

Church & State

An Irish History Magazine

And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World

The Reformation In Ireland
Religious Enthusiasm, Affairs Of State,
And Bishop Berkeley

Whence The Renaissance?

Luther's October Revolution

Darwin Has No Clothes!

H.G. Wells on Progress

Pomeranz & Solzhenitsyn

Daniel O'Connell: Veto, Duel,
Politicising The Peasants!

Future of Church?

The Reformation In Ireland

On the 500th anniversary of Luther's attack on mainstream European Christianity, the *Irish Times* asked: "*at the risk of being parochial...: why did the Reformation fail in Ireland?*"

There is of course no risk of the *Irish Times* becoming parochial—not Irish parochial at any rate.

It qualified its question:

"It must be said at the outset that the Reformation was not a complete failure on this island as it gained followers in Ulster and Dublin".

Did the Reformation really *gain* followers in 'Ulster? Or was it that Ulster was colonised by Reformationists? We never heard of the mass conversion of the Ulster Gaels to the theocratic rigours of Calvinism. We are sure that they had no more taste for it then than they have now.

Trinity College seems to have known more about Ireland 80 years ago than it does now. In the extensive history of the Church of Ireland that it produced (under the Editorship of Professor Alison Phillips) in response to Fianna Fail and the Eucharistic Congress, it has a chapter entitled *Puritans and Planters*.

The bogus English Reformation—which was only a Government institution—provoked authentic Reformationism beneath it in the form of Puritanism. And the Puritans, feeling oppressed by the Government religion in England bought freedom of religious development as Planters in territories conquered by the new English Empire that was established in conjunction with the breach with Rome. They were the people of God in the world and in their main sphere of action, North America, they laid waste all other forms of human life, and created the U. S. A.

The Reformation that came to Ulster in the form of a mass colonisation was conducted on the authority of the British Crown, but discontent with bogus English Government Reformation was not its driving force. That came from the authentic Reformation in Scotland, a few years after the British Crown was established by the succession of the Scottish Stuarts to the English (or Welsh) Tudor dynasty: the Union of Crowns in 1603.

The Plantation of Ulster—the main event in the Reformation in Ireland—began when the O'Dougherty lands were confiscated in 1608 and a large Protestant population was brought in from Scotland to fill the space that had been emptied. The Protestant presence in Ireland was increased greatly, and the new addition was soundly Protestant. It was fundamentalist, rather than merely opportunist—as so many of those who had changed their religion in the Ireland were.

Bishop Mant, in his impressive mid-19th century *History Of The Church Of Ireland From The Reformation To The Revolution: With A Preliminary Survey, From the Papal Usurpation, In The 12th Century, To Its Legal Abolition In The 16th*, praises James the First and Sixth for his care of the

Church of Ireland, but he is in two minds about the Ulster Plantation:

"Notwithstanding... the regard... shown by the king for the well-being of the Church, and for the maintenance of the established religion, of this plantation there was one result deeply to be lamented, as disturbing to the Church's peace, impeding her progress, and diminishing her power of promoting religious improvement. The emigrants from Scotland, who were a numerous division of the new settlers, brought with them their own peculiar prepossessions, and were attended or followed by ministers of their own, apparently sincere and zealous, though mistaken men, earnest in maintaining and disseminating their national opinions.

"These opinions for the most part consisted in hostility to the primitive and apostolical form of Church government by bishops, and a partial predilection for the Presbyterian model, recently invented by John Calvin at Geneva, and imported into Scotland by John Knox: in a rejection of that liturgical mode of worship, which has been transmitted from the earliest through all succeeding ages of Christianity, and was now continued in the British reformed churches; and in an attachment to the modern fashion of devotional aspirations, uttered under the supposed immediate dictation of the Holy Spirit; in a contemptuous repudiation of several decent and orderly, innocent and edifying and ancient, signs and accompaniments of divine worship, and a studied affectation of a bare, an abstract, and frigid simplicity in the service of God; in a condemnation of the aboriginal and hereditary sentiments, practice, and authority of Christ's Catholick Church, as the interpreter of God's holy word, and in the proposed reverence for that word alone as the guide to religious truth, not however independent of the freedom of private judgment, carried to an undue and dangerous extent, or of the system of some favourite reformer, who had acquired over their minds and opinions little less than a Papal control.

"Under the influence of such prejudices as these, congregations were formed by the new comers from Scotland in the northern counties of Ireland, opposed to the principles and provisions, and the estranged from the communion, of the Church.

"The settlement of the Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland was not agreeable to the former inhabitants, either to the earlier occupiers, or those of English extraction: and a special Act of Parliament was necessary to legalize it. For down to this period in the reign of King James, there was still in force a statute, enacted in the third and fourth years of King Phillip and Queen Mary, which prohibited the bringing in, retaining or marrying of Scots. This statute continuing part of the law of the land during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, adventurers of that nation were precluded from settling in Ireland. But, in the year 1614... this Act was repealed, and multitudes of Scots passed over into Ulster... At the same time there are came over three ministers from England, one a pupil of the celebrated Puritan, Cartwright, patronized by the Lord Chichester, then Lord Deputy, who had been a pupil of Cartwright also, and was a favourer and encourager of Puritans. These congregations were soon afterwards united into a system of mutual agreement and co-operation, and presbyteries formed in various districts.

"Schism was thus established among the Irish Protestants: a schism, opposed at the same time to all the principles and laws of the Church Catholick, and injurious to Christianity in general, but especially detrimental under the circumstances of Ireland, where a consentient, combined, and co-operating effort... by all the opponents of the papal errors, might have been a powerful instrument in God's hand for correcting them; and where the want of such agreement and co-operation... served as a positive argument for confirming the Papist in his

delusions" (Pages 365-368. Richard Mant was Anglican Bishop of Down & Connor. This book was not published by either Oxford University or Trinity College).

There were two Protestantism in Ireland. There was a Government one, which functioned as part of the apparatus of State and whose members live mainly by a monopoly of the professions and of land ownership and by exploitation of the dis-franchised Catholic population. And there was a religious one which was given confiscated Catholic land by the British State under its first Scottish king and which lived thereafter by its own resourcefulness.

Government Protestantism began to wither after the Act of Union as Westminster began to enact reform in the Catholic interest under pressure from the resurgent native population. The other Protestantism, not being an instrument of the State, continued.

The Anglican Church (Church of Ireland), claimed to be a continuation of the pre-Reformation Catholic Church, minus the Pope. There appears to be some substance in that claim. The English conquest of Ireland by Henry the Second was authorised by the Pope for the purpose of bringing the Church of Gaelic Ireland more effectively under Roman discipline. (The Normans were the secular arm of the Papacy.) But the more Romanised Church in Ireland between the Conquest and the Reformation seems to have been confined to the Pale.

A major circumstance in the Government-directed English Reformation was the privatisation of the Monasteries. The Monasteries in England were major economic institutions. The King gained revenue by selling them off, and at the same time created a class of gentry with vested interests in the consolidation of the new anti-Roman political order. The privatisation of those monastic institutions of the feudal system was the beginning of the bourgeois revolution. But the Christianity of Gaelic Ireland was organised differently.



Forthcoming Referendums

Referendum on the eighth amendment of the Constitution, May/June 2018.

Referendum to remove blasphemy as an offence, October 2018: aims to remove Article 40.6.10.

Referendum on women's place in the home, October 2018: aim is to remove gender-specific language.

Referendum on having directly elected mayors, October 2018.

Referendum on giving Oireachtas Committees more powers, late 2018, aiming to allow the findings of fact rather than merely making recommendations.

Referendum to reduce the divorce term, 2019, aiming to reduce the waiting time for divorce from four years to two.

Referendum to extend voting rights that emigrants, 2019. Aims to allow immigrants to vote in Presidential elections. It will not be held before the planned 2018 Presidential election.

Referendum to reduce the voting age, 2019. Aims to reduce the voting age to 16 from 18.

