asked me a question. I'm giving you honest language. If you want me to—

BBC: —It shows indifference though, does it not?

GK: No, it isn't indifference at all—

BBC: —to life and threat to life when you call something a yarn in which people died and were threatened with their lives.

GK: Well, it's—

BBC: —It sounds casual.

GK: Well, it's not casual. It was one of the biggest days in my life. I know it was one of the biggest days in other people's lives as well. Let us also not talk about this as if it was not the [??]. You know ten people died in the H Block, and there was demoralisation outside of Jail and inside of Jail. What did Republican prisoners do? They said, OK, we are where we are. Now how do we move our struggle forward? You have to look upon this in the

context of struggle. And it was a very fierce struggle. There was no quarter given by either captive or captors. This was a prison which was trying to break Republican prisoners. And Republican prisoners decided that one of the ways, because the slogan of the time was Smash the H Blocks! One of the ways to smash the H Blocks was to break out. This was the biggest prison escape in British penal history of recent times.

BBC: It came at a cost, though.

GK: Well, yes. It came at a cost.

BBC: When did it first enter your mind that you could escape from that prison?

GK: I had two priorities while I was in Jail. As most Republicans probably had. And it was to educate myself, and to escape. And, in my priorities, escape came first. So it was always on my mind. When did I think that we could do it? As the plan developed. It was quite an intricate plan, very complex.

BBC: Who came up with the plan?

GK: Well, it was a plan—this idea of taking over the Jail was not a new idea, but the putting together of the plan was a very collective thing. However, Larry Marley was crucial in it, and Larry Marley was later assassinated by Loyalists.

BBC: And was it sanctioned, this escape, was it sanctioned by the IRA Army Council outside?

GK: Something like that. It would have had to go past them. There were weapons involved.

BBC: And did they organise it? Did they feed into the plan?

GK: The prisoners organised it.

BBC: And they gave their approval.

GK: Yes. Larry Marley was the Escape Officer, so he was coordinating the escape; collecting Intelligence, doing all the facts. And then we would have had someone who would be in touch with the outside world, feeding them the information, saying there is a need for a number of weapons and explaining, I suppose, the argument for this, because I suppose for the IRA outside it was a huge risk, because, if it had went wrong badly, the end-up would have been more demoralisation. If it was going right, then it was a boost to the Republican struggle at the time. And, in the end, it was a boost to the Republican struggle.

BBC: You waken up in the morning of the escape. What's in your head?

GK: It was a wee bit like Christmas. All these thoughts going about in my head. I went to bed early. I usually had very little trouble sleeping. I'd usually get up just as the morning shift was coming on, of prison guards. But I woke up fairly early that morning and I put my hands behind my head. I was part of the planning, so I went through what had to happen during the day. I mean, the reason this escape was [successful was], probably that everybody

did their bit, because there were so many different parts of it. The Block itself had to be taken over within a period of something like two to three minutes. So everybody had to do precisely what was necessary at that point.

BBC: And what was your part in that?

GK: Well, my role in that was to help take over the Circle. The Circle area, that was the Administration area, where it was very hard to get prisoners into. It was different in the Wings. We lived in the Wings. This was the part of the Block which we didn't live in. So we had to get ourselves out into there and take over that part of the Block. Then my job was to be in the front of the lorry. The rest of the prisoners would have been in the back. And I was in charge of the Guard who was in the front of the lorry, and he was to drive us down to the Front Gate, where we were to take over the Security—the Security Building there.

BBC: And, when you say, "taking over" the Wings, that's threatening to kill people, using violence, and scaring people that they were about to die at gun-point, in order to let you escape.

GK: Well, actually in the Wings it didn't involve guns, but in the Circle it did. You say it was threatening to take over. Yes, it was made very clear that this was an operation, that they should not interfere with it, and—

BBC: —Be killed.

GK: Yes, that would be the threat. But you also have to understand that there was a psychology of the escape, and the psychology. Remember, as I said earlier, this was an atmosphere—there's no point in describing it in any other way—of anger and hatred between both sides: between the prisoners, after all those protests and after the Hunger Strikes and all of that. So within that atmosphere there had to be a psychology of escape which would prevent any undue violence. So this was the psychology of the escape. And this was made clear to every single person. Use verbal aggression so that you do not have to use physical aggression. However, if physical aggression was needed to save, to protect a Volunteer, or to save the escape, that should be—

BBC: —Kill somebody if you have to—

GK: Well, that's not what was said but—

BBC: —That's what you meant.

GK: Well, in the scheme of things, if you want to put this in context: 38 persons involved in a mass escape—these actually could have been a hundred and twenty-six prisoners, but the only people who could—because of the danger involved in the escape—was anyone who was doing more than four

years—more than four years left in their sentence. That's why there was 38 people. And their determination was to get out. Yes. And remember—

BBC: —Kill people if you have to.

GK: Remember, this was part of the struggle, part of a war, part of a conflict.

BBC: I'll read from the book: "Kelly put one hand in through the bars and pulled back the large bolt in the gate and swung the gate open. He now had an uninterrupted view and contact with the Guard. He said, consciously using the Christian name to ease the tension, this to the Guard: 'John, we've taken over the Block and we're well armed.'" Now this is you. Right?

GK: Yes.

BBC: Will you read from your own book, that passage?

GK: You continue. You're doing fine.

BBC: You won't! This is because its your words—

GK: —I've already read it. But go on ahead.

BBC: "John, we've taken over the Block and we're well armed. If you do what you're told, there will be no problem. If you do not do what you're told, then you will not make it through today. Do you understand?"

You were going to kill him if he didn't follow your orders.

GK: Well, he wasn't killed.

BBC: But all of these years later, I guess this is what I'm asking you: Could you have easily killed him?

GK: Well, I don't know, because you're asking a hypothetical question.

BBC: But you must have thought about it?

GK: I'll give you an honest answer to your question. You've asked a hard question. Let me give you an honest answer. At the time, in the middle of a conflict, I belonged to an organisation which was involved in death. I have said this many times. Because, in conflict and wars, combatant forces are involved in that. So, was I the same as a British soldier or an RUC man, or for that matter a Loyalist paramilitary, prepared to use weaponry of war. Yes. I would.

BBC: Because I've interviewed you many times during the normal course of political interviewing about all the stories of the day when they came up. Because I know you as a politician. I don't know you. I'm genuinely interested in: Could you easily have pulled that trigger, given what your beliefs were and given how you saw the enemy?

GK: Well, the answer is, not easily, but let me say this. I don't mean this in any other way except to be fair. Would you ever ask such a question of a British soldier—or an RUC man or woman, who were also prepared,

and are actually trained, to kill. And a soldier, remember, a British soldier, a formal soldier, is trained to kill on the basis of an order—not on the basis of conscience. IRA Volunteers are Volunteers. They were people who did not get paid, who believed in what they were doing, who had the conviction to do what they were doing, but who had made the decision, and of course it was not an easy decision, that they were prepared—and I'm one of those people—who were prepared to involve themselves in military operations, which meant attacking the enemy and being attacked by the enemy.

BBC: And killing.

GK: That's part of it, yes. But let me emphasise this to you. Would you ask such a question to a British soldier? Or is your issue that, because they are official, because they are part of a Government—and there's a book out from Ann Cadwallader [Lethal Allies], which shows how deep the collusion was. And that people in uniform did not carry out just what might be termed—and what I would not accept—but might be termed legal killings, also of course carried out illegal killings.

BBC: The Security Forces would of course deny, as you know, the equivalent that you draw between them and you and the IRA.

GK: Well, actually, I am not drawing an equivalence, just to be very clear with you. I have said that a British soldier, and indeed any standing soldier in any Army, will kill on the basis that they're trained to do so, and on the basis of orders that they are given. That means they don't necessarily use their conscience any time they do it. And a Volunteer, in a Volunteer Army like the IRA, is there because of their convictions.

BBC: You see, you asked me a question and I will answer it. If a soldier's life was not under threat and they were standing with a gun to your head as an IRA man at that time, would I ask that question? Yes. Would I ask them would they have been prepared to kill someone unnecessarily? Because to shoot a gun in the protection of life is the kind of threshold that a lot of society has drawn at that time, would I ask that question? Yes. Would I ask them, would they be prepared to kill someone unnecessarily? Because to shoot a gun in the protection of life is that kind of threshold that a lot of society has drawn: that your life is under imminent threat. But, when you're standing close to another human being, here's the harshest question I'm going to ask today. Right.

GK: Finish your own answer.

BBC: Yes, I would have asked the question to that soldier in exactly the same way, with exactly the same point.

GK: But it is interesting. [Unintelligible.] So let me point this out to you. So what you're doing is you're dividing killing—so just be very frank with yourself—you're dividing our killing, and yours; so you say that in certain circumstances it's ok to kill—

BBC: If you life's under threat.

GK: But in certain circumstances—

BBC: — Society does that.

GK: But in certain circumstances—just to be very clear, that's all you're saying—it's acceptable to kill and in other circumstances it isn't—

BBC: I'm not saying that: society does that.

GK: That's fair enough. But you need to realise that's what you're saying. Because you're not taking a principled stand against anyone being killed.—

BBC: — I'm saying —

GK: And sometimes it appears that's what you are doing. I just want to be clear on that.

BBC: And what I'm saying is that society often draws that distinction, that if someone's life is under imminent threat, then you can use force.

GK: And of course that's true, and if you look at the conflict here, never mind anywhere else, if you look at the conflict here over the last—well during the period of conflict, over a period of nearly thirty years, I can tell you, and it might be a revelation to some people, but I can tell you that, because of collusion, and because of the attitude of the British soldiers, I've learned many, many times that people were killed, and yet none of them was—well, I can count it on one hand—the soldiers who were actually arrested for it. So that's what we're talking about as well. I didn't know this was the way the conversation was going, but it is an interesting conversation because I think that you also as an interviewer have to realise that it isn't as straight-forward as you can do it and you can't do it. And that's where the debate is.

BBC: Well, I think what is the most uncomfortable question from me to you, to be able to kill someone when you're not under imminent threat: Does that require a psychopathic tendency? And I'm asking that genuinely. If you're standing there and there is a human being, and I don't care whether he's a Prison Officer or an IRA man actually, if there's a human being standing beside you and you've got a gun in your hand and you're prepared to blow his head off: Is that the action of a psychopath?

GK: Well, here's the situation—because you're asking a very hypothetical situation.

BBC: It was real for you. You were there.

GK: Well, I was there—

BBC: — And you were prepared to pull a trigger.

GK: And I was prepared to pull the trigger. That doesn't mean that I did pull the trigger. You've asked a highly hypothetical situation, and I put it back to you. Would you ask that question of a British soldier, or an RUC man?—

BBC: — Yes.

GK: No, you wouldn't.

BBC: Yes, I would.

GK: No, you wouldn't.

BBC: Yes, I would: if I ever get the opportunity to, I will.

GK: No. Well, if you need, well I will hold you to—

BBC: — If they were standing looking at any individual.

GK: There are hundreds of people who were killed by the State forces when there was no risk to their lives. And, see one of the things which astounds me—

BBC: — Which I would ask the same question.

GK: One of the things that astounds me, and you're not on your own, I'm not picking on you, is that the media generally—though you're saying that you would ask the question—then why has it not been asked, ever? Ever? In a programme? Because there is a view that, if it is the State that's doing it, it must be OK. And, if it is not the State that's doing it, then it's not OK. And if there was—if we had been in a democratic state—then I would not have taken up arms in the first place. And my generation of Nationalists and Republicans felt that there was no other way to fight military power except with military power. Remember it wasn't the IRA who started it off in 1969, or indeed 1966. In fact, the first bombs were actually paramilitary. And then the Army came in, the British Army came in, and it turned on the Catholic population as well.

BBC: Let's come back to the main question. When you said to this Prison Officer, "if you do what you're told, there will be no problem, if you do not do what you're told, then you will not make it through the day. Do you understand"—what did he do?

GK: He got down on the floor, and he did exactly what he was told, and I was very relieved.

BBC: And what happened? You moved where? He got on the floor. Where did you move to? What did that give you access to?

GK: Well, forgive me, but let me cut this short for you. OK? There was an incident after that, and there was a number of people in the Circle area, who were prisoners. And John Adams, the Prison Officer—

BBC: The Circle area, because remember my knowledge of this isn't very—

GK: — — It's the main administration area, and this control room and a number of other rooms are on this.

BBC: And that's the key area to get outside.

GK: That's the key area. To control the Block you have to control that area, which is why the first move was in the Circle area. And there was an incident in which a Prison Officer, John Adams, was shot. My belief is that he closed the door and was interfering, or there was a chance that the escape was then going to be scuppered. And he was shot. And that is all I'm prepared to say about it. Because I know that you're going go through analytically, step by step, here.

BBC: It was widely reported that you shot him.

GK: I know it was widely reported I shot him. But also, to be quite factual about it, in the Court case, where I was charged and found Not Guilty, there were four witnesses who said that I did it, and there were four witnesses who said somebody else did it.

BBC: Did you shoot him?

GK: I'm not prepared to go any further than that.

BBC: Why not?

GK: Because I'm not prepared to. But let me make this last wee point on it. Sometimes people quote Court at us. I've been through the Court. The Court found me Not Guilty. So, why would you, or some of these other people who make these accusations, think that they're better than the Court.

BBC: Well, I'm not making an accusation. I'm giving you an opportunity to put on record— —

GK: — — And that's — —

BBC: — — That you did not shoot that prison officer.

GK: And that is as far as I'm going on the record.

BBC: So you won't rule yourself out of having shot him?

GK: There was a Prison Officer shot, and he was clearly shot by a prisoner, and I was one of the prisoners in the Circle.

BBC: Did he deserve to be shot?

GK: Well, it depends on what context you look at it. In the context of saving an escape of 38 prisoners outside the Jail, and having been warned that, if he did anything, that he was in danger, I don't think deserve comes into it. It's a question of the Volunteer involved thought that he had to do it to save the escape.

BBC: And, in the chronology of that day, you then get control of that area, what happens next. Where were you?

GK: Well, in the front of the cab of the lorry. So I am on the floor of the lorry, and I'm in charge—I suppose is the best way to put it. I have arrested the Prison Officers.

BBC: You say you arrested. You actually get a gun up to the head of this Prison Officer, this driver, or the stomach of his body.

GK: That's right.

BBC: And what were you saying to him?

GK: Well, he has already been told the same instructions that everyone else got: that, if you do what you're told, everything will be OK, if you don't, you'll be in danger.

BBC: You'll die.

GK: You will be in danger. And, of course, he didn't die.

BBC: And you're driving out there. Is there a sense of euphoria, that you're escaping.

GK: There is clearly a sense of huge nervousness and excitement, yes. This is a huge moment in everybody's life. I'd been in Jail at that time over ten years, so the idea that I might escape was at the top of my mind. But I was taking it one step at a time.

BBC: And straight into IRA activities in Europe. You were fighting for the cause you believed in.

GK: Well I returned to active service, which is all I'm prepared to say about that as well.

BBC: What drove you at that stage?

GK: My beliefs. My beliefs.

BBC: Beliefs that you could achieve what, though? Was it a belief of a hatred of what had happened to your community? Was it— — I am trying to genuinely get inside your head and give you an opportunity to tell me what was driving you.

GK: But you see, if I can say this again. You're talking to me as if trying to get into my head, you know, this is hard to find. I was one of thousands of people who fought against the British during that conflict. And I've said it many times, be very clear, that I am proud of it.

BBC: But was it worth it?

GK: We would never have got where we are today without it, if I'm being honest.

BBC: So that's some of the Interview we did some years ago now, with Gerry Kelly. The context of why we're playing that Interview, some of it, today is the tweet which we read out a matter of minutes ago from Gerry Kelly which he posted on Friday, celebrating the break-out from the Maze.

Comment

We recall a reading on BBC Radio of a book by Patrick Leigh-Fermar about his adventures in war. During World War Two, he was with a Special Force on a mission to capture a German General in Crete and bring him back for questioning. The General was captured, along with his chauffeur. They had to be

taken across the island to a pick-up point with a British submarine. There was difficult mountain terrain on their route. The chauffeur, who had been injured in the capture, was unable to cope with it. They decided they could not leave him behind, so they killed him.

He was no immediate danger to the man who killed him. It was an intimate face-to-face killing: Sorry mate, but we feel its best to extinguish you!

We do not recall that there was any BBC moralising on the matter. War is war, and war is about killing, and the gory details of killing are not dwelt on when yarns about it are being told.

In 1939 the democratically-elected French Government declared war on Germany. In 1940 Germany responded to the declaration of war made against it, and with inferior forces it defeated the French and British Armies poised on its borders. The elected French Government, with its Army broken, negotiated a settlement with Germany. Britain took the remnants of its defeated Army home, and condemned the French Government for conceding defeat and trying to end the War, and it launched what it called "ungentlemanly war" on French authority in France and on the German forces who were in Northern France pending a settlement with Britain. Special Forces were dropped into France to do sabotage and killing. It was individual killing of people who were not endangering the lives of those doing the killing.

The saying that the end justifies the means is always condemned in the abstract and is always applied in the particular. The means by which wars are fought can hardly be considered good things in themselves. The extermination of civilians in the undefended cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was not treated as being in any way improper by the United Nations, when it was set up to pass judgment on such things.

The deliberate targeting of civilians was pioneered by Britain in the Boer War, and was continued in the 1st and 2nd World Wars; and in the Malayan War after the Nuremberg Trials.

Was what went on in Northern Ireland between 1970 and 1918 a war? Or was it mayhem conducted by a great mass of psychopaths who happened to appear just then?

The British Army, which had 26,000 troops deployed at one time, thought

it was fighting a war. It was engaged against a military force under central command and with a competent Intelligence service.

Since the BBC has raised the question of psychopaths and war, where were the psychopaths likely to be found? Surely in the Special Force on the British side, which operated in secret, and which as individuals had no stake in what was at issue, and had their existence officially denied. They were cold, detached, secret killers. They did not do what they did because they were endangered by their victim.

Gerry Kelly said that, if he had grown up in a democratic state, he would not have made war on it. That was the heart of the matter. The BBC chose not to hear it. It knew very well that it would be damaging to dispute it, so it did not hear it. It regiments its staff very well.

The Six Counties were detached from the rest of Ireland by the British Government in 1921, and were placed under an intensely provocative form of undemocratic government. Under that form of undemocratic government there was an insurrection in 1969 and war was declared in 1970.

The State found itself at war with the region of itself which it had subjected to fifty years of undemocratic government. Failing to win that War, it negotiated a settlement under which the system of franchised government was greatly altered. It could not be said that it was made democratic, but it was made relatively tolerable.

The 1998 settlement acknowledged implicitly that a war had been fought, and that there had been sufficient reason for it. Prisoners were released as de facto prisoners-of-war, and individuals hitherto described as godfathers of crime became Government Ministers. But there was no official acknowledgement that a war had been fought, and that events during those 28 years should be judged by the standards appropriate to war.

The Dublin Government, which signed the Agreement ending the War, might have given the "Troubles" the conclusive status of a war, but it refused to do so. It was more resistant to the idea than was the British Government of the time. The Dublin parties continued to describe the "Troubles" as an outbreak of criminality.

The 'Constitutional' argument was

widely heard in 1970 that, if a private group was allowed to declare war, then anybody could make war. In the real world wars do not happen because of a 'right' to make war. They happen because of circumstances. And the 'right' follows the fact.

The possibility of half a million people in a liberal-democratic state of about 60 millions making war on the State, and sustaining it for twenty-eight years, lay in the fact of the very exceptional and provocative mode of government which the British State imposed on its Six County region. Those circumstances have been amply described in this journal and its sister-publications over the decades.

We did not support the Sinn Fein War, but neither did we deny that it was a War, and that it was actually supported by the community on whose behalf it was declared.

Regarding the "right" to make war, here is what is said by John Locke in his *Second Treatise On Government*, which was the manifesto of the 'Glorious Revolution' on which the present British regime was founded, and which is celebrated annually on July 12th in Northern Ireland. In a state of nature every man has the right to make war. That individual right ceases when a community is formed:

"But 'tis not every community that puts an end to the state of nature between men but only this one of agreeing together mutually to enter into one community, and make one body politic." (Paragraph 14.)

"...where an appeal to the law and constituted judges lies open, but the remedy is denied by a manifest perverting of justice, and a barefaced wresting of the law, to protect or indemnify the violence or injuries of some men or party of men, there it is hard to imagine anything but a state of war. For wherever violence is used, and injury done, though by hands appointed to administer justice, it is still violence and injury, however coloured by the name, pretences, or forms of law" (Para 20).

"...it is easy to discern who are and who are not in political society together. Those who are united into one body, and have a common established law and judicature to appeal to, with authority to decide controversies between them, and punish offenders, are in civil society with one another,

but those who have no such common appeal... are still in a state of nature, each being, where there is no other, judge for himself and executioner..." (Para. 87).

Civil society exists where a number of men "*enter into society to make one people, one body politic under one supreme government*" (Para 89).

"...when any number of men have, by the consent of every individual, made a community, they have thereby made that community one body, with a power to act as one body, it is only by the will and determination of the majority..." (Para 96).

When did the inhabitants of Northern Ireland—a 1921 invention—agree to make "one community, one people"? There were two communities in the Six Counties. They were at war with each other, on different sides of the Anglo/Irish war. It suited British strategy in its war against the elected Sinn Fein Government to treat the Six Counties as a distinct political region and impose a system of government on it which neither side wanted,; and set up one community to govern the other in a regional system, detached from the state system, with the regional minority having no means of appeal to the state Government against the conduct of the regional Government.

There is nothing else like it to be found on Earth. According to Locke's standard, it was itself a state of war. What Sinn Fein did was let it express itself.

There have been some attempts on the British side to go back on the 1998 settlement. These have been encouraged by Dublin Governments. And the BBC has been to the fore in this.

