

Irish Foreign Affairs

Volume 11, Number 1

March 2018

“Every nation, if it is to survive as a nation, must study its own history and have a foreign policy”
—C.J. O’Donnell, *The Lordship of the World*, 1924, p.145

Editorial: “Foreignness” and material aid in warfare: on Irish foreign policy
in transition to Europe p. 2

Palestine and Israel Edition

A Forgotten Corkman on the Zionist Project *Brendan Clifford* p. 6

The Times and the Balfour Declaration—Both Zionist and Anti-Semitic *Manus O’Riordan*
p. 15

On banning the import of Israeli settlement goods
David Morrison p. 18

Israel must be forced to end the occupation, or there will be no Palestinian state
David Morrison p. 19

Documents

In Year Zero, A Contribution to the History of the German Press, Part III
by Hans Habe p. 22

Editorial

“Foreignness” and material aid in warfare: on Irish foreign policy in transition to Europe

Martin Mansergh has sent us the following letter in response to editorials in the June and December 2017 issues of this magazine.

The Editor,
Irish Foreign Affairs
Sir,

To begin on a positive note, the outcome of the first phase of the Brexit negotiations and the arrangements for the second, including specific reference to Ireland and the border as an area requiring agreement, clearly vindicate the view expressed in your columns with which I fully concur that Ireland has to work as part of the remaining EU 27. In the *Guardian* (20 December), Rafael Behr states: ‘It is true that the EU empowers smaller countries. Witness the clout Ireland has had in Brexit talks’

With respect, the issue of how Ireland handles Brexit has nothing to do with the question whether the State regards Britain as a foreign country (as opposed to a separate country). In the early decades of independence, political rhetoric describing Britain as a foreign country and British people (especially monarchs) as foreigners was liberally deployed, often at the highest political level. All the while, the British Government and its lawyers chose, even after the 1937 Constitution was promulgated, to regard Ireland as a dominion and to continue to treat its citizens enjoying rights of residence and employment in the UK (barring wartime restrictions and State employment in Northern Ireland) as British subjects. When it was announced in 1948 that the Republic would be declared and leave the Commonwealth, which took effect in April 1949, some consideration was given in Britain to retaliating by treating Irish citizens as aliens, but this was not pursued, both because it would have been very disruptive and because other Commonwealth countries with significant Irish populations of their own were strongly opposed. The Taoiseach John A. Costello made a declaration in the Dáil on 24 November 1948, which stated that Ireland, following repeal of the 1936 External Relations Act, did not intend to regard British or Commonwealth citizens ‘as foreigners or their countries as foreign countries’, and more importantly that ‘accordingly, the factual exchange of rights will continue unimpaired’. In the course of his speech, he made all the points about the intimate interrelationship between the people of the two islands which has become commonplace since. Section 2.1 of the UK’s Ireland Act, 1949, declares ‘that the Republic of Ireland is not a foreign country for the purpose of any law in force in any part of the United Kingdom’. Most unionists in Northern Ireland who refer to the Republic as a foreign country are totally unaware of the joint British and Irish position on this nearly 70 years ago, but I am surprised if that is also true of your publication.

While Commonwealth citizens’ rights were changed as it expanded, these reciprocal British and Irish declarations are the basis of the Common Travel Area formalised subsequently and of the rights, later including reciprocal general election voting rights, enjoyed by Irish citizens in Britain and British citizens in Ireland that both countries are most anxious to preserve in the context of Brexit. It was acknowledged by Prime Minister Attlee that these were novel but practical arrangements, what Haughey and Thatcher acknowledged in 1980 as a ‘unique relationship’. I am not aware of any serving

President, Taoiseach or Irish Government Minister who has referred to Britain specifically as a foreign country in the past 20 years, and it would cause considerable controversy if they were to do so. When I made reference to this in the past, I was simply articulating what is the position of both countries since 1949, even if not widely known, discussed or understood, not expressing some ideological deviancy of my own.

The editorial on democracy in your December issue, inspired in part by the autumn issue of *Studies* devoted to the topic, to which I was invited to contribute, makes the claim, not for the first time, but more carefully worded, that I am or was a supporter of Irish involvement in the Anglo-American invasion of Iraq for the purpose of introducing democracy there. To avoid any misapprehension arising from this as to my attitude, I stated as an ordinary member in the Seanad on 21 March 2003, a few days after the war started: ‘As far as support for war is concerned, we made clear that a second UN resolution was imperative from our point of view - that remains our position and we do not support war’. In my *Studies* article on democracy, I had a strongly critical paragraph on hubristic attempts to impose democracy from outside on countries like Iraq, which ‘often leave a trail of destruction’ and ‘can have a very high and prolonged human cost’ (*Studies*, vol.106, no.425, pp.290-1). Though presumably read, this critique was ignored/dismissed by your editorial writer. It is of course easy to denounce anyone, if you turn their position around 180 degrees.

The claim, though not explained, may rely on the fact that the Government of the time, with the support of the vast majority of Oireachtas members including myself, made the difficult and borderline decision not to suspend relatively longstanding transit arrangements at Shannon Airport to unarmed US military transport planes, following outbreak of the war. While this certainly stretched neutrality to breaking point, it was done in the belief that to do the opposite risked serious damage to our economic and employment interests and multinational investment, as well as being poorly received by a country that had given such strong support to the Irish peace process. It was immaterial to either the course or the outcome of the war. The Government at the time made it clear that it did not support the war, and I am sure would have argued strenuously that allowing the facilities at Shannon to continue did not constitute involvement in it. Once the war was over, the UN passed a resolution calling on all member States to give every assistance to the peaceful reconstruction of Iraq, fully justifying from then on the continued use of Shannon. It should also be recalled that Shannon airport was previously an important re-fuelling base for Aeroflot civilian aircraft flying to Latin America during the 1980s, something the Americans did not like and which may have contributed to the establishment of US pre-clearance facilities there.

Yours sincerely,
Martin Mansergh
21/12/2017

Reply to Dr. Mansergh

In the above letter, Dr. Mansergh says that “it is of course easy to denounce anyone, if you turn their position around 180 degrees.” He says this in response to an IFA editorial statement that he had been “a supporter of Irish involvement in the Anglo-American invasion of Iraq for the purpose of

introducing democracy there.” He also takes issue with how the IFA challenged him celebrating the “non-foreign” status of Britain in Ireland.

What is a “foreigner” but a person currently in one country who is a citizen/subject of another “foreign” state? But no, in the case made by Dr. Mansergh, in Ireland this clear language does not apply. Here, uniquely among sovereign states, Britain is not a “foreign” but a “separate country”. So if people from this “separate” country find themselves in Ireland, they will not be foreigners and their state will not be regarded as a foreign one. By this logic, although there are more British immigrants in Ireland than Polish ones, only the Poles are “foreigners”. But does the “separateness” as opposed to “foreignness” distinguishing Ireland’s relationship with Britain, in contrast to its relationship with any other state, not denote a weaker form of sovereignty in relation to it?

Dr. Mansergh bolsters his case of Ireland’s uniquely non-foreign relationship with Britain by elevating to an act of statesmanship John A. Costello’s concession, when declaring the Irish state a Republic in 1948, that Ireland “did not intend to regard British or Commonwealth citizens ‘as foreigners or their countries as foreign countries’.” As Mansergh almost admits, this bizarre statement occurred in a context of threatened retaliatory measures by Britain against Costello’s Republic in the form of treating the Irish in Britain as “aliens” unless Costello defined his Republic as merely a rhetorical flourish, as not really a Republic at all. Costello obliged.

Britain of course had refused since 1918 to accept Ireland not only as a foreign country but even as a “separate” one. The “common travel area” (i.e. the common labour market) formed part of Britain’s refusal to accept the substance of Irish sovereignty. In the British Constitution, the legal framework for “Anglo-Irish relations” remained the Government of Ireland Act 1920 which constituted what is now the Republic as “Southern Ireland”, as amended to “dominion” by the Free State Act of 1922. For imperial strategic reasons, Ireland would not be “foreign”. All developments of the entity thereafter towards sovereignty were treated as not really having happened, with the aim when opportunity arose of reversing them. As Mansergh himself delicately puts it, “the British Government and its lawyers chose, even after the 1937 Constitution was

promulgated, to regard Ireland as a dominion and to continue to treat its citizens enjoying rights of residence and employment in the UK ... as British subjects.” When Britain insisted on a restatement of the substantial principle in 1948, Costello felt he had little choice but to oblige. For Mansergh this was a happy event, ending a previous unsatisfactory situation. This was when Irish leaders expressed themselves in “political rhetoric”, “liberally deployed, often at the highest political level”, throughout “the early decades of independence”, “describing Britain as a foreign country and British people (especially monarchs) as foreigners.” Costello’s statement thankfully put an end to all that!

Dr. Mansergh further describes how Ireland in 1948 had to extend the “non-foreigner” category not only to British but all “Commonwealth citizens”, and how this subsequently changed when, as he delicately puts it, “Commonwealth citizens’ rights were changed as it expanded”. As Britain decided to change the rules on what constituted “Commonwealth citizens” when non-whites in large numbers – especially Indians - began to be involved, Ireland had no choice but to accept the new arrangements as a *fait accompli* as it had no say whatsoever in defining the terms of the “special relationship”. Britain’s “special arrangements” regarding Ireland were and always had been dictated by one side, the British side. Mansergh elaborates the “non-foreigner” arrangements (common labour market and travel area, and reciprocal voting rights) as ones elevated by – of all people – Haughey and Thatcher to the very substance of the Irish-British “unique relationship”. The former Taoiseach would certainly have had something to say about that interpretation of the term were he still around to do so!

Dr. Mansergh treats the “non-foreigner” arrangements as prized achievements to be preserved at whatever cost for ever more. Why should this be so? In previous writings he deployed a convoluted logic concerning citizens of Ireland with a semi-British “identity” as the reason for maintaining it. But the British had other purposes, deploying the outcome of the history of Irish emigration as a lever (in addition to its bigger lever, the absurd constitutional limbo in which it placed its sub-statelet “Northern Ireland”) to reduce the extent of real separation between Ireland and Britain, to minimize Irish sovereignty, and to retain means of influence - and more - over its polity. Given the common EU citizenship arrangements (still) applying in Ireland and Britain, there is no reason why the Irish in Britain should not continue to enjoy the benefits of that status on the same basis as other EU citizens, and whatever safeguards the EU secures for them in the Brexit negotiations. The citizenship arrangements applying in the Northern entity are unique to it, an outcome of the IRA war, and functional to the entity’s transitional status. But why any continued need for an additional “separate”, “non-foreigner” status in Ireland/Britain proper? What purpose could it possibly serve other than the one already referenced? It may be noted that no comparable special arrangements exist between Ireland and the US, another major destination of Irish emigrants and a state with which Ireland has close relations. Nor is one actively sought by either the Irish or American governments, as it is obvious to both sides that any such bizarre “arrangements” would involve compromising the sovereignty of one of the parties.

As we write, the Irish state remains trapped in this special British “non-foreigner” arrangement, one now being adroitly exploited in Whitehall’s divide-and-rule tactics towards Europe to maximise its benefits from Brexit. It would be better for all concerned to begin treating each other as friendly foreigners.

As regards the use of Shannon Airport as a substantial port-of-call by the US military in waging war on Iraq in 2003 and since, and whether Ireland – and Dr. Mansergh as an

Irish Foreign Affairs is a publication of
the *Irish Political Review* Group.
55 St Peter’s Tce., Howth, Dublin 13

Editor: Philip O’Connor
ISSN 2009-132X

Printers: Athol Books, Belfast
www.atholbooks.org
Price per issue: €4 (Sterling £3)
Annual postal subscription €16 (£14)
Annual electronic subscription €4 (£3)

All correspondence:
Philip@atholbooks.org
Orders to:
atholbooks-sales.org

operative of its governing coalition - was a participant in that war for the destruction of the Iraqi state, as a prelude to the obliteration of other independent Arab states, Dr. Mansergh evades the issue in the manner in which he challenges the assertion that he was. He points to the Irish Government's formal position of not supporting the initial invasion without a second UN resolution, a speech he himself made in the Seanad at the time in which he declared himself an opponent of the war, and a recent article by him in *Studies* which included "a strongly critical paragraph on hubristic attempts to impose democracy from outside on countries like Iraq, which 'often leave a trail of destruction' and 'can have a very high and prolonged human cost'." But he does not say that, acting on its formal position, Ireland then proceeded to not involve itself as one of the Coalition of the Willing in that act of barbarity, but only that its admitted involvement "was immaterial to either the course or the outcome of the war".

This reduces "real" collaboration in a war effort to the question of whether the collaboration in question is substantially material to the war's outcome. In September 1944 Romania, which had formed a very real part of Germany's aggression against the Soviet Union, changed sides and threw its forces into support for the Soviet Union's counter-war against Germany's aggression. Romania's belated military campaign against Germany can be said to have been "immaterial to either the course or the outcome of the war" in the substantial sense, but hardly not to have been of material assistance to the Soviet war effort. The Romanian decision was a cool, rational choice to maximize benefit to itself by siding with the obvious winners and avoid repercussions for not doing so. It hardly ranks among the more noble deeds of European political history.

In making his "immaterial to ... the course or ... outcome" point, Mansergh digs himself deeper into the hole. The Irish decision not to "suspend relatively longstanding transit arrangements at Shannon" was not because it judged these "transit arrangements" immaterial to the US war effort. The decision, Mansergh admits, "certainly stretched neutrality to breaking point". But to have done "the opposite", he argues, "risked serious damage to our economic and employment interests and multinational investment" and ran the risk of "being poorly received by a country that had given such strong support to the Irish peace process." In other words, and all the rhetoric about "opposing the war" aside, it was a materially opportunist decision by the Irish government, of which Dr. Mansergh was a part, of a type with that made by Romania in 1944, and, like it, constituted a not very high-risk gamble on material involvement on the side of those who claimed to be waging war "for the purpose of introducing democracy" to Iraq. How can it be interpreted any differently?

Dr. Mansergh would be one of the first to admit that had Ireland made its ports available to the German Navy during Britain's second Great War against Germany - as it unquestionably made a substantial airport available to the Americans in the Iraq war - that that would have unequivocally constituted an act of aggression against Britain, and that the moral strength of de Valera's enforcement of Neutrality was precisely that it allowed for absolutely no such use of Irish waters or facilities by Germany. De Valera made some minor concessions to Britain in the war out of a general sympathy with the Allied cause, but none that seriously breached Ireland's neutral status (Prof. O'Halpin's lavishly overstated case to the contrary has been disassembled elsewhere, e.g. in the *Irish Political Review*, July 2014). Applying the same logic to the Iraqi destruction, it is obvious that Ireland allowed itself to be absorbed into the Coalition of the Willing, whatever hair-splitting it engaged in in relation to it at the UN, in the materially substantial sense of making itself a point of transition for the

US soldiery and bombing forces on their way to "theatre". Dr. Mansergh adds an absurd exculpatory statement that "once the war was over, the UN passed a resolution calling on all member States to give every assistance to the peaceful reconstruction of Iraq, fully justifying from then on the continued use of Shannon." In other words, following Bush's declaration of "mission accomplished", US military traffic to Iraq through Ireland consisted of activities directed towards the "peaceful reconstruction of Iraq"! The stark reality is that Ireland set aside its pretence of Neutrality in 2003 to materially aid the US side in its uneven "conflict" with Iraq, which resulted in the obliteration of that state over the course of several years under the pretence of introducing democracy to it.

Michael McDowell TD, Justice Minister and colleague of Dr. Mansergh in the Fianna Fáil-PD Coalition at the time of the Iraq aggression, whose erudite grasp of matters legal is beyond dispute, is quite clear about the situation in which Ireland placed itself at the time and the convenient delusions under which it acted:

"Having destroyed Iraq on the pretext of finding non-existent WMDs, you might think that the US, which teamed up with Blair to lie convincingly to the gullible world (myself included) about those WMDs, might just admit to a little guilt or shame in relation to the hundreds of thousands who lost their lives, their kin, their homes and their futures since that escapade."