Contents

	Page
The Reformation In Ireland	
Editorial	2
Forthcoming Referendums	3
Religious Enthusiasm, Affairs Of State, And Bishop Berkeley	
<i>The Reformations, Part Four</i>	
Brendan Clifford	4
Origins Of The Renaissance	
Peter Brooke	12
October Revolution	
<i>Reflections On The 500th Anniversary of Luther's posting his Theses on Indulgences on the Church door at Wittenberg. Part Two</i>	
Stephen Richards	14
Darwin Has No Clothes	
Review: 'Charles Darwin: Victorian Mythmaker' by A. N. Wilson	
Jack Lane	19
H. G. Wells on the fashionable Darwinism	
John Minahane	21
The Case Of Grigori Pomeranz	
<i>Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin And The Russian Question. Part 7</i>	
Peter Brooke	22
Future Church?	
Wilson John Haire	27
Daniel O'Connell (Part 3)	
Jules Gondon's Biography. 1847	
Cathy Winch (First English Translation)	29
Democratic Wars	
Wilson John Haire (Letter)	35
Vox Vox: (Higgins In Australia; What Is Political?)	36

Part 13 of John Minahane's
The Spanish Polemic on Colonisation
will appear in the next issue

Sales:

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

Church & State

Editor: Pat Maloney
ISSN: 0332-3625

All Correspondence should be sent to:

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

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

ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS: €8 (Sterling £6)

Cheques/postal orders payable to ATHOL BOOKS please
from

athol-st@atholbooks.org

The Reformations, Part Four

Religious Enthusiasm, Affairs Of State, And Bishop Berkeley

The purpose of the Reformation in the societies where it developed authentically—that is, in Germany and Switzerland—was to destroy the Roman Church, on the ground that it had perverted the Christian message, and to restore the original Christianity by deducing it strictly from the Bible.

I don't know that authentic Reformationism had any influence in Ireland. It seems that Luther, Zwingli and Calvin were unknown to the Irish until the English Reformation brought them.

The authentic Reformation aimed to destroy a Church in which Christianity had gone astray, and take its place. Religion was incidental to the Reformation that imposed itself on Ireland by force.

The English breach with Rome was not a religious event. It was a political event caused by the accident that the King could not get the divorce he needed for purposes of state because his Queen was the aunt of the Hapsburgh Emperor and the Emperor happened to have Rome under occupation just then and wouldn't allow the Pope to do his duty.

The King, who had been accorded the title of *Defender of the Faith* by the Pope for his refutation of Luther, declared himself head of the Catholic Church in England in order to grant himself the divorce which the Pope was prevented from granting. He intended to continue in the role of *Defender of the Faith* against Lutherism after he took over the function of the Pope as head of the Catholic Church in England.

Tony Blair has pleaded that it was not his intention to throw Iraqi society into an anarchy of warfare when he invaded it in 2003. He says he thought he could remove "the Dictator" and for the rest let things be. Blair is a liar. Like Lloyd George in 1917 he had a vision of a world in flux—his image was that of a kaleidoscope that had been shaken—on which he could impose any order he pleased by the power of his will. But Henry appears to have been an honest man. He seems to have made

a serious effort to preserve under his headship the Faith which he had defended when the Pope was head of it. But it didn't work out. It turned out that the Pope in Rome was a necessary part of the Faith, and that Henry unhinged the Faith when he usurped the function of the Papacy in England by making himself King-Pope. (I have tried to explain some of this in *Puritanism And The Theatre*.)

The English Reformation was in the first instance not a Reformation at all. It was only a kind of schism. Henry was a kind of rival Pope. As King-Pope he was essentially the King of a monarchical state that had begun to assert itself as an Empire.

Within the Roman system there was an Emperor and there was a Pope, but there was never an Emperor-Pope. Each had its own distinct organisation but together, in conflict with each other, they constituted the Holy Roman Empire. And each was elected. The electorates were small, but they were electorates nevertheless.

No Pope in Rome exercised as an individual the kind of power that was exercised by the King-Pope in England, who was primarily a King who was establishing an absolute state. But Henry, for all his power, could not hold together the Roman Church as an English Church after he had usurped the leadership of it. Rome would not recognise the usurpation of its authority. Henry was therefore obliged by circumstances to move on from being an administrative usurper to becoming a religious reformer. But his reforming was not guided by any comprehensive vision of a new order. It consisted of piecemeal borrowings from the Continental Reformation which he hated. But the Reformation caught fire underneath him. And, as his children inherited his absolute power, they engaged in wild swings this way and that.

*

What it all amounted to for Ireland in the long-run was a series of Protest-

ant colonisations that could be relied upon not to blend in with the Papist Irish—who, though not very Papist, had no trace of Calvinism in them. Pre-Reformation colonists had become Irish in much more than a geographical sense. They mixed in with the Irish and became a common society with them. The Protestant colonists did not blend in. They were the Elect of God, in the grip of Salvation, and were not to be seduced into the pleasant, idolatrous ways of the Irish.

They were assembled into the Kingdom of Ireland following the Williamite Conquest of 1691. They were established as the rulers of Ireland. Indeed they were Ireland. They did not really rule the Irish. They barbarised the Irish under godly inspiration. Their sense of godly superiority settled down in the course of a generation or two into a kind of racial contempt.

It must have been expected that the Irish would wither under the disapproval and deprivation of the Penal Law of the Protestant Kingdom of Ireland. But they did not wither. Like the Palestinians under comparable Jewish colonial occupation, they multiplied. An Israeli Government Minister said the Palestinians bred like cockroaches. An Irish writer of the 19th century said "*We multiplied by neglect and plenty*". The plenty was provided by potatoes grown on small plots of land. Neglect was a way of describing the destruction of the structure of Irish civilisation by the Penal Laws against Irish landownership, Irish education and organised Irish religious life, and exclusion from the life of the colony. Deprived of responsibility for themselves, the Irish lived in quick generations in a residue of the culture which was marked down for destruction.

The colony, as a Kingdom, never produced a colonial peasantry that could squeeze out the native peasantry in competition for rack-rented tenancies, and its laws against the Irish ensured that a loyal industrious peasantry could not evolve out of the native population.

(Poetry that scanned and rhymed and

commented on life was still popular when I was young and the body of verse that was popular in my corner of Slieve Luacra included English poems as well as Irish. Particularly popular was Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*. It describes idyllic village life that was being destroyed by Progress. It was doubted whether such a village had ever existed in Ireland under British rule, and it was suggested that he must have been describing an English village. I don't know. I suppose it is possible that in the Irish patchwork of the 18th century a village such as Goldsmith described might have existed somewhere in the Midlands. If so, it would have been a village based on a colonial peasantry.

The attraction of the poem in Slieve Luacra in the generation around the 1940s lay in the fact that, in describing the past that had been ruined, it was describing the life of the present in the Ireland that had wrenched itself apart from England. Only it wasn't life in the village that I knew, but life in the surrounding townlands.)

The fact that the Irish decided to live irresponsibly when deprived of the structures of responsible living, instead of accommodating themselves to the laws of Progress discovered by England, and dying out, messed up the life of the colony.

*

The Kingdom of Ireland was by the mid-18th century subject to a relentless force of subversion that it could do nothing about, short of adopting a policy of direct physical extermination. I don't know that genocide by direct means was ever considered at this juncture. It had been in the past. But that was when England only had Ireland to subjugate. By the mid-18th century, by virtue of victory at "*Derry, Enniskillen and the Boyne*", and the associated war in Europe, England had become a World Power, with many irons in the fire. It had become the chief slave-trader in the world. It ran great industrial slave-labour camps such as the world had never seen before. Slavery, in one form or another, was its main business. (If you had money it was the only sensible thing to invest it in.) And it had many *progressive* genocides in operation.

Slavery and Genocide were integral to the Progress that actually happened. Official slavery was phased out in the official sphere of action during the first half of the 19th century. Genocide continued to be a normal British activity,

declared to be a necessity by the famous liberal intellectuals of Progress. And it was forcefully defended by Winston Churchill right up to his War, which came to be called the *Anti-Fascist War*.

It was clearly not on the ground of principle that direct genocidal action against the Irish was not undertaken when it became evident that the indirect genocidal action of the Penal Laws was not working.

Bishop Berkeley published a rant against the Irish as the scum of the earth in the late 1740s. But: "*Sticks and stones*" etc. I quoted him in the issue before last. Martin Mansergh, wrote in the last issue:

"Clifford with the help of some quotations concentrates exclusively on the negative, frequently patronising attitude of Berkeley to the alleged lack of industry of the people around him".

And he says my account of the Reformation is "*one-sided*".