The 1998 arrangement is an anomalous means of dealing with an anomalous system. It has been enabled to work by Sinn Fein and the DUP taking discreet account of the anomalous nature of the structure. Gerry Kelly's interviewer, who also hosts a mainland BBC radio programme, is of Belfast Unionist origin. He knows that Northern Ireland is not governed as part of the democracy of the British state but the general tendency of his questioning presumes that it is. Both the DUP and Sinn Fein have therefore in recent times refused to take part in his programme, which is the main BBC political programme in 'Ulster'.



section of a species that survived passed on the adaptive traits to the next generation, enabling the species to better “fit” its environment. But the proponents of the theory of evolution had no idea how those traits could be passed on to make evolution possible.

At the time it was thought that the offspring inherited a mixture of their parents’ traits. But, if this were the case, how was evolution possible? A particularly well-adapted male of the species would inevitably have his traits diluted when producing the next generation. To use an Irish expression, the son could never be the man his father was. (If the female parent was more adapted than the male, the same logic applies. The offspring could never be as adapted to their environment as the female parent.)

The Augustinian friar Gregor Mendel was able to solve this problem. He was a very different type of scientist to Darwin or Wallace. Whereas the latter tested their hypotheses by observing nature as it presented itself to them, Mendel observed nature under controlled conditions, so that the relationship between cause and effect would not be distorted by extraneous factors.

He set out in a very systematic way to understand how traits were inherited. First of all, he had to decide what species would be the subject of his experiment. After careful consideration he selected the pea plant. The reasons for this choice were—among others—the varieties of pea plant have clearly distinguishable traits. Also, he thought it was easier to control pollination in this plant.

Having made his selection he then had to make sure that he knew what variety of pea plant that he was subjecting to his experiment. Like Marx he realised that it was essential to go beyond the appearance of things to their substance.

Plants have male and female organs so they can reproduce by themselves (self-pollination) or alternatively can reproduce with other plants (cross-fertilisation).

Mendel started from the proposition that a self-pollinating plant will reproduce the same traits in its offspring. It seems reasonable to assume that two identical self-pollinating plants will produce identical offspring. However, this did not appear to be the case. Mendel found that some plants with identical traits produced offspring with different traits. He concluded that their hereditary make-up was different, even though they appeared to be identical.

Darwin, Mendel and the Number 3

A few years ago British television conducted a poll inviting viewers to vote for the greatest Briton. Charles Darwin was the highest ranking scientist on the list; in fourth place overall, two places ahead of Isaac Newton. Was he really greater than Newton or for that matter Tuhning or Faraday or James Watt?

Darwin’s claim to fame rests on his theory of evolution, which he originally published jointly with Alfred Russell Wallace. There were other people with similar ideas in other countries such as the Austrian, Franz Unger. However, the theory was subsequently brought to a wider audience in Darwin’s classic work: *On The Origin Of Species*, which is probably the most popular book on science ever written. For evermore the theory would be associated with one man: Charles Darwin.

Wallace never attempted to deny Darwin the credit for the theory. It seems that he was more interested in the theory itself and thought it would be more easily accepted if it was promoted by Darwin who belonged to a higher social class and had much greater influence within the British Establishment.

If there were any doubts about the greatness of Darwin or the origin of the “*Origin*” surely, they would be resolved by the scientist’s subsequent work. But therein lies the problem! His subsequent work does not confirm his place in the pantheon of great scientists.

Darwin made extensive alterations to the “*Origin*” following the publication of the first edition and continued to do so with each of the subsequent editions. It might be thought that with each edition there would be an improvement. Mistakes in the original would be rectified in subsequent editions. But that doesn’t seem to have been the case with the “*Origin*”. Penguin publishes the first edition for a modern reader. It seems that that this publishing house thinks that, in the remaining five editions, Darwin had regressed. It would be interesting to know if there is any other classic work in which the first edition is preferred to all subsequent editions.

It is reminiscent of the commentary by the famous German chess writer and champion Siegbert Tarrasch:

“Up to this point, White has been following well-known analysis. But now he makes a fatal error: he begins to use his own head.”

Darwin used “*his own head*” in his book *The Descent of Man* and it was not a pretty sight. While the “*Origin*” is a serious scientific work, the “*Descent*” reads more like a political tract. In the “*Origin*” man hardly features at all. He is just another animal. Whereas the “*Descent*” attempts to use science to extol the virtues of the Anglo-Saxon race. But nature does not give lessons in politics or morality.

Misconceptions about nature, of course, are not just confined to scientists with a political axe to grind. In the area of jurisprudence it is claimed that “*natural law*” is above ordinary law. But there is nothing “*natural*” about any man-made law and there is nothing virtuous about “*nature*”.

The “*survival of the fittest*” means those species best fitted to their environment. It does not mean the survival of the strongest or most worthy, as the example of the Madeira beetle in the “*Origin*” (first edition) shows. In this instance, the strong survived, but so did the weak. The beetles with the strongest wings were able to resist the winds that dashed most of the species against the rocks. But the other variety of beetle, whose wings were too weak and who never attempted to resist the fierce winds, also survived. These weak beetles retained a residue of the wings that they once used, demonstrating that they were products of evolution rather than intelligent design.

More recent research suggests that man was a weak ape and that he was pushed out of his natural habitat by stronger apes. This required him to adapt to different habitats including the requirement to stand upright. The survival of the fittest could also be interpreted as the survival of the “*luckiest*”.

The problem with the “*Origin*” is that it was incomplete. It claimed that the

Modern science makes the same distinction. Species that share the same traits have the same “phenotype”. But species that have the same hereditary make-up have the same “genotype”. Genotypes are a subset of phenotypes.

Mendel set himself the task of identifying pea plants with the same genotype or, to be more specific, he wanted to identify the plants that reproduced through self-pollination the same traits (“constant traits”).

It took him two years to be certain that he had identified pea plants that would reproduce the same traits on self-pollination. (Let us call these plants: “plants with constant traits”.) He had a large number of such plants. He was now ready for the next part of his experiment.

He decided to cross-fertilise plants with constant traits with other constant trait plants. Each parent had a different set of constant traits to the other parent. To avoid self-pollination he disabled the anther or male organ of the plant he was fertilising.

The results were startling. In every case the offspring of plants with constant traits had one or other trait from the parents, but not a mixture of both. Secondly, certain traits always appeared in the next generation.

So, for example, when a pea with a violet-coloured flower was crossed with a white flower the offspring was always a violet colour—not a pale violet colour as was the conventional wisdom at the time.

Similarly, when a plant with a yellow seed covering was crossed with a green seed covering, the offspring had always a yellow seed covering.

These results were obtained, regardless of whether the yellow seed covering was from plants with only the female organ (stigma) or not.

Mendel concluded that plants either had dominant or recessive traits. If a plant that had a dominant trait (and with self-pollination only reproduced this dominant trait) was crossed with a plant with a recessive trait, the dominant trait would be reflected in the offspring.

If, at this stage Mendel had decided to retire to a life of spiritual contemplation, his contribution to science would already have been considered highly significant. But the Augustinian friar was only getting in to his stride.

In the next stage of his experiment he arranged for the offspring of the parents with the constant traits to self-pollinate. Let’s call these offspring hybrids. Again, the results were startling.

In the case of the plants which had been crossed with violet and white flowered plants, the hybrids produced 705 violet and 224 white flowered plants following self-pollination.

So even though the hybrid was violet, the recessive trait had not disappeared and following self-pollination it re-emerged in the next generation.

He obtained similar results with other hybrids that self-pollinated. The yellow seed coloured hybrids produced 6022 plants with yellow and 2001 plants with green coloured seed coverings. In all his experiments the ratio of plants with dominant traits to recessive traits was approximately three to one.

Mendel concluded that nature was acting in accordance with the number three, and that the variations from this number were just random.

How can this be explained?

1) The basic hereditary unit or what we now call a gene consists of two traits (now called alleles). A gene can have three possible combinations: two dominant traits; one dominant and one recessive trait; and two recessive traits.

2) A gene cannot produce a seed by itself. It must divest itself of one trait to join with a trait from another gene to produce a seed.

3) If a gene has a dominant trait and a recessive trait, the dominant trait will determine the appearance (phenotype) of the organism. This is what happened in the first experiment that Mendel conducted. He had crossed genes with two dominant traits with genes with two recessive traits. It was therefore a logical certainty that the offspring would all consist of one dominant trait and one recessive trait and would display the characteristics (phenotype) of the dominant trait.

4) In the case of the hybrids in Mendel’s experiments, all the genes had one dominant trait and one recessive trait. Let’s denote the dominant trait with the capital letter A and the recessive trait with the small letter a. There are four equal probabilities for the genotype of the offspring. These are: AA, Aa, aA and aa.

Since Aa and aA are identical (it doesn’t matter if dominant or recessive traits come from either the male or female sex organ) the probabilities can be restated as:

AA, 2Aa and aa.

It can be seen immediately that the probability of two dominant traits is 1/4; the probability of a dominant and recessive trait is two quarters; and the probability of two recessive traits is 1/4. But, as we have seen, a gene with a dominant and recessive trait will always give the appearance (phenotype) of the dominant trait. So, 3/4 of the offspring would display the dominant trait or, to put it another way, the ratio of dominant to recessive traits will tend towards the number three.

Armed with this mathematical insight, Mendel felt that he could predict the genotypes of future self-pollinating plants. Assuming that at generation zero there is just one hybrid (i.e. a genotype of Aa) and this plant produced 4 offspring and each of the offspring produced 4 offspring what would the breakdown of genotypes of future generations of plants be?

Mendel produced the following table:

Generation	AA	Aa	aa
1	1	2	1
2	6	4	6
3	28	8	28
			... etc

As we have already seen the first generation will produce 1AA, 2Aa and 1aa. In the next generation the 1AA will produce 4AA, but the 2Aa will produce another 2AA, 4Aa and another 2aa. The 1aa will produce 4aa. So the second generation will be 6AA, 4Aa, 6aa.

As we progress from generation to generation, it is highly noticeable that the proportion of plants with constant traits increases and the hybrid plants decreases.

Mendel derived the following formula for the ratios:

$$2^n - 1 : 2 : 2^n - 1$$

From an evolutionary standpoint there is no dilution in the traits handed down from generation to generation. On the contrary the proportion of hybrids diminishes and the proportion of plants with constant traits increases. It opens up the possibility of the plants with constant traits diverging from each other in the same way as the Madeira beetle

mentioned earlier.

Indeed, if a plant or other living being combined different traits, the possibilities of numerous species developing along different lines seems very likely. But is there anything restricting such novel combinations? Readers will not be surprised that the indefatigable friar was already on the case!

Mendel decided to experiment with two separate characters and then do further experiments with three separate characters. He conducted these experiments with his usual rigour. As with the previous experiment, his first task was to establish a parent with constant traits and then cross-fertilise with another parent with different constant traits. As before the resulting hybrids all gave the appearance (phenotype) of the dominant traits. He then as before arranged for the hybrids to self-pollinate.

In his experiment with two characters, the parents with constant traits had round seeds and yellow seed coverings (dominant traits) and the other parent with constant traits had wrinkled seeds and green seed coverings (recessive traits).

As expected, all the hybrids had round seeds and yellow seed coverings. After arranging for the hybrids to self-pollinate the results were as follows:

315 round and yellow
101 wrinkled and yellow
108 round and green
32 wrinkled and green

This was roughly in the ratio of 9: 3: 3: 1.

These results confirmed Mendel's hypothesis. This can be seen by making a few simple probability calculations. The probability of a round offspring is $\frac{3}{4}$; and the probability of a yellow offspring is also $\frac{3}{4}$. So the probability of a round and yellow is the product of the two probabilities which is $\frac{9}{16}$ (horse racing enthusiasts will recognise this as an accumulator bet).

Using the same mathematical technique the probability of wrinkled and yellow is $\frac{3}{16}$ (i.e. $\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}$); round and green $\frac{3}{16}$ ($\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{1}{4}$); and wrinkled and green $\frac{1}{16}$ ($\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{4}$).

The above are phenotypes but Mendel arranged for further self pollination to identify the genotypes.

He confirmed that the offspring with

constant traits of round and yellow represented $\frac{1}{16}$ of the total sample; round and green $\frac{1}{16}$; wrinkled and yellow $\frac{1}{16}$; wrinkled and green $\frac{1}{16}$.

Offspring with one constant trait and one hybrid trait each represented $\frac{2}{16}$ of the total sample.

Offspring with two hybrid traits represented $\frac{4}{16}$ of the total sample.

When he conducted the experiments with three characters, the results confirmed the mathematical hypothesis. In other words, there were no restrictions in the combinations of genes. It might not have been his intention, but Mendel had rescued the theory of evolution from

oblivion. But, of course, he had done far more than that.

It took Mendel eight years for him to complete his work, which was a breathtaking intellectual achievement. The English evolutionary biologist Sir Gavin de Beer summed up his contribution in the following terms:

"It is not often possible to pinpoint the origin of a whole new branch of science accurately in time and space... But genetics is an exception, for it owes its origin to one man, Gregor Mendel, who expounded its basic principles at Brno on the 8th February and on the 8th March 1865".

Amen!

Martin Tyrrell

The View from Airstrip Two: Part 5

Orwell, Ireland and the War

Sometime in 1939 George Orwell ceased to be a revolutionary socialist opponent of the British Government's war on Nazi Germany and became a revolutionary socialist supporter of it. He attributed his change of mind to a sudden resurgence of patriotism. He said that he had been drilled in patriotism for much of his childhood, like most middle-class boys of that time, and that it had activated as soon as there was a war on. He had seen the war coming from as far back as the early thirties and, from 1937, had said repeatedly that it would be a conventional balance of power war in which there would be precisely no working class interest. But when the war came about—when Britain declared war on Germany in September 1939—Orwell was supportive, though it took him a year to go public on his change of mind, which he did in the essay *My Country Right or Left*, published in the autumn 1940 edition of the influential magazine *Folios of New Writing*. It is here that he writes of growing up within the sound of bugles, of "the spiritual need for militarism and the military virtues", and of a dream he had had a few weeks before the British declaration in which he had

dreamed that the war had already begun and that he was all for it. And, when he awoke, he said, he realised that he was indeed supportive of it, unconditionally supportive of his nation whatever 'jam' it might get itself into.

I am sceptical of the dream story. The fact that Orwell did not go public on his change of mind for more than a year after the alleged dream weighs against it. Also this, from a book review he wrote at the start of 1940:

"Morally, the Munich settlement was odious enough, but in the light of the last six months it is not at all certain it was unwise".

"*Not...unwise*" implies that it was wise and that Orwell, at the start of 1940, was still uncertain whether a little more appeasement over Danzig and the Polish Corridor the previous autumn might have been a good thing. When Orwell declared his support for the war in *My Country Right or Left*, the war was markedly different from what it had been in September 1939 when he had speculatively written to the relevant government section, asking if he could be of some use. (He had said he was a

writer, so they wrote back and said, in effect, they had put his application with those of all the other writers and that when they needed a writer for war work, they would be in touch.) By late 1940, there had been Dunkirk and the fall of France, and the Battle of Britain was still underway. All in all, much more like a 'jam' than a year earlier when the war was still 'phoney' and negotiation might have been productive. (In July 1940, the French, working from a position of surrender, had had a preliminary negotiation with the Germans, and managed to hold onto their navy and their colonies.)

The state at war to which Orwell was patriotic was the same state whose prospective war he had lately opposed. In the years leading up to the war, he had gone as far as to say that there was no fundamental difference between a liberal democracy and a fascist state, that the colonial empires of Britain, France and the rest undermined their claims to be democracies, and that there was some moral equivalence between the Third Reich and the British Empire.

Orwell's connection to that Empire was not remote. His great-great grandfather, Charles Blair, had prospered as the owner of plantations in Jamaica, worked by slave labour ("*an absentee owner, in the style perhaps of Sir Thomas Bertram of Mansfield Park*" is how Peter Stansky and William Abrahams describe him in their pioneering 1972 biography, *The Unknown Orwell*). Charles was sufficiently successful with his plantations that Thomas Fane, the Eighth Earl of Westmoreland (the eighth earl of the second line of Westmorelands, to be precise, the first line having been cancelled on account of its unrepentant and enthusiastic Catholicism) was able to marry off one of his daughters, Lady Mary Fane, to him. When slavery was abolished Charles Blair's son, Charles junior, "*absentee owner of tropical plantations and wretched slaves in Jamaica*", received £4,400 in compensation for his 218 slaves, now freemen—some £50 million in today's money. The £50 million was then somehow exhausted in the single generation between Charles junior and Orwell's own father, Richard. Amongst what survived was a portrait of Lady Mary that hung in Orwell's house and passed to his sister, Avril, on Orwell's death.

The connection to Empire survived as well. Richard Blair worked for the Opium Department in the British colonial administration of India. This was a

Department that facilitated the opium trade rather than try to prevent it. It subsidised the production of opium by farmers in what is now Pakistan and Afghanistan; quality-assured what was produced: sold it, primarily to China; and provided the sophistic justification for what was going on. Opium sales accounted for some 16% of Indian revenue at the time.

Orwell, too, would work for the Empire, as an officer in the Indian Police service, stationed in Burma. But he sickened of it—the hangings, the beatings.

Orwell, once he had changed sides on the war from anti to pro, never properly acknowledged the extent of his previous anti-war beliefs or refute them. His revolutionary socialist anti-war position was formed in the Independent Labour Party (ILP), which maintained its hostility to the war for its duration, and for a time after. Orwell never took issue with his former ILP comrades, never debated the war with them, and never made much of the fact that he had previously been fully with them on the matter.

When he did eventually debate the ethics of opposing the war, with some anarchist men of letters in the American journal *Partisan Review*, he managed not to say that he had himself once held views similar to theirs prior to the revival of his patriotism. And none of the literary anarchists brought it up either (though George Woodcock came close).

Orwell hinted at his coming public support for the war in his 1940 review of Malcolm Muggeridge's *The Thirties*. He wrote:

"It is all very well to be 'advanced' and 'enlightened', to snigger at Colonel Blimp and proclaim your emancipation from all traditional loyalties, but a time comes when the sand of the desert is sodden red and what have I done for thee, England my England?"

'*England, my England*' is from the poem *Pro Rege Nostro* by William Henley, which was written in the late 1800s. It had a revival during the First World War when it was set to music and became a staple of the militarism and patriotism that Orwell said he was exposed to. It is less a poem than a kind of secular prayer, a chant even, with something of the shrill tone of fanaticism.

What have I done for you,
England, my England?
What is there I would not do,
England, my own?
With your glorious eyes austere,
As the Lord were walking near,

Whispering terrible things and dear
As the Song on your bugles blown,
England—
Round the world on your bugles blown!
Where shall the watchful sun,
England, my England,
Match the master-work you've done,
England, my own?
When shall he rejoice agen (sic)
Such a breed of mighty men
As come forward, one to ten,
To the Song on your bugles blown,
England—
Down the years on your bugles blown?

England, my England is also a story by D.H. Lawrence in which an effete and hedonistic man eventually decides, through guilt and peer pressure, to volunteer to serve in the First World War and is promptly killed on the Western Front. It is an ambiguous work that I suspect was intended to be pro-war in a roundabout kind of way. The authorial sympathy is not, I think, with the protagonist. Rather, Lawrence seems to see it as a useful function of war that it culls such people.

The *sodden red sand* is from Sir Henry Newbolt's *Vitai Lampada* and celebrates the defeat at Abu Klea of around 10,000 Arab rebels by a British unit that, though smaller in number, was much better armed and trained. There is a certain amount of artistic licence (or 'spin') with the facts—Newbolt implies that the British, outnumbered, were facing imminent annihilation but were able to turn the tables by a last minute appeal to the Public School spirit ('*Play up, play up and play the game!*'). In fact, it is unlikely that the outcome of the battle was ever in doubt.

Newbolt is not the only poet to have celebrated Abu Klea. The Scottish poet William McGonagle also wrote a commemoration that, whatever else, arguably achieves a greater honesty than the more illustrious Newbolt.

Ye sons of Mars, come join with me,
And sing in praise of Sir Herbert
Stewart's little army,
That made ten thousand Arabs flee
At the charge of the bayonet at Abu Klea.
General Stewart's force was about
fifteen hundred all told,
A brave little band, but, like lions bold,
They fought under their brave and
heroic commander,
As gallant and as skilful as the great
Alexander.
And the nation has every reason to
be proud,
And in praise of his little band we
cannot speak too loud,

Because that gallant fifteen hundred
soon put to flight
Ten thousand Arabs, which was a
most beautiful sight.

And when the victory was won they
gave three British cheers.
While adown their cheeks flowed
many tears
For their fallen comrades that lay
weltering in their gore;
Then the square was re-formed, and
the battle was o'er.

Imperial wars, waged to colonise
or to suppress indigenous revolts were
generally waged without the modicum
of humanity that characterised wars
between European states.

And colonial wars were often the
testing ground for new military technol-
ogy, technology that might not have been
used elsewhere. (Not initially anyway.)
At the Battle of Omdurman, in 1898,
for instance, Kitchener deployed Maxim
guns and dum dum bullets against the
Mahdists, resulting in more than 12,000
Mahdist killed.

And, after the battle, he had the tomb
of the Mahdi desecrated. The body was
removed and decapitated and the torso
burnt and thrown in the Nile. The fate of
the skull is unclear. Kitchener allegedly
wanted to keep it as a trophy of war, to
use as a paperweight or an inkwell.

Churchill, in his younger days, was
publicly critical of the desecration of the
Mahdi's body until it was suggested to
him that this might be a bad career move.
(Later, as Prime Minister, he would have
strong reservations regarding the bomb-
ing campaign in Germany; again, he
would be persuaded out of these.)