(The time has come to speak truth to power - Samantha Power', *Sunday Business Post*, 18/12/2016, available on www.michaelmcdowell.ie).

Maybe other members of the Ahern-Harney government of the time should also come clean on the crude mercenary calculations behind its involvement in the destruction of the Iraqi state. Dr. Mansergh's admission of the crude material motives underlying its collaboration is a good start.

If states don't have friends, only interests, Dr. Mansergh's "separate but not foreign" doctrine in relation to England, and material interest swathed in hypocrisy in relation to matters of US wars, brings us to the matter of Brexit. A *cri de coeur* from the political editor of *The Irish Times* on the future for Ireland in the world of the EU without Mother Britain must have been emotionally wrenching for its ABC1 readership:

"The spectacle of the British government's management of Brexit has, for those with a clear-eyed view of Irish interests, long since stopped being funny ... But whatever type of Brexit is eventually settled on - hard, soft, crusty, squishy in the middle, whatever - the EU after Britain leaves is going to be a colder and lonelier place for Ireland ...

"It's one of the small ironies of history that our principal gallant ally in Europe for most of our period in the EU ... has been the UK ... The Irish and British have consistently been on the same side on trade, on economic matters, on justice and home affairs, and on EU efforts for further integration across a variety of policy areas. Sometimes Irish diplomats and politicians would wait for the British to block proposals that Ireland didn't like but didn't want to alienate other countries by objecting to. A lot of this was in the area of what one Irish official calls 'all that future of Europe stuff' ..."

(Pat Leahy, 'Why we will miss the British when they're gone', *Irish Times*, 10/02/18)

All that "future of Europe stuff" will now be the daily bread and butter of Iveagh House. *Quelle horreur!* Finally, after all the "European" blather in which Dublin 4 bathed itself on their rebound from Irish "nationalism" has come home to roost. It's now time to actually become "European"! Now that Whitehall might no longer be there to bat on our behalf, we will have to make alliances, define our interests and set about

pursuing them within Europe. For the first time since the era of the aberration, Charles Haughey, who aligned Ireland solidly with France and Germany, the “threat” now, in Tara Street’s view, is very definitely Franco-German:

“Currently, Germany and France combined have 29 per cent of the EU’s population. You need 35 per cent (and four member states) to form a blocking minority ... Germany and France combined will have 34.6 per cent of the population. Ireland, the Baltics and the Nordics combined will have 11 per cent ... This change in the voting clout comes at a point that the old Franco-German motor is revving up. French president Emmanuel Macron has declared he wants a European finance minister and budget, tax harmonisation, a common defence budget and policy, a European intelligence agency, universities, ... and so on ... He is a committed European federalist ... Herr Schultz is clear what direction he will move in: ‘We will return to an active and leading role in the EU, and I hope this forms the basis of a closely-integrated co-operation with Paris’ ...”

For *Irish Times* political editor, Pat Leahy, and his ABC1 readership, it’s all a horrifying and unedifying prospect (“the boys are back in town”), but we must fight it on the beaches:

“The drive for greater EU integration will soon focus on tax – Ireland’s great concern ... Extreme Euroscepticism is a fringe pursuit in Ireland. But if the EU takes a turn in a more integrationist direction – and that is likely – our perception will change. That’s inevitable. ... Europe has changed constantly since Ireland joined. It is now on the verge of another big change – comparable and perhaps more profound than the single market, the euro, the eastern expansion. All these things worked to Ireland’s advantage. The coming change will not. That will inevitably change Ireland’s relationship with the EU, one way or another.”

If semi-editorials from Tara Street are a good guide to thinking in the halls of Iveagh House and associated institutions (they are!), our “separate” and very definitely “foreign” European friends are about to get a piece of our mind!

There are various matters on which the IFA is at one with Dr. Mansergh. In a previous letter from him published in our December 2017 edition he stated of the unique Haughey interlude:

“I stated [in a book *Ireland and the Challenge of Europe*, edited by Dermot Keogh – Ed.] that ‘on most of the high profile issues of strategic importance such as the CAP, the Structural Funds, the EMS and the further development of the Community, Ireland and Britain have tended to be on opposite sides’. I then went on to say that ‘on many issues, the EMS being the perfect example, we have tended to align ourselves where appropriate or at least reach an understanding with either or both members of the Franco-German partnership and indeed with the Commission’. I know Mr. Haughey agreed with this, because I discussed it with him. Soon after, he strongly backed German unity as President of the European Council, despite the vitriolic opposition of Mrs. Thatcher.”

Throughout the recent crisis years induced by purposeful chaos in global finance capitalism, Fintan O’Toole peddled a line that Ireland was a “failed state”, drawing international attention to its alleged weaknesses and systemic “corruption”, and undermining its recovery attempts which critically depended on international “market” credibility. But it has been heartening to see that in recoil from the recently launched impressive Irexit campaign, O’Toole has rediscovered Lemass’s views on Ireland’s future lying long-term with a strong Euro-integrationist development in alignment with the Franco-German core (‘Irexit would be the end of Irish nationalism’, *Irish Times*, 13/02/18). It might be added that Lemass’s successor, Charles J. Haughey, almost uniquely

among Irish leaders and daily hounded by Mr. O’Toole’s organ, relentlessly pursued the same strategic orientation. But O’Toole’s intervention is nevertheless a welcome antidote from a corner of Tara Street at least to the gallop of Leahy & Co. towards a fortress Ireland line within the EU battling European integration while bewailing the loss of our “great friend”.

It was also heartening to see some independent reflexes on display in the relatively *Irish Times*-free zone of the *Tonight Show* on TV3 (12 February), where ex-Minister Ivan Yates pointed to the obvious, that the direction of Irish EU strategy should not be encumbered with a Leahyesque state of mourning over losing our “special friend” but rather get on with the business of assisting indigenous firms to diversify away from Britain into new European markets and building direct-link communications and transport infrastructure to Europe. Needless to say, the long overdue jettisoning of the “non-foreign” “special arrangements” with the maritime power, instituted as a diplomatic stratagem at a time of weakness, should be got on with in the process, and the sooner the better. And to use a favoured Haugheyism, there can be no place in this for “special pleading”. □

(continued from p. 17)

In the car on the way back to the city Wechsberg and I debated which of us would be first to write up this ‘novella’ after the war. Unless Wechsberg, though hopefully not, has beaten me to it in the *New Yorker*, I have now won this race, twenty years later.

By the time we arrived at the printing works not far from the Rhine the night sky over Cologne had turned red. German artillery from across the river was still firing into the ghost town and our artillery was responding in kind. It was a duel over a cemetery. An occasional burst of machine gun fire seared the air. We didn’t walk upright into the printing works but rather crept from the jeep to the door. We thought of the two film stars, man and wife, in the quiet villa and then of the task that lay before us. ‘Was ever woman in this humour wooed? Was ever a newspaper in this humour founded?’

The *Kölnische Kurier* was born the next morning, as unlikely as this may seem. We had brought most of the manuscripts needed with us from Luxembourg. The news was not completely fresh, but the idea of newness is a relative one. With the help of a font sample-book I set up the articles on a printing press that had survived in relatively good shape. Meanwhile a ‘monitor’ – I had one of these ‘eavesdroppers’ working with me in Camp Sharpe and they tended to take an eternity to carry out their task - supplied the latest reports from the BBC in London and another colleague had arrived in Cologne the day before. So the editorial team now consisted of a total of four people: Wechsberg, the monitor, myself, and our Cologne ‘special correspondent’ – a “local” reporter who provided us with the news, advice and commands issued by the Military Government and who passed on to Wechsberg small items of news from the dead city, which the Staff Sergeant then set as a feature article in cursive font. While life has seen Wechsberg and I parting ways and becoming estranged, I can confirm that that famous associate of the *New Yorker* never delivered a bad feature. A few days afterwards I returned to Luxembourg while Wechsberg stayed on in Cologne.

My office at Luxembourg radio station had now become my home, not least due to the devoted assistance I received from the broadcasting staff. And it was here that I began drafting a work plan for the coming months. That plan, compared to its actual implementation, seems now like the fevered fantasy of a fool, but the realisation of the project speaks for itself. (To be continued)

A Forgotten Corkman on the Zionist Project

By Brendan Clifford

On January 8th, 2018, the founder of Hamas was given a hard time by Stephen Sacker on his BBC *Hard Talk* programme. Why wouldn't the Palestinians behave sensibly, resign themselves to their fate and stop being a nuisance to the world? Why did the Hamas leaders keep on asserting that the Palestinians had the right to resist under conquest, and entering a reminder that it all began when Britain conquered them and set in motion a process of colonisation designed to brush them aside and set up a Jewish State in their place. Sacker indicated that the world was tired of the repetition of that old story. He did not dispute its accuracy. He just indicated that it was time to stop telling it.

There was nothing new in that. The world that arranged for the Palestinians to be snuffed out—the General Assembly of the United Nations—meeting in the shadow of the Nuremberg Trials of Germans for genocidal action against Jews—has long been tired of hearing the stories of what Jewish colonial nationalism has been doing to the Palestinians who have not the decency to go away.

Well, the General Assembly might still give an ear to Palestinian complaints about the way they have been treated—and it was the General Assembly that adopted the Balfour Declaration as UN policy—but General Assembly motions are of no effect.

The sole effective act of the General Assembly was its 1948 Resolution on Palestine. The Security Council transferred to it the power of decision in this one matter because Britain wanted to appear to wash its hands of responsibility for implementation of the Balfour Declaration. It would have been responsible for a Security Council decision because it had a power of Veto on the Security Council. So the matter was handed over to the General Assembly, and the little client states on all sides were hustled into voting for the setting up of Jewish and Arab states within defined territories in Palestine. And then the General Assembly was deprived of the right to oversee and police implementation of what it had authorised.

The very large Arab minority in the territory allocated for a Jewish State was ethnically cleansed by Zionist action straight away, and Jewish expansion into Arab territory was only halted by Jordanian military action. This produced Ceasefire Lines, far beyond the borders laid down by the General Assembly Resolution. The terms of the 1948 Resolution were consigned to the rubbish bin of history. The 1967 Ceasefire Lines have taken their place—but only as a debating point. The Zionist project remains a work-in-progress. No Israeli party that hoped to be elected would propose that the 1967 Ceasefire Lines be made the Borders of the State.

Sacker could not dispute that the Hamas leader was telling the true story. That was not the point.

Charles Townshend, in his much admired *The Republic: The Fight For Independence, 1918-23*, branded the Irish national independence movement of 1919-21 as fantasist. He said it was living in delusions because it put its trust in having Right on its side. This implied that the operative principle in the world of the League of Nations was that *Might is Right*—though it is not advisable to state it too bluntly.

There was nothing new in Sacker's treatment of Hamas. But a remarkable thing happened coincidentally with it. A book

was published about J. M. N. (Joseph Mary Nagle) Jeffries, a Corkman who was an influential journalist during and after the 1st World War and who published two major books in the 1930s. The book was *Balfour In The Dock* by Colin Anderson.

As far as the Dictionary of Irish Biography (Royal Irish Academy and Cambridge University) is concerned, Jeffries never existed. Brief extracts from these two books will explain why this eminent Irishman has been disowned.

Jeffries' book, *Palestine: The Reality*, issued by Longmans, Green in 1939, said:

“Though the world of to-day, in these last months of 1938, has much for which to be ashamed, there is nothing in it so shameful as the condition of Palestine. From end to end the Holy Land has been running with blood...

“Yet the more we are grieved by these events, the more it is incumbent upon us to examine the causes which have produced them. Political murder, in particular, is the product of extreme degrees of exasperation. Though nothing condones it, yet ere it becomes common in any State something must have been thoroughly wrong with that State, and wrong for a considerable time, and all reasonable means of procuring redress of what was wrong must have been found worthless.

“Unhappily that is what has occurred in Palestine. The Arabs, the people of that country, are suffering from a supreme injustice. We have abstracted from them the control of their own destinies and by force of arms have imposed upon them a multitude of undesired immigrants and an alien system of life. For twenty years they have essayed every form of pacific appeal to have this injustice remedied. Interviews and petitions, mass-meetings, public pronouncements, protests to the League of Nations, repeated embassies to England, all have been tried. All of them have failed. Not only have the Arabs' petitions not been granted, but of what was fundamental in them consideration itself has been refused. They have never been allowed to place their full case before any national or international Court in the world, with a right to win a verdict upon the facts...

“The aim of the present book is to give this case as amply as possible. It is the history of what really happened in Palestine and of what was done concerning Palestine from the days of the War till now...

“The Arabs of Palestine are a small body, living far from this country and having perforce—since they are Arabs—none of their race in positions of influence in Great Britain. On the other hand, their opponents in the matter have been constituted by a series of British Governments themselves and by the extremely influential members of the Zionist organisation, who either live in this country or are constantly visiting it. These Zionists and their British backers hold prominent positions in Parliament, in the Press, in the social and professional and commercial spheres of our national life. So that from voices which are familiar in their varying degrees and respected in their varying degrees the public has heard over and over everything that is to be said for political Zionism, for the theory, that is, which establishes Jews by main force, not as the religious but as a political entity, in the Holy Land.

“From the Arabs the British public has heard little, despite all the endeavours the Arabs themselves have made to present their cause. How could it be otherwise? The lonely groups of men, whom their countrymen have sent so often to our shores to plead for them, have never obtained in the newspapers or upon the platform one thousandth part of the space or of the time which they needed to say all they had to say. They had a great deal to say, because as time went on what is called the “Palestinian Question” became increasingly intricate.

“Any first-class political question grows intricate if it is left without an effort to solve it for a number of years. It grows particularly intricate when one of the parties to the affair finds refuge in this passage of years, taking advantage of all the secondary issues naturally or artificially produced during them to cloud the main issue that was clear at the beginning. There becomes so much to speak about, so much to controvert and so many falsely raised issues to pursue that a vast deal of time and space presently would be needed by the other party to accomplish this. But time and space on such a scale have been unprocurable. To give the full Arab case the newspapers of Britain would have had to turn themselves into political documents dealing with the Levant. Anybody can see that was impossible...

“We who sympathise actively with the Arabs are a small group, a pitifully small group. We are bound to be a small group because knowledge of the Arab case, knowledge of the true facts concerning Palestine, was never to be acquired easily and ordinarily in England.

“It required special knowledge to be a champion of the Arab cause. This knowledge in general was only to be gained in Palestine itself, or by close acquaintance with the others who had been in Palestine, or through the study of evidence which practically remained private.

“So that we who *were* cognizant of the facts were necessarily few in numbers. We were a few ex-soldiers, some former officers and functionaries of the Administration in Palestine—a fact which had its significance, some dwellers in that country, some missionaries and teachers there, one or two journalists whose eyes had been opened there. Against us stood the Government of Great Britain and the Zionist societies with their ramifications throughout the universe. Against us stood the wealth used to spread the Zionist case. In comparison with this the Arabs were paupers, and we few who knew the justice of the Arab cause had to suffer all the impediments and heaped obstacles of their and of our own poverty in trying to reveal it.

“In consequence, this book is as full as I can make it, it is not quite as full as it might be and as it should be. There is for example a great deal that should be divulged about the way in which political Zionism came to be espoused and the Arab case came to be put aside by the Government of the United States at the time of the Peace Conference. I was offered opportunities for investigation into this, what appeared to be singular opportunities, but I could not avail myself of them because I had not the money to go to the United States and to stay there the length of time which would have been necessary. For the same reason I could not even return to Palestine before I began writing and then go on to Iraq though it can be imagined how much there is in that quarter still waiting to be investigated and to be read.