I quoted Berkeley at very great length in order to ward off any notion that I had snatched at some unfortunate phrasing and presented it out of context. But I obviously didn't quote enough of it.

Berkeley's pamphlet, *A Word To The Wise*, is 15 pages long in the 1750 London edition. It begins with some general remarks about the benefit of useful labour. The rant begins on the second page and continues to the end:

"The Public hath endeavoured to excite and encourage this most useful Virtue. Much has been done; but whether it be from the Heaviness of the Climate, or from the *Spanish* or *Scythian* Blood that runs in their Veins, or whatever else may be the Cause, there still remains in the Natives of this Island a remarkable Antipathy to Labour. You, Gentleman, can alone conquer their innate hereditary Sloth..."

The "*Gentlemen*" addressed by the pamphlet are the Catholic priests. Berkeley exhorts them to make their flocks into a useful peasantry for the Colony—that is what it amounts to. The Penal Laws are not mentioned at all, as far as I recall—either as a cause contributing to the lack of public spirit or private enterprise in the populace, or as an obstacle to the project which he exhorts the priests to undertake.

And why should Catholic priests, surviving precariously and illegally under the Penal Laws, become a civil

agency of the Protestant Colony that enacted those Laws? Because, says Berkeley, of the leniency with which the Penal Laws were being applied against them.

And why did Berkeley think that priests drawn from the feckless populace might be capable of acting on that populace in the way that he urged? Because he knew from personal experience that the official ideology of the Glorious Revolution, and its Irish Colony, associating Papism with "*brass money and wooden shoes*", was false.

He had travelled on the Continent in search of culture, as every English gentleman who aspired to be cultured had to do. He had gone there a number of times and observed it closely, and he knew that the Revolution ideology, which justified the system in which he served the State as a Bishop, was a caricature of Catholicism.

But he never confronted the falsity at the heart of the combined Church/State system in which he flourished. He does not relate the condition of the populace to the system in which it is outlawed. But he knows that its condition is not due to Catholicism. Therefore he attributes it to their racial character as Irish.

A Word To The Wise is Berkeley's main communication to the Irish, or the Catholics. It is in effect an appeal to the Romanist elite amongst the Irish to take in hand the Irish, who were entirely beyond the reach of the Colony (though it was now calling itself the *Irish nation*), and civilise them into an industrious peasant foundation for the Colony, and put an end to their hopeless dreaming of themselves as still being the *Irish people*.

*

Mansergh would like to pass over in silence Berkeley's main publication addressed particularly to the Irish, and to concentrate on *The Querist*. He seems to think that *The Querist* made amends for *A Word To The Wise*. In fact the two were published together as a single pamphlet in many editions around 1750.

A Word To The Wise is not included in the reprint of *The Querist* referred to by Mansergh (Dundalk 1970), nor is it mentioned in the long Introduction on *Historical Perspective* supplied by Joseph Johnston of Trinity College. And Johnston refers to "the Ascendancy clique of Protestants" whereas Ascendancy Protestantism was the main body of Protestants, on which the Williamite

Kingdom of Ireland was based, and which resisted reform until it was abolished in 1800.

The Querist consists of hundreds of questions about all sorts of things. What interested Johnston was the questioning of money. Berkeley, having discarded matter from the world in his *Principles* (1710), speculated in *The Querist* about the separating of money from its material base in gold and silver and treating it as a ticket, having no value in itself, which gave you purchasing power.

*

There was nothing new in paper money when Berkeley asked his enthusiastic questions about the vista opened when the ideal essence of money was freed from its material form. Bank-notes—notes from a bank saying that a certain quantity of money had been deposited in it—came to be used, within severe limits, as if they were themselves money.

The limits were broadened as the use of Bank-notes increased. Credit—or debt—became a form of money. Britain fought its first Great War on credit—the one which gained it the monopoly of the Slave Trade. Swift had played a part, as Tory pamphleteer, in bringing that war to what the progressive Whigs thought to be a premature conclusion. One of his strong arguments against continuing the war until the enemy was destroyed and humiliated, was the great expansion of credit-money that the War brought.

Money, freed from its material substance, tended to dissolve the social bond.

But money freed from material substance tended to become speculative money and to run wild before collapsing. Gold money had independent value as Gold, which is why it was used as money. Paper money—credit money—had no value as paper. The proliferation of credit-money was therefore an artful business. How it came about that England mastered this art for the financing of the War Of The Grand Alliance I do not know.

Others who had a vision of the ideal essence of money and went directly for it tended to erect systems that collapsed as soon as they were taken in earnest.

Germany, under the Versailles depredations, resorted to this ideal money in desperation, and soon people were shopping with wheelbarrow-loads of paper.

Mansergh quotes De Valera as saying at a ceremonial occasion marking the bi-centenary of Berkeley's death that he "*posed several questions about Ireland's economic development to which we in Fianna Fail... have endeavoured to provide the concrete answers*". Not in the creation of ideal money in the form of tickets, they didn't. They were conservative materialists in this matter of money.

*

Another question asked in *The Querist* of which Dev took no heed was whether Ireland should not be merged with England. Arthur Aston Luce, Trinity College editor of Berkeley's *Collected Works*, put it this way:

"Berkeley had relatives, friends and interests, on both sides of the Channel, and he was prepared to divide his sympathies and make the best of both worlds..."

"True, he wished 'both nations to become one people' and asked 'Whether we are not as much *Englishmen* as the children of old Romans, born in Britain, were still *Romans*?..."

But, Luce comments, "*an Irishman is expressing the wish, and an Irishman is asking the hard question...*"

Well, a possessor of Ireland on the authority of English conquest was asking the question. And, by the time of *The Querist*, anybody with a sense of historical reality could see that the future of Berkeley's "*Irish nation*" was in jeopardy. The great ceremonial days of the Colony still lay ahead—when it took advantage of England's difficulties in America to assert its Legislative independence—but its viability was already in question. And what its frivolously-established independence did—Legislative independence depending on continuing English Executive power—was demonstrate that it was unfit to exist.

In 1800 it sold its Legislative independence back to England rather than make terms with the contemptible Irish so vividly described by Berkeley. And, when Berkeley suggested a merger of the Irish and English, in *Querist* No. 90, the Irish he had in mind were obviously not the "*Scythians*" he described in *A Word To The Wise*.

*

Mansergh quotes De Valera as saying at a ceremonial event in 1953 that Berkeley "*loved his country and his*

people". No doubt he did. His country was the country given to him in 1692, when he was ten years old and the first Conquest Parliament was assembled. And his people were the people who were put in command of that country as the Protestant Kingdom of Ireland in 1692. We have seen what he thought of the other people on the island.

Berkeley's Ireland was Revolutionary Ireland—a title that was not displaced until 1916.

In 1910 a major work of history was published in Dublin: *Revolutionary Ireland And Its Settlement*, by the Rev. R.H. Murray, of the Queen Alexandra College for Protestant young ladies. It had an Introduction by the Rev. Mahaffy, Provost of Trinity, and a letter of recommendation by J.B. Bury, Regius Professor of History at King's College, Cambridge. No need was felt for a subtitle specifying the *Revolution* that was meant. There was only one authentic Revolution: 1688.

It is not an uninteresting book. It might be re-issued with a more apt title: *Revolutionary England And Its Attempt At An Irish Settlement*. It describes the making of Berkeley's Ireland—Penal Laws and all.

So Berkeley loved his Ireland and his people. And he thought it might be well for his people to be recombined with their English source, from which they had not moved very far.

De Valera in 1953 had a remarkable career behind him. He had achieved much but had failed on two matters that he considered essential: an all-Ireland state and the restoration of the Irish language. I suppose it was his achievement that Fine Gael had become Republican again. He took part in the great Anti-Partition campaign it launched in 1948. He must have known it was hopeless, but it was necessary to keep up the agitation, even though every speech hardened still further the Ulster Unionist determination that there would be no United Ireland.

I presume he had read *The Querist* and knew of Berkeley's thoughts about reuniting the colony with its source. But saying nice things about a Protestant, even though a Southern one, so that the Ulster Protestants might hear, was less obviously futile than anything else that might be said.

*

Mansergh is aggrieved that I did not

tell people that Berkeley was one of the famous British Empiricists. There are many things I did not let the people know about him—his extensive writings on Tar-water as a miracle cure, for example.