In 1936, Orwell wrote:

"When a subject population rises in
revolt you have got to suppress it, and
you can only do so by methods which
make nonsense of any claims for the
superiority of Western civilisation. In
order to rule over barbarians, you have
got to become a barbarian yourself."

(‘Barbarian’ is here intended as ironic.
This was the pre-War, newly socialist
Orwell. Elsewhere in the article—a book
review—he writes of "*the inherent evil
of imperialism*".)

The Battle of Omdurman was still
a living memory at the time of the
Second World War. A few of the men
who fought in it were still alive in the
1940s. As a teenager, the comedy writer,
Jimmy Perry, served in the Home Guard
alongside one of them. This veteran,

Perry recalled, was especially fond of
the bayonet, the cold hard steel of it, and
was forever saying that the Mahdists and
whoever "*didn't like it up them*". He was
the model for Lance Corporal Jones in
Dad's Army.

"*May I ask whether in a war with
a civilised Power such a gross outrage
would be permitted?*" asked William
Redmond in the House of Commons
when the desecration of the Mahdi's
body came up in *Parliamentary Ques-
tions*. But no answer was given. It was
probably taken as read that colonial
wars—wars waged against non-Euro-
pean peoples—were fought to a looser
morality than wars fought between
Europeans, and European-descended
peoples. However, the emergence of
Japan as a major military power com-
plicated things.

"*A student of Japanese military strat-
egy would have known that the sudden
surprise attack was a Japanese special-
ity*", writes A.C. Grayling in *Among the
Dead Cities*, his historical account (and
ethical assessment) of the British and
American air-raids on Germany and
Japan towards the end of the Second
World War. "*In 1905*", he continues,
*"the Russian fleet in Port Arthur was sur-
prised by Japanese forces in a manner
closely prefiguring Pearl Harbor"*.

In the second half of the 1800s,
Japan had been ‘opened up’ to the world
from which it had sealed itself off for a
couple of centuries. The Japanese had
gone along with the opening up in the
expectation that if they did not open up
themselves, it would be done for them.
That was the understanding on which the
Japanese had modernised. They proved a
quick study. In 1905, fifty years on from
being opened to the world, they defeated
Russia, sinking the best part of two Rus-
sian fleets and out-classing the Russian
army in Korea.

In the aftermath, the Russians com-
plained that the Japanese had initiated
their war without first declaring it and
alleged that, if they had declared it prop-
erly, they almost certainly would have
lost it. (The Japanese had attacked the
Russian fleet at Port Arthur three hours
before the declaration of war. The Port
Arthur attack failed, and all of the major
and conclusive battles of the war—
Tsushima, Mukden—took place after the
Japanese had formally declared war. But
the Russians held that the surprise Japa-
nese attack, which they had repulsed,
was a factor in their defeat.)

About a year after the war, Theodore
Grayson, an American academic, assess-
ed the declaration controversy and
other aspects of the war in his essay,
*The War in the Orient in the Light of
International Law*. He had a look back
over a century or so of wars to see what
the general practice had been regarding
declarations.

What he found was that, when a
European state fought another European
state, the proper diplomatic choreogra-
phy was generally observed with formal
declarations of war exchanged prior to
so much as a shot being fired. But, when
a European state fought what Grayson
called a "*semi-civilised*" state, the shoot-
ing came first and the declaration after.
And it was never the semi-civilised state
that shot first and declared after. It was
always the state that was fully civilised
that did this, the European state.

It was European practice, when fight-
ing colonial wars, to start the war before
it was declared. So it could be argued,
said Grayson, that the Japanese, having
lately come to civilisation, had learnt the
lesson of it well. Grayson also mentions
how the Russians mutilated the bodies
of Japanese soldiers to collect body parts
for trophies, a practice that was revived
by the Allies in the Second World War.
He does not mention the 20,000 Chinese
civilians killed by the Russians in Man-
churia and Korea.

An innovation of the First World War
was that there were again significant
civilian casualties in Europe as an out-
working of strategy. The main initiative
here was the blockade of German ports,
which was expected to turn the screws
on Germany's civilian population forcing
the German Government to seek terms.

The Germans estimated that the
blockade resulted in more than 760,000
civilian deaths, that being the excess of
wartime over peacetime civilian mortal-
ity up to the start of 1918, when the gov-
ernment service that had been collecting
the statistics ceased functioning. Since
the blockade carried on in full force un-
til the second quarter of 1919 and then
on slightly lower strength into the early
Summer, the death rate per this method-
ology, had the data collection continued,
might have been higher.

(Data collection ended just as the
1918 ‘Spanish’ flu pandemic was taking
off. People deprived of key nutrients—as
most Germans were—would have been
especially vulnerable to this pandemic).

Although a post-war German analysis
reduced the estimate to around 400,000,

the official British history of the blockade by A.C. Bell accepted the original 760,000. (Bell, in fact, commended the German statisticians for their meticulous analysis.)

This official history, which was published in 1937, was officially suppressed on publication (and remained suppressed until 1961), but this had nothing to do with its citing the German estimate of blockade-related deaths. According to American academic Marion Siney, who met Bell in London in 1938 when she was working on a PhD on the blockade, the book was suppressed because of the detail it went into on how the British had browbeaten the European neutrals into becoming their partners in operating the blockade.

When the Nazi Government procured a copy of the suppressed book, this was the aspect of it that interested them. It was to highlight this that they arranged for an abridged German language edition to be published. The high estimate—more than three quarters of a million German dead—was generally accepted without issue until relatively recently when a few commentators have, in effect, revised it down to zero. The high German estimate—the three quarters of a million plus—was sometimes cited against critics of the Allied air raids who were told that the raids had killed fewer people than the blockade and were therefore more humane.

During the Second World War, blockading lost out to aerial bombardment as the principal means of putting civilian populations under pressure. Around 60,000 British civilians were killed in the Blitz and other forms of aerial attack and a least five times that number of German civilians were killed in the raids on Germany that were carried out mainly in the final eighteen months of the war.

A.C. Grayling writes that, in the post-War years, it had been widely assumed that air raids, like blockading, would cause the target civilian population to 'squeal' and that victory would fall to the state whose civilians 'squealed' the least. However, in practice, according to Grayling, this was not what happened. In Germany as in Britain, air raids instead resulted in increased civilian solidarity. According to Grayling's account, Goebbels was cheered in the ruins of Berlin and even some anti-Nazis became supportive of the regime. Grayling suspects the raids had little impact on the outcome of the war. He notes that the Allied advance was sometimes thwarted by the

destruction caused by Allied air raids and that the raids themselves took a heavy toll on the RAF.

Officially, the Churchill Government said that the air raids on Germany did not target the civilian population and that civilian casualties were the unintended consequence of attacks on military and industrial targets. However, the media generally accepted what was, in fact, the case: that these were attacks on civilian areas carried out in the knowledge that they would result in civilian casualties, the "*deliberate terror bombing of German population centres as a ruthless expedient to hasten Hitler's doom*", as one American journalist put it.

Vera Brittain, in *Seed of Chaos* (1944), challenged the State's unwillingness to admit the nature of the campaign it was waging and the impact that campaign was having on Germany's civilian population. In the United States the book was widely criticised as a pro-Nazi polemic and in Britain was generally ignored, except by Orwell. Orwell used his *As I Please* column in *Tribune* to criticise Vera Brittain and offer a rationale for the bombing campaign. He said that war could not be regulated to make it more humane and that a state at war cannot be expected to limit the military options available to it.

As for the civilian casualties, he questions why was considered worse to kill civilians rather than soldiers, or women rather than men. Bombing, he said, kills a cross-section of a population rather than "*the healthiest and bravest of the young male population*" and that "*it is probably somewhat better to kill a cross section of the population than to kill young men*".

(Maurice Parmelee, an American sociologist and wartime blockade administrator, took a similar view with regard to the blockade. In his 1924 book *Blockade and Sea-Power: the blockade 1914-1919 and its significance for a world state*, Parmelee describes blockades as "*more barbarous than fighting on the battlefield*" but highlighted as well their "*poetic justice*" since one effect of them was that a greater proportion of a belligerent's population was made to suffer the consequences of war. On account of the First World War blockade, he said, that war had not been the usual "*holocaust of young men*").

"Why is it worse to kill a woman than a man?" asked Orwell, answering that the objection is more sentimental than anything else. A war that kills a cross

section, he claimed, arguably does less damage to a society than a war that kills only young men. Indeed, he speculated, the cross-section that was killed might not even be a true cross-section since children tended to be evacuated. And bombing might reach the people most responsible for the war, something he had said previously in *Homage To Catalonia*:

"Sometimes it is a comfort to me", he writes in that book, "to think that the aeroplane is altering the conditions of war. Perhaps when the next great war comes we may see that sight unprecedented in all history, a jingo with a bullet-hole in him".

In his rejoinder to Vera Brittain, he writes:

"It does not seem to me a bad thing that others should be killed besides young men... The immunity of the civilian, one of the things that have made war possible have been shattered".

Or the immunity of some civilians anyway! Orwell was aware that states differed in their access to 'bombing planes'. This was one of the reasons he thought that India could not be independent any time in the foreseeable future and that Burma would probably never be independent. The decades since the end of the Second World War, and the last three or four decades in particular, had shown that a state with a large air-force, and with aircraft carriers to ferry it about, could wage war against a state with a small air-force (or none) with minimal risk to its civilian population, and only a modest risk to its military personnel. Air power, far from increasing civilian risk, had, for the civilians of some countries anyway, almost completely eliminated it. While for other states, it was made a fact of life.

In his controversy with Vera Brittain, Orwell rejected the argument that aerial bombardment was a British innovation. He wrote:

"In a number of 'little wars' from about 1920 onwards the RAF has dropped its bombs on Afghans, Indians and Arabs who had little or no power of hitting back. But it is simply untruthful to say that large scale bombing of town areas, with the object of causing panic, is a British invention. It was the fascist states who started this practice, and so long as the air war went in their favour they avowed their aims quite clearly."

He does not say what it is that makes the bombings of "*Afghans, Indians and Arabs*" different from the preliminary fascist efforts in Spain and Ethiopia.

(In his ILP days, he would have said there was no difference whatsoever.) All of these were terroristic in that their aim was to terrorise the people on the receiving end into submission. In this respect, they were similar, say, to the use of Maxim guns against the Mahdists in the Sudan, or any deployment of modern military technology against societies that did not have it.

Grayling, in *Dead Cities*, writes that there were some efforts to ban aerial bombardment in the inter-war years. However,

"both Britain and to a lesser extent France had far-flung empires, parts of which occasionally needed to be bombed in the interests of good order, so neither was keen on an outright ban".

Grayling cites Lord Macaulay as an early critic of the idea that war might be civilised, and Admiral Jacky Fisher was similarly dismissive in his memoirs. To Fisher there was as much chance of civilising Hell proper as there was of civilising the Hell of war. And Orwell, too, rejected the idea in his rebuttal of *Seed of Chaos*. All three dismissed the idea that war is civilisable—and in largely the same language ('humbug' and so on) which would suggest that it was a kind of 'meme' that had been doing the rounds since Macaulay's time.

Around the same time as his debate with the literary anarchists and his rejection of *Seed of Chaos*, Orwell also had an exchange of correspondence with John Middleton Murry, like Orwell ex-ILP but unlike Orwell still anti-war. Orwell had misrepresented Middleton Murry's views in print and, when confronted with the facts, apologised in private correspondence. Middleton Murry offered Orwell space in *Peace News*, which he edited, to set out some ideas for a post-war settlement that might safeguard against further wars, but Orwell did not take him up on this.

In early 1940, Orwell had reviewed Benes of Czechoslovakia by Godfrey Lias for Time and Tide. Orwell was positive and nostalgic towards the Czechoslovak state, by then partitioned and annexed, suggesting that he had not looked at it too closely. Thus he wrote that, for the twenty or so years it existed, it "was one of the best-governed as well as one of the most democratic states in Europe". But, he said, its fate was illustrative of the problem of small nation-states—"*when small nations are independent they are*

unable to protect themselves; when they are not independent they are invariably misgoverned". This will be the case, he said, until Europe is federated. There was no plan for a federated European state in the 1930s, not in the mainstream anyway. There had been a plan for an alliance under French direction—the '*petite alliance*'—that would have brought together Czechoslovakia and several of the other Versailles states. But this was discouraged by Britain on Balance of Power grounds. Proposals for a union of democratic European states would have likely received the same short shrift.

Orwell himself came out in favour of European unity in the Summer of 1947 in an article, *Towards European Unity*, published in *Partisan Review*. Here, he advocated a union of socialist European states with decolonisation a prerequisite of membership. In the (highly unlikely) event of a union of this type coming into being, Orwell thought opposition would come from the Soviet Union (and the Soviet-aligned Communist Parties), the United States, and the Catholic Church. This was because, he said, the Church opposed freedom of speech, thought, equality and "*any form of society tending to promote earthly happiness*".

I reckon Orwell's *Towards European Unity* was written with no serious intention that it might be taken up by anyone

who could actually make it happen. (If Orwell had seriously desired European unity, he could have used his Labour Party and *Tribune* connections to put the idea in the minds of the people then in government, or in the minds of the people close to government. At the very least, he could have pushed the idea in subsequent writings.)

The essay's pie-in-the-sky quality is evident in Orwell's imagining that the United States might go socialist, that the next generation of Russians might rebel against totalitarianism, and that capitalism has no future. Also, in the implication throughout that, if there is to be European unity, it is Britain that will lead the initiative.

In the event, the first steps towards what would become the European Union were taken about a year after Orwell's death. This development—the European Coal and Steel Community—and the various developments that came after it indicate how wide of the mark Orwell was. The impetus for union came from the Christian Democrat parties, which had grown out of the Catholic Centre Parties, and from people like Monnet who had been advocating it their entire adult lives. Its economic basis was capitalist, albeit with a strong social dimension. The United States was supportive. And Orwell's '*country right or left*' was ineffectually hostile.

National Graves Association

Open Letter to An Taoiseach, Mr Leo Varadkar TD.
10th June, 2020

Seán Russell—A Fascist?

A dhuine uasail,

I write to you as Secretary of the National Graves Association. Our organisation has sole responsibility for the care and maintenance of the monument in Fairview Park, Dublin that is dedicated to the Men of the Forties and includes the statue of Seán Russell.

Many of the recent comments circulating in the media regarding Seán Russell are unknowingly or deliberately incorrect. The statue in Fairview Park is dedicated to all the brave men of the Forties who died for Irish freedom. If there are statues that "we need to talk about", there are numerous statues in Ireland that

might be subject to consideration when one looks at our colonial past. There would also be a great number of street names that would need to be changed.

The National Graves Association is a voluntary organisation with no political party affiliations. Fascism, in any form, should always be condemned without reservation. Seán Russell was a traditional Irish Republican and the statue serves as a reminder to following generations of the fragile and difficult situation that Ireland was experiencing during the 1930s and 40s. Churchill's plan to invade Ireland was a real and palpable threat. We, along with all right minded

people, strongly condemn the murder of George Floyd, as indeed, we have always condemned racism and intolerance in all its forms. The recently stoked-up racial tensions across the world should not be used as an opportunity to rewrite Irish history.

Seán Russell is remembered, in part, for his highly effective role in opposing the spread of fascism in Ireland. The Seán Russell monument was erected in 1951 with many prominent people present for the unveiling.

A huge crowd attended the ceremony comprising of various arms of the Republican Movement and the broad Irish left. This included units of the IRA, along with Sinn Féin, Cumann na mBan, Na Fianna and Clan na Gael. From the left joined the Transport Workers Union band, along with members of Clan na Poblachta, The Labour Party and the Trade Union Movement. Public bodies represented included Dublin Corporation and the G.A.A. Many well-known individuals also attended including the writer Brendan Behan and various TDs.

The original clenched-fist statue was damaged by an anti-Semitic/Clerical group who denounced Seán Russell as a communist. The statue never had a Nazi-Style salute, as was stated by some journalists. Eoin Ryan former MEP showed a complete lack of understanding of the history of the 1930s / 1940s period when in June 2004 he called for the removal of the Seán Russell monument. Any incitement against tolerance leads to the path of fascism. In Ireland the rise of the Blue-shirts during the thirties was met head-on by the Republican movement.

It is interesting to note what the German Intelligence thought of Seán Russell and what British Files revealed regarding his views on the Nazi philosophy.

“The Irish man was a hyper-sensitive Celt who, however willing he might be to use the Germans for his own political ends, regarded the Nazi philosophy as anathema... Russell was the only one of the I.R.A. with whom I dealt who was a real Irish Republican of the old school”.

Erwin Lahousen, head of second bureau of German Intelligence.

“Russell, throughout his stay Germany, had shown considerable reticence towards the Germans and plainly did not regard himself as a German agent.”

National Archives of England and Wales File KV 2/1292.

The British secret service was most interested in Ryan and Russell’s activities and interviewed German officials after World War II.

“I am not a Nazi. I’m not even pro-German. I am an Irishman fighting for the independence of Ireland. The British have been our enemies for hundreds of years. They are the enemies of Germany today. If it suits Germany to give us help to achieve independence I am willing to accept it, but no more, and there must be no strings to the help”.

Seán Russell

Mr. Varadkar, as Leader of Fine Gael you surely should have a better knowledge than most of your own party’s history during 1930s and 40s.

The following quotations demonstrate the attitude held by some in Ireland at that time:

“There is one thing that Germany did and that was to rout the Jews out of their country. Until we rout the Jews

out of this country, it does not matter a hair’s breadth what orders you make. Where the bees are there is honey, and where the Jews are there is money.”

Oliver J. Flanagan TD,

Dáil Éireann maiden Speech 1943

Fine Gael TD 1954-1987

Minister of Defence 1976-1977

‘Father of the Dáil’ 1981-1987

Father of current Fine Gael Cabinet Minister Charlie Flanagan

“The Blackshirts have been victorious in Italy and Hitler’s Brownshirts have been victorious in Germany, as assuredly the Blueshirts will be victorious in Ireland.”

John A. Costello

Declared in Dail Eireann 1934.

Leader of Fine Gael/Taoiseach 1948-

1951 & 1954-1957

10th June, 2020

Matt Doyle

Rúnaí,

National Graves Association

Stephen Richards

Part Two

A Lodge In The Wilderness

I think it’s safe to say that world view set out in John Buchan’s Socratic novel of 1906, *A Lodge in the Wilderness* (“Lodge”) is one that was representative of influential sectors of Edwardian society in Britain: the political, the military, the financial and even the ecclesiastical. That’s not to say that there wasn’t a lively debate going on about the role and future of the Empire, just as there is within the pages of the novel, but there was a certain common understanding within which the debate was conducted. The Gladstonian Liberal view had little input into the debate, nor did the position of the Imperial Preference Tories who tended to see the Empire primarily as an economic construct.

And, as we have seen, this was a commonality that—in Buchan’s eyes anyway—transcended the day-to-day rough and tumble of the domestic political scene. However worked up the protagonists might become, it seems that Buchan and his circle were determined not to take it too seriously. The Bar, where many of them had (in the language

of the day) ‘earned their spurs’, was the living working model of a cosmos where the most bitterly fought actions ended with the rival counsel going off arm in arm for lunch at the club they both belonged to. So, it was a competitive world if you like, but it was also a sort of game; whereas the Great Game on the North West Frontier of India was all too deadly serious.

I sometimes wonder if there was an auto-immune reaction going on here. By the skin of its teeth Britain had managed to avoid a revolution, most recently around the time of the Great Reform Act and the Chartist disturbances. The necessity to neutralise internal conflict in the state under the guise of no-holds-barred political pantomime, Mick McManus-style, had been burned into the memory of the ruling class. Or did Buchan indeed have a premonition of what might happen if political passions boiled over, as they did in the period 1912-14 over Home Rule? Buchan was above all a man who saw things, as Chesterton said of Carlyle.

I would also argue that his short stories, above all, dashed off at times with probably not much thought, give us our clearest insight into Buchan. I never seemed to be able to come across the edition apparently edited by David Daniell (improbably both a Tyndale scholar and a Buchan scholar), but I would encourage everybody to buy them or dust them down again. You can get the complete collection on Kindle for just 49p in UK money. I undertake to reimburse any buyer who's not completely satisfied.

Magic Dust

Anyway, this same attitude of amused (not exactly cynical) detachment is evident throughout these stories. There's one that particularly exemplifies it: *A Lucid Interval*. The hinge on which it turns, as with *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, is magic dust in the eyes, or in this case a secret ingredient in a curry, so it's not the vagaries of love but the vagaries of political conviction that are exposed to mockery.

A native Indian landowner, for revengeful reasons of his own, suborns a clan dependant, who happens to be a chef, to introduce certain little alien crystal-like grains into a curry dish with a view to upsetting a dinner party arranged by an eminent Earl. One of the guests is poor Tommy Deloraine, another member of the aristocracy, and with some post on the General Staff, but he's really a jolly good sort with simple outdoor tastes. He's smitten by Claudia Barriton, who unfortunately has spurned his advances and is instead mesmerised by a charismatic young Radical politician, one Abinger Vennard, who might be described as a classic bleeding heart Liberal. But after ingesting the curry Vennard suddenly starts holding forth on the need for the firm smack of government in India. And then, after a few days, he's writing to *The Times* to posit a linkage between the labour shortages in the Transvaal and the famine simultaneously affecting Bihar:

"The peoples of the Empire, he said, must be mobile, shifting about to suit economic conditions. But if this was true of the white man, it was equally true for the dark races under our tutelage. He referred to the famine and argued that the recurrence of such disasters was inevitable, unless we assisted the poverty-stricken ryot to emigrate and sell his labour to advantage. He proposed indentures and terminable contracts, for he declared he had no wish to transplant for good. All that was needed was a short season of

wage-earning abroad, that the labourer might return home with savings which would set him for the future on a higher economic plane. The letter was temperate and academic in phrasing... but in Liberals who remembered the pandemonium raised over the Chinese in South Africa, it stirred up the gloomiest forebodings."