“It is not usual perhaps to mention personal affairs of this sort, but here they must be mentioned because of their importance. We who are on the side of the Arabs are a group with a good deal of special knowledge, but without the funds to use it and to diffuse it as we should wish. In that we differ from our opponents, who where the spreading of their gospel is concerned, can talk in tens of thousands of pounds and in hundreds of thousands of dollars” (xiv/xv).

“The history of Palestine from the days of the War till now is sometimes... intricate... It ought not to be intricate... There was no Palestine Question, nor ever would have been one, if certain statesmen had not created it. Since it was thus unnaturally created, however, it tends at times to intricacy...

“The men who created the Question, however, should not be able to escape being held to account by their agility in complicating our national books. If political personages can toy with treaties or wriggle out of pledges simply because the public will neither examine treaties nor analyse pledges, then the public has abdicated its control over the government...” (xvii).

“A final point calls for an introductory mention... It is a religious consideration. Since many persons... judge the subject of Zionism solely from this standpoint, it is proper that it should be considered.

“Those who take this view are moved by the fact that the return of the Jews to the Holy Land is an accomplishment of the prophecies of the Bible...

“Hardly any of us, certainly not I, oppose the return of Jews to Palestine. What we resist is a very different thing, the manner of their return and the extent of their return. The manner has been illegal and arrogant, and the extent excessive.

“In any event, the reinstallation of Jews in Palestine cannot be said to be impeded by our actions, since the Jews *have* returned there. Everything calls for criticism in the whereabouts and style of their return, but that is their responsibility, not their critics’. As far as the numbers go, at the close of the Great War there were some 60,000 of them in residence, who had lived for the most part on terms of reasonable understanding, if not amity, with the native population. Most of them were recent comers, who had entered the country in the proper way, under its common law, as pilgrims or as settlers, demanding no special status for themselves at the expense of that native population. Since then their totals have increased sevenfold.

“The additional three hundred and forty thousand and more, who have entered under our aegis, have been brought in arbitrarily. To all intents the Arabs have been tied by Great Britain to the doorposts while the Jews streamed past. Despite this, the Arabs... are willing so far to accept compromise concerning them. It would be well... to take advantage of the willingness to compromise while it exists...

“At present... they are willing to regard the great bulk of the immigrants as innocent and ignorant agents, who have come to Palestine thinking it was theirs, and they do not seek to expel them. The terms of the immigrants’ residence remain to be settled, but as long as they are content with the common rights of inhabitants and do not demand extravagant privileges such as territoriality and extra-territoriality at once, they should be able to stay. That means 400,000... Jews are in Palestine and are not likely to leave it unless of their own free will.

“This fact is of great significance if considered in conjunction with the prophecies of the Bible...” (xx)

Jeffries then, while not conceding that the Jewish Scriptures constitute international law, argues that the Scripture prophecies are fulfilled by this 400,000. He quotes Deuteronomy as saying that the Jews will return to Palestine “*More numerous than were their fathers*”. And he quotes Sir G.A. Smith’s *Historical Geography Of The Holy Land*:

“We cannot be far from the truth in estimating the Jewish nation at the end of the seventh Century (B.C.) as comprising at least 250,000 souls”.

And he comments:

“Dr. Weizmann proposes bringing another million and a half into the country during the next twenty years. All this stuffing to repletion is justified by nothing in the Scripture”.

*

This Introduction is followed by a 700 page history of what Britain did to Palestine after conquering it in 1917. And the opening paragraph is:

“In 1922 Lord Northcliffe, visiting Palestine and perceiving the results of our government there, declared that we were making a second Ireland of that country. What happened in the succeeding years, and even more what has been happening of late, in 1937 and 1938, show that he spoke only too truly. All the mistakes and misdeeds which fed eternal discontent in Ireland and culminated in so much vain bloodshed and destruction there have been reproduced in Palestine. It is almost as though the Irish precedent, far from being kept in mind as a warning, had been remembered as a valuable example of success and was being copied assiduously in every detail.

“But if this imitation of the worst policy is mentioned here, it is but to emphasise the fact that Palestine has less room in it for bad policy than even Ireland had” (p1).

The comparison with Ireland holds good with regard to British treatment of a conquered territory. But there is a point on which comparison is complicated:

“Lord Balfour kept himself determinedly innocent of everything concerning Palestine, and then exploited his own innocence. It was a state of mind that appealed to his peculiar cast of character.

“One piece of general ignorance which helped enormously, and without doubt still helps the Zionist cause, is the popular notion that all Jews were driven into world exile when the Romans took Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple in A.D. 70. As a matter of fact the Jews remained still strong enough in Palestine after the fall of Jerusalem to launch a final revolt sixty years later.

“But that is a very minor point. The primal point is that most Jews were never driven into world-wide exile at all. They left Palestine, long before Roman days, because they wanted to go. Under pressure of hard times or in hope of bettering themselves they quitted the homeland and settled down all over the ancient universe. They were not exiled: they emigrated. They and theirs, when they had the means, liked to come back for visits to Palestine, but they had not the least intention of returning to live there.

“Their own writers... quite recognise the situation.

“The children of Israel {says Mr. Norman Bentinck} were scattered far and wide in all the countries of the Hellenic civilisation... And at Alexandria, the intellectual capital of the world {in the pre-Christian era} they were gathered in hundreds of thousands and occupied two of the five quarters of the city. By their numbers and their commercial prominence they held a position there, at the centre of the Orient, analogous to that which the Jews hold in the metropolis of the New World to-day.

“At the time of the *debacle* {the fall of Jerusalem} writes Mr. Leonard Stein, Palestine did not contain more than a fraction of the Jewish race. Flourishing Jewish communities had long existed in Egypt and in Cyrenaica, in Syria... and in

Mesopotamia, in Italy and Greece. Jews were dispersed long before the collapse of the Jewish State.

“The plain fact is that the vast majority of Jews for more than two thousand years has been satisfied to live outside Palestine. They remained attached to Palestine, at least those who remained attached to it were very attached. But they were not and never have been exiles for an enduring space in any true sense of exile...

“Unfortunately this fact is not widely known. Our own politicians have been the last men to disclose it. They preferred their constituents to think that the Jews had been driven *en masse* from their home and had been impeded *en masse* from returning thither, and that these conditions always prevailed.

“However, let us trace the course of the Jews *in* Palestine. After the final insurrection, the land was laid waste. They were butchered in great numbers and were enslaved. Many of the Palestine Jews endured genuine exile for a while, such as the Arab leaders have suffered in the Seychelles. Under the emperors who followed Hadrian however they were allowed to return, though there was little then to induce them to return. Jerusalem having been made into a Roman city, entitled Aelia Capitolana, and this particular area, their own capital, was forbidden to them. They chose in the main to stay in Alexandria and in the other cities in which they had taken refuge.

“A group of their priests and teachers however never were expelled from Palestine, though driven from this place to that. Eventually they came to rest chiefly in Galilee, where they established rabbinical schools. They were men of strong faith, who when their visible sanctuaries were destroyed, made sanctuaries of their minds... They gained reverential repute throughout the Diaspora, the Greek word generally used to designate the mass of Jewish settlements scattered around the world.

“But with the passage of time their schools declined, and Jewish representation in Palestine grew more tenuous. Whether for a period it survived or vanished altogether is a moot point. No one can be quite sure about what happened in the middle of the Dark Ages...

“During the 15th and 16th centuries the Jews in Jerusalem seem to have varied in number from 250 to 1,500 souls. The expulsion of the Jews in 1492 from the Spanish peninsula accounted for the larger total. Most of the expelled Jews however who came to the Orient went not to Palestine but to Salonika, where they have remained ever since” (29-31).

“There is nothing in all this to disturb any defender of the Arab cause in Palestine to-day. If modern Jewish immigration, in continuation of the old connection, had been properly begun and conducted and had been reasonable in volume, there would have been... probably no Palestine Question and no Arab cause to defend. It is only because this old connection is interpreted after a fashion which challenges the Arab ownership of the country that trouble has arisen and has become endemic.

“That Arab right of ownership should not have had to meet a challenge so groundless...” (33).

*

All of this is, of course, highly offensive to the Zionist cause, which was adopted by the British Empire as it was conquering Palestine in 1917, while stirring up an Arab Rebellion, having suppressed an Irish Rebellion that had needed no foreign stirring up.

No less offensive, in the other direction, is Jeffries' account of his family of origin in his other book:

"I come of that Anglo-Irish stock which nowadays is dwindling away, as the produce of all small workshops dwindles in the modern world. Before long the Anglo-Irish blood will have been disintegrated by the violently applied currents of politics into Irish or into English. My family entered Ireland in the days of Charles I, in the King's army, but the head of it ended by going over to Cromwell, with all the English settlers around Bandon in his following. They remained aloof from the Irish for a full century and a half, and then my great-grandfather married one of them. As a result he was dropped from his grandfather's will. He died young and his widow brought her children up in her faith and changed their name from Gifford or Jeffard—both forms being used in papers—to Jeffries.

"Alliances followed with families of recusant Jacobite stock. The Hickies and the Nagles had been both recusants and Jacobites in their days; the Nagles had gone with James II to St. Germain. My father went further afield for his wife. She was a MacCarthy, of Irish lineage, but from the United States...

"My paternal grandfather brought the family back to England... When life grew difficult in Ireland through agricultural depression, his thoughts reverted to England. I was already in the world by then, but very young" (*Front Everywhere*, 1935, p12).

His English ancestors came to Ireland in the 17th century colonisation, and held themselves apart from the Irish for 150 years. And then, when one of them married a native, he was ostracised by his kind and disinherited by his family.

Can this be true!?! Haven't we been repeatedly told in recent times that the discouragement of mixed marriages came from the Irish side, with the *Ne Temere* Decree of 1907?

Of course it is true. And it was not a mere matter of voluntary personal bigotry. The Colonial Protestant Irish Parliament established on the Williamite conquest in 1691 did not actually make it illegal for the colonists to marry natives, but it deprived them of property rights and political rights if they did so.

But how tactless of Jeffries to remind us of this! And how shamelessly matter-of-fact is his statement that his great-grandfather perverted! (That was the word that was used over many generations for a Protestant who went Catholic.)

Jeffries, as far as I know, settled down in England to be unproblematically English, and was one of the best known journalists of his generation—except for the kink of being a Catholic from a colonial family that went native. It was possibly that kink that made him acutely aware from the start, as a war journalist, about what the British Government was doing with the conquered Middle East. It was he who brought to light, around 1920, the Treaty Britain had made with the Arabs to get them as an ally in the war against Turkey, and the way it was broken. He also brought to light how the Balfour Declaration came about, and how a Jewish nation in Palestine was conjured into diplomatic existence for the Versailles Conference—from which the actual Irish nation was excluded: a fact that he doesn't mention, being no sort of Irish nationalist.

Insofar as there was informal discussion of the Palestine Mandate in Parliament (chiefly the Lords) it was informed by Jeffries' articles.

The Zionist/British colony in Palestine behaved towards the natives in much the same way as Jeffries' ancestors had done in Ireland. But the colony in Ireland was constituted into the Irish

state immediately following the Williamite conquest, while Britain, which had been greatly damaged by the war on Germany and Turkey in which it had expected easy victories, did not feel confident enough to act so rashly with its Jewish colony in Palestine in 1919. The project had to be advanced by deception over thirty years, before being handed over irresponsibly to the United Nations General Assembly for final authorisation. (The General Assembly was an irresponsible body because it had no power whatever to control the implementation of what it had been given exceptional legislative power to authorise.)

Colin Anderson, in *Balfour In The Dock* (Skyscraper Publications, 2017), gives extensive extracts from Jeffries' early letters to the press about Palestine; from his 1923 pamphlet, *The Palestine Deception*; from *Palestine: The Reality*; from his letters dispute with Balfour's niece and biographer, Blanche Dugdale. And it seems that *Palestine: The Reality* has been reprinted for the first time, but I have not seen it.

Jeffries was a journalist on the Conservative *Daily Mail*. The paper that advocated the Zionist cause was the Liberal *Manchester Guardian*. That was as it should be. The *Mail* was *reactionary*; the *Guardian* was *progressive*. The Arab cause was reactionary. Arabs on the whole lived traditional lives in pre-Capitalist economies. The Zionist cause was progressive. Jews on the whole lived in capitalist economy (except for a segment that stood aside to study Scripture), were strongly represented in its most advanced form, financial services, and were to the fore in espousing liberal causes in Gentile societies.

Zionist colonisation would modernise Palestine, so it would. Well, it would: in much the same way that Williamite colonisation modernised Ireland—by becoming Ireland.

"Progress" decreed that the backward Irish (so vividly described by Bishop Berkeley in *A Word To The Wise*) would fall away. But they didn't. And it remains to be seen if the decree of Progress will make itself good on the Palestinians.

What sense is there in being squeamish or sanctimonious about this? Seventy years into the era of the United Nations, the world lives by the law of the jungle. The UN was carefully constructed to ensure that it lacked the power, and even the formal authority, to realise the ideals which it proclaimed. The Great Power veto system in its Executive—the Security Council—gave immunity to the states that were most likely to break its 'laws' from the application of those laws. The actions of a Veto Power cannot even be discussed by the Security Council without the consent of that Power. And, right at the outset, all five Veto Powers acted together to affront even the ideal that was being proclaimed by ordaining the establishment of a Jewish nation-state in Palestine. This followed the precedent of the League of Nations in 1919 which, in the name of national self-determination, adopted the Balfour Declaration for the formation of a Jewish nation-state where there was no Jewish nation. And Balfour himself cheerfully admitted in the early 1920s, in a speech which Jeffries does not seem to have taken notice of, that his Declaration was a breach of the principles of the League, and the principles which Britain had given as its reasons for launching the World War.

Balfour gave as his reason for breaking the rules in favour of the Jews that the Jews were an extraordinary people. Twenty-five years later others gave the reason that an attempt had been made to exterminate the Jews and that therefore they needed a safe haven. (That the haven being given them would only be safe if the Jewish state—based on ongoing, and massive,

colonisation—was enabled to dominate its surroundings militarily was not much discussed.)

In 1919 the safe haven argument was not mentioned. Tsarist Russia was where there had been some anti-Jewish activity during the generation before 1914. But Tsarist Russia had been broken up, and Jews were so prominent in the Bolshevik leadership that the Russian Revolution was seen to be a product of international Jewish conspiracy by many in British governing circles. Churchill described it in those terms in a popular article, and Balfour himself did not disagree.

Jeffries, writing in 1937, did not see any threat to Jewish existence in the world. What he saw was a threat to Arab existence in Palestine—a Jewish threat backed by the British Empire.

The threat to world Jewry was brought about between 1939 and 1941 by an astonishing turn of events in world affairs. That turn of events resulted from the apparently erratic conduct of the British Empire, which was still at that time the world Super-Power.

Jeffries poses a curiously naive question about a blind spot in Zionist vision:

“If Herzl’s fundamental thesis was that persecuted or unenfranchised Jews should get away from their false environment and found a State where they would be by themselves and so be the equals of any men, if this was what Herzl meant, how then could he come to consider Palestine as a spot where such a State could be founded? It was a territory where the Jews could not be self-secure, for the Arabs were already living there in hundreds of thousands. How could Herzl fix his eyes on Palestine then, where conditions for his Sinn Fein ‘ourselves alone’ State were unobtainable?

“The question may well be asked. But it would be difficult for Zionism to provide an answer to it. Nothing is more significant of the character of the Zionist movement than the fact that in those crucial days of the last century it never paid the least attention to the Arabs who peopled the country upon which all its efforts were directed. Not a lift of the Zionist eyebrow seems to have been wasted upon an Arab form.

“The sincere Mr. [Leonard] Stein is one of the few Zionist writers who seems conscious of this shortcoming. He does what he can to rectify it. ‘Where Herzl’, he explains, ‘had spoken of a Charter [from the Sultan] ‘he had not, needless to say, contemplated any eviction of the Arabs of Palestine in favour of the Jews. He was, to judge from his Congress addresses, hardly aware that Palestine had settled inhabitants, and he had, in perfect good faith, omitted the Arabs from his calculations’.