I assumed that anybody with the slightest interest in Berkeley or in British philosophy would know that he was one of the famous trio of British Empiricists, Locke/Berkeley/Hume. And I didn't see that the fact that he was a British Empiricist detracted from his Englishness.

His contribution to Empiricism was a smart logical exercise on Locke's theory of knowledge: Locke said that matter, external to the mind, makes impressions on the senses, which the mind works up into ideas. Berkeley said he saw no reason to suppose that sense impressions were made by matter external to the mind. Those impressions existed in the mind. They were created by the mind out of itself. Their existence was mental. And to suppose that there was something resembling them which existed as matter outside the mind, and that it somehow impressed their appearance on the mind, was unwarranted and gave rise to paradoxes. The only intelligible meaning of "to exist" was "to be perceived". And perception existed only in the mind.

Somehow connected with this reasoning is his insistence that only particular ideas can exist and that general ideas are impossible. His proof of this, as I recall, is that a general triangle cannot be pictured. Any picture of a triangle must be of a particular kind of triangle.

The point must be conceded. The general idea of a triangle cannot be an image. And, if thought is possible only in images, there can be no general ideas.

Berkeley's philosophy is a metaphysic of surfaces. The world that gives the appearance of having an existence of its own, and all the people who seem to be busily engaged in its affairs, are surface phenomena such as occur in dreams. He refers to dream images to lend plausibility to his case. But, as the poet puts it, *"An image is for looking at./ It's not much of a thing to be./ Merely a plane surface that is seen and cannot see."*

*

Mansergh quibbles about my description of English State Protestantism as "a made-up religion in the service of the state". And he says that "Most religion has been state-backed throughout history".

I suppose the debating tricks of the party spin-doctor become ingrained. "State-backed religion" is an idea that is located somewhere not too far away from the idea of a religion made up by the State. But they are not the same idea. And I would have expected an admirer of Berkeley, with his emphasis on the particularity of ideas, to see them as very different ideas.

English Protestantism was made up piecemeal by Henry when he found that he could not simply retain the Catholic Church in England with himself as head of it. He found himself obliged to break it up and devise a new religion to take its place. This he did reluctantly, bit by bit, with borrowings from the German Reformation, which he would probably have been engaged in crushing but for the difficulty over the divorce.

I don't know of any other religion that was made up piecemeal in this way as a matter of political business.

When a State adopts a religion which gained force independently of it, or when a religious movement takes over a state, the order of causation is reversed. There is autonomy of religious development. The Government of Zurich did not invent Zwinglianism. Zwinglianism took over the Government. Likewise with Calvinism in Geneva. And Christianity had three centuries of life behind it when the Roman State adopted it. But Henry, for purposes of State, was obliged to destroy the religion that he liked, and replace it with borrowings from a religion that he hated, because his first concern was for the state and the state had to have a religion.

Seeds of the borrowing took root. Under his children the State made a wild religious swing in one direction, and then a wild religious swing in the other direction before settling down as an official State Religion, with not too much religious content, under his astute third child, Elizabeth.

If Edward had lived longer, there might have been an effective national Protestant settlement in England. If Mary had lived longer there might have been an effective Catholic restoration. What Elizabeth brought about was an official State religion, with authentic Reformationism fermenting below the surface, rather than a national religious settlement.

The attempt by the Scotsman, Charles I, to make the State religion the national religion provoked the Puritan Revolu-

tion, which swept Anglicanism aside. The Puritan Revolution triumphed under Cromwell's leadership but was then aborted by him and collapsed into a shambles. Anglicanism was restored as the State religion by Charles 2. His brother James 2 abolished religious ascendancy and introduced freedom of religion and was overthrown.

It is very unlikely that Anglicanism could have maintained itself as a mere religion in free contention with the popular forms of Protestantism that had maintained themselves as Dissidents under Anglican State dominance. Under 17th century conditions Anglicanism, the creation of the State, was a State religion or nothing. Long, long ago I read the greater part of the multi-volume defence of it, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, by "the judicious Hooker". It was so judicious, so diffuse, so soporific, that it left me with the impression that Anglicanism (in England, at least) was a sort of Confucianism—a system of manners, rituals, and conventions which harmonised as a culture for those who lived in the service of the state. It was ceremonial.

I think it was Lord Melbourne (the husband of Byron's mistress), a good Anglican, who said around 1830, when there was a spark of revival in the Church of England, that things had come to a pretty pass if religion felt free to interfere in private life.

*

Mansergh says that Clifford "without any supporting evidence... even questions Berkeley's belief in the existence of God, though it is in fact essential to his philosophy".

I did no such thing. I have had some experience of Anglicans (proper English ones such as Berkeley was) including even a Vicar, and I know that, as Burke held that statesmen should be accorded a presumption of Virtue as a necessity of public life unless their flagrant viciousness made it impossible, so Belief should be assumed in Bishops. The matter is delicate and personal, and the probing of it would tend to put a premium on enthusiastic Belief. And that would not do at all! We don't want to encourage Paisleyism, for God's sake!

Cardinal Newman, a Believer in the Anglican fold, became a Catholic. When the Rev. Kingsley—the muscular Anglican imperialist—tackled him over his new Beliefs, Newman responded with a tormenting review of what could be found lurking in Anglicanism if it was taken in earnest as a belief system.

I indicated what Anglicanism was in its prime in 18th century England. I have no notion of what Dis-established Anglicanism is like in Southern Ireland now. I believe Tom Bates, one of the founders of this magazine, was an Anglican. If so, he had picked up the Catholic habit of not dragging religion into politics.

What I said about Berkeley and belief was a little joke that was very much to the point:

"I suppose Berkeley believed in God after some fashion. He did not believe in the existence of matter, so what else was there for him to believe in?..."

"Whether Berkeley actually believed in the God, which his disbelief in the existence of matter left as the only possible existence, I don't know. It doesn't matter. He was, in everything that matters, an English gentleman who happened to be born in Ireland and was lucky enough to get an Irish Bishopric."

Berkeley asserts repeatedly throughout the *Principles* that the mind knows only its ideas, and that the ideas are not the means by which it knows an independently existing world outside itself but are generated out of itself. And he is not agnostic on the question of the existence of a material world. He says there is no such thing. He denies it dogmatically.

The mind does not forge ideas through interaction with an independently existing world. The world which it mistakenly supposes to exist, and which it imagines itself to be interacting with, has no existence of its own. It exists only as an idea in the mind generated by the mind itself.

The world is an idea produced by the mind, existing only in the mind. The mind knows only the ideas that it generates. All the busy activity of the world, and all the variety of people in it with their great range of differing ideas, are your own solitary imaginings. It is television soap opera before there was television. It is subjective idealism. It is solipsism.

Berkeley's friend Percival (aristocratic son of a Cromwellian planter) introduced the book to London. Berkeley urged him not to make too much of its denial of the existence of matter, though it is almost the only thing in it.

(Fr. Ted, holidaying in a caravan in the countryside, explains to Dougall, as they look out of the window, the subtle difference between small and far away.

I assume that was inspired, via Trinity, by the *New Theory Of Vision*, which accompanied the *Principles*.)

Solipsism is a strange philosophy. Berkeley warded off solipsism by means of a *deus ex machina*—the logical postulate of God.

I know little about Belief. But I somehow feel that it is not quite the same thing as a logical postulate.

Mansergh is quite right insofar as he says that positing the existence of God "*is in fact essential to his philosophy*". It is essential if, from his startling denial of the existence of matter as his starting point, he is not to end up in the absurdity of solipsism. To ward off solipsism it was necessary for him to posit some existence other than himself. But the God in the *Principles* is a rabbit pulled out of a hat.

Now I would say that Archbishop King was a Believer—more so than perhaps was decent in an Anglican Bishop. He came from Ulster and he had been through the difficult early period of the Revolution in Ireland, and was not just a beneficiary of it. He scandalised Berkeley by denying that God was Omniscient. He supported Free Will, and the idea of God as Omniscient, Omnipotent and Omnipresent ruled out the possibility of Free Will. He dismissed those Omnis as turning God into a super-human. He envisaged God as a force of wilfulness that did not quite know what it was doing. That was in a sermon delivered in St. Patrick's Cathedral. And, in his big book on the *Origins Of Evil*, he says that what is experienced as Evil by man, as God's creature, is whatever obstructs his will.