This letter was just the prelude to a Bill which Vennard proposed to introduce:

"to authorise a scheme of enforced and state-aided emigration to the African mines. It would apply at first only to the famine districts, but power would be given to extend its working by proclamation to other areas... In a day or two the story universally believed was that the Secretary for India was about to transfer the bulk of the Indian people to work as indentured labourers for South African Jews."

Ram Singh, the scheming landowner, like the sorcerer's apprentice, suddenly sees that things have got out of hand: "*He waited two days, while on all sides the rumour of the Bill grew stronger and its provisions more stringent. Then he hesitated no longer*". He surreptitiously supplies the antidote.

Bluff And Double-Bluff

Like a lot of Buchan's short stories, this is more like a parable. At one level it's a jolly jape, quite diverting and well-told. It also underlines his view of politics as a kind of posturing. The actual subject-matter of the humour seems to us now to be rather crass. People may be starving to death in India, the working conditions endured by indentured labour in South Africa a matter of recent scandal, and these issues are used as the props for a typical English comedy of the absurd.

The less complex approach would have been to focus on a purely domestic political controversy to counterpose against the great concerns of Empire, but instead Buchan plays a game of double bluff, as even the matters of high Imperial policy are turned into farce. Why would he do that? I think the answer in part is that the political class felt secure enough to be able to riff on subjects that went to the heart of the national self-understanding. At a deeper level again, the subtext seems to be that, for all the vanity, prancing and preening of our public men, the imperial project goes on.

In *Lodge* (1906) the concept of the White Man's Burden would not have seemed at all absurd. Indeed Buchan to the end of his life was convinced that

Britain was a civilising influence in the world and that he himself was bound by all kinds of ties of duty and honour to play his part in that mission. But the emphasis was perhaps shifting away from India, and from most of sub-Saharan Africa, and towards the white nations of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa (which was looked upon as essentially white. Indeed in Greenmantle Peter Pienaar remarks in passing that it is the only white man's country).

In popular culture any reference to the White Man's Burden had already become a cue for sniggering even by the 1930s. Something of it survived in the 'Biggles' books of Capt. W.E. Johns, but it was a far cry from the appeal of the vastly superior novelist, G.A. Henty, in a previous generation.

Empire As Moral Uplift

One of the later Buchan short stories underscores the more muted post-War attitude to Empire: *The Last Crusade*. This is set some time in the early 1920s but the composition of the story is much later, as it's told by way of reminiscence. The Bolsheviks are now in undisputed control in Russia and are engaged in full-blast persecution of Orthodox clergy. As part of this, they put the Patriarch on trial and he's condemned to death. Hearing of this, an obscure Methodist Minister in the back country of South Africa, a Mr. Tubb, preaches a sermon to a sleepy set of Boer farmers and matrons, urging Christendom to a crusade against the Antichrist. By a series of flukes the report of this finds its way into the corpus of one of the international news agencies and from there to the popular press on both sides of the Atlantic.

Buchan has great fun with this conceit. Once again the story about the Bolshevik persecutions is an inappropriate hook for the story (even if this incident was concocted there were plenty of other incidents), but the point is that he includes a quotation from a fictitious Presbyterian magazine in Toronto:

"The second leader was called 'The Deeper Obligations of Empire' and, with a side glance at Mr. Tubb, declared that unless the British Empire was a spiritual and moral unity it was not worth talking about".

The subsequent death of Mr. Tubb (choking on a chicken bone) gives fresh impetus to the crusade, which is then taken up by a skilful English foreign correspondent. The Bolsheviks are spooked by the power of the fundamentalist conscience and the Patriarch is released.

Of course the whole story is tongue in cheek but there is the unspoken assumption that, in the real world of power relations, the British Empire has become a paper tiger. This is not a picture that the protagonists in *Lodge* would have found at all congenial.

In *John McNab* the feisty heroine, Janet Raden, who later so far forgets herself as to marry Archie Roylance, philosophises on the emptiness of a status that isn't underpinned by raw power. She uses the example of her own family motto, which is some Latin tag about faith and honour. But, says she, in former times it was a Gaelic war cry, something like "*Come, dogs, and I will give you meat*". Perhaps the older Buchan saw in the later Empire some macrocosm of that.

A Fireside Talk

Meanwhile, back at the Lodge, the party has decamped from Francis Carey's lofty palace down to the more typically tropical conditions of a big lake which they cross over in a yacht to a native settlement on the far shore. Here we have an absolutely classic clichéd scene of the local chiefs doing obeisance to Mr. Carey, their great white chief:

"Carey sat down on a tree trunk, and the spokesman of the chiefs approached him. In the main he spoke their own tongue but for those who used a special dialect he had a boy from the Mission to interpret... the discussion was mainly about crops and stock disease. There was some talk of a tribal disturbance on the western border, and once when a decision seemed to be questioned, Carey's slow, quiet tones changed to a sharp command, and the watchers saw his mouth harden. Sitting there among his own people, his massive figure and brooding face had a superb air of authority."

Carey moves on seamlessly from this tribal moot and into the whitewashed Mission Church (with resident elderly Scots Minister), where he proceeds to preach the Sunday sermon. And what a strange sermon it is. What follows is pure Buchan, with a fusion, not to say confusion, of Christian, Imperial, and social improvement schemes, a fusion which there are signs that the later Buchan may have drawn back from, the religion of Mr. Sensible:

"I am not going to talk to you about theology, but what I have to say to you is vitally concerned with religion. Whatever our creeds... we are all serious men, and in our various ways, as

far as our imperfect light allows, we may claim to be seeking the kingdom of God and his righteousness".

I have to quote the next section at length. Whether or not it was Rhodes's own precise approach to "*the native problem*", it probably approximates to it, and to Buchan's; and, for all that we might find it repellent for various reasons, it's still the most intelligent defence I have come across of the White Government being the paedagogos to bring the black man to civilisation. The paedagogos, *contra* the King James Version in the Letter to the Galatians, wasn't the schoolmaster, but the slave who accompanied the boy to school and would beat him up every so often if he stepped out of line, a sort of muscular Learning Support Assistant:

"I am going to talk to you today about the two extremes we have to avoid. The first is the danger of underrating the status of the black man and the second is the still greater danger of overrating it. As to the first, I know that you feel strongly about certain recent changes which have been made in the criminal law. Well, I was largely responsible for these changes, and I am here to defend and explain them. You argue... that the native is a child and must be treated as a child and punished at the discretion of his master, who stands to him in loco parentis. You maintain that to make native discipline depend upon the cumbersome machinery of a court of law is to make it a farce. Who, you ask, when his servant offends, will be at pains to take him before a magistrate? He will either take the law into his own hands, which will be bad for the discipline of the State, or he will let the matter pass, which will ruin the discipline of his household. That may be so, but if he follows the latter course he will have only himself to thank, and if he follows the first he will be punished. And the reason is that we dare not underrate the status of the native... The law must look upon him not as a potential but as an actual citizen, and must give him the dignity of such. He must stand before it as an equal with the white man—not a social equal or a political equal, but a legal equal. It is the State and not the individual that has the main interest in his development, and therefore to the State must be left the responsibility."

Carey then goes off into an interesting digression about the law of necessity in exceptional circumstances and the actual law still having to exert its penalty, but he shortly comes back to the main theme:

"The second danger is that you conceive of the native status as higher than it really is. The fault will be committed by the idealists among you, as the other will be the error of the practical man. And yet I have often found idealists and practical men alike doing homage to what I can only think is a false conception of native development. The native's mind is sharp and quick, his memory is often prodigious, and he has histrionic and mimetic gifts which may mislead his teachers. But for all that, he stands at a different end of the scale of development from the white man. He represents the first stage of humanity, and he has to travel a long way before he can reach that level which we roughly call our civilization. You cannot annihilate ten strenuous centuries by assuming that they have not existed... It is less a difference in powers—for he has powers as remarkable often as our own—as in mental atmosphere, the conditions under which his mind works, and consequently the axioms of his thought. He will learn gladly what we have to teach him, and you will imagine that the lesson of civilisation has been learned, when suddenly you are pulled up by some colossal piece of childishness which shows that the mind whose docility (!) you have admired has been moving all the time in a world a thousand years distant from your own. We must recognise this gulf and frame our education accordingly. At bottom, and for obvious reasons, the native mind is grossly materialistic. The higher virtues and what we call 'spirituality' are unintelligible to it, though it may learn to claim them and to talk their jargon. We must begin, therefore, with the first things, if we do not wish to get a dishonest, parrot-like adherence to creeds which are not understood and have no power to influence life..."

"Remember that education is a thing which must take its colour from the needs that it is provided to satisfy. Your business is to inculcate in the native mind the elements of citizenship and Christian morality... Teach the children to read and write but do not aim at higher education, for that means black parsons [see Buchan's novel, *Prester John*] and black schoolmasters, and for that class the market is overstocked, and they are outcasts from the society of those whom they would claim as intellectual equals."

A few things to say about this. First of all, I'm pretty sure that this is pure Buchan; second, this isn't some off-the-cuff bar-room expostulation but a considered view based on experience; third, the argument is strangely plausible, and is delivered with a Macaulay-esque

assurance. The substance of the argument too is very redolent of Macaulay. Just recently I came across evidence of this in his *Essays and Speeches*, which is less well-known than is *Essays*, and *Lays of Ancient Rome*. His essay on *History* (May 1828) demonstrates that the Whig theory of history had at its back a Whig historiography.

Not only peoples, but their historians are on squares on the anthropological game of Snakes and Ladders. Granted, every so often some society will go down a snake but there is an underlying forward movement.

Here is Macaulay on Herodotus:

“The faults of Herodotus are the faults of a simple and imaginative mind. Children and servants are remarkably Herodotean in their style of narration. They tell everything dramatically...

“He wrote for a nation susceptible, curious, lively, insatiably desirous of novelty and excitement; for a nation in which the fine arts had attained their highest excellence, but in which philosophy was still in its infancy. His countrymen had but recently begun to cultivate prose composition. Public transactions had generally been recorded in verse.”

So we have a clever, lyrical, but naïve, unsophisticated people, fit to be patronised by a post-Napoleonic generation at the very peak of political and cultural self-assurance. Strange that even the Greeks, to adapt the Wildean quip, appear to have passed from barbarism to decadence with such a small intervening window of civilisation proper, as Macaulay would understand it.

So must Gregory the Great have thought when he saw the English slave children, or St. Augustine (of Canterbury) when he came across the rude Kentish chieftains who were the proto-English. This was a people who had to be Christianised, civilised and Romanised, as three interlinked strands of the one process, no matter that the English were already being Christianised, and even to some extent civilised, by Irish monks moving south from Northumbria.

Now this begs the interesting question as to whether such a civilisational snakes and ladders board in reality exists, like the metre rule that sits in Paris. Some of these same African societies are today held to be backward because they have failed whole-heartedly to adopt the post-Christian consensus in relation to social policy, preferring instead to hold to the teachings of the nineteenth and early

twentieth century European missionaries who evangelised them. So, one problem with the metre rule is that western liberals tinker with it at will.

Another problem, hinted at earlier, is that no degree of civilisation is proof against a national or societal relapse into very uncivilised ways. But of course the biggest problem is for one civilisation, be it Graeco-Roman, British, American, or, currently, Chinese, to apply its own measure and experience in a Procrustean fashion. We're all admonished to be culturally sensitive these days, an admonition at which I balk very much, as it contains an implied bye-ball for all cultures other than white, western, heteronormative. Those of us unfortunate enough to come from that heritage are supposed to go through our lives wearing a badge of shame, which I refuse to do.

However, equally obnoxious is the casual assumption of Buchan and his colleagues, clever subtle intellects trained in the Classics, that they had nothing much to learn from the races under imperial suzerainty. In this as in other areas Buchan the storyteller was more insightful than Buchan the statesman and Imperial philosopher.

We Have The Technology

I think that Carey (Rhodes) was right in three respects: technology, medicine and governmental structures.

The British and other colonial powers had a distinct technological advantage. At the obvious level this was summed up by Belloc:

“Whatever happens, we have got
The Maxim, and they have not.”

The *locus classicus* of this is the Battle of Omdurman in 1898, which funnily enough was the date of Belloc's squib. The artistic representations of conflicts in that era are not revealing on this point. We have plenty of images of British troops fighting gamely against fearful odds, wielding their bayonets with great panache, or else involved in noble cavalry charges. But the truth was that the soon-to-be-subject populations had no answer to the machine gun. This from the Art Review at Rutgers University:

“In 1893 in Southern Africa, British colonial police slaughtered 1500 Ndebele warriors, losing only four of their own men in the process. This astronomical, almost unfathomable victory was earned not through superior strength, courage or strategic skill, but because the British were armed with

five machine guns and the Ndebele were not.”

And Julius Caesar managed to conquer the whole of Gaul without a single machine gun. How did he do it?

Readers may remember that, according to *The Thirty Nine Steps*, Hannay got his commission in 1914 by virtue of his youthful service in “*the Matabele Wars*”, an episode of Imperial history infrequently flagged up. Earlier in the novel, to prove his *sang-froid*, he had demonstrated “*the old Shona trick*”, throwing a dagger in the air and catching it in his mouth. But the Matabele much more than the Mashona were the warrior tribe: they were the Zulus of Rhodesia, which might explain their insane courage in launching themselves at machine gun fire. Some of them hoped that post-Independence they would be able to re-assert their dominance. Robert Mugabe had other ideas. Within two years of the Lancaster House agreements Government-sponsored militias went on a spree of blood-letting in Matabeleland. About 20,000 were massacred and from that point on Joshua Nkomo was finished.

Trains And Boats And Planes

But technology involves a lot more than the machinery of war. The technological superiority of the colonial powers enabled them to make the most of their overseas territories. They were in the business of transformation of these pastoral societies into go-ahead economies that would be attractive to ambitious youth from the homeland, and which would form part of the process of civilising and westernising the native peoples, on the principle of the rising tide lifting all boats. So, in southern Africa malaria was soon en route to being eradicated, pest control was instituted, new wells were dug, land was brought into arable production by schemes of irrigation, roads, bridges and railway lines were built, urban centres were established, mission hospitals and schools were opened. This was Development, along lines that were undisputed up to very recent times.

For any of this to happen there had to be a strategic intelligence at work, the ability to envisage a project, plan and prepare for it in a co-ordinated way, and then execute it efficiently. Project management demands a type of intelligence I'm wholly without and so I admire it inordinately when I see it. Most recently I have marvelled at it as I have seen how

slowly but surely, over about 18 months, five miles of road on my daily commute were turned into dual carriageway. It's the gift of administration which the British, by and large, possessed, and the sub-Saharan African peoples with their very different history by and large had not. The British seem to be losing it these days, but that's another story.

What is even more remarkable is that the British achieved so much, both for good and ill, in such a short time in Africa, especially perhaps in the twenty-five years or so of the Imperial zenith, from 1890 to 1914. Buchan was 16 at the start of that era and it's unsurprising that, at age thirty plus, it seemed to him that Britain was walking hand in hand with destiny. Indeed it's reasonable to assume that, had it not been for the two Wars, British prestige might have underpinned an ongoing tutelage up to the year 2000 and beyond.

Vanishing Solitudes

But, whether fast or slow, the clock was always going to be ticking. For one thing the arbitrary colonial border lines would eventually produce a national and nationalistic mindset in the native population.

More important, I think, the British development project was pregnant with the forces which would dismantle Imperial authority. The schools would play some part in this but the overwhelming factor was the huge population growth in Africa, enabled by the advances in medicine and pest control and by the absence for a couple of generations of the tribal warfare which had repeatedly devastated the country.

Buchan thought of the Transvaal as a vast aromatic tableland with just scatterings of Boers and native tribes. We think of Karen Blixen too and the Kenyan paradise of the 1920s and 30s. As for the Lowveldt, in the Eastern Transvaal, this was basically empty until the first Dutch settlers arrived around 1840. Not empty in the Laura Ingalls Wilder sense, with "only Indians" living there, but completely empty. Rampant malaria had made it almost uninhabitable. The Dutch pioneers, who were pretty tough to begin with, endured heavy mortality rates, and only the very toughest survived.

Barefoot In The Park

Buchan in some of his short stories makes great play of the arrogance and brutality of the Dutch towards the natives, and no doubt much of that was

true, and he had seen it at first hand. The difference I think was that the Afrikaans people didn't have any expansionist or Imperialist pretensions. They had carved out a place for themselves in this harsh landscape and they were determined to hold on to it. It's as if they were a white tribe, intent on dominating their own area, just as the Zulus had felt the need to dominate the Bantus, and the Bantus oppressed the Bushmen.

One interesting sidelight on this, which I noticed myself, was the sight of Afrikaans children going around in their bare feet, which apparently is a custom among them, demonstrating their historic closeness to the land. Some may remember Zola Budd, the waif-like Afrikaans girl who was enticed to take British citizenship so that she could run for Britain in the ten thousand metre race at the Los Angeles Olympics in 1984. How she managed to do it unscathed, running barefoot among all her spike-wearing competitors, I can't imagine, but it all ended badly when she accidentally got tangled up with Mary Decker Slaney, the American favourite, causing the latter to crash out.

I should say, by way of further parenthesis, the Eastern Transvaal is the only region of Africa that I'm at all familiar with, as we were invited out to stay a few years ago, by a couple who have an idyllic thatched house on the edge of Kruger National Park, not too far from the Lebombo hills, where one of Buchan's earliest heroes, Andrew Crawford was based, in Prester John. It's as peaceful as it's idyllic, or so everybody thought. But

our friends were badly beaten up by burglars a few months ago and I don't think they'll ever be back. The western media have largely closed their eyes to what's going on in South Africa, but it's pretty clear that the country is going down the pan, judged by whatever criteria one cares to apply.

Back to my argument, which is that for so long as there was some demographic stability, with only incremental growth of the native populations, and with a slowly-increasing settler population keeping in step with that growth, the Buchan/Carey vision had some solidity to it. But, in the years after the Second World War, the legacy of increased infant mortality, better nutrition and less internecine warfare had begun to make its demographic impact. The settler populations were not being replenished, and the colonial motherland was concentrating her efforts in spending Marshall Aid money to bring about heaven on earth. Britain was once again full of the despised Little Englanders, with not many Imperialist bones in their bodies. The abusive term is now of course used in a different context. So, in 2020, South Africa, that country for white men, has a population of something like 59 million, of whom perhaps only three or four million are white.

I would like to say something in the concluding instalment about the Empire as Greater Britain, about the economic vision of Empire as it was envisaged to impact on life in Britain, and about the religious or spiritual aspect of Empire.

Donal Kennedy

Famous Irishmen

In a Blog—*I Met A Traveller From A Distant Land*— I told the story of the man, who, when introduced to me, told me that he had lunched with Eamon de Valera in Dublin in the early 1960s in Aras an Uachtarain. The Traveller had a distinguished career as a journalist, a diplomat and statesman, and had UN prizes for translating Ottoman verse, and a major French prose work into Bengali. A Moslem, he had been taught by Irish Priests in Calcutta and sent his daughters to a Convent.

The establishment of an Irish State in the teeth of the most powerful Empire

the world had seen was a stupendous achievement, and recognised as such by the whole world—except those parts of the world where Imperialist media and academia maintained hegemony. For the past 50 years Imperialist propaganda has enjoyed a near monopoly.

The criminal attempt to imprison Captain James Kelly, Finance Minister Charles Haughey and others, on the perjured evidence of Defence Minister Jim Gibbons, although thrown out of Court by an honest jury, was followed by a State suppression of history teach-

ing (see Blog 'Fukuyama, Ruairi Quinn and the End of History Teaching'), and its substitution by a curriculum meeting British anti-democratic requirements. In 1969 British agents established a secretive, oathbound "Trust" to bring the *Irish Times*, which had recently evolved—after more than a century's fawning servility to English *herren-volk* interests—into a self-respecting journal for Irish men and women, back to its crawling past.

As the statues of slave-owners and the reputations of their admirers are dumped and derided around the world the hegemony of Imperialist propagandists is crumbling, even in London, Liverpool and Bristol. It can't last much longer in Dublin, Cork and Limerick. Can Sir Terry Wogan's statue much longer escape a ducking in the Shannon?

About three years ago I was at Mass locally in London, celebrated by a Nigerian Priest of the Holy Ghost Order. I told him I had been taught by a priest of his Order who had been with Bishop Shanahan in Nigeria in the first decades of the 20th Century. He told me that Bishop Shanahan's reputation in Nigeria was as great as that of St Patrick in Ireland.

Indeed *Wikipedia* describes Bishop Joseph Shanahan (1871-1943) as "*The Apostle*" of Nigeria. He died in Kenya, but his remains were returned in 1956 to Nigeria and reburied in the Basilica of the Most Holy Trinity in Onitsha after a "*solemn but joyous ceremony performed for a paramount Chief to ensure that his great spirit would always remain with the people, protecting and guiding them as he had done in life. He was the only non Igbo (Ibo?) to be awarded this honour.*"

The Priest who had been with him was the lovable Thady O'Connor, who was 73 years old when he first taught me in 1957, and remained in fine health until he died 2 years later. He coached Rugby teams and had an eye like a hawk. He had captained the Rockwell College Senior Rugby team as a pupil in 1904 when one of its stars was a Student/Teacher known as Ed. de Valera. He and Dev remained friends thereafter. And Dev was a life-long lover of Rugby.

The Apostle of Nigeria, Bishop Joseph Ignatius Shanahan was the son of a Farm Labourer from Tipperary.

Eamon de Valera was brought up in a farm-labourer's cottage in the neighbouring County of Limerick.