“Was there ever anything more extraordinary than this? Vast plans are made engaging the destinies of a multitude of people, yet the man who engenders these plans never takes the essential first step of surveying the land where he proposes to carry them out. Nor apparently do any of his associates suggest it to him. There might be no Arabs in the world for all the difference it makes to him or to his associates.

“Year by year Zionist Congresses are summoned, and from their platforms and in the corridors of the assembly speakers discourse incessantly about themselves, about champions and about opponents of the cause within the ranks of Jewry, about the dovetailing of ill-fitting factors in their programme, about their hopes and their fears of Gentile help, about their own culture and about their own need for spiritual expansion. Without doubt these were reasonable and respectable topics. When however were they put aside to consider the existence of inhabitants in the land which the Congress members proposed to acquire? When indeed?...

“I cannot see how it can be held that for these years a great number of admittedly intelligent educated men remained ignorant of the presence of the Arabs. If they did remain so ignorant, then it was as bad a case of culpable ignorance as can be imagined... But I do not believe in this ignorance...

“The only confusion then... is that if Zionism was unaware of the Arabs it was because most Zionists perceived an obstacle in the Arabs and did not want to be aware of them” (*Palestine: The Reality*).

But was this so very extraordinary? Was it so out of keeping with the spirit of the age in which Herzl conceived the Zionist project? Did other colonisers never turn a blind eye to the fact that they were colonising a land that was already inhabited?

Jeffries’ use of the term “*culpable ignorance*” displays the cloven hoof peeping out behind the camouflage, demonstrating that, though he was a famous English journalist, it was only a masquerade. “*Culpable ignorance*” is a standard term used in the Catholic teaching of children when preparing them for Confession. It requires you to know what you are evading knowledge of. It debilitates the individual’s capacity for casuistry—though casuistry is alleged by Protestant propaganda to be the hallmark of Catholicism.

As I became aware of the English Reformation as an adaptation of Roman Christianity to the requirements of an absolutely nationalist English State, it struck me that this idea of culpable ignorance was one of the important items that were dropped, and that the casuistry attributed to the Jesuits as dishonesty lay at the heart of the system of English Common Law, and of the culture influenced by it.

The practical resourcefulness of the individual was greatly increased as he was enabled to know and not know simultaneously: to not know what he was doing and yet to do it as if he knew it very well.

In public life it became standard practice. When Margaret Thatcher, interviewed for her television biography, said in reply to some question (about British businessmen spying in Iraq), “*I had no official knowledge of that*”, the interviewer did not bat an eyelid. The meaning was clear. She knew and did not know, and could choose which was to be the case.

On the other hand, when Albert Speer, who was not sentenced to death at the Nuremberg Trials, was being interviewed by Gitta Sereny for a biography she pressed him regarding the extermination camps far away in Poland, in the hinterland of the war in Russia, and he indicated that an inkling that something was going on there might have come to him but that, preoccupied with the exigencies of total war, he did not pursue it, she took that to mean that he knew.

Genocide is a word invented in the 1940s for a practice that had been going on from time immemorial, and that had not lessened in the 19th century when Herzl wrote *The Jewish State*. Sir Charles Dilke boasted in *Greater Britain*, not many years before *The Jewish State*, that the—

“The Anglo-Saxon is the only extirpating race on earth. Up to the commencement of the now inevitable destruction of the Red Indians of Central North America, of the Maoris, and of the Australians by the English colonists, no numerous race had ever been blotted out by an invader...”

Does “*the greatest extirpating race*” differ in meaning from “*the most genocidal race*”?

Greater Britain was not met with a cry of horror and repudiation by Liberal England. Far from it. The book was a best seller, and there was regret that the bigotry of the Nonconformist conscience prevented Dilke, who had been cited in a Divorce action, from succeeding Gladstone.

The final military measure of the prolonged and comprehensive United States genocide, Wounded Knee, happened in the 1890s, and General Pershing, who led the US Army in France in 1918 in the War for Democracy and the Rights of Small Nations, had taken part in it.

And the famous musical comedy about *Oklahoma* in the generation immediately following the ethnic cleansing and the great Land Race was written without embarrassment and is standard Christmas entertainment.

Territory folk should stick together,
Territory folk should all be friends!

Why should they? In the novel there is a hint of the lurking malevolent presence of the ethnically cleansed, but it is dropped in the musical. But can ignorance of what is meant by “*Territory*” be entirely innocent?

Dilke divided the world into “*dear peoples*” and “*cheap peoples*” and indicated that the world would be much improved if the cheap peoples ceased cluttering it up.

Is it likely that Herzl was unaware of how these things were regarded by the civilised world in his time? And is there any evidence that he regarded them otherwise? And is that not the meaning of the *blind spot*?

Herzl visited Palestine in 1898. He was not blind to the existence of the Arabs. He just saw them in a certain light. He saw them according to the conventional civilised wisdom of his time.

When did this wisdom become problematical?

It is hard to say. It was entirely reputable in 1914 to say that the extermination of inferior peoples was not only permissible but was necessary to the cause of Progress. H.G. Wells, the famous and influential liberal ideologist, insisted on it.

In the course of the War, however—with Germany, outgunned and cut off from the food and raw materials of the world by the Royal Navy’s Blockade—its astonishing resistance, year after year, which was ruining Britain’s plans, was held to be explicable only by access to some power beyond the normality of things: a power of Evil. Wells himself set out to discover in the personality of Germans which he had rather admired before the War, insidious forms of malevolence which had previously been concealed from him. There was a spurious revival of Christianity in Millenarian form when the situation became desperate, and that desperation inspired Parry to make a memorable war anthem out of Blake’s poem, *Jerusalem*. The professional war-propagandists at Wellington House made great play with their discovery of the German Corpse Factory—and boasted after the War about how they invented it. And Turkey—the “sick man of Europe”—proved almost as hard to defeat as the Germans, despite Russia’s success in bringing about a Christian insurrection within the Ottoman State. The Turks managed to suppress the insurrection, while at the same time inflicting severe damage on British invasions both in Gallipoli and Mesopotamia. Not much moral propaganda could be made of Turkey’s defensive action against what were clearly foreign invasions, but suppression of the Armenian Insurrection was depicted as a wanton attempt to destroy Christianity.

Finally the United States saved Britain by joining in the war against Germany for its own reasons and brought with it a web of disconnected idealism that had to be worked in with the British propaganda. This gave rise to the formation of the League of Nations by the Versailles Conference. The League purported to be a new world order in which all nations would be equal. The world was no longer to be after 1919 what it had been until 1914.

Elaborate pretences spun by the grandiloquent propaganda of powerful states which have just won a world war obviously count for something with public opinion, even though it does not need a very close look to see their hollowness. Japan, a victorious ally, was refused a declaration of racial equality. Ireland, which had elected an independent Government, had its delegates locked out of the Conference. Sir Maurice Hankey, the senior servant of the British State, who was uneasy about foisting the responsibility for the War on Germany because he had himself taken part in British preparations for war on Turkey, took the pretence of the establishment of a new world order so seriously that he was preparing to leave his job as Cabinet Secretary to become Secretary of the League, and had to be told not to be silly. The Empire would remain the thing. The League would be ancillary to it.

Two things demonstrated the falseness of the League from the start: exclusion of the Irish delegates from the Conference, and inclusion of Zionist delegates as representatives of a virtual Jewish State in Palestine where there were as yet no Jews capable of sustaining a state.

Zionist historians naturally do not draw attention to this. The League under British direction would facilitate their colonising and state-building activities. Irish historians have chosen not to dwell on it for very different reasons: their minds are not their own.

It is inconvenient in this era of the United Nations and the European Union to have a mind that is not organised by myth and patronage to see the Emperor’s clothes that are not there.

My mother-in-law was a Viennese Jew who escaped Hitler by getting to Palestine by way of Zionist networks. But in Palestine she behaved as an immigrant, not a colonist. And, like Jeffries’ ancestor, she married a native.

Colonists who marry natives are, naturally, hated and despised by the colony. They are regarded as subversives by the colony, and rightly so. Long after the event, when the event has been accomplished thoroughly, a kind of sentimentality may set in, and they might come to be seen in a false light as pioneers of individualist, or cosmopolitan, humanism. That is beginning to be the case in United States culture—Hollywood. But the light in which it is presented is false, and it must remain so until the civilising colonisation of North America is presented as genocide. And when will that be? At the point of infinity, as Kant used to say about certain things.

The human substance that made the United States was racist and genocidal. America could not have happened otherwise.

The dynamic force that made America was the authentically religious development within the essentially political Reformation of Henry VIII, Biblicalist Puritanism, and that crossed the Atlantic in leaky boats in order to be free. Henry broke with Rome for the purpose of establishing England as an absolute national sovereignty: an independent and tightly organised Empire disconnected from the sprawling, variegated European body known as *The Empire*. And the Puritans crossed the ocean in order to be free to enact the *Book of Joshua*. And, during the brief triumph of Puritanism at home in England,

Cromwell's Secretary of State, Milton the poet, declared that it was England's duty to *teach the nations how to live*.

(It is interesting that half a millennium later England is again disentangling itself from Europe, which it had joined in order to subvert.)

The Zionist event is not yet an accomplished fact. It is very far from accomplishment. It could not go about its business as the posterity of the Pilgrim Fathers did. The Great Powers that enabled the Zionists to begin their work had to impose certain conditions on the manner in which they went about it because of other irons that they had in the fire.

The Jewish State is not yet in being. There is a Jewish state power in Palestine but it is without borders. It refuses to define borders. It is a work-in-progress. Progress towards what? It would be inexpedient to say. But certainly nothing short of Biblical borders—whatever they might be.

Hitler aspired to colonise the Ukraine, save it from Communism, and make better use of it than the Ukrainians were doing. The Zionist organisation aspired to do likewise with Palestine.

Zionism was not a response to Nazism. If there was a causal connection between them, it was the other way about. Zionist colonisation of Palestine, with a view to taking it over as the site of a Jewish State, was already in progress when the Nazi Party was formed. And, when Hitler came to Office, Zionist colonisation of Palestine on British authority, over-riding Palestinian concerns, had been going on for more than a dozen years. And, when he came to Office, he co-operated with Zionists in the business of colonising Palestine.

Could all of that have played no part in his assumption that what he aspired to do in the Ukraine was reasonably in accordance with the way of the world under British hegemony in the era of the League of Nations?

The Israeli Prime Minister is at present attempting to indict Poland for Jewish genocide because extermination camps were situated in conquered Poland. The Polish Government, which is out of favour with the EU, rejects the indictment, asserts the indisputable fact that the camps were run by the German authorities, and puts the large number of Polish victims of the Nazi conquest on a par with the Jewish victims.

Now it is not accidental that the main extermination camps were sited in Poland. It is improbable in the extreme that such camps could have been established in Germany—and not chiefly because it was in Poland that the millions of Jews existed.

There was very little authoritative British writing on the Jewish Question in the War. The little I know of is an *Oxford War Pamphlet* by James Parkes, *The Jewish Question*. It distinguishes between two kinds of Anti-Semitism: Anti-Semitism-of-fact, and Anti-Semitism incited by State propaganda. The former kind is treated as occurring spontaneously where the Jewish percentage of the population rises above a certain level, and it is not regarded as being eradicable by propaganda against it (a view shared by Zionism). Parkes proposed that in European states after the War there should in effect be a quota system for Jews to keep them under the danger level.

In England itself this has been done, without legislation, by authoritative institutions in civil society, ever since the

Jews were readmitted in 1650 following their expulsion a few hundred years earlier. And there are certain British classics of Anti-Semitism that are held sacred, no matter how vehemently Anti-Semitism might be being denounced at a particular moment (Walter Scott, Shakespeare, T.S. Eliot). Britain has mastered the art of applying general principles to others and excluding itself from them.

A Jewish writer has referred in extreme terms to the element of anti-Semitism in English public life:

“Its wantonness is not flaunted, it is true, like the excesses of the German Nazis or the Polish Endeks. It lies icily beneath the shining hardness of bureaucratic logic. It is overlaid with the softness of English colonial skill—but, as we shall discover, it is in no sense less intense, and fully as implacable, as the open anti-Semitism of the Nazis on the Continent...”

This assertion is made in *The Rape Of Palestine* by William B. Ziff, published by Longman's (New York and Toronto, 1938). Longman's also published Jeffries' *Palestine Reality*, but in the copy I have seen it was the London branch. I don't know if Ziff's book was also published in London and Jeffries' book was also published in New York.

I gather that, when there was a demand for a reprint of *Palestine Reality*, Longman's refused to do it, and threw the copyright open. But the British copyright library does not show that there was any reprint until last year in the United States. It seems that at the start of the World War Jeffries went to Spain and there is no information about him after that.

The Spanish Civil War ended as Britain was launching its second World War of the half-century. The Irish state declared itself neutral in Britain's war, and dared Churchill to make good his insistence that Ireland was still under Crown authority and had no right to remain at peace when the King was at war. This denial of Britain's right to enlist Ireland in its World War was spun by the British propaganda into a denial that there was any World War. Ireland made itself ready to resist a British attempt to force it into the War. That state of readiness was called The Emergency, but the British propaganda held that The Emergency was what the Irish state called the World War: that there was a strict Irish censorship of news so that the Irish did not know that there was a World War going on. This has become a historical fact of British democratic life. It featured as a question in *Mastermind*: “*What was the Second World War called in Ireland? The Emergency*”. A whole bevy of Professors underwrote it as a fact—of which I recall on the spur of the moment Feargal McGarry and Brian Girvin.

If I wasn't so old that I hadn't read about the World War in the papers at the time, in the heart of nationalist Ireland, I suppose I would have taken it to be a fact that we had denied the existence of the World War.

The Irish state asserted its neutrality and maintained it. And the Fianna Fail Government had resisted Fine Gael pressure to become partisan on Franco's side in the Spanish Civil War, recognising the Franco regime as legitimate only after it had established its authority in fact. It adopted the old-fashioned view that it was the business of the Spanish people to decide what kind of State they should have. In holding this view it was probably influenced by the Irish Civil War in which it had been defeated in 1922-23. That Irish Civil War was fought at the behest of a foreign Power, the British Empire, and the victor was armed by Britain. But there was nothing at issue between

the contending parties about the kind of state they wanted. The only issue was whether to submit to a British ultimatum and replace the Republic which they had established with a state which acknowledged Crown authority. As a Civil War it was spurious, and therefore the British-backed victors did not quite know what to make of their victory.

The Irish Government did not interfere with the conduct of the Spanish conflict, though groups of Irishmen went to Spain to take part—Fine Gaelers to support Franco's rebellion and Republicans to support the elected Government of the Republic in Madrid.

The Fine Gael/Irish Christian Front group were the more numerous but under battle conditions the less useful, and it came home at the end. The smaller Republican group was more in earnest and more capable and those who were captured were interned. One of the Irish Republicans, Frank Ryan, was put under sentence of death. De Valera, recognising the Franco regime as legitimate under the basic rule of these things, interceded with Franco over Ryan.

In the Summer of 1940, France, having declared war on Germany under British encouragement, having lost the battle, made terms with Germany. Britain took its army home and condemned France for betraying it by making terms with the enemy—but France had nowhere to retreat to, and neither did it have a world-dominating Navy.

Franco released Frank Ryan into France, which had become friendly territory, and Ryan was passed on through France to Berlin. The following year Ryan, a socialist Republican, linked up in Germany with Sean Russell, an orthodox Republican who had gone to Berlin to seek arms for the IRA, and agreed to return to Ireland with him, but died on the way in the German submarine that was transporting them.