But Berkeley didn't hold with God being deprived of super-human qualities. He says somewhere that his philosophy would resolve the Free Will conundrum without taking anything away from God. But I couldn't see how it did. By making everything mental, I would have thought he intensified the problem.

(Towards the end of the *Principles* he uses the word "*spirit*" a lot without ever getting to grips with it. The obvious development for it was mysticism—everything was a play in the fancy of God as super-spirit. Half a century later Kant admitted to having used the word '*spirit*' a lot without having any idea what he meant by it.)

I have gone into this a bit because it is official Irish Philosophy. Trinity

College remains a colonial fortress in the heart of Dublin City—the material heart of it—and, making due allowance for the collapse of the English Christianity which it was set up to impose on us, it remains true to its mission.

Berkeley's Philosophy is a major business with it: an industry. And it has proclaimed Berkeley Philosophy, produced in the first generation of the Irish Colony as Kingdom of Ireland, as Irish Philosophy—the only Irish Philosophy there has ever been. And what philosophical existence is there in the post-Catholic National University, with all its Colleges, that would dare to take issue with it?

The Chief Executive of the Berkeley Industry at Trinity a generation ago was A.A. Luce. Today it seems to be David Berman—I assume the same David Berman who some time ago made a point of being an atheist.

When I left Slieve Luacra for London in my early twenties I went to have a look at the atheists in the Conway Hall. After a couple of visits I concluded that English atheism was a branch of Anglican theology.

*

"*Its [The Reformation's] main achievement in later German eyes was the impetus that it gave to intellectual freedom. If the freedom to think for oneself began with the Bible, it certainly did not finish with it.*" Do those two sentences say that freedom to think began with the Reformationist cult of the Bible? I think they must. And do they suggest that Bible-reading enhanced the capacity to think?

But the statement is elliptical, and ellipsis is a mode of rhetoric rather than thought.

Modern thinking began in the most Catholic part of Europe in the most Catholic century—Italy in the 14th, when Italy became Roman again, and incorporated Greek thought as Rome had done. And it happened amidst the fierce modern contentions between Church and State, both of which were Catholic. If Mansergh, after all this time, wishes to take issue with my view of things, he might take issue with this assertion which I have made repeatedly.

The modern world sprouted in Italy, about two centuries before the German Reformation, in the form of the Renaissance. The Reformation sought to close down the Renaissance world. Zwingli's Zürich and Calvin's Geneva

were the characteristic products of Reformationist Bible culture.

What the Reformation inculcated was not free thought about the Bible but closed Biblical thought. General "*freedom to think*" in Germany seems to have begun under the Tyranny of Frederick the Great.

Catholic Ireland in the early 19th century held up the example of Prussia to England as a Protestant state in which there was freedom of religion—but that freedom flowed from the absolute State rather than from the Reformation.

Frederick accorded the populace freedom of thought but reserved freedom of action for himself. I suppose this accorded with Luther's position that, while people should be free to interpret the Bible for themselves, this did not imply freedom to act in the way that the Bible might suggest to them.

I observed Reformationism at close quarters in Belfast. Nationalist Ireland denied itself that experience by denying that the Protestant Plantation and migration had undergone a distinct national development in Ulster.

Protestant Ulster was cut off from the political life of the British state by England almost a century ago. And Belfast, then a Presbyterian town, had only been accorded a position within the political life of the state in 1832: a position that was modified in 1886 by the Home Rule Bill. For all but half a century in the course of three centuries, Belfast had lived and developed by its own resourcefulness, economic, cultural and political. Then, in 1921, against its expressed wishes, it was persuaded to operate a subordinate government, for which its history could only disable it, and to do so in disconnection from the political life of the state, while retaining a semi-detached connection with the state. It did this as its "*supreme sacrifice*" for the Empire, to help it break up Sinn Fein.

It was then frozen into a time-warp. The Reformationist element in the 'mainland' had begun to undergo rapid erosion by that time. In Northern Ireland Reformationism, isolated from the politics of the state, was not only stabilised but went back into itself as the only thing it had to live by. And it was through encountering it in live form that I saw how essentially anti-political the Reformation had been as a historical event.

*

Mansergh writes:

"...

...Clifford goes on to conclude, having discussed only one side of the case, that the Ireland of today is in no way an evolution of Berkeley's Ireland, and castigates Irish intellectuals for regarding him as any sort of a forerunner. For good measure, and without any supporting evidence, he even questions Berkeley's belief in the existence of God, though it is in fact essential to his philosophy.

Long before there was much revisionist influence about, Eamon de Valera as Taoiseach gave a quite different and more generous appraisal.

...

Some of the thinking of Thomas Davis, which contributed important elements to the Irish-Ireland ideology on which independent Ireland was initially based, is consciously or not a development of Berkeley's thinking.

...

It is one thing to respect in the present day, as the Constitution now implicitly does on foot of the Good Friday Agreement, the wishes of those Ulster unionists who, though entitled to Irish citizenship, reject or repudiate it on principle (a bit less so in the Brexit context). It is quite another thing to attempt to deny people, whether living, dead or long dead, an Irish identity, in whole or in part, which they willingly profess(ed), on the grounds that their backgrounds or political attitudes exclude them.

The modern Irish State is understandably proud of all those who have played a part in enhancing the country's reputation at home and abroad, regardless of the tradition from which they come, including Bishop Berkeley, in whose memory on the tercentenary of his birth An Post issued a stamp in 1985. Berkeley belongs to more than Ireland and Britain, where he counts as part of a triad of empirical philosophers, Locke, Berkeley and Hume. A famous American university in Berkeley, California, and a college at Yale, of which he was an early benefactor, are named after him, as of course is the copyright library in Trinity College, Dublin.

The Ireland of the future, including a potential united Ireland, needs to be broad-based, and embrace all its traditions... In fairness, one must acknowledge that was more difficult to do in the past, when, with the hurts of history still raw, a country under acute social, economic and^{ooo} political pressures was still finding its feet in the first decades of independence, especially after the bulk of the

Protestant population concentrated in Northern Ireland had taken six counties out, regardless of the feelings of the nationalist community there. While there are some constants, conceptions of national identity change in every generation...

De Valera preferred to maintain bridges between traditions, as exemplified by the appointment of another gentleman Douglas Hyde as first President under the 1938 Constitution, rather than insist on rigorous demarcation. Still less did he demand excommunication from the nation and from the national story of a selection of figures from the Anglo-Irish tradition, particularly if there was something that could be held against them as anti-national, regardless of whether they saw themselves and were seen as Irish in whole or in part. David Trimble, by all accounts an enthusiastic supporter of the two-nations theory, was only being consequent when he accused this State of being 'monocultural', the other side of the coin, except that the reality was always different from the theory, and is even more so today. Why would anyone from a Protestant background in Northern Ireland ever willingly be persuaded to join with a State, which, if it followed the thrust of the article, would discount known co-religionist achievers from other parts of the country, like Bishop Berkeley, as not belonging, not valued, and not Irish? To its credit the State doesn't behave like that, and mostly didn't even back in de Valera's day, thanks to his good example."

All of this takes me back to 1969-70 and the farrago of debating points with which my statement of the obvious about the Ulster Protestant community was attempted to be conjured away by all and sundry in Dublin, including the leaders of Official Sinn Fein, who then seemed to be people of consequence in the life of the Free State, by C.C. O'Brien, and by Garret FitzGerald who knew that there was one all-embracing Irish nation because his mother was an Ulster Presbyterian. I recall a listing by Tomas McGiolla of all the things that Ulster Unionists and Irish Nationalists had in common, and commenting that, if it proved anything, it was not that the Ulster Unionists were Irish Nationalists but that the Irish Nationalists were English.

Berkeley certainly played some part in the development of the American colony, in which he spent some time as an Englishman from the Irish colony.

He would have spent much more time there if the expected funding of his projects by the English Government had not been stopped.

He is of course the big name in the Reformationist English College in Ireland. But Trinity Library is not an Irish Copyright Library: it is the British Copyright Library. It may have been Irished recently, but when I wanted to use it in the sixties, it was British with attitude, and it denied me the free access that I had to the English Copyright Library in the British Museum.

"a bit less in the Brexit context": the way that the underlying notion there used to be expressed fifty years ago was that what they loved was the half-crown rather than the Crown. They were a bought people, and were nothing in themselves. That is an idea that fits in well with Berkeley's theory of knowledge. It is a mental construct independent of external reality.