Michael Francis O'Dwyer, a fellow

Countyman and contemporary of the Apostle of Nigeria, the son of a 'strong farmer' with 500 lush acres in the 'Golden Vale', was born in 1864 and made a name for himself in the world. He was educated by Jesuits in Ireland, whom an *Irish Times* columnist approvingly tells us, boasted of how many Generals, and other luminaries their Society furnished the British Empire.

The Times (of London) gave Sir Michael Francis O'Dwyer, former Lieutenant-Governor of the Indian Province of the Punjab, a glowing Obituary in 1940. The Indians, (ungrateful wretches?)

apparently did not demand his remains be sent back to the Raj for burial.

In fact they erected, in 2018, at the site of the 1919 Amritsar Massacre, the statue of Udham Singh, who was hanged on July 1940 for the shooting of O'Dwyer. There's a lot about O'Dwyer, and General Dyer and Amritsar and their ilk available online. But devil a bit about how the *Irish Times* reported on them, except its approval of the Jesuits, rarely given to Catholic bodies by them.

(See *youtube*: "Radharc" – "He was our Saint Patrick: Bishop Joseph Shanahan".)

Brendan Clifford

AOH and AFIL

The Moynihan Brothers

The correspondence of the Moynihan brothers of Tralee from 1908 to 1918 was published by the Irish Academic Press some time ago. The brothers, Michael and John, were the sons of a Land League farmer who was also a member of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. They were educated to University level in Ireland. Michael went to London and joined the Civil Service, while John stayed at home.

Michael became increasingly Conservative in outlook. He joined the Territorial Army. When Britain made war on Germany, he delayed joining the Regular Army out of consideration for the feelings of his mother. He joined in 1916, when conscription was about to be introduced. He applied for a Commission and his father used his influence to help him get it.

John became a Socialist in outlook, and it would seem that he took part in, or was influenced by, Canon Sheehan and William O'Brien's All-for-Ireland movement.

Their correspondence ended in 1918 when Michael was killed in the War—the British one against Germany.

Deirdre McMahon of Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, supplied an Introduction to the Correspondence in which she said:

"In the twenty years after the fall of Parnell in 1890, a new Catholic elite emerged that was to dominate the movement for Irish independence in the early 20th century. It was largely the product of social and economic development after the Famine, particular-

ly the changes in the education system that followed such events as the passing of the Intermediate Education Act in 1878 and the creation of the Royal University in 1879. These provided opportunities for greater mobility for many Catholic children from middle- and lower-class backgrounds. This in turn led on to greater political mobility in the 1880s and 1890s, associated with the widening of the franchise in 1884, the appearance of the tantalising mirage of Home Rule in 1886 and 1893 and the Local Government Act of 1898. In his illuminating novels of the period, which the Moynihan boys read, Canon Sheehan expressed anxiety that the new Ireland would be both stagnant and materialistic, ruled by the principle of *cui bono* ('whose profit') and *quieta non movere* (undisturbed quiet).

"However, as Tom Garvin has observed, there were other undercurrents at work in the decades after 1870: restlessness, disillusion, political romanticism and cults of violence all over Europe. In Ireland, in the aftermath of Parnell's fall, these were fuelled by an increasing sense of political impotence and frustration with the long wait for Home Rule. When the Moynihan family correspondence opens in 1908, Home Rule seems as far away as ever; the Liberals had won a landslide victory in the general election of 1906 and were thus under no compulsion to reintroduce Home Rule..."

I know nothing about Deirdre McMahon beyond what she has written in this Introduction. Judging by the Introduction and its references, I would say that her thinking about the history of the period she writes about was done within

the framework of facts and assumptions presented to her by the academic establishment since University ideology was plunged into existential crisis by the Arms Trials of 1970. Her Canon Sheehan bears no resemblance to the Canon Sheehan I know, and the All-For-Ireland League and the Cork Free Press are absent, except for a bare, unexplained mention.

In her Bibliography Professor David Fitzpatrick has eight listings, Keith Jeffrey has four, Lord Bew has four, Senia Paseta has three, John Winter has four. Margaret O'Callaghan (who thinks that the Irish language was not snuffed out by the regime of Williamite Conquest but died a natural death), has two listings. And Eunan O'Halpin has two.

William O'Brien's *Olive Branch In Ireland*, which is the Irish book of the Parnell and post-Parnell era, is not mentioned at all.

Education is a sphere of life that is entirely beyond my experience. I think it must be one of those things which, if you were not put through it as a child and teenager, must forever lie beyond your comprehension.

I took it for granted that, when Pearse summed up the educational system that operated in the twenty or thirty years before the Great War as *The Murder Machine*, he had grounds for it. But now I can see from this *Moynihan Correspondence* that it must have been so. The sons of a Fenian Land Leaguer were well-educated, and their intellectual culture was British. What they discussed was what British intellectuals discussed. Their intellectual world was the world of Wells and Shaw, Belloc and Chesterton.

The Education system which Deirdre McMahon sees as feeding the independence movement actually fed something quite different. Its purpose was to lay a foundation for a native-based West Britain. And it did produce a stratum that was West British in substance. But that stratum can only be described as an elite in a peculiar sense. It was not an elite in Pareto's sense. It was not hegemonic over the populace. It was a detached elite. Or it was an elite that attached itself to the British elite and parted company with the Irish populace from which it had emerged. It was a useless elite.

There was more than one political national elite in Ireland in 1912-14. Deirdre McMahon discovered that there were three, thanks to Keith Jeffrey:

"In *Ireland and the Great War* Keith Jeffrey notes how the separate experiences of Redmondites, unionists and advanced nationalists actually constitute a series of 'parallel texts'. This emerges clearly in the letters of the spring of 1914..." (xxxii).

Were the services of an outsider really needed to bring that obvious fact to light in Irish academia in the 1990s? Probably. Professor Crotty had made a confession of intellectual bankruptcy, on behalf of the governing circle in Ireland, in an article in the *London Times* in 1972 in which he appealed to England to come back and take things in hand (see *Irish Political Review*, February 2012 for a reprint and commentary: the magazine is available via a free download, which can be accessed through the Athol Books website).

But the given list of "parallel texts" is seriously inadequate to explain the course of events.

To begin with, Redmondism was not one coherent thing.

When Parnell asserted dictatorial rights over the Party, he split it in three. The three were forced back together again under pressure of a land agitation worked up by William O'Brien. That agitation was conducted under the name of the United Irish League. Redmond, who had supported Parnell in his campaign against the majority of the Party, was appointed Chairman of the re-united Party out of sentimental regard to what Parnell had once been. He was not the Leader of the Party in any decisive sense, but was one of a triumvirate—and the weakest one. He was a British Parliamentarian born and bred, and he lived in a doctrinaire variant of that infinitely fluid thing called The British Constitution.

The other members of the triumvirate were John Dillon and Joseph Devlin of Belfast. Dillon represented a kind of Continental republican spirit deriving from Young Ireland. Devlin was the leader of a new movement, the Ancient Order of Hibernians. This was a mass organisation of the Catholic population, originating in the industrial North, and strongly oriented on the working class in Belfast. In its region of origin it can be seen as a necessary organisation, as a counter to the Freemasons and the Orange Order. And, like the Freemasons, it was a kind of secret society.

The UIL, once it had obliged the three post-Parnell parties to reunite in 1900, became the membership organisation of the united Party. It settled down quickly into an empty routine. There was

little for it to do as most Parliamentary seats went to the Party without a contest. Political activity consisted chiefly of waiting until an Election threw up a hung Parliament at Westminster and then making the Liberal Party the Government in return for an undertaking to bring in another Home Rule Bill.

It was under these circumstances that Joe Devlin's Catholic secret society wove itself into the structure of the Party, and spread quickly around the country.

Deirdre McMahon records that in May 1913 Tom O'Donnell, MP for Kerry West, gave a lecture to the Tralee branch of the AOH on The Duties of the Irish Citizen under Home Rule. She also records that "*In September [1912] there were pro- and anti-Home Rule meetings in Tralee*" (p. xxix). Unfortunately she gives no explanation of what the AOH was, or how it came about that anti-Home Rule meetings were held in Tralee.

I lived into my early twenties in a small corner of North-West Cork that had once been part of Kerry, was still part of Kerry Diocese, and was listed in some maps as the Eastern Fraction. It played both hurling and football [Gaelic, ed.] and therefore usually had a stake in All-Ireland Finals. But the life of North Kerry has always been a mystery to me. I noticed for example in the 1960s or 70s that the Listowel Writers Festival was an event in British literary life. Dan Cronin of Rathmore (who took an interest in the history of the region, which I never did) remarked that west of Scartaglen nothing makes sense. And that is how it seemed to me.

I was an altar boy as a child and in that capacity I tended to the October devotions. A new curate from Castleisland, with a well-known surname associated with bacon, broke down one evening, in the October twilight, while meditating on the Sorrowful Mysteries of the Rosary. People were astonished. I came across a perfect description of their outlook in a story told by Somerset Maugham about a similar incident in Spain, except that in that case it was about a preacher who was calming down the congregation which was taking things too seriously—"My brethren, reflect that all this I tell you happened a long time ago, and it may be that it never happened at all".

Anyhow: there was a branch of the AOH in Tralee and it held a public meeting in 1913 on the duties of citizens under the Home Rule Government that would soon be in place. There was also an anti-Home Rule meeting in

Tralee—not organised by Lord French, I assume.

The AOH was unheard of in the Eastern Fraction of Kerry in Cork. It was like hurling and football. Once you crossed the Blackwater everything changed.

In the course of my business as an altar boy I came across a jumble of things that were never used in a corner of the Chapel in Boherbue Village. (The Chapel was a big stone Church with aisles and galleries and nooks and crannies. It was replaced after Vatican Two with a dinky little Chapel that calls itself a Church.) I asked what all of that stuff was used for and I was told that it was of no use. So why was it there? I was told that some time in the distant past somebody must have got it with the intention of doing something with it. But it mustn't have worked out, so all the stuff must just have been let lie there.

It made no sense. Nobody had any interest in it. That was in the 1940s. But I remembered it decades later when I found out about the AOH. As far as I could gather, it was arranged according to institutions of the Church, deriving from institutions of the Roman State, that in mediaeval Europe had been part of the Guild system. So I guessed that in my mother's time some attempt was made to establish the AOH in Boherbue, but it was nipped in the bud. She never mentioned it, though she was as good a Catholic as the next person. All she ever mentioned about the clergy was that new curates sent from Killarney tended to be a nuisance for a while in the way that they tried to interfere with courting couples, but they were soon made to understand that this was none of their business.

It might have been a good thing in the long run if the AOH had succeeded in consolidating its position as a hegemonic influence on Irish national life and its leadership had become a functional elite. Nationalist Ireland might then have become part of European Christian Democracy.

It seems to me that the Veto issue in the 1820s and the AOH issue in 1910 were watersheds. Or they were points of departure from which different roads might have been taken. (The Veto dispute was over whether the British Government, in view of the considerable influence of the Church in Irish public life, should have a say in the appointment of Bishops. It is dealt with in my book, *The Veto Controversy*.) If Vetoist Emancipation had been carried, Ireland would have had something like a Concordat with the Vatican, which was

the normal European arrangement. And AOH dominance might have given national society the fundamental underlay which warded off liberal capitalism—Manchester Capitalism—in Germany and carried it through two all-out British attempts to destroy it. But the Vetoists were defeated, and much of the Jacobite intellectual culture that they carried with them was lost. And the AOH was defeated throughout Co. Cork in 1910 and never recovered. National society therefore did not have the cultural infrastructure on which the social Encyclicals of the Papacy could find some traction, as they did in Germany.

An attempt was made 30 years later to establish a vocational system. It came to nothing. Ireland had been committed to development in the liberal mode by the defeat of the AOH in 1910.

It was not that the 1910 Elections were fought on the issue of liberalism versus the Guild system. That issue was not mentioned as far as I know. But the defeat of the AOH on other issues set nationalist Ireland on a line of liberal development.

Something of the AOH view of the world carried over into Fine Gael. When it returned from the political wilderness in 1948 it set about financially starving Trinity College out of existence. Trinity was an essentially colonial and Protestant institution inflicted by the English State on the Irish for the purpose of snuffing them out in one way or another, by whatever means the circumstances of the particular moment allowed. It had failed after centuries of endeavour. It was intolerable that it should remain as a bastion at the centre of Dublin, paid for by the Irish state which had established itself by war against it and all that it stood for. So let it wither.

Fianna Fail returned to Office. Sean Moylan became Education Minister. He found Trinity withering. He saved it.

Moylan represented North Cork, where the AOH was scotched in 1910. The Redmond party did not even contest the second 1910 Election there. And, in the 1950s, the liberal culture of Young Ireland, as reinvigorated by Canon Sheehan and William O'Brien, still flourished there.

The issues in the 1910 Election in Co. Cork, where the Redmond Party lost eight of its nine seats, were the exhibitionist Catholicising of the Home Rule movement by the AOH, the immersing of the Irish Party in British party-politics, and the completion of land purchase. And the anti-Redmond Manifesto, stress-

ing the danger of Catholic Ascendancy, was written by Canon Sheehan.

In Britain the Liberal Party, which had won an outright majority in 1906 and therefore had no need of the Irish Party, had run into serious difficulty with its Budget. Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer) tried to mobilise public feeling in support of it by waging demagogic class war against the aristocracy. The Liberals went to the country early in 1910 for a mandate but failed to get it. Liberals and Tories were returned in equal numbers. Another Election was held at the end of the year, with the Liberals having agreed to bring in a Home Rule Bill, and a Bill to end the Lords' Veto on legislation, in return for Irish support in carrying the Budget. The result was equal numbers of Liberals and Tories again, but with the Liberals being given a large majority by the Irish Party. But the Irish Party again lost eight of its nine Cork seats, and did not even contest North Cork.

William O'Brien had extensive experience of British politics, both as an antagonist with the Government as a land agitator, and in collaboration with it in making a land settlement. And he had also collaborated with the Northern Protestant tenant-farmers in the land-purchase movement and had seen them force the landed gentry to give way to them in the Orange Lodges over land purchase. Nobody else in the Nationalist leadership had comparable experience of practical politics.

O'Brien was convinced that the whip-hand that Redmond had got over the Liberal Party was illusory: that the maximum Home Rule—that was got through making the Irish Party an instrument of the Liberal Party on a highly contentious issue in British politics—would raise an opposition to the Bill in British public feeling that would bring it to nothing; and in Ireland the conflict would drive the situation towards Partition because the Orangemen were not bluffers.

O'Brien took it that the major concern was to ensure that Partition did not happen, and to get some kind of all-Ireland self-governing body established, however slight it was. The only all-Ireland body in existence was the British administration. The idea had been floated around 1905, following the Land Act, of a general Council of Local Government Councils, which would have an elected element but no legislative function. It would provide some oversight of the British Dublin Castle administration. A strong practical case could be made for it. But the

Redmond Party rejected it out of hand, insisting that there could be no Home Rule without a legislative function. And the AOH element, which came increasingly to the fore in those years, necessarily had the effect of intensifying emotional Ulster Protestant hostility to Home Rule.

In the first 1910 Election Redmond lost his Cork seats to independents. Between the two Elections, the Independents organised themselves as the All-for-Ireland League. I assume that the Anti-Home Rule meeting in Tralee was an AFIL meeting, and was in substance an Anti-Partition meeting.

Things worked out as O'Brien saw that they must. It wasn't that he was a fortune-teller. He just knew from experience and reflection what the real forces in motion were. He understood the dynamics of British politics, and knew that a Party that was in government only by the will of the Irish Party—which, however "Constitutional" it might declare itself to be, was not Constitutional at all in the sense of seeking an electoral mandate to govern the state, but was trying to manipulate the governmental parties in order to leave the state—would prove to be weak when confronted by a determined Opposition, which would resist by all possible means. And when the Opposition compensated for the loss of the Lords' Veto by raising an Army to resist the implementation in Ulster of an Act which it declared to have been carried by unconstitutional means, the AFIL was not shocked, or even surprised.

It is not possible to think that by May 1914 Redmond still believed that the Unionists were bluffing, or, after the Curragh Mutiny was openly defended by the Opposition in Parliament as an action in defence of the Constitution, that Ulster resistance would be put down by British force. But he pressed on "Full Steam Ahead!", with legislative Home Rule, and put himself at the head of the Volunteers that had been raised by the Irish Republican Brotherhood.

AFIL commentators pointed out that the purpose of this in the circumstance could only be war between the South and the Protestant North. Redmond's latter-day admirers plead that this was not the case, and the reason he insisted on being put in command of the Irish Volunteers was to prevent them from acting out what they were formed to do. But, if the Government, with the support of the Opposition, had not eased the Irish situation by bringing about a World War within days of the Bachelors Walk shootings,

Redmond would have found himself in a predicament. Ulster had shown that it was not bluffing. Redmond, as Commander of the Volunteers, would have been under compulsion to decide whether he was bluffing.

Many newspapers at the end of July 1914 took the Bachelors Walk incident to be the opening shot in a war in Ireland. Four days later Redmond took the major decision of his life—it might even be described as the only real decision he ever took—when, without consulting the Party, he committed it, on the spur of the moment, in his seat in the Commons, to supporting the War on Germany. It was his way of escaping from the situation he had brought about in Ireland.

Former President Mary McAleese has revealed recently that early in her life she had come to agree with Daniel O'Connell that Irish freedom was not worth the shedding of a drop of blood, and that she had always been a strong opponent of the Provisionals. (She gave me reason to observe her closely when she was in Belfast, and I must say I did not notice this.) But O'Connell was not a pacifist. He was a Whig. The Whigs expected him, after they had helped to get Catholic Emancipation, to found the Whig Party in native Ireland—it was already well set up in the Plantation. But, instead of doing that, he founded the massive nationalist movement on the ground of Catholic Emancipation.

But he retained a British dimension, in which he continued to be a Whig. And Whiggery means Progress. And Progress requires war. The great war of Progress in O'Connell's time was the Opium War on China, which we launched by the Great Whig/Liberal demagogue, Macaulay, as Minister for War. Great vats of Chinese blood were spilled in it. I once searched for a protest from O'Connell against the War, but I couldn't find one. Irish freedom was not worth the shedding of a drop of blood, but a different standard applied to the requirements of British Imperial progress.

And so it seems to have been with John Redmond. He turned the Party into a recruiting agency of the British Army in return for having the Home Rule Bill signed into the Statute Book as an Act by the King, after a prior agreement was made with the Unionists that it would not be implemented until after the War, and not even then without alterations in the Unionist interest.

Of course, by doing this he split the Volunteers, and gave the earnest minority

the opportunity to prepare openly for the act of war that was launched in 1916. So the outcome of his shallow Constitutionalism was Irish involvement in two Wars, and the worst form of Partition!

Maurice Moynihan, Land Leaguer and Fenian, the father of Michael and John, a hillside man who stood by Parnell, according to Deirdre McMahon—

"was briefly involved with the United Irish League founded by William O'Brien in 1878, but once it lost its *grazier raison d'etre* and effectively became the constituency organisation of the reunited Irish Party, he abandoned it. In the General Election of 1900 he campaigned for Tom O'Donnell against the Healyite J.E.J. Julien" (xviii).

And it does not seem that he took any part in the agitation that produced the 1903 *Land Purchase Act*. He had spoken at meetings opposed to the Boer War, but then was happy to help his son become a commissioned officer in the British Army. That made him a member of the "new Catholic elite" of Parnellites who had stood by Parnell when he took his stand against the Party as its Master, and wrecked it.

Healy was "*the dirty little scut*" (or words to that effect) who, when Parnell, in Committee Room 14, told the Party that he was its Master, asked "*But who is its Mistress?*"

Parnell certainly felt that the Party was his to do what he pleased with, and that his followers were semi-educated culchies who would be nothing without him. Healy begged to differ. He said that he and people like him had created Parnell, the public figure, and that they would take no dictation from him.

Those who refused to take Parnell's dictation were unable to hold together against him. They split into factions. But when he went to the electorate against them he was defeated.

During the 1890s there were contested elections between the Nationalist factions. William O'Brien—who had tried and failed to persuade Parnell to make a minor concession to the English Liberal Non-conformist Conscience, with a guarantee that his position would be restored when the English fit of prudery burned itself out—stood aside from the factionalism and worked up the agitation on the land issue which brought the factions together again as a Party in 1900. He did not take up a leading position in the re-united Party, but applied himself to a fresh agitation to put an end to landlordism by making the tenants the owners of the land.

The Party did not approve of this. It was a distraction from Home Rule; removal of landlordism would deprive the Party of a standard complaint; and O'Brien was pursuing his object in collaboration with the Unionist Party.

O'Brien was jailed by the Unionist Government before making the deal with it, under which it financed the buying out of the land by the tenant farmers. That was how things were done in Britain under its robust idea of Constitutionalism. You made serious trouble, to the point of anarchy, as a precondition for an orderly reform.

Under the provisions of the 1903 Act, the landlords were quickly bought out in areas where O'Brien's influence was strong. Canon Sheehan took the lead in making sure that this happened. In the areas firmly under Party control the thing was dragged out.

The landlords lost the land in Co. Cork. Its value to them had been undermined by agitation during the preceding years, and under the Act they got more than they could have got for it in the free market. They had not been expropriated as many would have wished. They were ex-landlords with money. As former landlords they had nothing to lose from national independence. The O'Brienites therefore appealed to them in the 1910 Elections to become part of the national development and add a touch of class to a population of small property owners as Protestant country gentlemen.

(My grandfather became a small farmer under the Act—about 20 acres as far as I recall, much of it only good for rushes. On the facing slope there was what called the Minister's Farm—a bigger farm of much better land. Between the two there was a little stream—a Glasha. The Minister would occasionally walk his land. If my grandfather noticed him leaving his mansion for a walk, he would walk his land with his blackthorn stick, meet the Minister at the Glasha and exchange a few words with him as one country gentleman to another. I never knew my grandfather. I was told about him by my grandmother, a no-nonsense Culloty from Ballydesmond, who thought the whole thing was hilarious. I assume he had picked up the notion of a country gentleman from the AFIL propaganda of the time.