This incident has been made much of by propaganda activists of "The Emergency" school, such as Feargal McGarry. If Jeffries had gone to Spain to become a Francoite Fascist, I would expect them to have ferreted it out. They have acute noses for a hint of anything that might be discreditable to nationalist Ireland in any shade of its variety.

(As to Franco Fascism: I saw it when I was taken there on a package holiday when it was cheap and popular with British and Irish holiday-makers. I am not much of a holiday-maker so when I found myself there I looked around me. I had the idea that Spain was a Fascist State of the Catholic Clericalist kind—an established category at the time. But the first thing I noticed was that the priests were certainly not running the country. They had nothing like the bold self-confidence of priests in Irish cities then (though not in the Slieve Luacra countryside where I grew up). I subsequently observed them in Barcelona, Valencia and Malaga and I concluded that, while they had a place in the regime, it was far from being a dominant place, and that the regime consisted of a combination of functional elements of the kind praised by Churchill in his homage to Mussolini but much more competently conducted by Franco. I decided that it was time Fascism began to be treated historically as a phase of European history, instead of polemically as if it was still an issue in live politics.)

And, insofar as it was a live issue, it was in the form of a complex of irrationality which disabled contemporary European politics, especially in Germany and France, by making it impossible to deal with it as a phase of historical development with its sufficient reason in the Great War and particularly in the chaotic Settlement imposed by Britain.)

When you come across a book with the title *The Rape Of Palestine* you assume it is an indictment of Zionism. Ziff's book is strongly Zionist. It appeared at the same time as Jeffries' *Palestine Reality* and it is as well written, but it is based on a fundamentally different conception of the world.

I was prepared for it by a discussion with a Jewish in-law in Vienna, who had lived in Vienna all through the War. He told me that Britain had taken Palestine from the Jews in 1919. He was a perfectly rational property-owning citizen of Vienna, who took part in public life, and was so far removed from personal bigotry that he married a Christian, but it was a historical fact for him that Britain took Palestine from the Jews in 1919.

Britain took it from the Turks. But it did not belong to the Turks, though it had lived peacefully under Turkish rule for centuries (and has never lived peacefully since). When Britain took it from the Turks and did not hand it back to its owners, it stole it. And the fact that few of its owners lived there any longer was of no consequence.

Britain did not make war on Germany to save the Jews. It was only after the War that the Jews became the central issue in the War. But, if Britain had not brought about the German/Polish War, or if it had actually fought the war which it precipitated, it is improbable that Jews would have suffered as they did.

From 1934 to 1938 it had collaborated with Hitler in breaking the Versailles Treaty of which it was the guardian. It subverted the Czech state in the Fall of 1938 and gave the Sudetenland to Hitler. Then, in March 1939, it gave Poland the illusion of a military alliance, with France in tow. Germany was put within a military encirclement. But Hitler, whose Intelligence told him that Britain was not making preparations to fight along with the Poles, broke the encirclement by striking at Poland.

An Oxford War Pamphlet described the Polish Guarantee as an encirclement of Germany and said it was a good thing, provided its implications were carried through. But in September Britain stood idly by, leaving Poland to fight alone. It declared war but did not fight. Eight months later Germany responded to the declaration of war, won the first battle, and let Britain take its Army home. Britain, under no necessity of making a settlement because of its world-dominating Navy, set about "spreading the war" in order to get others to fight it. This was the context of a great expansion of German power, which was militarily defensive. Only Britain could end the War. Even the German attack on Russia in June 1941 had a defensive character: if the Russian state was destroyed, Britain would call off the war. And no doubt it would.

If Jews were saved on any large scale in the War, it was Russia that saved them. And why not? Wasn't Bolshevik Russia an instrument of the International Jewish Conspiracy? Hadn't Churchill himself said so!

Hitler's Jewish policies did not figure in the British decision (effectively taken in March 1939) to make war on Germany. The extermination of Jewry was not in contemplation by anybody as a realistic possibility at that time—not even by the SS as far as I could discover. It became a realistic prospect only in the context of the invasion of Russia. The British Government soon got to know it was a fact in progress, but chose to make little of it.

Britain never threw the Empire, in which there were great empty spaces, open to Jewish immigration. Maybe its colonists would not have let it. It never even threw itself open to any Jews who could reach it. But it is Ireland that is charged with anti-Semitism by historians currying favour.

After the War the Jewish Question became the supreme issue of the War, in the light of which all other awkward questions withered.

About a generation ago T.P. O'Mahony suggested that nationalist Ireland should make of the British-induced Famine (in which an earnestly under-counted number of millions died and were lost to Ireland) the great thing that Israel had made of the Jewish exterminations. He was jumped on by Professor Keogh of Cork University and seriously reprimanded.

The German extermination of Jews during about four years of total war, in a war launched by Britain on Germany, is The Holocaust. During about half of the period, the civilian population of German cities was under systematic bombardment under the method of area-bombing designed to destroy the industrial workforce. But the great question put to them is why they did not find out what was being done to the Jews in Poland and stop it. And the consensus over the years seems to have been tending towards the view that virtually all Germans were perpetrators.

On Radio Éireann, very occasionally, one hears questioning of what Colonial Jewry is doing in Occupied Arab lands. More than once I have heard an ordinary decent citizen of Israel say of the Palestinians: God gave this land to us, so why don't they all just go away! And I have never heard a secularist response from the interviewer.

Ziff's *Rape Of Palestine* has been adopted into the culture of the United Nations, nor formally but effectively. The Irish Nationalist claim to the Six Counties is a very slight thing compared with the Mosaic claim of the Jews on Palestine, but it is denounced as "irredentist", on the understanding that irredentism is very bad indeed.

This duplicity needs to be resolved. The United Nations, and EU, superstructures of make-believe are brittle and must soon vanish at a touch, like Logi's circle of fire around Brunnhilde.

Of Anti-Semitism of fact there was little in Germany, the Jewish population being numerically small. There was much of it in Poland. But it was not Polish Anti-Semitism that organised the Camps. The Poles had no authority in Poland just then. They lay under German oppression themselves and suffered severely. Hitler's object was to exterminate the leading stratum of a nation which he judged to have acted perversely in March-September 1939.

(Hitler in 1934 had made a Treaty with Poland, recognising the Borders set by the Versailles Conference: a thing which the Weimar democracy had refused to do. One issue was left aside for future settlement: the German city of Danzig, which was adjacent to the East Prussia region of the German state and which was not under actual Polish Government, but a kind of League of Nations protectorate. When Hitler, in March 1939, proposed the transfer of Danzig to East Prussia, Britain offered to Poland a military alliance with itself, and France followed suit. The new Polish Government entered this alliance, breaking its Treaty with Germany, and thus subjected Germany to military encirclement.)

The extermination of Jews was undertaken systematically on the territory of the Poles when, after June 1941, it was the hinterland of the German/Russian War, and the future of Poland was very uncertain indeed. (In the Summer of 1939, having made an enemy of Germany, Poland refused to make an alliance with Russia. And, as the Polish state collapsed in the face of German invasion and Anglo-French inaction in

September 1939, Russia re-occupied the territory it had lost to Poland in the War of 1920.)

The Poles, themselves under a kind of selective genocide, had no sympathy to spare for Jews who were being exterminated in their midst. But, more than that, the Polish peasantry, deprived of social leadership, had no reason to suppress a degree of Anti-Semitic satisfaction about the fate of the Jews.

On the other hand the underground Polish State, which lived a very precarious existence, investigated the Extermination Camps and sent an emissary, Jan Karski, on a dangerous journey to London and Washington with evidence of it—only to have it disregarded.

In Poland, as far as I could discover, there was very little collaboration with the Germans—and I suppose it was not wanted. In other countries—in the Baltic Republics liberated from Communism—there was active collaboration, and in places Jews were killed as a popular sport.

The great upsurge of Anti-Semitism in Central Europe between the Wars was not Hitler's work—it was only his medium of existence. Its ultimate cause was the war on Germany launched by Britain in August 1914, which Britain fought as a World War, that was both a war of conquest against German and Turkish possessions, and a war to replace Empire by nationality in some cases, though not in the case of Ireland. The most disastrous thing for the Jews was the deliberate breaking-up of the Hapsburg Empire and the fall of the Tsarist Empire.

The Jews were the commercial class of the Hapsburg Empire. That Empire was not broken up by the nationalist revolts within it. It was destroyed cold-bloodedly by Britain and France in the moment of victory; and nation-states whose nationalist development lay in the future were decreed into existence. The Jews as an international body of the destroyed Empire occupied places that had to be filled by nationalist developments, and they had to be cleared away.

A similar thing happened in states that sprang into being through the collapse of Tsarism. The charge of Anti-Semitism against the Tsarist state is grossly over-stated, and the upsurge of Anti-Semitism that accompanied the formation of nation states is scarcely mentioned. There are particular Jewish accounts of it, and a general account of it was published in the late 1930s: Oscar Janowsky: *A People At Bay. The Jewish Problem In East-Central Europe*. London 1938. But historical accounts do not suit Zionism, with its ongoing colonisation and ethnic cleansing in Palestine. What happened in Europe in 1919-45 must be made unthinkable. And Europe is content to have it made the unthinkable consequence of a force that somehow arose outside human history and intruded, and therefore cannot have its history written.

And the great ethnic cleansing, verging on genocide, that was enacted in 1945-6 under United Nations auspices, and by which Europe was settled down—what is to be done about that but pretend it never happened! □

To buy books published by Athol Books,

The Aubane Historical Society,

And

The Belfast Historical and Educational Society

Go to

www.atholbooks.org

(Please use Firefox, Safari, Chrome or similar).

The Times and the Balfour Declaration—Both Zionist and Anti-Semitic

By Manus O’Riordan

To mark the centenary of the Balfour Declaration, *The Times* (UK) celebrated its own role this past October 28, with an article headed: “Letter that heralded the birth of Israel: The combined efforts of *The Times* and Lloyd George’s government paved the way to a Jewish state.” Ben Macintyre related:

“On November 9, 1917, this newspaper published one of the most important documents in history. It was not a news story but a verbatim copy of a 67-word letter written by the foreign secretary Lord Balfour to the Second Baron Rothschild. The letter declared: ‘His Majesty’s Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object.’ Rothschild was authorised to pass the letter on to the Zionist Federation. The Balfour Declaration gave the Zionist movement the backing of the world’s greatest power, paving the way for mass Jewish immigration and the birth of Israel in 1948.”

“The impact of that fateful letter in *The Times* is well known. Largely forgotten, however, and still partly mysterious, is the role played by this newspaper leading up to that moment. *The Times* did not just report the government’s support for a Jewish homeland, it used its power, influence, and letters page to encourage the declaration, and stymie the anti-Zionist lobby in this country. (By what was meant the **Jewish anti-Zionist lobby** - MO’R). While the Jewish community in Britain broadly supported the establishment of a homeland, many long-established Anglo-Jewish families were strongly opposed to Zionism, saw no need for an independent Jewish state, and viewed religion and national identity as entirely separate concepts. These anti-Zionists were strongly represented in the Conjoint Committee, an alliance of the Anglo-Jewish Association, formed in 1871 to combat antisemitism, and the Board of Deputies, the body officially representing the Jewish community. Another vigorous and influential opponent of Zionism was Edwin Montagu, the secretary of state for India and the only Jew in the cabinet. In a memorandum, Montagu wrote, with some prescience: ‘The policy of His Majesty’s government is antisemitic in result and will prove a rallying ground for antisemites in every country of the world.’”

“Ranged on the opposing side of the argument were the Zionists, Rothschild, the prime minister David Lloyd George, Lord Balfour, the charismatic Russian-born Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, and *The Times*. In a private letter, the *Times* foreign editor Henry Steed told the paper’s proprietor, Lord Northcliffe: ‘I have been doing all I can to help the Zionists, and so far the Editor has given me a pretty free hand.’ Steed’s letter, held in the archives of *The Times*, deplored ‘the strange reluctance of our government to come out frankly in favour of the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine’, while noting that Lloyd George and Balfour were ‘in favour of our giving the Zionist Jews a general declaration of encouragement and sympathy’. Montagu, Steed noted, ‘has been opposing it tooth and nail’.”

“Support for the Zionists, in the government and *The Times*’ editorial offices, was based largely on wartime

geopolitical calculations. Britain was locked in a desperate battle with Germany, and a statement of support for Zionism was seen, in Balfour’s words, as ‘*extremely useful propaganda both in Russia and America*’. Jews had been prominent in the Bolshevik Revolution, and it was hoped that a pro-Jewish stance might encourage Russia to keep fighting on the Eastern Front, while undermining German-Jewish support for the war and stimulating increased financial contributions to the war effort from the Jewish-American community. ‘I am convinced that it is of immense importance for the future of the Empire that we should enlist on our side the active sympathy of the great mass of Jewry’, wrote Steed. A statement encouraging Zionism could help win the war.”

“Knowing that support for such a pro-Zionist declaration was growing, British anti-Zionists decided to get their pitch in first. The English Zionist Federation was due to hold a conference on Sunday, May 20, 1917. So three days earlier, in an attempt to spike the Zionists’ guns, the Conjoint Committee sent a letter to *The Times* entitled Views of Anglo-Jewry, attacking the idea of a separate Jewish state. ‘The establishment of a Jewish nationality in Palestine, founded on this theory of homelessness, must have the effect throughout the world of stamping the Jews as strangers in their native lands’, wrote joint-presidents David Lindo Alexander and Claude Montefiore. ‘The proposal to invest the Jewish settlers in Palestine with certain special rights in excess of those enjoyed by the rest of the population . . . would prove a veritable calamity for the whole Jewish people’.”

“The letter did not appear in *The Times* the next day. Nor the day after. When the Zionist conference went ahead as planned, federation chairman Chaim Weizmann took the stage and announced: ‘I am authorised to state in this assembly that His Majesty’s government is ready to support our plans (for) the creation of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.’ The letter from the anti-Zionists was held back for four more days. It was finally published on May 24 but in the wake of Weizmann’s announcement it now seemed petty and irrelevant. Moreover, in the next edition, *The Times* published no fewer than three letters rebutting its assertions: from Lord Rothschild, Chief Rabbi Joseph Hertz, and Weizmann himself, regretting that ‘there should be even two Jews (opposed to) a hope which has sustained the Jewish nation through 2,000 years of exile, persecution and temptation’. The argument had been won by the Zionists, the presidents of the Conjoint Committee subsequently resigned, and the stage was set for the publication of the Balfour Declaration the following November. A century later, the conflict over the founding of a Jewish homeland still rages, but one of its earliest and most significant battles was fought out not in the Middle East but on the letters page of *The Times*.”

With the Balfour Declaration promising Palestine to the Zionists, Rothschild had been fully won over - in the fourth year of what James Connolly had categorised as Britain’s “War upon the German Nation” (See www.marxists.org/archive/connolly/1914/08/waronman.htm for Connolly’s full article) - and would finally nail his colours to the mast in support of Britain in that War. For it is also a fact that, back in July 1914,

Rothschild had been frantic in his efforts to stymie the anti-German hysteria that was building up to Britain's declaration of that war. And in those days, both Northcliffe and Steed had exchanged very different commentaries on Rothschild and Jewry than they would in working for the Balfour Declaration. In his 1998 book *The Pity of War*, Niall Ferguson twice highlighted how Rothschild had been the object of vicious anti-Semitic denunciation by this *Times* duo on account of his opposition to Britain's impending declaration of War:

"The Rothschilds strove vainly to avert an Anglo-German conflict, and for their pains were accused by the foreign editor of *The Times*, Henry Wickham Steed, of 'a dirty German-Jewish international financial attempt to bully us into advocating neutrality.'" (p 32). And again: "On 31 July Rothschild implored *The Times* to tone down its leading articles, which were 'hounding the country into war'; but both the foreign editor Henry Wickham Steed and his proprietor Lord Northcliffe regarded this as 'a dirty German-Jewish international financial attempt to bully us into advocating neutrality' and concluded that 'the proper answer would be a still stiffer leading article tomorrow'. 'We dare not stand aside', Saturday's leader duly thundered." (p 195).