Thomas Davis as nationalist in the Berkeley mould!! Berkeley was an Ecclesiastical agent of the Williamite conquest in its Hanoverians development. Davis was the historian of the Irish Parliament of 1689 which asserted Irish independence when England was having its Glorious Revolution, and took James to be its King—and which was swept away by the Williamite conquest and the Protestant Colonial Parliament put in its place. And he wrote the Jacobite ballads that Professor Foster derides because they irritate him and he knows they will outlast him. A less plausible *"forerunner"* of Davis than Berkeley would be hard to find.

But Davis's account of James's Parliament of 1689, published by Gavan Duffy, has long been out of print. Duffy, the major literary figure of the Young Ireland movement, has long been out of print, consigned to the rubbish-bin of history. And the account of the Williamite Parliament of 1692 (the source of Berkeley's 'nation') by Ulster Protestant John Mitchell, is long out of print. The historical literature of Irish nationalist development against the Reformationist regime of destruction, has been taken out during the past sixty or seventy years that were dominated by Fianna Fáil. Literary genocide has been accomplished, and Ireland made a clean page for Oxbridge Academic history to be written on.

Dev kept bridges open and *"another gentleman"* crossed. Did the author of *An Gleann Nar Togadh Me* [The Glen

Where I Was Born] have to be allowed to cross a bridge from elsewhere in order to become President? And what resemblance can be established between Douglas Hyde and James Craig that might be of use in tapping into the Irish National strain that is alleged to exist in Ulster Unionist culture?

"Why would anyone from a Protestant background from Northern Ireland" join a state which disparages their *"known co-religionist achievers"* as I advocate. Where did I ever advocate such thing? I don't know where I ever took religion to be the determinant of social division. In 1969 I took the Ulster Protestant Community at its word when it said it wasn't nationalist Irish. And I know that those who condemned me—it was not mere disagreement—applied a semblance of logic which led them to assert that other Protestants in the South were not Irish either by my reckoning.

What I dealt with was coherent social bodies, colonies, not religions. The Ulster colony went through an effective development as a society which was not reducible to religion. The other colonies of different kinds around the South were parasitic on the native population. In the course of failing, great numbers of them left the country, some remained in order to tend to the property they had acquired as a ruling caste, and others joined the National development of the native population.

Davis appealed to his *"co-religionist achievers"* to join the national movement in the 1840s. The response was negligible. A greater response would probably have given a very different development to the national movement, and given some grounds for regarding it as an evolution of Berkeley's nation.

In 1910 Canon Sheehan and William O'Brien appealed to the landlords, who had recently been relieved of the burden of monopoly land ownership, to join the Home Rule movement, which they were purging of the Redmondite Catholic Ascendancy strain, and become Protestant country gentleman with a respected place in society. Again the response was negligible. The hard-core Protestant expectation, expressed in the *Church of Ireland Gazette*, right through to about 1923, was that England would yet again find a way of subordinating the Irish.

There still seems to be a bitter residue of Southern Protestant resentment against the national state. It is none of

my doing. It is all the doing of the premier political columnist of the mass circulation *Sunday Independent*, Eoghan Harris, and his protege, the Bishop of Cork.

And, if David Trimble has a bleak view of the South, that is none of my doing. He took his advisors from the Official IRA—Lord Bew and Eoghan Harris—and they encouraged his bleakness. But it is chiefly the Southern Establishment itself that has presented the world with a picture of the South as a priest-ridden hot-house of Romanist theocracy.

The categorical rejection of the two-nations view in 1969 by Jack Lynch led to a search for another explanation of why Ulster Unionists were so anti-Irish. The conclusion seems to have been that it was because the Irish state and Nationalist society were bigotedly Catholic. Aggressive Catholicism had alienated them, and encouraged Anglophobia. If the national culture was made non-descript, then the Protestants would be more inclined to come in. In order to encourage change, the status quo was painted in horrific colours.

Because I saw Unionist Ulster as a distinct nationality, I saw no sense in that approach. Nationalist Ireland would not bring the Unionist in by defaming itself. As a two-nationist, I could allow nationalist Ireland its integrity, whilst also describing the course of national development of the Ulster colony. Because of that I soon came to be regarded as extreme nationalist, while still being blackballed as two-nationist.

"It is one thing to respect... as the Constitution now implicitly does... the wishes of those Ulster Unionists...". Doesn't this say that I was premature in describing the social reality of the North in 1969 because the Constitution was still denying it?

What I proposed the 1969 was that the Constitution should acknowledge the reality so that there might be a degree of North/South *rapprochement*. The change might have had some effect on Unionist attitudes then. When it was made thirty years later, with the permission of the IRA, after a War had been fought, it had no effect.

After Jack Lynch rejected my proposal in 1969, and I ascertained that Southern opinion supported him, I proposed that political normality in the North should be sought through democratisation into the political life of the

British state, of which it was effectively a disfranchised region.

Mansergh has chosen to be Irish. He is free to be as Irish as he is capable of being as far I am concerned, but he came to Ireland with upper-class English breeding and education, and it is unimaginable to me that he does not know how Britain is governed. And it beats me how he could fail to see that Northern Ireland is a region of the British state governed by a perversely undemocratic Constitutional variant specifically designed for it in order to serve an unacknowledged purpose of State.

But Fianna Fail will not allow that to be the case. And, when my proposal for democratisation was making headway in a campaign directed by David Morrison, Dublin pleaded with Whitehall to rebuff it.

(Whitehall had no intention of giving up on its Northern Ireland arrangement that had disrupted Irish nationalist politics so effectively.)

Westminster wantonly excluded the Six Counties from British political life when partitioning Ireland, while continuing to provide all the major services of state, and it placed the Nationalist minority under Protestant communal rule in a system that had no possibility of political life in it. After half a century of routine humiliation and aggravation, culminating in a pogrom, the Nationalist Community went to war against the State. How can the IRA, which fought that war in the interest of the politically-disabled Nationalist community and with its support, be regarded as anything but a *justified belligerent*?

But Fianna Fail will not have it so. That is the result of never having had a Northern Ireland policy, either as domestic policy under the assertion of sovereignty under Article 2, or as foreign policy under the suspension of sovereignty in Article 3. Dev encouraged Nationalist discontent but discouraged Nationalist action. He did not admit Northern representatives to the Dail, nor did he organise Fianna Fail in the North, leaving it to the futility of Redmondism.

What was the basis of the antagonism within the North? It was left to the British propaganda to determine in the public mind that it was religion, and thus to exonerate itself. These fundamentalist religious antagonisms are beyond the reach of reasonable politics aren't they?

It escaped notice that the War was

not a Catholic/Protestant war (though the British Government tried to make it one), but a war between the Nationalist community and the State.

°°Religion was still an important element in British political life when the Home Rule conflict began, and Parnell fell foul of it. The multitude of changes during the Great War and the emergence of a new party-structure at the end of it reduced the significance of religion greatly. But that was the point at which the British in the Six Counties were excluded from the party-political structures of British development and frozen into pre-war attitudes, and driven back into Reformationism as a substitute for state politics.

The reason Ulster Protestants were not Socialists and Tories in the 20th century, and were just Protestants, was not that they rejected the British parties but that the British parties rejected them.

Westminster arranged that the only way they could remain attached to the British state was to band together as Protestants at every election and return a clear Unionist majority. That was not the case in any other region of the state. And the Catholics did not reject the politics of the state either—as they had done a century earlier under O'Connell's influence—but were excluded from state politics. If Northern Ireland was a "*sectarian*" hot-house, it was Westminster that made it so.

*

Communal Protestant rule over Catholics, flimsily disguised, was not a regional development but device of the British State which the Irish State preferred not to see. It was found more satisfactory to deride the Protestants as bigots (while in the next breath treasuring them as part of the Irish nation) than to enquire how they came to be in a political arrangement that put a premium on bigotry.

The nationalist community made war on the State and was condemned by Dublin for further alienating the other part of the nation—the bigoted Protestant part. And I was condemned to suggesting that the Protestants were not mere bigots.

I was condemned for excluding these bigots from the Irish nation by refusing to see them as Irish. Irishness was pressed upon them by constitutional nationalism, and in the mid-seventies the slogan KAI appeared on the walls in East Belfast: *Kill All Irish*.