A different world began, going south-eastwards from the Minister's Farm. I was vaguely aware of it when cycling through it to football matches on early Sunday

afternoons when the Minister's Church at Dromagh was still active, hours after religion had ended for the week in Boherbue.

The Minister's farm ceased to exist in the early 1950s. It was bought by one of the Guerins who had a farm next to my grandfather's. The whole Parish gathered to help at the first threshing, to see the house. People were especially struck by the very large kitchen—with the line of bells by which servants could be summoned to the various rooms.)

The Protestant country gentleman who was part of the national community never materialised. I have no knowledge from the inside of what has been happening since the mid-1950s, but I have somehow got the notion that Protestants who stayed on because they felt attached just became Catholics.

Anyhow, the point is that Canon Sheehan actively sought a Protestant presence in the national community, and that goes completely against the fake-liberal caricature of him that has become standard.

Because of Sheehan, and of the society he reflected—traces of which existed all around me—I was much more familiar in my teens with German culture than with the culture that is now presented as having been characteristically Irish (Yeats, Synge and the rest).

The interest of Anglo-Ireland (Irish Times, Lord Bew etc.) in Parnell seems to derive from a notion that he might have brought an end to the march of the nation by means of a Home Rule/West British settlement by preserving a landlord interest and arranging some kind of accommodation with 'Ulster'. That would also account for the absence of a clear, realistic, account of the breaking of the Party in 1891, and for the virtual removal from published history of the Land Purchase conflict and the associated political conflict in which the Party was defeated in Cork in 1910, and for the caricaturing of Canon Sheehan.

A land settlement might have been made without the removal of landlordism. The landlord system was never abolished in English agriculture, where there is a substantial rented sector. It is entirely compatible with free capitalism, and might be said to be necessary to it—and the general ideological notion of 'freedom' in the West is traceable to the conditions required by Capitalism. The separate functions of ownership, money-lending, and entrepreneurship are all attributes of the breakthrough of Capitalism in 18th century England.

When the aforementioned Sean Moylan became Minister for Agriculture he deplored the absence of a free market in land. That was due to the merging of ownership and entrepreneurship brought about by the 1903 Act. The burden of ownership inhibits entrepreneurship, whereas renting facilitates it. It was not the arrangement best suited to Capitalism. It provided for a society of a different kind.

Of course the rack-renting system brought in by the Williamite conquest was intolerable, and was economically perverse. It had to be ended, and force had to be applied to end it. But O'Brien was not content to have tamed Ascendancy landlordism, civilised it to meet the requirements of capitalist Political Economy. He went on to abolish it in the national interest. And it was the extensive population of free owners of land which determined the course of events in which Home Rule was set aside and British rule was ended.

Maurice Moynihan, the Parnellite who stood with Parnell against the Party, appears to have been content, as a go-ahead businessman, with the modified landlordism that existed in 1900. He entered his sons into what was then a narrow elite of University graduates whose intellectual concerns were increasingly British. It proved to be an elite without a future because of the dominating presence of the large new class of very small-scale landowners—the "property-owning democracy"—brought about by the combined efforts of William O'Brien and the Unionist Government of 1903.

An Anglican Vicar's Diet:

Fish Fingers And The Body Of Christ!

"Since lockdown began, I have been on a mission. No bread, no pasta, no rice, no potatoes. And I have been pretty religious about it. I have allowed myself the breadcrumbs around a fish finger and the body of Christ, but apart from these I have cut out bread and those other foods completely. I have lost over three stone."

Rev Giles Fraser, Rector of St Mary's, Newington. June 25, 2020. UnHerd.com

The question is: where did Rev Giles Fraser get hold of the body of Christ? He complained in an earlier blog that his bishop would not even allow him to enter his church alone to pray, let alone celebrate the Eucharist. The only explanation can be that he rustled up the body of Christ in his kitchen, just like the Archbishop of Canterbury at Easter. Still, as a diet it seems to have worked miraculously well!

Contributed by *Niall Cusack*

Looting In The Foundation Of Israel

“Jewish soldiers and civilians looted Arab neighbors' property en masse in '48. The authorities turned a blind eye.

Refrigerators and caviar, champagne and carpets—a first-ever comprehensive study by historian Adam Raz reveals the extent to which Jews looted Arab property during the War of Independence...”

So wrote Ofer Aderet in the Israeli paper, *Haaretz* (3.10.20) in a review of a new Hebrew-Language book by Adam Raz, which has turned up copious archive material on the matter. Here is a sample testimony from a looter in 1948:

“We turned a mahogany closet into a chicken coop and we swept up the garbage with a silver tray. There was chinaware with gold embellishments, and we would spread a sheet on the table and place chinaware and gold on it, and when the food was finished, everything was taken together to the basement. In another place, we found a storeroom with 10,000 boxes of caviar, that's what they counted. After that, the guys couldn't touch caviar again their whole life. There was a feeling on one hand of shame at the behavior, and on the other hand a feeling of lawlessness. We spent 12 days there, when Jerusalem was groaning under horrible shortages, and we were putting on weight. We ate chicken and delicacies you wouldn't believe. In [the headquarters at] Notre Dame, some people shaved with champagne.”—Dov Doron, in testimony about looting in Jerusalem” (See: “*Looting of Arab Property in the War of Independence*”, Carmel Publishing House, in association with the Akevot Institute for Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Research; in Hebrew).

Haaretz comments that Adam Raz collected:

“... for the first time in a single volume, all existing information about the pillaging of Arab property by Jews during the 1947-49 Israeli War of Independence—from Tiberias in the north to Be'er Sheva in the south; from Jaffa to Jerusalem via the villages, mosques and churches scattered between them. Raz pored over 30 archives around the country, perused newspapers of that era and examined all extant literature on the subject. The result is shattering.

“Many parts of the Israeli public – civilians and soldiers alike – were involved in looting the property of the Arab population”, Raz tells *Haaretz*.

“The pillaging spread like wildfire among that public.” It involved the contents of tens of thousands of homes, stores and factories, of mechanical equipment, farm produce, cattle and more, he continues. Also included were pianos, books, clothing, jewelry, furniture, electrical appliances, engines and cars. Raz has left to others investigation of the fate of the land and buildings left behind by the 700,000 Arabs who fled or were expelled in the war. He focuses on movables only, items that could be stuffed into bags or loaded onto vehicles.

...[In Tiberias:] “there was competition between different units of the Haganah... who came in cars and boats and loaded all kinds of objects... refrigerators, beds and so on...”

“So widespread was the looting and theft that the general prosecutor who accompanied the fighting forces in Haifa, Moshe Ben-Peretz, stated in June 1948: “There is nothing [left] to take from [the] Arabs. Simply a pogrom... And the commanders all have excuses; ‘I just got here two weeks ago,’ etc. There is no one to detain.” ...

Members of the Communist Party also spoke out on the subject. In a memorandum to the People's Administration (the provisional government cabinet) and Haganah headquarters, the party referred to “*a campaign of looting, robbery and theft of Arab property in frightening dimensions.*” Indeed, “*The great majority of the homes of the Arab residents have been emptied of all valuables, the merchandise and commodities have been stolen from the shops, and the machines have been removed from the workshops and factories.*”

“...A reporter for Maariv, who took part in a tour of Jerusalem in July 1948, wrote, ...“All along the way there is no house, no store, no workshop from which everything was not taken... Things of value and of no value – everything, literally! You are left with a shocked impression by this picture of ruins and heaps of rubble, among which men are wandering, poking through the rags in order to get something for nothing. Why not take? Why have pity?”—Ruth Lubitz, testimony about looting in Jaffa...”

However, it emerges that this was not mere theft: there was a political

purpose to the purposeful stripping of Arab property: it was not intended that the owners should come back: indeed, there was to be little for the refugees to come back to! *Haaretz* continues:

“Raz, 37, is on the staff of the Akevot Institute (which focuses on human-rights issues related to the conflict), and edits the journal *Telem* for the Berl Katznelson Foundation. (He is also a frequent contributor of historical pieces to *Haaretz*.) Though he does not possess a doctoral degree, his résumé includes a number of studies that could easily have served as the basis for a Ph.D. thesis – about the Kafr Qasem massacre, the Israeli nuclear project and Theodor Herzl. The looting of Arab property by Jews has been written about before, but Raz is apparently the first to have devoted an entire monograph to the subject.

“Unlike other researchers who have written about the war, I view the looting as an event of far greater order than what has been said about it previously,” the historian notes. “In the book, I show how disturbed most of the decision makers were about the looting and the dangers it posed to Jewish society, and the degree to which it was a contentious issue among them.”

He also maintains that there has been a “*conspiracy of silence*” about the phenomenon. As a result, even now, in 2020, colleagues who read the book prior to its publication were “*surprised by its scale*”, he says.

He describes the plundering of Arab property by Jews as a “*singular*” phenomenon, because the looters were civilians (Jews) who stole from their civilian neighbors (Arabs).

“Looting in wartime is an ancient historical phenomenon that is documented in texts thousands of years old. My book does not deal with the phenomenon in general, but with the Israeli-Arab-Palestinian case. It was important for me to emphasize that the looting of Arab property was different from ‘regular’ wartime looting. These weren't American soldiers, for example, who plundered the Vietnamese, or Germans thousands of kilometers from home. These were civilians who looted their neighbors across the street. I don't mean that they necessarily knew Ahmed or Noor whose property they stole, but that the neighbors were part of a shared social civil fabric.

“The Jews from Haifa and the area who looted the property of close to 70,000 Arabs in Haifa, for example, knew the Arabs whose homes they pillaged. That was certainly the case also in the mixed cities and the vil-

lages that existed next to kibbutzim and moshavim. The book is rife with examples attesting to the fact that the looters knew that what they were doing was immoral. Furthermore, the public knew that the majority of the Palestinian community had not taken an active part in the fighting. In most cases, in fact, the looting took place after the fighting, in the days and weeks following the Palestinians' flight and expulsion."

"...I think that the looting of Arab property during the war is a singular and distinctive case ... an integral part of the Jewish public took part in the looting and theft of the property of more than 600,000 people...

"Haifa, for example, had a population of 70,000 Jews and a similar number of Arabs before the war. After the Israeli conquest of Arab Haifa, around 3,500 Arabs were left in the city. The property of the 66,500 Arabs who fled from the city was looted by the Jews, not by the beaten and frightened Arab minority."

...
"The people who came with the trucks went from house to house and removed the valuable items: beds, mattresses, closets, kitchen utensils, glassware, sofas, curtains and other objects. When I returned home, I wanted very much to ask my mother why they were doing this – after all, that property belongs to someone... But I didn't dare ask. The sight of the empty city and the taking of all the possessions of its inhabitants, and the questions all this aroused in me, haunted me for years."— Fawzi al-Asmar, about the looting in Lod

"The plundering was a means to realize the policy of emptying the country of its Arab residents.

...."

See the full report at:

<https://www.haaretz.com/misc/article-print-page/.premium.highlight.MAGAZINE-jews-looted-arab-property-en-masse-in-48-the-authorities-let-them-1.9201926>

Postscript

Wilson John Haire recalls another instance of Israeli looting:

"I was in Israel in 1974 staying with a former Israel soldier and his wife, friends of Ken Campbell, the comedian, whom I went along with.

The young soldier, still in his early 20s, spoke of looting when Israeli soldiers reached the Egyptian city of Alexandria in 1973 (the Yom Kippur War). One soldier had two TVs and

when asked for one by another soldier, smashed both of them on the ground with the words: "If I can't have the two I don't want any."

He noted how the Israel troops seemed to go mental in their looting.

There was worse in the Sinai Desert with a few Israeli soldiers extracting gold teeth from dead Egyptian soldiers with pliers.

Egyptian POWs who complained of being hungry or thirsty were shot dead.

Gillian Kingston,

Vice-President
of the World Methodist Council:

Letter to
Minister for Foreign Affairs

Simon Coveney

Dear Minister,

Recently I received the September Bulletin of The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions and am very concerned by its contents.

I have visited Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories on a number of occasions; I always return deeply disturbed by harassment and persecution suffered by Palestinian people at the hands of both illegal settlers and the

Israeli authorities. Such treatment often includes the demolition of Palestinian homes and other buildings.

One report in this Bulletin tells of destruction and violence at the Tent of Nations outside Bethlehem. This farm has been in the hands of the Nasser family since the early 1900s and is now managed by the fourth and fifth generations. A Christian family, their motto is 'We refuse to be enemies'. This principle they pursue in the face of ever-increasing provocation. The farm is used as a base for peace and reconciliation purposes and for capacity-building among women and young people. For almost thirty years, the Nasser family has had to engage in legal action in order to keep their land from confiscation.

I highlight this particular case because I have had the privilege of visiting the Tent of Nations, when, in my capacity as Vice President of the World Methodist Council, I presented the family with the 2017 World Methodist Peace Award.

I write to ask if you would raise this matter with the Israeli authorities as a matter of urgency, requesting that action be taken to prevent attacks from the surrounding settlements and that the family be allowed to continue the invaluable work in which they are engaged.

Cathy Winch

La Fontaine on Class

A striking fable; the donkey will not carry his master away from danger, here a band of armed men. He is quite happy to stay and serve them because it won't make any difference to him who he serves: "*Our foe is our master*".

Unfortunately the translation does not keep the plural, our foe, our master, which implies that all donkeys, and by extension anyone subjected to a master, see their master as their foe.

The Old Man And The Ass (*Le Vieillard et l'Ane*)

An old man, riding on his ass,
Had found a spot of thrifty grass,
And there turn'd loose his weary beast.
Old Grizzle, pleased with such a feast,
Flung up his heels, and caper'd round,
Then roll'd and rubb'd upon the ground,
And frisk'd and browsed and bray'd,
And many a clean spot made.

Arm'd men came on them as he fed:
'Let's fly,' in haste the old man said.
'And wherefore so?' the ass replied;
'With heavier burdens will they ride?'
'No,' said the man, already started.
'Then,' cried the ass, as he departed,
'I'll stay, and be—no matter whose;
Save you yourself, and leave me loose.
But let me tell you, ere you go,
(I speak plain French, you know.)
My master is my only foe.'

Un Vieillard sur son Ane aperçut en passant
Un pré plein d'herbe et fleurissant :
Il y lâche sa Bête, et le Grison se rue
Au travers de l'herbe menue,
Se vautrant, grattant, et frottant,
Gambadant, chantant et broutant,
Et faisant mainte place nette.

L'ennemi vient sur l'entrefaite.
Fuyons, dit alors le Vieillard.
Pourquoi ? répondit le Paillard.

Me fera-t-on porter double bât, double charge ?
Non pas, dit le Vieillard, qui prit d'abord le large.
Et que m'importe donc, dit l'Ane, à qui je sois ?
Sauvez-vous, et me laissez paître :
Notre ennemi, c'est notre maître :
Je vous le dis en bon français.



Solzhenitsyn's Two Centuries Together.

Part 15: *The Pogroms, Part 4*

Kishinev

The pogroms for which Russia is so famous—despite the fact that very few Russians were involved in them—occurred in two main clusters: 1881-2 (with further outbreaks in 1883 and 1884 which however, though vicious, were quickly and efficiently suppressed¹) and 1903-6. As well as asking why pogroms occurred then we could also ask why they did not occur, at least on the same scale, between 1882(or 4) and 1903, and between 1906 and 1917.

The 1903-6 cluster could perhaps better be described as two clusters—1903, dominated by Kishinev and Gomel, and 1905-6, the confrontations that occurred in the wake of the 1905 'revolution' and the 'October Manifesto', issued by the Tsar, conceding certain constitutional rights, including the establishment of a representational assembly—the 'duma'.

Kishinev, now called Chişinău, is the capital of Moldavia, now called Moldova, or at least of that part of it that was incorporated into the Russian Empire, initially under the name 'Bessarabia'. Moldavia and Wallachia had existed as semi-independent principalities under Ottoman rule but the area that included Kishinev was incorporated into the Russian Empire following the Turkish Russian war of 1806-12. Part of the territory, not including Kishinev, was regained by the Turks after the Crimean war but recovered by the Russians in 1878 when Romania gained its independence from the Ottomans. The whole area, including Kishinev, was taken by Romania in the

¹ According to the *Jewish Virtual Library* account: "In the spring of 1883, a sudden wave of pogroms broke out in the towns of Rostov and Yekaterinoslav and their surroundings. On this occasion, the authorities reacted with vigor against the rioters and there were several casualties among them. The last great outburst occurred in June 1884 in Nizhni Novgorod, where the mob attacked the Jews of the Kanavino quarter, killing nine of them and looting much property. The authorities tried over 70 of the rioters and severe penalties of imprisonment were imposed on them. This marked the end of the first wave of pogroms in Russia." As mentioned in a previous article Nizhni Novgorod was unusual in that it was outside the Pale of Settlement. Jews were living there because they had served in that area in the army.

chaos following the 1917 revolution and then incorporated into the Soviet Union as a result of the Second World War. It is now an independent state.

Its history is thus a little different from that of the other areas of the Pale, incorporated as a result of the Polish partitions. The population was largely Romanian speaking and, since the language of education and literature was Russian, there was a higher than usual illiteracy rate. Romanian is considerably more distant from Russian than Ukrainian. Kishinev had a Moldavian, Romanian-speaking, majority but a large Jewish, yiddish-speaking, minority, highly visible through its shops and small businesses. The small minority characterised as 'Russian' was, Solzhenitsyn points out, mainly Ukrainian.

The pogrom that occurred in Kishinev over two days (Easter Sunday and Easter Monday) in April 1903 is particularly important. Steven Zipperstein, in his book *Kishinev and the Tilt of History* (New York, Liveright publishing Corp, 2018) says: "*Prior to Buchenwald and Auschwitz, no place-name evoked Jewish suffering more starkly than Kishinev*" (p.xiii).

Kishinev stood out for several reasons. First, because of the attacks on persons. We have seen that in the 1881-2 pogroms there seems to have been a principle at work that attacks on property were allowed but not attacks on persons. In the two days of the Kishinev pogrom, forty-nine Jews were killed²—almost twice as many as in the whole 1881-4 period—and there many cases of rape, including gang rape. Secondly, although it was widely believed that the 1881-2 pogroms had Government support (1883 and 1884 clearly hadn't), it was very difficult to prove and, again as we've seen, modern historiography following after Hans Rogger, is sceptical on the subject. In Kishinev, however, a particularly virulent anti-semitism had clearly been fomented by the Government-approved journal, *Bessarabets*; and there seemed to be definite evidence of Government support in a letter said to have been addressed by Minister of Interior Vyache-

² Zipperstein's figure. Solzhenitsyn has 38.

slav Konstantinovich Plehve to the Governor General, R.S. von Raaben, shortly before the outbreak, ordering him, in the event of a pogrom, not to use force to suppress it. Simon Dubnow in his highly influential *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland* (vol iii, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1920), also mentions "*an emissary of the political police, the gendarmierie officer Levendahl, who had been dispatched from St Petersburg; after Easter, when the sanguinary crime had already been committed, the same mysterious envoy vanished just as quickly*" (p.71).

But perhaps most important, in establishing the importance of Kishinev in the Jewish collective memory, were two pieces of writing—the poem *City of Slaughter* by Hayyim Nahman Bialik which, according to Zipperstein (p.xviii) is "*widely considered the most influential poetic work written in a Jewish language [Hebrew, though Bialik also produced a version in Yiddish—PB] since the Middle Ages*"; and the detailed in-depth reporting of the Irish Nationalist and land reformer Michael Davitt, "*whose book, based on his newspaper reports titled Within the Pale: the true story of anti-semitic persecution in Russia set the standard for Western descriptions of Russian Jewish life for the decade to come*" (ibid, pp.xviii-ix).

Solzhenitsyn, basing his account on the case drawn up by the local prosecutor, V.N.Goremykin (a source dismissed by Dubnow as invidious), tells a story that is rather different from the other versions I have read. He describes a relatively mild bout of stone-throwing on the Sunday afternoon, dealt with inadequately by the police. "*In the evening the disorders calmed down. No act of violence was perpetrated against the Jews that day*"... (p.357, apparently quoting Goremykin). The police arrested sixty persons. By contrast Zipperstein says:

"Attacks on women that night were ferocious. In an apartment near the New Market on Nikolaevskii Street, one of the city's major boulevards, a woman was raped repeatedly for four consecutive hours by members of a mob that included seminarians, according to Davitt" (p.69).

He goes on to say however: "Curiously, despite the day's horrors, many Jews—including communal leaders—remained convinced that the riot was not nearly as bad as had been feared, or that it had now been contained". He agrees with Solzhenitsyn's figure of sixty arrests.

Solzhenitsyn goes on to say, again in quotations, presumably from the trial, that the next day (7th April):

"“More than one hundred Jews had gathered, armed with stakes and posts [‘pieux et piquets’—following Harraps Dictionary they both seem to mean the same thing—PB], with rifles, here and there—some shots were fired. The Christians didn't have fire arms. The Jews said ‘yesterday you didn't disperse the Russians, today we're going to defend ourselves.’ And some were holding bottles of vitriol which they threw at the Christians they met...’ The chemists shops ere traditionally kept by Jews’ [Solzhenitsyn adds in a parenthesis. Rumours spread across the town that Christians were being attacked by the Jews ... It was said that the Jews have sacked the cathedral and killed the priest ...” (p.357).