The Times knew exactly what the Balfour Declaration would mean for the indigenous Arab 90 percent majority population of Palestine. "*The Land of Israel for the People of Israel*" was a slogan that left no doubt. Under the heading of "JEWISH SOLDIERS' MARCH", *The Times* would report on February 5, 1918:

"Four companies of the Jewish Regiment returned to London from their training camp and marched through the streets amid scenes of enthusiasm. Interest was not confined to the Jewish inhabitants of the East End, for along the whole of the route the men, whose sturdy physique and martial bearing were favourably commented on, were heartily welcomed. The 426 men and 12 officers slept in the Tower of London overnight, and when they emerged, headed by the band of the Coldstream Guards, were greeted with an outburst of cheering. The cheers were repeated as they went by way of the Minorities, Aldgate, Fenchurch Street, and Lombard Street to the Mansion House. As the soldiers, commanded by Colonel J H Patterson, marched past the Mansion House the Lord Mayor took the salute from the balcony. The march was continued eastward until a halt was called at the Pavilion Theatre in Mile End, where the Mayor and Mayoress of Stepney and members of Stepney Borough Council had assembled. The march resumed to Camperdown House, where the men were inspected by Lieutenant-General Sir Francis Lloyd. Sir Francis said that he saw a battalion that would do great credit to itself and the country. It was by no means the first effort that the great Jewish population of Great Britain had made in the patriotic defence of this country, but they had concentrated on it a special effort which would long be remembered. He wished the men God-speed and the fortunes of battle, and expressed the hope that honours might be showered on them. Luncheon was served. Across the room in bold Hebrew characters hung the motto '*The Land of Israel for the People of Israel*'. Mr Joseph Cowen presided in the unavoidable absence of Lord Rothschild. The company included many prominent Jews, among whom was Lieutenant Jabotinsky, whose idea of a separate unit for Jews took the form of the Zionist Mule Corps in Egypt, and has now received a commission in the '*Judeans*', as the new regiment is popularly called. The Chief Rabbi gave the men his benediction, reminding them that every Jewish soldier held the honour of his people in his hands. They would, he said, be worthy successors of the ancient Jewish warriors - the Maccabeans. (Cheers)"

Ah yes, Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky MBE. No better Zionist leader to make even more explicit the full meaning of those "*bold Hebrew characters*". In 1923, Jabotinsky published *The Iron Wall*, an uncompromising exposition of his Zionist programme for the expropriation of the indigenous Palestinian Arabs:

"There can be no discussion of voluntary reconciliation between us and the Arabs, not now, and not in the foreseeable future. All well-meaning people, with the exception of those blind from birth, understood long ago the complete impossibility of arriving at a voluntary agreement with the Arabs of Palestine for the transformation of Palestine from an Arab country to a country with a Jewish majority. Each of you has some general understanding of the history of colonisation. Try to find even one example when the colonisation of a country took place with the agreement of the native population. Such an event has never occurred. The natives will always struggle obstinately against the colonists - and it is all the same whether they are cultured or uncultured. The comrades-in-arms of Cortez or Pizarro conducted themselves like brigands. The Redskins fought with uncompromising fervour against both evil and good-hearted colonisers. The natives struggled because any kind of colonisation anywhere at anytime is inadmissible to any native people."

"Any native people view their country as their national home, of which they will be complete masters. They will never voluntarily allow a new master. So it is for the Arabs. Compromisers among us try to convince us that the Arabs are some kind of fools who can be tricked with hidden formulations of our basic goals. I flatly refuse to accept this view of the Palestinian Arabs. They have the precise psychology that we have. They look upon Palestine with the same instinctive love and true fervour that any Aztec looked upon his Mexico or any Sioux upon his prairie. Each people will struggle against colonisers until the last spark of hope that they can avoid the dangers of conquest and colonisation is extinguished. The Palestinians will struggle in this way until there is hardly a spark of hope."

"It matters not what kind of words we use to explain our colonisation. Colonisation has its own integral and inescapable meaning understood by every Jew and by every Arab. Colonisation has only one goal. This is in the nature of things. To change that nature is impossible. It has been necessary to carry on colonisation against the will of the Palestinian Arabs and the same condition exists now... Therefore, a voluntary agreement is inconceivable. All colonisation, even the most restricted, must continue in defiance of the will of the native population. Therefore, it can continue and develop only under the shield of force which comprises an Iron Wall through which the local population can never break through. This is our Arab policy. To formulate it any other way would be hypocrisy."

Following its success with Balfour's letter to Rothschild in November 1917, had *The Times* reversed the virulent anti-Semitism that characterised its July 1914 attack on Rothschild's opposition to Britain's War on Germany? For let us not forget how British imperialist war hysteria, driven by *The Times*, had impacted on Jews, not only in Britain, but also in Ireland. Indeed, the anti-Semitic hysteria of the British Establishment had its greatest impact in Ulster. In his *Jews in Twentieth Century Ireland* (1998), Dermot Keogh brought to light the fact that Sir Otto Jaffe, Belfast's only Jewish Lord Mayor, who had held that office in both 1899 and 1904, was compelled to resign his seat on Belfast City Council and flee Ulster in 1916. Despite the fact that this Life-President of the Belfast Jewish Congregation had lived in Ulster for over sixty years, that he

had funded the establishment of a physiology laboratory in Queen's University Belfast and that he had both a son and a nephew serving in the British army that was waging war on Germany, his own German birth now made Jaffe a marked man among his fellow-Unionists.

Russian-born but Newry-reared Leonard Abrahamson observed in 1914 that "*the virus of anti-Semitic feeling, born of ignorance and fostered by unrelenting prejudice, still courses in the veins of numerous - if not the majority - of Britishers*". And Leonard's own father became the target of such anti-Semitism. Never in his life had he had the remotest connection with Germany. But this mere fact was not to spare David Abrahamson from being subjected to the "anti-German" attacks of Ulster's Empire Loyalists in both Newry and Bessbrook. Leonard further observed: "*Since the outbreak of the war, the belief generally rampant that all Jews are Germans, has given rise to many unpleasant and reprehensible occurrences. Not only has this erroneous notion gained ground amongst the uneducated but it has been fostered by the repeated linking in several journals - amongst others, the 'Times' - of the term Jew and German*".

There is nothing to suggest that there was any change in how *The Times* viewed Jews in the UK's own midst. Nor should we forget that the Arthur Balfour of November 1917, who would declare his Government's readiness to impose mass Jewish immigration on a Palestine newly occupied by Britain, was the same Balfour who, as Home Secretary, had introduced the Aliens Act of 1905, to appease a mass anti-Semitic campaign directed against those Jewish immigrants to Britain who had been fleeing the oppression and pogroms of Tsarist Russia. As far as Balfour and *The Times* were concerned, Jewish immigrants in Britain continued to be viewed, with distaste, as an unwelcome alien body. Let them go to Palestine!

As an example of how *The Times* continued to view Jewish immigrants in London's East End, let us see how it reported - and did not demur from - the characterisation of them as an "alien type" that acted "*in a way unworthy of men and more nearly approaching the ways of the lower animals*". "ALIENS IN AIR RAIDS" was the heading given to the following report published by *The Times* on February 2, 1918:

"A London coroner held an inquest yesterday on eight of the 14 victims of the panic which occurred on Monday night at the entrance to a shelter following the maroon warning of an air raid. The names of the killed were: Woolf Biber, 70; Isidore Schagrin, 75; Louis Belitsky, 5; Esther Harris, 60; Marx Green, 7; Rosa Green, 14; Cassie Bodie, 5; and Abraham Hankin, six months. The coroner said that the deaths appeared to have been due to panic on the part of persons who might be called foreigners, or who were of foreign extraction. One could have hoped that people living in London would have the self-confidence and control to act very differently, and not in a way unworthy of men and more nearly approaching the ways of the lower animals."

"A police superintendent said that shortly after the discharge of warning rockets some people - aliens chiefly - thinking that these were bombs, lost their heads and rushed for the shelter. In the rush some dropped articles they were carrying, and when they stooped to pick them up they were knocked over. He was amazed at the number of strong, able-bodied young men, nearly all aliens or of alien type, and it was these people who were largely responsible for the trouble. Continuing, the witness said: '*I am proud to say that we have not had the slightest trouble with English people, but we have very great trouble with the foreign element. We cannot overcome these people unless we have a whole army of police stationed at the shelters.*'"

"The coroner remarked that one effect of these raid shelter rushes was to increase the number of deaths among children, who caught a chill. "What I do," he added, 'is to go to bed. If I am killed, I am killed, and I am in bed all ready to lay out.' One witness said that his wife, who was killed, went to the shelter because she was nervous. He stayed at home. The coroner: And thereby saved your life. In the case of the six-months-old child of a Russian, the mother said the baby was knocked out of her arms and she lost it. It was stated that property found on the bodies included 384 £1 notes, 23 £5 notes, three £10 notes, a £50 war savings certificate, and some Russian bank deposit receipts. A verdict of 'death by suffocation' was returned in every case."

That *Times* report spoke for itself. □

(Continued from p. 24)

I knew her from Hollywood - "I'm visiting my husband," she answered, completely non-plussed. "Who is your husband?" "Sterling, of course." Now the secret was out.

Sterling Hamilton had joined my unit shortly before but I had not realised that he and the well-known film star, Sterling Hayden, were one and the same person. Neither had I known he had married Madeleine Carroll. But that wasn't all, by a long shot, for how had Madeleine managed to get to Cologne, which was then the front line where the only thing separating us from the guns of the Wehrmacht was the river Rhine?

"It was easy", Madeleine explained. "I was General Eisenhower's dinner guest a few days ago in Paris. The General praised all I had done for the Red Cross and gallantly asked whether he could accommodate me in any way. 'Yes, General', I said, 'let me go visit my husband for a day. He's in Luxembourg.' And, just imagine, the General arranged for his car to be put at my disposal. But when I arrived in Luxembourg, Sterling was gone - which is all your fault!"

"You don't mean to say that you drove to the front in the Supreme Commander's five-star car?" I asked. "Exactly that. I talked his driver round. Hopefully no one finds out - the poor boy would get twenty years."

Just as unforgettable as this conversation was the evening meal that followed it. There were about ten of us at the table. Sterling Hayden, wearing the green uniform of the marines and looking very smart, sat at the head of the table, with Madeleine to his left and me to his right. Given the complete blackout we had just a couple of candles burning under the table. The plump cook had worked magic with the army rations and a good bottle of Rhineland wine had been brought to the table. But you could cut the atmosphere with a knife. The young couple had only one night together and only one thought: to get rid of us all as soon as possible. They strove towards this respectable end employing opposite methods - due to the difference of the sexes or possibly just a difference of character. The dark-blond Madeleine was exuberantly courteous. She probably thought that the more cordial she was, and the more she acted the housewifely host, the sooner her grateful guests would depart the inhospitable place. She responded to her devoted spouse's disapproving glances with ever more enthusiastic table-serving. Her husband had apparently assumed that icy silence, inhospitable behaviour and general discourtesy would hasten us on our way.

I brought this menacing Virginia Woolf scene to an end as soon as I could. "Well ultimately I suppose we're not here to indulge in delicious wine," I said, "but to launch the first American newspaper in Germany. I believe we will find our way without your assistance. (Continued p. 5) Gentlemen!"

On banning the import of Israeli settlement goods

By David Morrison

On 30 January 2018, Independent Senator Frances Black tabled the Control of Economic Activity (Occupied Territories) Bill 2018 in the Seanad. This sought to make it illegal to import goods or services into Ireland from illegal settlements in occupied territories, in particular, from those settlements established by Israel in the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) which it has occupied since 1967.

The Government opposed the Bill – speaking in the Seanad debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Simon Coveney, criticised Israeli settlement building at length but opposed the Bill on the grounds that passing it would displease Israel.

Sinn Fein, the Labour Party and a number of independents supported the Bill. Fianna Fail sat on the fence saying they supported “the broad thrust of the Bill” but they refused to vote for it.

In those circumstances, if a vote had been taken the Bill would have fallen at the first hurdle. However, the Minister gave Senator Black a written commitment that, if the debate on the Bill was adjourned without a vote, the Government would facilitate the resumption of the debate before the summer recess in July 2018. This was accepted by Senator Black.

Why the Government says Bill must be opposed

Why is the Government opposed to the Bill? Because, according to the Minister, passing the Bill would displease the Israeli Government and damage Ireland’s ability to persuade it to participate in the “peace process” and deliver a workable two-state solution. Here’s some of his argument:

“If ... the Bill were adopted, the impact on settlements would be minimal. However, the cost to Ireland’s ability to influence the Middle East peace process in a positive way could be significant, particularly at this time, given the amount of time and effort that we have put into building relationships over the past six months. ...

“If adopted, the Bill would, rightly or wrongly, be seen very negatively in Israel. At this critical moment in the Middle East peace process, it would undermine the impact the Government may have in its direct interaction with the Israeli Government. ...

“I strongly believe that we need to maintain a relationship with both sides, in a respectful manner, listening as well as talking. If we do that, Ireland will remain politically relevant in helping progress a new initiative that ultimately can deliver a workable two-state solution for Palestinians and Israelis.”

So, Coveney purports to believe that another bout of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, facilitated in part by Ireland, could deliver a workable two-state solution – and therefore the Bill should not be passed because doing so would displease Israel and impede Ireland’s ability to facilitate these negotiations.

Coveney’s argument against the Bill

It is inconceivable that Simon Coveney actually believes that in a renewed “peace process” Israel might agree to withdraw voluntarily from the Palestinian territories it has occupied since 1967 and allow a Palestinian state to come into being.

He knows that the present Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu was elected in March 2015 on a platform of no Palestinian state on his watch (see *Netanyahu: If I’m elected, there will be no Palestinian state*, Haaretz, 16 March 2015). Handing over territory to a Palestinian state would, Netanyahu said, threaten Israel’s security by opening the door to “radical Islamist attacks against Israel”.

He knows that Netanyahu has stated regularly that he will not give up an inch of the West Bank, for example, speaking at a Jewish settlement in the West Bank on 28 August 2017, he declared:

“We are here to stay forever. There will be no more uprooting of settlements in the land of Israel. ... This is the inheritance of our ancestors. This is our land. (*Netanyahu vows he will never evacuate another settlement*, Times of Israel, 28 August 2017)

(For more on this, see my *Israel must be forced to end the occupation, otherwise there will never be a Palestinian state* below).

Coveney’s argument (such as it is) for blocking the Bill – that passing it will displease Israel and thereby impede a revived “peace process” and prevent a two-state solution – is fraudulent, since there is no chance whatsoever that a revived “peace progress” would deliver a two-state solution.

The “peace process” is a charade

Nowadays, the “peace process” is a charade by means of which Ireland, and other EU states, can give an appearance of working towards a settlement in Israel/Palestine, while in reality they are merely providing cover for Israel to continue with its aggressive colonial project in the West Bank. When negotiations are in prospect or in progress, they can pretend that a Palestinian state is around the corner (when they know it isn’t) and they can absolve themselves from devising and adopting a realistic policy to secure a Palestinian state, which would

inevitably include serious and sustained sanctions against Israel to force it to withdraw from the occupied territories.

This is the charade that Simon Coveney is engaged in on Ireland's behalf. He told the Seanad that "Prime Minister Netanyahu has told me that he is committed to negotiations". That is hardly a surprise, since negotiations with no pre-conditions (such as freezing settlement activity) and that take forever but go nowhere are ideal for Israel, since colonisation of the West Bank can continue.

That's what happened during the last set of negotiations, sponsored by US Secretary of State, John Kerry, which lasted around nine months in 2013/14 and produced nothing. Something similar will happen if Coveney and his EU colleagues manage to facilitate another round of the charade – and lest his role in this facilitation be inhibited he tells us that Ireland must not displease Israel by passing the Bill.