A friend of mine, Liam Lynch, who had spent some years in the Catholic monastery, took lodgings on the fringe of East Belfast. He was identified as Catholic, kidnapped and taken away for shooting. On the way he persuaded his captors to go with him to his lodgings where he would show them why they should not shoot him. What he showed them was leaflets written by me—two-nationist etc. They read the leaflets and left without him.

If "*constitutional nationalism*" had ever addressed Protestant Ulster as what it was, instead of telling it that it was entirely mistaken about itself and was really something entirely different, things would have been very different in the North.

Gerry Fitt, the great Constitutional nationalist of the period (who would've been a Labour Party MP if that party had not excluded the North from its sphere of operations) refused to distinguish between Unionists. He said: *a Unionist is a Unionist is a Unionist*. And he was right. And in Unionist eyes a Nationalist was a Nationalist was a Nationalist. And the 'Constitutional' variety was, in my experience, certainly not hated less than the Republican variety.

*

How could Dev, berated by the Treatyites for having read Machiavelli, not have understood what Britain had done with the Six Counties? Why did he just let it be, regularly stoking it up a bit, while always keeping it at a distance? I can see political purpose in this until he achieved *de facto* independence in 1938, and then in warding off British invasion during the war. But what sense was there in it after 1945?

He made his Berkeley speech in 1953, when Fianna Fail had come to the rescue of Trinity from the Treatyites. The Fine Gael Coalition had not only broken links with the Empire that Dev had preserved, but had set out to break the Empire Bastion in central Dublin by starving it of funds. Then Fianna Fail returned, and restored Trinity, so that it could continue doing what it had always done. Why?

Mansergh seems to suggest that Dev saw 20th century Ireland as an evolution of Berkeley's Ireland. George Gilmore suggested much the same thing in 1937. I don't know. I have never had any contact with Fianna Fail—except for one strange almost-contact that should be described some time. But Mansergh is a Fianna Fail insider and presumably

has some grounds for what he suggests.

But I can't see evolution. What I see is ruptures. The totalitarian Protestant regime of 1692 broke with all that had gone before. Years later Berkeley wrote:

"We are a nation as it were in its nonage, put under the guardianship of a people who do everything for us" (Letter to Percival, March 1710).

Nonage is an obsolete word for infancy.

England would not let its infant colony in Ireland grow into a Protestant rival, and Berkeley protested. But I doubt very much whether Berkeley's nation could have flourished if England had let it be. It depended on its creator, England, against the Irish. And a generation later Berkeley was saying that they were still English and perhaps should be merged it back into the English nation.

Berkeley's nation abolished itself in 1800. Its independence during the 20 years of Grattan's Parliament was disastrous for it.

Berkeley's "*Scythians*" were still there after a century of Penal Laws and they shrugged off the Glorious Revolution and set off on a new adventure. At the start they were, as Pearse said, something like a "*mob*", but they did realise themselves as a nation. There might have been a hybrid development if Berkeley's nation in decline had ever thrown in its lot with the Irish. But they never did. Occasional individuals joined the Irish, but there was never a collective merger of the old colony with the new nation.

The Parnell Split was a kind of rupture. The fall of Parnell is lamented, and misrepresented, in certain quarters^o because he is seen as not quite having joined the Irish, as Davis did, but as having aspired to master them.

PS: Berkeley published a second Address to Catholics, around the same time as *A Word To The Wise*, at the height of the Penal Laws in 1845, when the Jacobite rebellion offered some prospect of alleviation:

"My Countrymen and Fellow-Subjects
"...I find myself strongly inclined, at this critical juncture, to put you in mind that you have been treated with a truly Christian lenity under the present government; that your persons have been protected and your properties secured by equal laws; and that it would be highly imprudent as well as ungrateful to forfeit these advantages by making yourselves tools to the ambitions of foreign princes, who fancy it

expedient to raise disturbances among us at present...

"Is it not evident that your interest consists in lying still and waiting the event, since Ireland must necessarily follow the fate of England..."

"Under Protestant governments those of your communion have formerly enjoyed a greater share of the lands of this kingdom, and more ample privileges... If these advantages have been since been impaired or lost, was it not by the wrong measures yourselves took to enlarge them..."

"You know all these things to be true... Dear-bought experience hath taught you... But perhaps you follow conscience rather than interest. Will any men amongst you pretend to plead

conscience against being quiet, or against paying allegiance and peaceable submission to a Protestant prince, which the first Christians paid even to the heathen..." (Collected Works, 1953, Vol. 6, p229).

This exhortation to unconditional submission was in fact in accordance with his general political doctrine of Passive Obedience whatever the state happens to be. The state in Ireland happened to be a Protestant dictatorship. And Passive Obedience, a comprehensive negation of the principle by which the Glorious Revolution justified itself, was, for obvious reasons, the doctrine of that Revolution in Ireland.

Peter Brooke

Origins Of The Renaissance

Why did the Renaissance and the Reformation develop in the womb of Western Christianity, centred on old Rome, rather than that of Eastern Christianity, centred on New Rome (Constantinople)?

Or, to put it another way (leaving aside for the moment the Reformation): Given that the pre-Christian classical culture—Latin and Greek—of the Roman Empire played an important role, why did the Renaissance not occur in the culture (Constantinople) that was continuous with the Roman Empire and that had, contrary to Western Christendom, preserved a large part of its culture?

I don't want to exaggerate the difference. The Renaissance was first and foremost an Italian phenomenon, and Italy was the part of Western Christianity that was closest—geographically and culturally—to the Eastern Roman Empire. Although Italy had come under the domination of the barbarian Ostrogoths and Lombards, and was under the influence of the Franco-German world, nonetheless something of the old Roman tradition remained. Italian Gothic architecture has a different—more decorative, more human—feel from Franco-German Gothic. Italy was the most obvious destination for Eastern Christians escaping the advance of Islam, and there was a well-established Greek colony in Calabria.

There was also in the fourteenth and

fifteenth century what might have been the beginnings of a 'Renaissance' development in Constantinople, associated in the fourteenth century with the Calabrian monk, Barlaam, and in the fifteenth century with the Platonist philosopher, Gemistos Plethon.

But for the moment I want to concentrate on the difference.

The administrative structure of the Roman Empire had collapsed in the West and new administrative structures and a new culture had been created, almost from scratch, on the basis of people who had never been fully part of the Empire—Irish, Germans, Angles, Saxons, Franks, Visigoths, Ostrogoths. Of course they looked to what they knew of Old Rome as a model that could (when they so choose) be followed and there was a continuity in the papacy. But the new structure of Charlemagne's Empire and its successors developed in a state of tension with the papacy, a tension that included in the German courts the development of an intellectual life that was independent of Rome.

In the eleventh century, under the Emperor Henry III, the Germans secured control of the papacy and it is no coincidence that this marked what is conventionally seen as the final break between the two Romes with the formal exchange of anathemas in 1054.

This new Roman—even to some

extent anti-Roman—culture that developed in the West may have evoked the names of Plato and Aristotle but they had very little access to their actual writings and virtually no access to the original Greek. They knew nothing or very little of Greek poetry, of Homer or the tragedians or even of the Greek Christian Fathers. Plato was known through Latin synopses prepared by Porphyry and through the accounts given by Augustine; Thomas Aquinas knew Aristotle through Latin translations of Arabic translations of the original Greek.

But all this material—both the poetry and the philosophy—was preserved in Constantinople. It was taught in schools and an effort was put into establishing good texts. But, at the risk of over-generalising, it seems to have been preserved, so to speak, in amber. It was regarded as a model of the good use of the Greek language and also, with regard to the philosophy, as a useful mental exercise. But it was not regarded as a useful means for discovering 'truth', at least the sort of truth that interested Plato and Aristotle, the truth of 'being'. Such truth was known by other means.

The difference was, I believe, clarified in the fourteenth century, in the dispute between the Calabrian monk Barlaam and the monk of Mount of Athos, Saint Gregory Palamas. Barlaam had been brought up in Italy, albeit in a Greek speaking part of Italy, but had moved to Constantinople where he became influential as a Christian theologian, particularly charged with relations with the Western Church and therefore with clarifying differences with the Western Church.