Interestingly Zipperstein confirms the Jewish effort at self-defence on the Monday morning:

"Yehiel Pesker, the owner of a glass store at the New Market who, like Yisrael Rossman, went to inspect his shop early Monday for damage, encountered on the way home a large group of Jews—he recalled that they numbered at least two hundred—gathered in the wine courtyard, armed and prepared to fight. He saw the clubs in their arms; it turned out that several were carrying guns as well. Returning home inspired by what he had seen, Pesker set in motion plans to protect his building. He armed himself with a club, too, and instructed his neighbours to join him in battling the mob. This they did until they were overwhelmed." ... "In arguments made by defence attorneys at the trials of pogrom-related crimes, Sunday's rioting was dismissed as a ruckus that would quickly have come to an end—much as the governor general assured the Jewish delegation on Monday morning—had Jews not overreacted. In this version it was the all-but-unprovoked aggression of Jews and subsequent rumours of attacks on a church and the killing of a priest that set in motion the unfortunate but, under the circumstances, understandable violence" (p.87).

Bialik And Jewish Cowardice

The point is important because part of the power of Bialik's poem, and of its huge influence on subsequent Jewish culture, was the accusation that the Jews did nothing to defend themselves. The poem has played such an important role in Jewish—and especially Zionist—culture that it is worth quoting at length:

"Pause not upon this havoc; go thy way—
Unto the attic mount, upon thy feet and hands;
Behold the shadow of death among the shadows stands.
Crushed in their shame, they saw it all;
They did not pluck their eyes out; they Beat not their brains against the wall!
Perhaps, perhaps, each watcher had it in his heart to pray:
A miracle, O Lord, and spare my skin this day!
"Come, now, and I will bring thee to their lairs
The privies, jakes and pigpens where the heirs
Of Hasmoneans lay, with trembling knees,
Concealed and cowering—the sons of the Maccabees!
The seed of saints, the scions of the lions!
Who, crammed by scores in all the sanctuaries of their shame
So sanctified My name!
It was the flight of mice they fled,
The scurrying of roaches was their flight;
They died like dogs, and they were dead!
And on the next morn, after the terrible night
The son who was not murdered found
The spurned cadaver of his father on the ground.
Now wherefore dost thou weep, O son of Man?"
The poem is written in the first person of a God who says:
"See, I am fallen from My high estate.
I grieve for you, my children. My heart is sad for you.
Your dead were vainly dead; and neither I nor you
Know why you died or wherefore, for whom, nor by what laws;
Your deaths are without reason; your lives are without cause."
It is an attack on the tradition of Jewish passivity in the face of persecution—the very tradition that, as discussed in the previous article in this series, is celebrated by Yaakov Rabkin:
"Turn, then, thy gaze from the dead, and I will lead
Thee from the graveyard to thy living brothers,
And thou wilt come, with those of thine own breed,
Into the synagogue, and on a day of fasting,
To hear the cry of their agony,
Their weeping everlasting.
Thy skin will grow cold, the hair on thy skin stand up,
And thou wilt be by fear and trembling tossed;
Thus groans a people which is lost.
Look in their hearts—behold a dreary waste,

Where even vengeance can revive no growth,
And yet upon their lips no mighty malediction
Rises, no blasphemous oath.
Speak to them, bid them rage!
Let them against me raise the outraged hand,
Let them demand!
Demand the retribution for the shamed
Of all the centuries and every age!
Let fists be flung like stone
Against the heavens and the heavenly Throne!
And thou, too, pity them not, nor touch their wound;
Within their cup no further measure pour.
Wherever thou wilt touch, a bruise is found,
Their flesh is wholly sore.
For since they have met pain with resignation
And have made peace with shame,
What shall avail thy consolation?
They are too wretched to evoke thy scorn.
They are too lost thy pity to evoke.
So let them go, then, men to sorrow born,
Mournful and slinking, crushed beneath their yoke.
So to their homes, and to their hearth depart
Rot in the bones, corruption in the heart."³

Bialik had been commissioned to go to Kishinev to collect eye witness accounts on behalf of the 'Kishinev Historical Commission', headed by Dubnow. According to an account by an American historian, specialist in the twentieth century history of Palestine/Israel, Monty Noam Penkower:

"What Bialik saw in Kishinev ... almost drove him mad. Aided by a local Hebrew teacher, Pesah Auerbakh, he investigated the pogrom in painstaking detail. For more than a month, he collected documents, took photographs of the dead and of desecrated Torah scrolls, and got people who suffered to talk to him. Working in a state of mounting internal tension, as recalled by Yisrael Berman, a youth who escorted him about, the poet filled up four large notebooks [five, according to Zipperstein—PB] of almost 200 pages."⁴

Instead, however, of writing up his notes, he wrote the poem, which proved

³ Taken from the website of the World Zionist Organisation

⁴ Monty Noah Penkower: 'The Kishinev Pogrom of 1903: A Turning Point in Jewish History', *Modern Judaism*, Oct., 2004, Vol. 24, No. 3 (Oct., 2004), p.196.

to be a much more effective piece of propaganda, at least among Jews. He effectively buried his notebooks away and it was only in the 1990s that they were finally published. Penkower continues (p.197): "*Bialik chose, as well, to make no mention of the evidence about sporadic Jewish self defence that his own notebooks documente*", and Zipperstein says:

"Bialik's anguished cry had a particularly powerful impact on Jewish fighters once the poem was translated in 1904 into Russian and recited widely (and brilliantly) by the young, restless Vladimir Jabotinsky. Bialik's work left little doubt that the response of Kishinev Jews to violence had been gutless. Curiously enough, however, Bialik recorded in the transcripts of the interviews he conducted during his Kishinev stay, often in copious detail, many efforts at Jewish self-defense, including one so notorious—in the minds of local antisemites and their sympathisers, at least—that they would credit it, not their own actions, as the main cause for Monday's violence" (p.86)

Zipperstein also says that—

"Before the outbreak of violence preparations had been made to store arms at the home of Jacob Bernstein-Kogan, whose apartment had for years been the main office of the Zionist movement's correspondence bureau, and was equipped with a telephone. It was designated as a headquarters of sorts. But Bernstein-Kogan and his family fled their residence on the first day of the pogrom—soon afterward it was looted—and whether the arms were stored there were used or not is unclear" (p.88).

Bernstein-Kogan was an important member of Herzl's Zionist movement—sufficiently important that, according to the German Wikipedia account, disagreements he had with Herzl mattered. This brief passage leaves him looking rather unimpressive—fleeing the apartment where the guns were stored (Zipperstein doesn't seem to question their existence. Did they fall into the hands of the looters? Did Bernstein-Kogan distribute them?) Later in Zipperstein's account, as we shall see, however, he appears very impressive indeed, using his position as head of the correspondence bureau, in a town close to the border of the Russian Empire and therefore convenient for smuggling, to publicise very effectively the events in Kishinev.

Michael Davitt

Zipperstein was at the top of Michael

Davitt's list of people to meet when he arrived in Kishinev. Davitt had been commissioned to report on the pogrom for William Randolph Hearst's paper *The New York American*. Solzhenitsyn is unimpressed: "*But it was by far the European and American press which showed itself to be the most virulent (notably the press magnate William Hearst).*" He quotes the *Jewish Chronicle* referring to the pogrom as a "*holocaust*" and imploring "*the God of Justice to come down and finish with Russia as He finished with Sodom and Gomorrah... and that he remove from the face of the Earth this centre of pestilence*" (p.366, quoting from the *Jewish Chronicle* 15th and 22nd May 1903. My translation of a French translation of a Russian translation. I'm not in a position to consult the English original).

While on his way to Kishinev, Davitt found himself "*by coincidence... traveling in a sleeping car on a seat across from the British businessman and Marxist politician (the author of the first introduction to Marx in the English language) Henry Hyndman*" (Zipperstein, p.120). According to Zipperstein, following Hyndman's Memoirs, they had an interesting exchange, beginning with Davitt's observation that "*There is not a police bureau in Europe [that] would believe this was an accidental meeting*".

Zipperstein continues:

"The gist of what Hyndman took away regarding Davitt's views of Jews was that, while he felt great antipathy for those responsible for the massacre, he saw Jews as fanning discontent or worse. 'Undoubtedly, Davitt in private while not excusing the Russian authorities felt that Russia would be much better off if she had no Jews at all in her boundaries.' ...He never did rationalise their oppression, but it was a sufficient argument for Jewish mass migration elsewhere—preferably, as Davitt would come to see it, to Palestine."

Despite his suggestion that "*Hyndman might have exaggerated Davitt's antagonism to Jews in light of his own jaundiced opinions: 'Anglo-Hebraic empire in Africa' was how he referred to South Africa*", Zipperstein says:

"In a bloated six-hundred-page tome published in 1902, *The Boer War for Freedom*, he [Davitt] singled out as prime exploiters of the beleaguered South African region no fewer than forty 'Anglicised and German Jews' who, alongside Cecil Rhodes, were 'the capitalist kings' most responsible for oppression of the Boers. Davitt never entirely turned his back on such

notions: In the preface to his Kishinev book, written the following year, he states: 'Where anti-Semitism stands in fair political combat... or against the engineers of a sordid war as in South Africa... I am resolutely in line with its spirit and programme'."

Davitt seems to be among those—like Solzhenitsyn himself, Plehve, Churchill and the SS Commander Baron Leopold Edler von Mildenstein⁵—who believed that the presence of Jews was a problem for the people among whom they lived and that the solution was the formation of a Jewish state, with Palestine as the obvious choice of territory. By Zipperstein's account he became something of a folk hero among New York Jews. After describing a play called *Kishineff*, whose hero, "*a naive and good-hearted journalist from the United States, whose courage is all the more impressive since he was one-handed*" (as was Davitt), Zipperstein continues (p.105):

"he was responsible for the most harrowing—certainly the most widely read—accounts of the Kishinev pogrom, all of which were sympathetic to the Jewish victims, which catapulted him to meteoric fame. He was the inspiration for several other plays, too, as well as Yiddish poetry. His untimely death in 1906 would be treated much like the death of a holy martyr, marked by Jewish commemorative events attended by huge appreciative crowds."

John Klier On Solzhenitsyn

In previous articles, centred round the 1881-2 pogroms, I've shown, or at least suggested, that modern English language research on Russian-Jewish conflicts supports Solzhenitsyn's view that the pogroms were not provoked, or at all wanted, by the Russian Government, that Government representatives, whatever their personal feelings about Jews, tried to suppress them, though often in a fumbling manner. Zipperstein broadly goes along with this. He points out that, internationally, Russia had the reputation of being a highly efficient police state. In this respect he quotes (p.90) Herbert Spencer's *Principles Of Sociology*: "*Russia, as well as ancient Peru, Egypt, and Sparta, exemplify that owning of the individual by the state... for a social system adapted for war*". Hence the difficulty in believing that anything like a pogrom could occur without Government compliance.

⁵ Yakov M. Rabkin: *What is modern Israel?*, Pluto Books, London, 2016, p.93, discusses his enthusiasm for Palestine as the solution to Germany's Jewish problem.

"In reality' he continues, 'Russia was far less militarised than then believed. The guidelines for the use of the military in civil disturbances were hopelessly complicated and designed largely for rural disturbances, not urban ones. The military typically resented being used for such purposes, and, more often than not, befuddlement or obtuseness were the main reasons why Russian officials like those in Kishinev so mishandled urban riots—which were increasingly common at the turn of the century, mostly in the form of ever-more-violent industrial disputes."

In the earlier articles I made great use of writings by the specialist in nineteenth century Russian/Jewish relations, John Klier. It happens that, in the case of the Kishinev pogrom, we have an article by Klier directly commenting on Solzhenitsyn's account.⁶ He again agrees that the Government did not instigate the pogrom. We remember that in Dubnow's account the government had encouraged the virulent anti-semitism of Bessarabets, that the pogrom had been preceded by the arrival of the mysterious Okhrana (secret police) official, Baron Levendahl, who had just as mysteriously disappeared after it and, as the most convincing proof, there was the letter from Plehve to the Governor, von Raaben, instructing him, in the event of a pogrom, not to use force to suppress it.

According to Solzhenitsyn, the finger was pointed at Levendahl by "*the famous lawyer Zaroudny, sent to Kishinev by the Jewish Defence Committee to investigate the situation*". He quotes a report by a member of the committee, M.Krohl, published in 1903, as saying "*it was on his order that the police and the army helped the murderers and looters*". According to Krohl, Levendahl planned the pogrom with "*a merchant named Pronin and a notary called Pissarjevsky*". Zipperstein hardly bothers mentioning Levendahl (only in passing as the possible model for the villain in the New York play celebrating the heroism of Michael Davitt, Kishineff), but he does take the view that a group gathered round "*the builder Georgi Pronin*" had a role in directing events. His book includes a photograph of Pronin's house which is a very grand mansion. Pronin was expelled from Kishinev by von Raaben's successor, Sergei Urussov.

Klier, like Solzhenitsyn, sees no reason to think that 'Levandal' had anything

to do with it. Far from disappearing after the events, he stayed in post in Kishinev and in May (before Urussov's arrival in June) and participated in a meeting to organise measures against another possible outbreak.

The Plehve letter, which Zipperstein says was of huge importance as a rare documentary proof of Government compliance, was published in the Times in London on 18th May 1903. In response, the Government, in Solzhenitsyn's account,

"could think of nothing better than to produce a casual denial signed by the chief of the police department A [Alexei] Lopukhin, and that only on the ninth day after the scandalous publication of the Times but instead of investigating the forgery it merely expelled Braham [the Times journalist who published it—PB] from the territory."

He continues:

"We can say with certainty that it was a fake, for several reasons. Not only because Braham never advanced the slightest proof of the letter's authenticity. Not only because Lopukhin, a declared enemy of Plehve's, himself denied the text [he was police chief under Plehve. Zipperstein says he reaffirms Plehve's innocence of the letter in his often very frank and revealing memoirs—PB]. Not only because Prince Urussov, very sympathetic to the Jews, who succeeded von Raaben and took charge of the governorship archives, found no 'Plehve letter'. Not only because poor von Raaben, sacked, his life and career broken, never, in his desperate efforts to restore his reputation, complained of having received instruction 'from above'—which would have immediately saved his career and made him the idol of liberal society. The main reason lies in the fact that the state archives had nothing in common with the faked up archives of the Soviet era when any old document could be put together on demand, while another could be got rid of secretly. No. In the Russian archives everything was kept, inviolably and for ever. Right after the February revolution, a commission of enquiry set up by the provisional government and, even more zealous, the 'Special Commission for the study of the history of the pogroms', with investigators as serious as S. Dubnow and G. Krasny-Adnoni, found neither in Petersburg nor in Kishinev, the incriminating document, nor any record of it having been received or sent. They only found the translation of Braham's English text ..." (p.368).

Dubnow's *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*, vol iii, published

in English in 1920, does concede (p.77) that "*The authenticity of this letter is not entirely beyond suspicion. But*", he continues, "*there can be no doubt that instructions to that effect, rather by word of mouth than in writing, probably through the secret agent Levendahl, had been actually transmitted to the authorities in Kishinev*".

Klier regards the letter as a forgery but nonetheless indicates an element of doubt, saying that, according to the archive Dubnow and his colleagues examined, there should have been four files relating to Kishinev but they only found one. And he adds that the letter was convincing because it corresponded so well to the behaviour of the Government. It didn't actually call for a pogrom. It said that, in the event of actions against the Jews, they should be stopped by "*admonitions... without at all having recourse, however, to the use of arms*" in order to avoid "*instilling, by too severe measures, anti-governmental feelings into the population, which is not yet affected by [revolutionary] propaganda*". It wasn't until he had authorisation from Plehve, late on Monday afternoon, that von Raaben gave von Bekman, commander of the local garrison, freedom to act, which he did very quickly and efficiently, bringing the whole thing to an end in a couple of hours (with 600 arrests—there were 900 altogether).

Klier's main criticism of Solzhenitsyn is that he doesn't take sufficient account of the atmosphere of the time created by a Government which gave little indication that violence against Jews would not be tolerated. In 1881 the Government had promoted the idea that Jews were exploiting the peasantry, and in 1903 that they were over-represented in the revolutionary movement. Plehve had, only shortly before the Kishinev pogrom, made a speech to that effect in neighbouring Odessa. And the Government had indeed, as Dubnow complains, permitted the vicious anti-semitism of Bessarabets. Klier also says (p.54) that Solzhenitsyn "*fails to appreciate the impact of the pogrom on Russian Jewry*". He gives a brief account of it. And it was indeed huge, not just on Russian Jewry but on Jewish politics in New York, on the wider Zionist movement and on Palestine since, together with the events surrounding the 1905 'revolution', it prompted the second aliyah. It is indeed for that reason that I've devoted so much space to this one single pogrom, one among many, but the one that had probably a much greater impact than any of the others.

⁶ John Klier: 'Solzhenitsyn and the Kishinev pogrom - a slander against Russia', *European Jewish Affairs*, Vol 33, No 1, 2003, pp.49-59.

**Pavel Krushevan And
The Protocols Of The Elders Of Zion**

But before leaving Kishinev and moving on to these wider consequences, I'd like to say a word about Bessarabets and particularly about how it, or its founder, Pavel Krushevan, is understood by Zipperstein.

Zipperstein admits to being fascinated by Krushevan:

"Capable of producing the vilest, most contemptible trash, Krushevan also wrote work of distinction, even beauty. He was rightly depicted during his lifetime as a sensitive, yielding man, and a hysteric; a rank pogrom monger and yet also Bessarabia's most distinguished intellectual."

In particular, "*His lavishly illustrated guide to Bessarabia had elicited a commendation from the Tsar. That volume was deemed so impressive that the new governor general, Urussov, regarded it as his main source of information about the province before his arrival*" (p.165). His writings, including at least one novel and an ambitious general account, *What Is Russia?*, are currently being reprinted in Russia where "*He is now touted as an early, singularly incisive exponent of 'Christian Socialism', which is seen as a healthy antidote to liberalism's anonymity, its soullessness and its susceptibility to the machinations of Jews*" (p.148).

Prior to the pogrom breaking out, and at the beginning of the Jewish Passover, the body of a peasant boy was discovered with multiple stab wounds in the nearby town of Dubassary. There was an immediate suspicion that it was a Jewish ritual killing to obtain Christian blood for baking unleavened bread. In Dubnow's account: "*The Bessarabets immediately launched a campaign against the Jews, accusing them of ritual murder. 'Death to the Jews! Let all Zhyds be massacred!'—such appeals were almost daily repeated in the paper which was read in all the saloons and public houses of Bessarabia*". Dubnow doesn't mention that the local police quickly gave the lie to the charge of ritual murder. (It was a cousin of the boy, deep in debt, hoping to secure his inheritance.) But it is certainly true that, despite these findings, Bessarabets continued to make it. I find it difficult to believe, however, that it actually had headlines saying '*Let all Zhyds be massacred*'. Zipperstein seems to have gone to the trouble of reading it and gives some examples (p.165):

"Zhidy think about how best to rob the honour, the conscience, the truth of peasants" (March 17, 1903). "What is the source of the success of

the Jews? It is their unification under one single corruption and their capacity to act collectively, all for one and one for all. And we can mirror them united into one guild, one brotherhood" (March 4, 1903). "Everywhere Jews live they figure among the bulk of deviants, counterfeiterers, handlers of illegal documents, goods, food, wine, medical supplies, delicacies" (March 23, 1903)."

But he doesn't repeat the headlines calling for massacre, which I would have thought would have been worth mentioning. At the time of the pogrom Krushevan was in Saint Petersburg, working on a new venture, *Znamia* (The Banner). After mentioning the Tsar's approval of his *Guide to Bessarabia*, Zipperstein continues:

"Krushevan had also recently received a handsome subsidy of five thousand rubles for the publication of *Znamia*. These expressions of sympathy reinforced the impression that Krushevan lived something of a charmed life and was supported generously by officialdom. Yet barely three weeks after Krushevan received the tsar's laudatory letter, his debts were deemed so crushingly heavy that he was served with a bailiff's letter inventorying his belongings for auction. The list was strikingly meager: bits and pieces of furniture, including one chair, one table, a few bookcases, and two printing presses, all stuffed into a modest flat on Gogol Street. He had sold Bessarabets, taking payment for the newspaper but managing nonetheless not to deliver it to its new owner; subscription payments were still in his hands. As a result legal proceedings were now initiated against him... His new St. Petersburg publication was a four-page, large-size weekly available only by subscription because censors feared its explosive content, especially its antisemitism."

It is at this point that the story gets very interesting. It was in *Znamia*, in 1903, that the first version of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* was published.

According to what has become the standard account, the *Protocols* were put together by the then Paris-based Okhrana chief, Pyotr Rachkovsky in the mid to late 1890s. This is a theme that is developed, with a great deal of detail on the inner workings of the Russian court and government, by Norman Cohn in his book *Warrant For Genocide*.⁷ According to the Italian linguist Cesare G. De Michelis, however: "*the PSM [initials*

⁷ Harmondsworth, Pelican Books, 1970. First published in 1967.

of the Russian language version—PB] were realised between April 1902 and August 1903. One can even say that at that second date they weren't yet 'completed'..."⁸

As we know the *Protocols* follow very closely a French original text, the *Dialogue aux enfers* by Maurice Joly, originally published in 1864 as a satire on the rule of Napoleon III. It had nothing to do with Jews. It takes the form of a dialogue between the eighteenth century liberal political philosopher Montesquieu (Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu) and the Renaissance political philosopher of realpolitik Niccolò Machiavelli. The arguments of the Elder of Zion are taken from Machiavelli's argument for a benign but utterly ruthless despotism (not, it seems, unlike the arguments advanced by Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazov*). The case De Michelis puts for 1902-3 as the probable date of composition is based on a detailed examination of the differences between the French text and the Russian, including arguments on the ways in which French words have been interpreted. Zipperstein takes it as a definitive repudiation of the thesis that it originated with Rachkowski in Paris in the 1890s.