Eamon Gilmore supported an EU-wide ban

When Eamon Gilmore was Foreign Minister, Ireland was committed to excluding settlement products from entry into the EU as a whole.

On 25 October 2011, he was asked in Dáil Éireann by Pádraig Mac Lochlainn of Sinn Féin "if he supports the exclusion from the EU of produce from Israeli settlements in occupied Palestinian territories. He replied:

"The Government's firm views on the establishment and continued expansion of illegal Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories are clear and well known. I would support any move at EU level to exclude settlement products from entry to the EU."

Gilmore added that "it is clear that such a proposal would not at this point have any prospect of commanding sufficiently wide support" in the EU.

It looks as if this policy is no longer operative under Simon Coveney: though he didn't specifically contradict it in the Seanad on 30 January 2018, his opposition to an Ireland-only ban on settlement goods on the grounds that this would displease Israel and inhibit the "peace process" would apply even more so to an EU-wide ban.

Is legislating on settlement goods within Ireland's competence?

Gilmore always contended that, since external trade was within the exclusive competence of the EU, it would be contrary to EU law for Ireland to go it alone and legislate to exclude settlement products from Ireland.

In the Seanad, Simon Coveney also questioned whether it is within the competence of the Oireachtas to legislate to exclude settlement products from Ireland. This is an issue of international trade and, as Coveney told the Seanad:

"Issues of international trade fall under the common commercial policy of the EU. Under Article 3 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, TFEU, the common commercial policy is an exclusive competence of the Union."

This is difficult to argue against – Article 3 of the TFEU specifies areas in which the EU has exclusive competence. These include "customs union" and "common commercial policy".

Senator Black argued that Article 36 of the TFEU "provides for exceptions where it can be justified on the basis of public policy or the protection of the health and life of humans". However, Article 36 is not relevant, since it applies to trade between member states within the Single Market and not to external trade, which Article 3 makes plain is the exclusive competence of the EU.

At the end of the day, if the Oireachtas did proceed to legislate, it would be up to the European Commission and ultimately the European Court of Justice to decide whether Oireachtas was competent to do so and therefore whether a ban would stand.

26 February 2018 □

Israel must be forced to end the occupation, or there will be no Palestinian state

By David Morrison

The "peace process" is now a useful instrument for Israel to continue its occupation and settlement expansion.

"The people of Palestine have lived through half a century of occupation, and they have heard half a century of statements condemning it. But life hasn't meaningfully changed. Children have become grandparents. But life hasn't changed." (UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, 27 January 2016)

On the eve of the Israeli election on 17 March 2015, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stated unequivocally that, if he were returned to power, a Palestinian state would not be established.

Any handover to Palestinians of territory on the West Bank occupied by Israel since 1967 would, he asserted, threaten Israel's security:

"I think that anyone who moves to establish a Palestinian state and evacuate territory gives territory away to radical Islamist attacks against Israel. The left has buried its head in the sand time and after time and ignores this, but we are realistic and understand."

Asked if that meant there would be no Palestinian state during his tenure of office, he replied: "Indeed."

In the election, he saw off his political rivals and his Likud party was returned once again as the largest party in the Knesset (with 30 seats out of 120). This enabled him to continue as Prime Minister in a new coalition government.

On 28 August 2017, at an event in the Barkan settlement to celebrate 50 years of Israeli occupation and colonisation of the West Bank, thousands cheered Prime Minister Netanyahu as he restated his determination that Israel will hold on to the West Bank permanently. Here's an [extract](#) from his speech:

“We are here to stay forever. There will be no more uprooting of settlements in the land of Israel. ... This is the inheritance of our ancestors. This is our land.

Imagine that on these hills were the forces of radical Islam. It would endanger us, it would endanger you, and it would endanger the entire Middle East.”

A month later on 29 September 2017, he repeated this unequivocal message to cheering crowds at a meeting in the Gush Etzion settlement.

Trump’s “ultimate deal”?

So, the “peace process” is dead, isn’t it?

It is clear from these and similar statements by Prime Minister Netanyahu in recent years that he has no intention of withdrawing from any of the territory that Israel has occupied since 1967 so that a Palestinian state can come into existence. To do so, he has said repeatedly, would threaten the security of Israel.

So, the “peace process” is dead, isn’t it? Apparently not. The New York Times reported on 11 November 2017 that President Trump and his advisers “have begun developing their own concrete blueprint to end the decades-old conflict between Israel and the Palestinians” and achieve Trump’s “ultimate deal”. However, according to the President’s chief negotiator Jason Greenblatt, the Trump administration is “not going to impose an artificial timeline on the development or presentation of any particular set of ideas” and “will also never impose a deal”.

Missing from this New York Times report, and from most other commentary on prospects for negotiating a “two-state solution”, is the fact that the Israeli Prime Minister has ruled out giving up territory to a Palestinian state. And Jason Greenblatt has confirmed that the Trump administration, like its predecessors, has no intention of forcing Israel to do so.

In the light of all this, the proposition that these negotiations, if they take place, will lead to a Palestinian state is a fantasy.

1999 Likud platform

When Netanyahu was re-elected in March 2015 on a mandate of “no Palestinian state on his watch”, it should have convinced everybody that another bout of negotiations, of itself, hadn’t the remotest chance of bringing about a Palestinian state.

It is not as if Netanyahu has been an enthusiastic supporter of a “two-state solution”, who has suffered a temporary relapse on 16 March 2015. On the contrary, this pre-election promise mirrored an earlier one during the February 2009 election campaign, as a result of which he became Prime Minister. Then, he told supporters in Beit Aryeh, a small settlement in the West Bank:

“The election on Tuesday will be about one issue - whether this place will remain in our hands or will be handed over to Hamas and Iran. We will not withdraw from one inch. Every inch we leave would go to Iran.”

This Netanyahu stance isn’t surprising, since it is consistent with the 1999 Likud platform, which

1. rejects the creation of a Palestinian state in the West Bank, and
2. supports unlimited Jewish colonisation of the West Bank (referred to as Judea and Samaria by Israel).

Here are the relevant points from the platform:

- a. “The Government of Israel flatly rejects the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state west of the Jordan river.”

b. “The Jordan Valley and the territories that dominate it shall be under Israeli sovereignty. The Jordan river will be the permanent eastern border of the State of Israel.”

c. “Jerusalem is the eternal, united capital of the State of Israel and only of Israel. The government will flatly reject Palestinian proposals to divide Jerusalem”

d. “The Jewish communities in Judea, Samaria and Gaza are the realization of Zionist values. Settlement of the land is a clear expression of the unassailable right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel and constitutes an important asset in the defense of the vital interests of the State of Israel. The Likud will continue to strengthen and develop these communities and will prevent their uprooting.”

This Likud platform may be nearly twenty years old, but these principles expressed in it have never been repudiated by Likud.

Tzipi Hotovely is Likud Knesset Member and an important figure in the modern Likud, its “ideological voice”, according to Haaretz. Netanyahu appointed her as Deputy Foreign Minister in his coalition government. As such, she is Israel’s second highest ranking diplomat, after Netanyahu himself, who acts as his own foreign minister.

In an inaugural address to Israeli diplomats around the world on 22 May 2015, she gave full expression to the principles embodied in the Likud platform, saying:

“We need to return to the basic truth of our rights to this country. ... This land is ours. All of it is ours. We did not come here to apologise for that.”

She justified her stance on the grounds that God had promised the land of Israel to the Jews and she set herself the task as a foreign minister of getting “the international community to recognise Israel’s right to build homes for Jews in their homeland, everywhere”.

It is sometimes said that the political status quo in Israel/Palestine is unsustainable.

Today, Netanyahu heads a coalition government with five other parties – Bayit Yehudi (Jewish Home) (8 seats), Yisrael Beiteinu (6), two ultra-Orthodox parties, United Torah Judaism and Shas (6 and 7 respectively) and the centrist Kulanu (10). With the possible exception of Kulanu, none of Likud’s coalition partners are in favour of a Palestinian state (see, for example, Jerusalem Post article *How the parties stand on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process*).

If Netanyahu were to seriously pursue a “two-state solution”, it would be in the teeth of opposition from his own party and from the parties that make up his governing coalition. It’s not going to happen.

Status quo unsustainable?

It is sometimes said that the political status quo in Israel/Palestine is unsustainable, since Jews will “soon” be in a minority in the area under Israeli control – because of the higher Palestinian birth rate. Therefore, it is suggested, if the Jewish state is to continue to have a Jewish majority in the area under its control, it will have to relinquish control over at least part of the West Bank and the Palestinians who live there.

But, Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza have no vote in Knesset elections – only Jewish settlers in the West Bank enjoy that privilege, which calls to mind the electoral system in apartheid South Africa (and undermines Israel’s pretensions to be a democratic state).

As long as West Bank Palestinians are denied that privilege, the Knesset electorate will continue to have a Jewish majority

no matter how many Palestinians live on the West Bank – and the status quo can continue indefinitely.

No effective external pressure on Israel to end occupation

This may not be a democratic arrangement, but it is an arrangement that has existed for 50 years since the occupation began in 1967 – and there has been no effective external pressure on Israel to bring it to an end. The Security Council has never applied any sanctions against Israel to force it to reverse its illegal territorial expansion in 1967. And, far from sanctioning Israel for its 50 years of occupation and colonisation, the US and the EU have showered it with privileges.

Since 1967, the US has donated to Israel well over \$100 billion in (mostly military) aid and it has protected it politically in international fora, for example, by vetoing resolutions critical of it in the UN Security Council. In recent years, the US has given it over \$3 billion a year in military aid, making it the recipient of more US tax dollars than any other state in the world, even though its GDP per capita is on a par with that of the EU. And before he left office in January 2017, President Obama guaranteed that Israel would receive at least \$38 billion in military aid over the following ten years.

As for the EU, it made Israel a privileged partner in 1995, allowing it to sign up to the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, and granted it privileged access to the EU market in 2000 under the EU-Israel Association Agreement. Last August, the retiring EU ambassador to Israel, Lars Faaborg-Andersen, [declared](#) “we’re great supporters and great friends of Israel” and that the EU relationship with Israel is “very special” and “the most developed with any non-member” state. Clearly, Israel has nothing to fear from the EU, despite its 50 year record of occupation and colonisation.

In marked contrast, the US and the EU immediately applied economic sanctions to Russia, when it took over Crimea in 2014, even though the takeover enjoyed the broad support of the people living there.

Giving the impression of negotiating

Of course, under certain circumstances, Netanyahu has been prepared to give the impression of negotiating about the creation of a Palestinian state, providing there were no awkward pre-conditions such as “freez[ing] all settlement activity, including natural growth of settlements”, to which Israel agreed in the 2003 [Roadmap](#). And it can be guaranteed that he will ensure that the negotiations go nowhere.

That’s what happened during the last set of negotiations, which took place from July 2013 to April 2014 during the Obama administration. These negotiations went nowhere, even though, [according to the New York Times](#), Secretary of State John Kerry met President Abbas 34 times and Netanyahu roughly twice as many times during that period.

Despite that, the establishment of a Palestinian state was never seriously discussed – according to Barak Ravid [writing in Haaretz](#), Netanyahu “flatly refused to present a map [of what a Palestinian state might look like] or even to discuss the subject theoretically” and “throughout the nine months of the talks Netanyahu did not give the slightest hint about the scale of the territorial concessions he would be willing to make”.

The “peace process” is now a useful instrument for Israel to continue its occupation and settlement expansion – since while negotiations are in prospect or in progress, what little international pressure there is on Israel to curtail its illegal

activities in the occupied territories is removed, lest criticism of Israel’s behaviour gives it an excuse to break off negotiations.

As Israeli historian Professor Avi Shlaim has [written](#):

“The American-sponsored peace process, which began in 1991 after the Gulf war, is all process and no peace. It is a charade. It is pretence. It is worse than a charade because the peace process gives Israel the cover it needs to pursue its aggressive colonial project on the West Bank.”

The “peace process” is also convenient for the EU states – while negotiations are in prospect or in progress, they can pretend that a Palestinian state is around the corner (when they know it isn’t) and they can absolve themselves from devising and adopting a realistic policy to secure a Palestinian state, which would inevitably include sanctions against Israel to force it to withdraw from the occupied territories. That’s why EU states too are always keen on negotiations.

The “peace process” is also convenient for the US – to be seen to be doing something about the long standing Israeli/Palestinian “problem” improves their relations with the Arab world and their general standing as a world power.

It’s a game in which everybody wins apart from the Palestinians, for whom life under Israeli military occupation continues to be a brutal reality.

Keeping up the pretence of a viable “peace process”

The “peace process” is now a useful instrument for Israel to continue its occupation and settlement expansion.

If this game is to continue, Netanyahu knows that he cannot always “flatly reject the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state west of the Jordan river”, in accordance with the 1999 Likud platform. To keep up the pretence of a viable “peace process”, he knows that, every so often, he must hold out the prospect of some kind of a Palestinian state being established.

Thus, when the newly elected President Obama pressed him to reopen negotiations with Palestinians in 2009, he allowed the phrase “Palestinian state” to pass his lips for the first time. In a speech at Bar-Ilan University on 14 June 2009, he [said](#):

“If we receive this guarantee regarding demilitarization and Israel’s security needs, and if the Palestinians recognize Israel as the State of the Jewish people, then we will be ready in a future peace agreement to reach a solution where a demilitarized Palestinian state exists alongside the Jewish state.”

A few months earlier, he had stated in his election campaign that he would “not withdraw from one inch” of the occupied territories.

And when the EU foreign policy chief Federica Mogherini visited Israel in May 2015, he reassured her that a Palestinian state was possible on his watch, even though he had ruled it out a couple of months earlier on the eve of the Knesset elections. He [said](#):

“I want to reiterate my commitment to peace. We want a peace that would end the conflict once and for all. My position hasn’t changed. ... I support the vision of two states for two peoples – a demilitarized Palestinian state that recognizes the Jewish state.”

And so the game continues – Netanyahu pretends to believe in a “two-state solution” and the EU pretends to believe him, so that the pretence of a viable “peace process” can be maintained.

Palestinian children have become grandparents under occupation

UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, spoke for Palestinians on 27 January 2016, when he said:

“After nearly 50 years of occupation -- after decades of waiting for the fulfilment of the Oslo promises, Palestinians are losing hope. Young people especially are losing hope. They are angered by the stifling policies of the occupation. They are frustrated by the strictures on their daily lives. They watch as Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank, including East Jerusalem, expand and expand. ...

“The people of Palestine have lived through half a century of occupation, and they have heard half a century of statements condemning it. But life hasn’t meaningfully changed. Children have become grandparents. But life hasn’t changed.

“We issue statements. We express concern. We voice solidarity. But life hasn’t changed. And some Palestinians wonder: Is this all meant to simply run out the clock? They ask: Are we meant to watch as the world endlessly debates how to divide land while it disappears before our very eyes?”

Ban Ki-moon went on to say:

“The United Nations is committed to working to create the conditions for the parties to return to meaningful negotiations. That is the one and only path to a just and lasting solution -- an

end to the occupation that began in 1967, leading to a sovereign and independent State of Palestine, living side by side in peace and security with the State of Israel.”

Unfortunately, that is a pipe dream – without serious and sustained international sanctions being imposed on Israel to force it to end the occupation.

Otherwise, today’s Palestinian children will still be living under occupation when they are grandparents. □

5 December 2017

The above is the article published by OpenDemocracy at <https://opendemocracy.net/north-africa-west-asia/david-morrison/israel-must-be-forced-to-end-occupation-otherwise-there-will-n> (with the links replaced with online references.)

About the author

David Morrison has written widely on the Middle East including two highly regarded pamphlets – ‘Iraq: Lies, half-truths & omissions’ and ‘Iraq: How regime change was dressed up as disarmament’ – on the deception perpetrated by the British government to induce the British public to support military action against Iraq. He is the co-author with Peter Osborne of “A Dangerous Delusion: Why the West is Wrong about Nuclear Iran” (published by Elliott & Thompson, 2013).

Documents

In Year Zero, a Contribution to the History of the German Press (Part III) By Hans Habe (1966)

Germans in American uniform

This is an appropriate time to express my great respect for the German emigrants who fought with the American Army. Of course there were some ‘real’ Americans with us, but the unit I commanded consisted almost exclusively of former Germans and Austrians. The fate of such men if caught by Sepp Dietrich’s SS Panzer troops hardly bore contemplating. But my only difficulty was having to choose who I thought had to go, as not one of my people wanted to leave Luxembourg. I selected nine. One of them, the poet Stefan Heym, returned to his home town of Chemnitz after the war. Out of loyalty to the DDR he handed back his bronze star, but I never regretted having pinned that medal for bravery on his chest.

As it transpired, staying put in Luxembourg proved a good choice. Another incident occurred there worth recounting.

Two days before Christmas – the sky was still leaden with cloud – Major Hertz and ‘Dick’ Crossman appeared. We worked on a leaflet for our Air Force to drop over German lines once the weather improved. The leaflet, the intellectual creation of Crossman, now a British cabinet minister, would prove to be our most successful propaganda stunt of the war after the famous ‘Passierschein’.

Psychological warfare, like artillery, is an offensive weapon, used on the attack. The chief aim of war propaganda is to undermine the morale of the enemy, i.e. convince him that he has lost the war, or at least the battle. It is pointless to try to undermine the morale of an enemy triumphantly advancing, as a soldier in such a situation can’t surrender even if he wished to.

Crossman succeeded in turning our defensive position to offensive advantage. The leaflet displayed a map on one side, showing the German advance exactly as it had happened, and with large arrows indicating the direction in which the Wehrmacht planned to further advance. These corresponded to the details of the Rundstedt Plan, which Bradley had already got

his hands on – strategy is a science. The reverse of the leaflet consisted of text, in which we paid tribute to the boldness of the surprise German offensive and the courage of the ordinary German soldier. But we also warned that the Wehrmacht’s last fuel supplies were nearly exhausted, which was true, and that they would absolutely have to reach Liège or otherwise Germany would lose the war.

The leaflet was what military science calls a calculated risk, a long shot.

In an article I later published in the 1945 Christmas issue of the *Neue Zeitung*, I set out the principles underlying this leaflet and our propaganda at the time:

“If you read the leaflets we dropped at Christmas 1944 today, or the manuscripts of speeches by Colonel Tompson, Linley Frazer or Peter Anderson which we broadcast by radio, you will readily see the difference between National Socialist propaganda and the warnings spread by the Allies, which were based on simple facts... If the Wehrmacht and the German civilian population had had the courage to read and listen at the time, and especially if they had had the courage to draw the conclusions from what they were told by those who had had the courage to listen, there would not have been the thousands of German and Allied graves in the Ardennes ... there were exactly a year ago, covered in the heavy snow of the Ardennes forest. The sacred memory of those who lay buried under the snow – both those who died for a just cause and those who fell in action for a delusion – must be matched with the knowledge of which really served the interests of coming generations... The German soldiers who fell did not die in the service of the greater good, but cheated by a gigantic fraud, of which they became both victims and tools.”

Crossman’s leaflet, which was titled “*Das war der Plan*” (“That was the Plan”), was based entirely on facts, as even the text on the map illustrated: “The map below shows the routes of the breakthrough and the German objectives

planned by Oberkommando West. What it does not show are the positions of the allied armoured forces.”

The situation in besieged Luxembourg was highly tense. We had barricaded ourselves into the broadcasting station, which we ironically named the ‘Rosenbaum Line.’ The good Lieutenant Colonel Rosenbaum had ordered a machine gun to be positioned in front of the gate, which would hardly have halted Sepp Dietrich’s Panzer army. I had stacked our confidential files into a mountain of paper in the middle of the marble lobby of the radio station, with petrol canisters all around them. If the Germans threatened to overrun the station we were to throw hand grenades at the petrol and send all the material and propaganda up in flames. That was our plan anyway.

Tension grew after we heard that German paratroopers had landed and were infiltrating Luxembourg wearing American uniforms and riding ‘American’ jeeps. This operation, believed to have been masterminded by the original German James Bond, Oskar Skorzeny, illustrated the desperation prevailing among the German leadership at the time. Nevertheless, it gave rise to considerable commotion, particularly among Luxembourg civilians, who were naturally less able than we to distinguish between genuine and fake Americans.

The operation was well prepared. The German paratroopers involved in it all spoke excellent English, without trace of an accent – they were probably former German-Americans – and carried forged American military papers. They threatened to cause considerable confusion and enormous damage. “It’s a short step from the sublime to the ridiculous,” as they say, and even I almost fell victim to the ruse. The operation was of course strictly contrary to military law, but was also common practice in the actual conduct of modern warfare.

We had housed about a dozen German prisoners of war, soldiers and officers prepared to broadcast to their fellow countrymen, in a building near the radio station. Following one of these broadcasts, one of my people – Sergeant Otto Brand, a lawyer with Brandstätter’s who came originally from Vienna – was escorting a German Lieutenant back to the ‘prison house’. They were talking to each other in German in a friendly and pleasant manner, as they were accustomed to doing. This did not go unnoticed by Luxembourg civilians, who had become extremely nervous since news of the German paratroop operation had spread. As the two men were crossing the city park chatting, a crowd of civilians ‘surrounded’ them and shortly afterwards a couple of armoured American tank destroyers, which had stayed behind to serve as a kind of police force, arrived on the scene. These tough American youngsters curtly arrested the German officer and the American sergeant.

It proved to be a close shave for the endearing, cool-headed solicitor from Vienna. Although the American ‘prisoner of war’ had done nothing wrong, the tank crew were under orders to shoot ‘on sight’ any German spies caught in American uniform. Paradoxically – or maybe not – they explained to the enraged Luxembourgers that they would spare the German Lieutenant, who was an honest man as he was in German uniform, but intended immediately putting the cowardly German ‘spy’ up against the next tree and shooting him. This was fully in accordance with military law, all the more so as my good Brandstätter friend not only did not speak flawless English but, to top it all, was carrying a captured German weapon over his shoulder.

The sergeant was then subjected to a highly embarrassing interrogation in the middle of the wintry park. Due to the paramilitary nature of the German operation, the military police had orders to ignore papers they were presented with and instead to ask suspects difficult questions that only ‘real’ Americans could answer. There were six such questions –

such as to explain what “Dr. Pepper” was, a lesser known drink in the Coca Cola range – that unlucky neo-Americans would be unlikely to be able to answer. It wasn’t until Brand was asked to explain the phrase ‘tough shit’ that his face lit up: he had been in the army long enough to know this was the authentic G.I. expression for ‘hard luck’. So although under pressure Sergeant Brand was in luck, and the Americans decided not to shoot him straight away but bring him to the next gunner’s post for further questioning. When news of the incident reached me, I got on to the commander of the tank destroyer unit to have Brand released. But the reaction was not what I’d come to expect in the Grand Duchy. When I explained that Brand was one of ‘my people’, the young captain responded with suspicious irony: “And who, may I ask, are you?”

When I gave him my papers, the captain, who did not take kindly to my foreign accent, smiled sarcastically: “I overestimated you Germans. This is a lousy counterfeit.” It was only with extreme effort that I managed to convince him to ring my superior, Colonel Powell. When he returned from the call, he said, smiling: ‘Please excuse me, Captain – you can go.’ ‘But how did you identify me?’ I asked, confident again and wishing to display my flippancy, ‘the colonel hasn’t even seen me.’ ‘You are free to go,’ the captain merely answered. He had clearly had enough of the passengers from the Ship of Fools.

It wasn’t until I was back at the radio station that I discovered how useful unmilitary behaviour can sometimes be. From the very start of my military career I had persistently refused to get a ‘military’ haircut and only ever wore a helmet – which they say is detrimental to hair growth – in the most critical of situations. Colonel Powell had apparently asked the tank captain whether the man calling himself Hans Habe was wearing a helmet. ‘No, he doesn’t have a helmet.’ ‘Has he got ridiculously long hair?’ ‘Absolutely ridiculous’, the Captain had replied, glancing at me. And thus I was identified beyond doubt and allowed to return with my released officer to the ‘Rosenbaum Line’.

We now went back to work to await the day we could test whether the ‘calculated risk’ of our ‘defensive’ leaflet had borne fruit.

On the morning of the 28th December the blanket of cloud that had hung over the western front for twelve days hindering any operation by the Allied Air Forces finally lifted. A clear blue winter’s sky opened over the Duchy and then at twelve noon precisely the sky darkened again, but this time it was a darkness we had prayed for over twelve sleepless nights. Hundreds of British and American bombers and fighters flew in eastwards over Luxembourg. The German offensive had become bogged down in mud, blood and ice twenty kilometres south-east of Liège; to our north-east Bastogne, which had held out since the 16th under General McAuliff, was relieved by Patton’s tanks charging up from the south. Among the first planes to arrive from London was one carrying four million copies of the Crossman leaflet.

There was hardly a German soldier in the Ardennes who didn’t get to see one of these leaflets. Every one of them who read it knew its truth, confirmed by his own experience. ‘Your tanks have no way back’, the Allied headline bluntly stated to them: when Field Marshall von Rundstedt ordered the retreat, soldiers only had to recollect what they’d read in our leaflet to know that the German Army simply didn’t have sufficient ‘juice’ to bring its stricken units home. Our hastily erected prisoner of war camps were soon not big enough to accommodate the thousands of German troops who now capitulated.

Pornography and propaganda

Psychological warfare is not only an effective offensive weapon, but can also be a two-edged one, and can’t

under any circumstances be left to amateurs, as we discovered in Luxembourg on one occasion.

During this time three Soviet officers came to visit us in the Duchy to study our propaganda methods. With an innocence bordering on naivety I had been sent from Paris to induct our Allies into the secrets of our propaganda. But these Russian 'colleagues' – one of whom was from the Baltic and spoke fluent German – really did their work in style. They had brought with them a giant album as a present for us, containing the Red Army's best leaflets. I have never seen more amateur propaganda. Some of the leaflets consisted purely of political manifestos, supposed to persuade German soldiers to defect on the basis that the Soviet Union was a workers' and peasants' paradise, Stalin a homely father figure, and Hitler concerned solely with exploiting the working class. Such leaflets would surely have left German soldiers even colder than they already were, lying in the freezing dirt. We never once used ideological slogans in our front-line propaganda. Instead we used facts such as informing units facing us that they would not be receiving a consignment of new boots dispatched to them from Paderborn military base as the train carrying them had been destroyed in a bombing attack. The second part of the Soviet album, which I leafed through in my Luxembourg office, was much more amusing and a delight for any old gentleman with a penchant for pornography. These very tastelessly illustrated leaflets declared: 'While you are facing a miserable death out here, those "base sitters" are sleeping with your wives and lovers.' But this challenge to the soldiers' manhood had the opposite effect to what the Soviets intended, as even those who believed them reacted by gripping their weapons with re-doubled determination to avenge themselves, on whichever target aroused their anger more: their loved ones, the 'base sitters' or their wives' slanderers. It was impossible to convince the Russian officers that the Marxist pornographic methodology of their psychological warfare contravened the most basic insights into human psychology. They responded that the Germans employed similar methods, which was true, but a flawed argument.

Meanwhile, the Battle of the Bulge was coming to an end. On New Year's Eve we gathered in the room of Sergeant Jules Bond, a former editor of the Vienna *Telegraf* who later worked for 'Voice of America' in New York and was an excellent cook. But we had gathered not to enjoy his culinary delights but to listen to Hitler's New Year radio address. When the 'Führer' had finished, Peter Wyden remarked: 'We can finally get ready for the Bristol Hotel'. This time it was not a vague promise.

On 7th March 1945, 9th Armoured Division of III Corps of First Army Group captured the Ludendorff Bridge over the Rhine almost intact. Five divisions under Omar N. Bradley crossed the fatal German river and soon the western part of Cologne was abandoned by the Germans. I was instructed to bring out a first German newspaper once the fighting in Cologne had come to an end.

I admit that this was not the first democratic newspaper we published on German soil, for the *Aachener Nachrichten* had preceded it, a story requiring a short digression.

While the Americans believed that Germany should be revived through American ways, the British had their own ideas for the German press in 'year zero'. The British knew we wouldn't delay in issuing newspapers, but differed from us in the approach they believed should be taken. Long before even stepping on European soil, the Americans had already begun planning an 'American press for the German people'. Newspapers should remain in American hands until the 'Licensing Teams' could find politically clean and journalistically impeccable Germans to take over from them. The differences between the American and European approaches were accentuated by the much greater

suffering endured in the 'German war' by the British than the Americans, who treated their enemies with far more trust. To the Americans, the Germans were enemies, but the British, like the Germans, were Europeans, and were certain they would find reliable German newspeople in the first few days who their press officers could select, direct and advise, assessing their skills in actual practice. The British had no intention of 'making' newspapers themselves.

Both methods had their pros and cons. The British certainly made themselves more popular with the premature praise they heaped on their selected German publishers. To this day former British press officers do not carry the odium of the 're-educator' that our people do. Their approach also produced quicker results. Thus the British press officer, whose name actually was Chestnut, charged a German social democrat, Heinrich Holland, with publishing the *Aachener Nachrichten* as early as 24th January 1945. It was small comfort to my ambitious team that the press in the British Zone became somewhat 'bow legged', like children who start to walk too early, and that the papers we founded, though late-born, far surpassed this 'English' press. But the British won their lion's share of the future press fair and square.

A film star at the front

The beginnings of the *Kölnische Kurier*, as I decided to call our first newspaper, occurred under peculiar circumstances. I have never known the foundation of a newspaper to be composed of such a mixture of gossip, satire, irony and deep meaning. The day the western part of Cologne fell I sent an 'advanced unit' into the destroyed city. Their task was to establish whether there was a printer still operating or who could be quickly brought into operation. This technical team was also tasked with finding the necessary newsprint, rounding up printworkers and organising the production and circulation of the paper.

On an unusually hot and humid early spring evening, Staff Sergeant Josef Wechsberg and I drove in a Jeep into Cologne from Luxembourg. The city was in darkness, with its tram tracks ripped out and protruding everywhere. My driver, a former racing driver called Whitey, now an operator of garages in Harlan, Iowa, steered us cursing through the ruined wasteland. The leader of the technical unit, Sterling Hamilton, a captain in the marines, had given us directions over the field telephone to the house he had requisitioned as his residence, but it took a great deal of effort to locate it. As the city was completely destroyed, Hamilton had set himself up in an isolated villa outside town and it was 9 o'clock in the evening before we finally found it.

We were astounded when a plump but neatly dressed cook answered the door, and were left completely speechless when the portly housekeeper responded to my request to speak to Captain Hamilton by shaking her head and stoutly refusing, saying the captain was not ready to receive us. "What's that supposed to mean?" I demanded, "Where's the captain?" She signalled upstairs. "Up there. With a woman." With a woman? The non-fraternization law prohibiting American soldiers from any intercourse with Germans had just come into effect, and it was certainly not yet time to throw that incredible law out the window. 'Intercourse' with a 'woman' was out of the question.

We entered a small parlour furnished with bourgeois gaudiness. "I'll give him ten minutes", I said to Wechsberg, "then I'm going up."

Exactly ten minutes later the door opened, and who should come through the door but the then very popular film star, Madeleine Carroll (not to be confused with the Frenchwoman Martine Carol), wearing the uniform of a Red Cross assistant. "Good heavens, Madeleine, what are you doing here?" I asked – (continued p. 17)