The text had little impact until 1917. In 1920 the *Times* in London regarded it as the authentic record of a Jewish project until, in 1921, also in the *Times*, a journalist called Philip Graves drew attention to the resemblances with the *Dialogue aux enfers*. At the time Graves presented Joly's text as extremely obscure, but De Michelis points out that actually in the late nineteenth century it was quite well known:

"Republished several times in French, it was immediately translated into German and some years later was also translated into Spanish. What is more the 'personalities' of this late 'dialogue of the dead' were well known in Russia, also as personalities in the literary genre; and in the second half of the nineteenth century, Machiavelli's Russian reputation had undergone a sudden revival, linked to the revolutionary movement" (p.282).

In other words, the earliest compiler of the *Protocols* could reasonably expect

⁸ Cesare G. De Michelis: 'Les "Protocoles des sages de Sion"', *Cahiers du Monde Russe*, July-Sept 1997, Vol.38, No 3, pp.263-303. My translation from the French. Zipperstein gives as reference a book, Idem: *The Non-existent manuscript, a study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion*, (Lincoln, NE, 2001).

that its source could be recognised. On that basis De Michelis suggests that it was originally intended not as a forgery—supposedly an account of an event that really occurred—but as a satire. And he goes on to suggest that the context of the project was the Fifth Congress of the Zionist movement held in Basle in December 1901, "*whose importance was enormous, since that was when the concrete plan for buying territories in Palestine was announced, the first step towards the constitution of a Jewish state entity [entité étatique]. The Russian judeophobe world was struck by the event*".

Three and a half months later the first mention of the Protocols appeared in the widely read paper *Novoe Vremia* in an article by Mikhail Osipovitch Menshikov, who says he had been shown such a text in 1902 but "*doubted its authenticity and refused to have anything to do with it*" (Zipperstein, p.168). When Krushevan published it, he too raised doubts about its authenticity. According to Michelis, Krushevan's Russian text has a number of peculiarities that indicate a Ukrainian origin, i.e., not having been written by a Russian Okhrana agent in Paris. There are also indications that the text, particularly when compared with later versions, notably one by Krushevan's close associate Georgiy Butmi, was put out in something of a hurry in an incomplete state. Michelis speculates that the PSM are "*in the first place a parody of T.Herzl's Judenstaat*" and that:

"they were originally conceived as a mock [prétendu] document preparatory to the Fifth Congress... Then the events of 1903 could have pushed Krushevan into using this 'product' still in a raw state; then came that terrible year for Russia, 1905, and someone ... 'perfected' it and then one way or another Nilus [Sergei Nilus who published the final version, the one that took off in 1917—PB] was implicated".

The "*events in 1903*" that would have inspired Krushevan to rush the document out were the consequences of the Kishinev pogrom—the fact that all of a sudden Kishinev was famous throughout the world, resulting in devastating consequences for the Russian Government, including the withdrawal of a long-standing and important US/Russia trade agreement. And, at the centre of this worldwide reaction to the pogrom, was the local representative of the Zionist Congress, manager of the movement's correspondence bureau, Jacob Bernstein-Kogan, whom Krushevan knew well—they had been in school together.

The pogrom was followed by the visit to Russia of Theodor Herzl himself, a very controversial event among the Zionists since one of the purposes of his visit was to meet the arch villain Plehve—a meeting in which Plehve (soon, in 1904, to be assassinated, not by a Jew but on a Jewish initiative) agreed to use Russian influence with the Ottoman sultanate to allow Jewish settlement in Palestine.

For the anti-semites, Herzl's visit was deeply disturbing:

"This would only be accentuated after news spread of the wildly enthusiastic reception he received when, on visiting Vilna, the 'Jerusalem of Lithuania', thousands greeted his train in the middle of the night. Circles close to Krushevan as well as the Russian government registered all this with mounting concern. The government made this clear in a book-length report on the Zionists that was produced soon after the Minsk conference by the police director Aleksei Lopukhin, a particularly well-informed bureaucrat... Mentioned frequently in the Lopukhin report is the prominence of Kishinev's Bernstein-Kogan, with nearly as many references to him as to Herzl. Bernstein-Kogan was described as occupying a role unmatched in the Zionist hierarchy, the virtual 'president' of the movement in Russia" (Zipperstein, pp.177-8).

Zipperstein goes on to say that,

"though he was far from the darkly influential figure imagined by St. Petersburg officials or Kishinev's far Right, Bernstein-Kogan's role in catapulting the city's pogrom into a world-famous event was pivotal. His ability to spread word of the pogrom—and with breathtaking speed—to newspapers, organisations, and influential figures throughout Europe, the United States, and elsewhere would consolidate the belief that he was at the epicentre of Jewry's worldwide machinations. Here was that rare moment when fantasy, or at least the previously unprovable, seemed to mesh seamlessly with reality."

Zipperstein is probably exaggerating when he says (p.182): "*So it was that an overweight, underpaid, midlevel political activist—someone known to Krushevan since boyhood, when both were clothed in the same gymnasium uniform—became the unlikely inspiration for the most terrifying Jew on the planet*". But he may well be right that this was the context in which Krushevan decided to present what had originally been conceived as a satire on Herzl and the Fifth Zionist Congress as a possibly (but guarding his back by expressing doubts as to its authenticity) genuine record of a real event.

Contributed by
Eamon Dyas

(Due to pressure of space,
we are omitting Chapters on
Sir Michael Dwyer's
Education and Service in India)
Part 4

**Sir Michael O'Dwyer
- an Irish Catholic in the
service of the British Empire**

Settling Down In Ireland *Problems of the Free State*

Dangers Ahead

(From a Correspondent)

The Times, 8 September 1925.

Since the Treaty of 1921 Irish affairs have attracted but little attention in England. The circumstances of the withdrawal of the British administration, before any alternative Free State Government had been firmly established, were such as to incline the British Press and public to shut their eyes to the tragic results and to thank Heaven that they were at last rid of the eternal Irish problem.

Hence there is today much ignorance here of present conditions in Ireland. This is not to the advantage of either country, and even in the Free State there is some disposition to resent the manner in which they are ignored by Great Britain. The present writer has recently spent some weeks in Southern Ireland (excluding Connaught), which he had last visited in 1919, before the Civil War and the Treaty, and he gives the following impressions, gathered from all sorts and conditions of Irishmen, for what they are worth. Now that the political situation had been defined people in Ireland, as a rule, state their views with much more frankness than in the past. Indeed, criticism of their own Government is almost as common, and sometimes as ill-founded, as it was when the British Government was their target.

Republican Weakness.

It is admitted on all sides, and even by the Republican leaders themselves, that the Republican Party is steadily losing ground. It is a dwindling and discredited minority, and if there was a General Election tomorrow it would probably lose, even under the minority-favouring system of proportional representation, at least half of the 44 (out of a total of 136) seats it now holds. The recent efforts to galvanize it into vigour have made its weakness only more apparent. Arch-

bishop Mannix, who a few years ago was a popular hero, having successfully fought conscription in Australia, has been given the cold shoulder by priests and people at his recent visit. He has been debarred even from speaking to the students at Maynooth College, of which he was once president; and Clonmel and other towns formerly noted for their Republican feeling have refused him their freedom.

The same is the fate of Mr. de Valera. Last week at a once noted Republican centre, where the writer happened to be staying, only a few people of little significance assembled to welcome the "*ex-President*". Indeed, an Irish-American visitor in an outburst of bibulous confidence told the writer that thought, three years ago, he had subscribed 3,000 dollars to the Republican funds, he was now convinced, after seeing Ireland, that the Free State was the Government to support, even at the loss of his dollars. The secession from Republicanism would be even more rapid were it not that many of its former adherents still regard themselves as bound by the oath they once took to the Republic. Some of the Ulster Covenanters are probably in the same plight.

Mr. De Valera himself recently admitted that he has no hopes from the present generation. Probably the stream of American subscriptions has run dry, and he certainly now receives no financial support in Ireland. Without funds or a Press to push his propaganda, he finds his influence is rapidly waning; while most of the Republican gunmen who supplied the powder and shot, the most effective form of propaganda, have gone under in the Civil War. Those that remain have little stomach for fighting, least of all under his leadership. The Free State has, therefore, little to fear at present from the Republican faction. But in Ireland it is the unexpected that generally comes to pass. A serious blunder or false move by the Irish Government might easily, among an excitable people only recently weaned from lawlessness, endanger their stability and indirectly strengthen the Opposition, whether headed by de Valera or some other leader.

Ministers' Courage.

However one may criticize particular measures one cannot but admire the courage and energy with which the Ministers of the Free State – mostly young men, and all with little or no previous experience of administration – have faced a situation of appalling difficulty, regardless alike of personal risk and unpopularity. They have within a few years restored public security, organized on broad non-sectarian and non-political lines an efficient judiciary, reduced without much friction an army of over 50,000 men to one of under 20,000, and set up a Civil Guard in place of the historic Royal

Irish Constabulary. Both the Army and the Civil Guard are composed of good material, though hitherto "services in the War against the British" have played too large a part in selection, and both would doubtless be more efficient if the officers were more largely drawn from a class superior to that of the rank and file.

The Ministers have also carried through a Land Bill to complete the purchase at 15 times the rental by tenants of their holdings, at a cost of some 20 millions sterling—the bonds being guaranteed by the British Government. The purchase price is attacked by many landlords as grossly inadequate; but it must be borne in mind that these had refused the opportunity to sell under the more favourable terms of the Wyndham Act, and that the new Act compares favourably with the recent agrarian legislation of other new states—Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, which have a strong savour of confiscation.

The Government have also shown laudable firmness in suspending corrupt or grossly inefficient public bodies, including such influential ones as the Dublin and Cork Corporations and certain County Councils, the administration being temporarily vested in salaried commissioners, to the great benefit of the civic services and of the ratepayers. But an even greater test of their determination is the salutary decision to reduce the excessive number of public-houses by nearly one-half, those that are abolished being compensated at the expense of those which retain their licences. One wonders if any British Government in these days would have the courage to tackle so many thorny questions involving such powerful vested interests. So far, so well. But the danger is that the Ministers may try to accomplish too much in their eager desire for speedy reform or for the enhancement of the national prestige.

Unpopular Measures.

Three measures in particular are now widely criticized. The Shannon power scheme, to be carried through by a German firm at a cost of five to 10 millions, causes many shakings of the head among sober citizens and appears to find little support outside official circles. Even assuming that the power is generated according to plan, in the absence of any existing large industries it is open to doubt whether for many years the demand will be forthcoming. There was an interesting contoured plan of the scheme at the Dublin Horse Show in August, but the courteous official in charge was unable to give his questioners any assurances on that point.

The compulsory teaching of Irish in the primary schools appears to be exciting opposition in the most unexpected quarters. This year the schools were closed for months, doubtless to the delight of the pupils but to the disgust of the parents, so that the teachers could go through a course of training in Irish. One hears many complaints that general education is being sacrificed to the fad of teaching a language which even such patriots as Senator Fogarty condemn as only pseudo-Gaelic—see his vigorous protests in the Irish Press of August 22. The writer was assured that in Mayo—where Irish is still a living language—a school teacher had to apply for an escort of the Civic Guard to protect him from the missiles of the angry parents. There appears to be little doubt that the enthusiasm for compulsory teaching of Irish has died down considerably, and only strong pressure from above keeps it going.

The recent decision to start a separate medical register for the Free State, and sever relations with the British Medical Association, in which the Irish branch of this profession is so largely and worthily represented, has met with almost universal condemnation, not only by the medical profession, but also by the Press and educated public of all shades of opinion. Among the severest opponents of a measure threatening the very existence of the splendid medical schools and hospitals of which Dublin is justly proud, are the famous surgeon, Dr. Fogarty, one of the ablest members the Senate, and Dr. Hennessy, who, as a Free State candidate for the Dail, recently captured one of the most important seats from the Republicans. The writer did not hear a single opinion in favour of the measure, which will place the 85 per cent of Irish medical graduates who annually have to seek employment outside Ireland at a decided disadvantage. It is hard to see what the Government hope to gain by this unpopular measure. They talk of the "national dignity" and internal patriotism; but these may be pushed too far when they cut at the roots of an honourable and popular profession, which is divorced from politics and rightly regards medicine as a professional science knowing no geographical bounds.

Non-Party Movement.

The people generally recognize that they now possess all the essentials of self-government. Their aspirations are rather economic than political, and they are showing this in the rapidly growing movement for the exclusion of party politics from local and county councils, in

which the old Unionist element is beginning to pay a larger part. But the Government, either under the influence of its left wing, or to take the wind out of the Republican sails, now and again shows an unexpected inclination to purely partisan aims.

While the Republicans hold aloof, there is no real Constitutional opposition; for the Labour Party is small and divided. Such being the case, a Government which has to handle the reconstruction of a new State would probably be stronger and more efficient if, instead of being a purely party one, it included members representing Constitutional Labour, the old Unionist element, and the old Nationalist Party. It would then be "broad based upon the people's will". Among other advantages, that would help to bridge the gulf between Ulster and the South, which the measures above referred to have undoubtedly tended to widen, and at a time, too, when on both sides there appeared to be a growing desire for closer relations.

The writer hardly heard a word about the Ulster boundary. In the Southern counties the people appeared to take no interest in a matter so remote from them. Doubtless in the counties adjoining the border the issue is a live one. But in Dublin most people seemed to think that it would be settled by a rectification, not sweeping, but rather in favour of the Free State, and that however much politicians on both sides might denounce it, that would be the just and wise solution.

Settling Down In Ireland

Southern Unity Needed

Some Bright Spots

(From a Correspondent)

The Times, 9 September 1925.

Probably much of the successful working of the new State is due to the wise but unseen guidance and advice of the Governor-General. Mr. Healy in a recent public speech bitterly described his functions as akin to those of the shops which carry out "invisible mending". He is no doubt wise at this stage to keep in the background; but self-effacement may be carried too far by the King's representative.

For instance the writer heard the modest expenditure of £37,000 on the Governor-General and his establishment denounced as "wicked waste", the reason given being that his Excellency's public duties consisted in putting his name to 70 documents last year. Or take another instance; the turnout at the Horse Show—Dublin's great annual carnival—this year savoured too much of Republican simplicity and many sturdy Irish democrats who love a show and a splash compared it unfavourably with the glamour and glitter of former Lord-Lieutenants.

The Horse Show presents Ireland at its best. It brings together North and South and

all classes interested in the breeding and performances of the horse; and this year's Show was in quality and number of exhibits and the attendance of the public one of the best on record. One point might be noted as characteristic of Ireland. One of the most successful exhibitors of Irish hunters was a well-known judge of the High Court, and in riding one of his prizewinners in the parade he showed that he has as firm a seat in the saddle as on the bench.

The Economic 'Slump.

In Ireland since the treaty, as in England since the peace, the chief difficulties have been economic. Ireland benefited more than any other part of the Empire by the great boom in prices of produce during the war. The "slump" following the war was correspondingly severe. It was aggravated enormously by the wanton destruction during the rebellion and subsequent civil war, not only of police and military barracks, Courts of Justice, post offices, Custom Houses, and other emblems of British domination, but by an appalling and utterly senseless destruction of private property, railways, roads, historic mansions, comfortable farms, banks, find shops, creameries, and warehouses. Some of this may be laid to the charge of the Black-and-Tans in their wild measures of retaliation, but by far the greater part of the wrecking and incendiarism was the work of Irishmen themselves. In many parts of the country you cannot go a mile without seeing traces of this devil's work, and though the victims have got compensation, often, indeed lavish, from the British and Irish Treasuries, it will take years to make good even a substantial part of the losses suffered. The enforced withdrawal to England of many once wealthy families who spent money freely, and the recalling of the 50,000 British troops, who brought 15 to 20 millions annually into the country and kept many of the small garrison towns of the South prosperous, have rendered the financial depression caused by the bad harvests of 1921-24 more acute, and created grievous unemployment. This has been further aggravated by strikes and other labour troubles as well as the consequent reduction of tillage and the change from dairying to dry-stock by many of the farmers.

The lamentable result is that you now see able-bodied labourers—the dole is lower than in England and much more difficult to obtain—tramping from farm to farm, even in harvest time, in vain

search of employment. No wonder one now and again hears the wish expressed that "*the English would come back*", that the old families would return, and that the pre-war flow of British tourists would be resumed. Meantime taxation is substantially higher than in England; prices of manufactured articles are, as a result of the new import duties, considerably dearer; the railways, as pointed out in a recent article in *The Times*, are being worked at a steadily increasing loss, and this year the holders of 75 per cent of the railway stock received no dividend at all. An even more serious matter is that for the last year or two imports for the first time are exceeding exports, and the livestock, the main capital of the country, is showing in places signs of depletion, due to some extent to the losses caused in recent severe winters. All these factors indicate that what the Free State wants today – and most people will tell you so – is not a narrow nationalism or intensive patriotism, but a steady and continued effort by all parties and classes to restore the national prosperity, which is the only sure basis of national dignity and efficient.

To be continued

V O X	Birth Rate	P A T
-------------	------------	-------------

Falling Birth Rate:

Girls aged under 16 gave birth to 21 babies in Ireland last year, with 864 teenagers in total giving birth.

Overall, fewer babies are being born here and the average age of first-time mothers is rising, figures from the Central Statistics Office reveal.

The birth rate dropped by 2% between 2018 and 2019, continuing a trend which has seen the rate plummet by 20.2% since 2009.

There were 59,796 births in 2019 compared to 61,016 in 2018. However, deaths rose slightly, from 31,116 in 2018 to 31,134 a year later.

The fertility rate has now dropped to 1.7, which is below the 2.1 replacement level generally considered necessary to replace a domestic population, excluding migration.

Poor old Ireland : lost between Wall Street and Coronation Street!

V
O
X

Skeleton History?

John Wayne
Gold!

P
A
T

Skeleton History?

A study of skeletons dating back nearly 200 years has debunked stereotypes created in Victorian England that the Irish were inherently violent and short.

The research, which scrutinised groups of Irish and English skeletons from the 19th century, debunks the notion violence was a peculiarly Irish trait.

Recently discovered skeletons from Spike Island jail in Cork and the Kilkenny Union Workhouse were compared to remains from lower to upper class burials at St Martin-in-the-Bullring parish in Birmingham from the mid-18th to mid-19th centuries.

The study found that both English and Irish skeletons showed similar marks of violence but the injuries sustained by the Birmingham victims were more consistent with boxing while the Irish injuries were more likely sustained by blows from shillelaghs used in faction fighting.

The authors did find a stark difference in the higher number of Irish women who sustained violence-related injuries compared to their British counterparts.

Evidence of bone fractures to both Irish men — and women — in the Kilkenny Union Workhouse is uncovered in their skeletons which were buried between 1847 and 1851 at the height of the Famine.

There was evidence found among the skeletal remains that the third stereotype of Irish people being heavy smoking did ring true. (Irish Examiner, 27.4.2020)

Did these academics ever hear of the game of Hurling?

John Wayne

The actor was born in a staunchly Protestant small town in Iowa. His family attended the Methodist Church. Wayne appeared in more than 250 motion pictures. He married three times and had seven children. In 1963, he underwent surgery for the removal of a cancerous lung. In 1979, he converted to Catholicism on his deathbed. He died in June of that year in Los Angeles after receiving the last rites of the Catholic church.

"He considered himself a Presbyterian, probably because of his Scotch-Irish ancestry, but jokingly referred to himself as a "cardiac Catholic", a reference to people who convert to Catholicism on their deathbeds... in the end John Wayne's long-standing joke about being a "cardiac Catholic proved to be a preminition"... (A Century of Catholic Converts, Lorene Hanley Duquin-Indiane, U.S.A.-2003)

In a 1971 *Playboy* magazine interview, he came out all guns blazing on his opinion of Black people, Native American, the LGBTQ fraternity—thank heavens, he wasn't asked his opinion on Social Welfare beneficiaries

• In discussing the revocation of activist Angela Davis' teaching credentials, Wayne said, "We can't all of a sudden get down on our knees and turn everything over to the leadership of the blacks. I believe in white supremacy until the blacks are educated to a point of responsibility. I don't believe in giving authority and positions of leadership and judgment to irresponsible people."

• Asked about Native Americans playing subordinate roles in his movies, he replied, "I don't feel we did wrong in taking this great country away from them, if that's what you're asking. Our so-called stealing of this country from them was just a matter of survival. There were great numbers of people who needed new land, and the Indians

were selfishly trying to keep it for themselves."

• When the interviewer requests an example of movies he finds perverted, Wayne singles out Dustin Hoffman and Jon Voight's characters in *"Midnight Cowboy"*, which won three Oscars: "Wouldn't you say that the wonderful love of those two men in 'Midnight Cowboy,' a story about two f...gs, qualifies? But don't get me wrong. As far as a man and a woman is concerned, I'm awfully happy there's a thing called sex."

• On the matter of education in the African American community, he said, "Some blacks have tried to force the issue and enter college when they haven't passed the tests and don't have the requisite background. ... I don't know why people insist that blacks have been forbidden their right to go to school. They were allowed in public schools wherever I've been."

• Again on education, he said, "I don't feel guilty about the fact that five or 10 generations ago these people were slaves. Now, I'm not condoning slavery. It's just a fact of life, like the kid who gets infantile paralysis and has to wear braces so he can't play football with the rest of us. I will say this, though: I think any black who can compete with a white today can get a better break than a white man."

Wayne had a self-imposed rule: "Talk low, talk slow, and don't say too much."

A pity he didn't apply it in his *Playboy* interview!

GOLD!

"I doubt if the habit of thrift will ever be restored till the gold currency comes back. Gold is the only metal for which human beings have any lasting respect. No one but a child would save up pennies. There is something in gold—the colour, perhaps, reminding us of the sun, the god of our ancestors—that puts us into the mood of worshippers. The children of Israel found it impossible not to worship the golden calf. They have gone on worshipping it ever since. Had the calf been of paper, they would, I feel confident, have remained good Christians."

(The Pleasures of Ignorance; Robert Lynd; London, Grant Richards Ltd.-1921)