Ironically enough, the dispute with Saint Gregory began with Barlaam writing in defence of Eastern Christianity against Thomas Aquinas. Against Thomas's view that divine things could be known by the operation of the human reason, Barlaam argued that "*most divine things transcend human knowledge*". The gulf between the Uncreated (God as Trinity) and the created (everything else) was absolute and could never be bridged either in this life or in the next.

In the course of developing his argument, he ridiculed a tendency that was very powerful among the Eastern Christian monks. This, dating back to the earliest days of the monastic movement, was enjoying a revival under the name '*hesychasm*'. The name is derived from the Greek '*hesychia*'

meaning '*silence*'. The hesychasts believed that, through ascetic discipline, it was possible for man, even in the course of his life on earth, to achieve a union with God analogous to the union of God and man in Christ, and that this is what characterises the Saints as a category of humanity different from the rest of us. It is this direct experience of God, not any process of philosophical reasoning, nor study of the Bible understood as the 'Word of God', that enables knowledge of divine things.

(The Bible is treated in hesychast literature as a manual of prayer. The violent confrontations between the people of Israel and the peoples of Canaan become an account of the struggle with demonic forces that afflict the soul. This mode of interpretation goes back to the earliest days of Christianity, with Origen, writing in the third century. A notable example is the *Life of Moses* by Saint Gregory of Nyssa, from the fourth century. I was amazed and pleased, on my last visit to the Evangelical Bookshop in Belfast, to see the *Life of Moses* offered for sale on its shelves.)

In the course of his polemics Barlaam used the term '*omphaloscopoi*' to characterise the hesychasts—'navel-gazers'. It was a word that caught on.

Palamas drew the distinction, very important in Orthodox theology, between the essence and the energies of God. He agreed that the Trinity in its essence was absolutely unknowable but we can, he argued, participate in the energies, and the energies are of the uncreated nature of God in much the same way that the light of the Sun is of the nature of the Sun.

Although Barlaam's teaching was condemned by a Council of the Church and he himself returned to Italy (where he became a tutor teaching Greek to the poet Petrarch), he did have a substantial following which remained in Constantinople. Indeed the dispute was tied up with a dynastic struggle that had created a situation of near civil war.

The dispute furthermore fed into the attempt in the following century at the Council of Florence to establish a union between the Western and Eastern Roman Churches on the eve of the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks. It is in this context that a massive transfer of Greek culture, including in 1423 the entire *corpus* of Plato's writings, occurred, together with a transfer of leading intellectuals, including Plethon and Bessarion, leader of the Orthodox

delegation at Florence, later to become one of the most influential Cardinals in the Latin Church.

One of the motives for union was hope that the West would come to the rescue of Constantinople against the Ottomans. A union was actually agreed at Florence but it provoked a revolt among the Orthodox, including the slogan, '*Better the turban of the Turks than the cardinal's hat*'. The slogan was not as extreme as it might appear. Once incorporated into the Ottoman Empire, the Patriarch of Constantinople could re-establish contact with the large swathes of Eastern Christendom which had already come under Muslim rule. The alternative was to be an isolated community wholly dependent on the goodwill of the traditional '*Frankish*'—generic term for the Latin west—enemy.

But the point I want to retain here is that, for the Eastern Church, where there was a continuity of culture from the conversion of Constantine, knowledge of God was a matter of experience normally obtained through ascetic discipline. It was concentrated in the person of the Saints, hence the importance of venerating the Saints. Their experience was the guarantee of the truth of the Church and since the Church was One Body, participation in the Church was a joining together in one body with the Saints, so sharing vicariously in their experience.

I'm not suggesting that such thinking was totally alien to the Western Church, especially, perhaps, at a popular level: but the emphasis it seems to me is different. Here the continuity had been broken by the barbarian invasions and the new people—converted from Ireland, which had never been part of the Roman Empire, as well as from Rome—effectively created a new Church, in which doctrine arrived at by a process of intellectual speculation had a much more important part to play.

It may be that the very difficulty of obtaining access to Plato and Aristotle increased their mystique, the sense that they might provide a means by which the truth of Christianity could be secured by an 'objective' process of reasoning. Such an idea would have seemed to mainstream opinion in Constantinople to be absurd. It was of course the position that Barlaam, speaking as a representative of the Eastern Church, was trying to confute.

Familiarity with the Greek philosophers only seemed to confirm the Greeks in their view that in the Church

and in the monastic discipline they had something better. It is noticeable that the conversion of the Slavs to the Greek Church did not entail any transfer of the pre-Christian culture. I don't think this was because the Greeks were reserving to themselves something they thought guaranteed their superiority. On the contrary they believed they were giving the best of what they had. The other stuff, to which they themselves had a sentimental attachment, would have been an unnecessary encumbrance.

Edward Gibbon, in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, sums up the

situation as follows:

"The Greeks of Constantinople... held in their lifeless hands the riches of their fathers, without inheriting the spirit which had created and improved that sacred testimony; they read, they praised, they compiled, but their languid souls seemed alike incapable of thought and action."

We might express it differently. The Greeks, having been long storm-tossed by the tempests of philosophy, had at last arrived in the calm haven of the Christian Church which gave them, so

they felt, what they wanted, what the philosophers had been searching for. The Western barbarians (I hope it's understood that I'm not using the term pejoratively—far from it. I'm simply referring to those who had not experienced classical culture) received philosophy concurrently with their Christianity.

Consequently the haven of Christianity was a bit more troubled than it was in Constantinople. When suddenly the full of range of classical literature was flung at them the waters rose and (to say the least of it) risked throwing them out of the haven altogether.

Stephen Richards

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

Part Two

October Revolution

As I have re-read the first part of this two-part article I've had some misgivings. By our words, potentially, we're going to be condemned. Among the things that worry me most are, first, my lack of mastery of the period in question, leading to over-reliance on secondary sources; secondly the problem of accurately defining the terms of the debate, hence the casual throwing about of words like Renaissance, Humanism, Scholasticism and so on; and thirdly my admitted prejudice against the pre-Reformation Church, leading to the position that the Lutheran earthquake, in however qualified a sense, was a Good Thing.

Above and beyond all that sits the cardinal difficulty of trying to enter into the thought processes of men, and women, whose understanding of the world was very different from our own. The most impressive attempt I've ever come across to build that bridge (in a far different context) was by H.F.C. Milsom, who lectured us at Cambridge, in his *Historical Foundations of the Common Law*, a book that I sadly gave away and haven't managed to source since. It's more like a long essay than a book, imbued with a sort of muscular density that meant that each page took about half an hour to make sense of (perhaps I was a slow undergraduate). Yet it wasn't at all a conventionally academic book.

The Jewish Problem

With some of these *caveats* in mind

I'd like to look at the very combustible topic of Luther and the Jews. Except in England, from where the Jews had been expelled in the reign of Edward I, mediaeval and early modern Europe has had what until recent times was called the Jewish Problem. Of course England, despite being a Jew-free state from 1290 until Cromwellian times, participated imaginatively in the general *animus* against the Jews, as seen very clearly in *The Merchant of Venice* and Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, which shortly predated it. The extent to which England has been preoccupied with Jewish issues, as reflected in the great literary classics, has been explored by Anthony Julius in his *Trials of the Diaspora* (OUP, 2010), which was also referenced in a recent *Northern Star*.

The very term, "*the Jewish Problem*", is at best euphemistic: what it suggests to the mind, namely the problem posed by the Jews for the societies in which they lived, has often, if not necessarily, morphed in reality into the problem posed to the Jewish populations of Europe as they have struggled to survive, let alone flourish, amid the different levels of persecution, from civil disability mounting up to Holocaust, with which they have been successively, and sometimes simultaneously, visited.

But, leaving aside the whole issue of European Gentile bloodguiltiness, we need to try to enter into the minds of European Catholics and early Protestants

as they struggled to comprehend the purposes of God in preserving this stubborn, ingenious, resourceful wedge of an alien community in their midst, a community that continued to close its eyes to the obvious light of Christ in the Gospel (see II Corinthians 3, 13-15).

The presence of Jewish populations, and the psychological necessity to persecute them, have been constants of the European experience. The reasons have been sometimes religious, sometimes racial. At times the Jews were seen as a privileged elite, at other times as a verminous rabble (which is what they had been reduced to by previous persecutions). They were persecuted because they lived in ghettos, or *shtetls*, which they had been compelled to live in, and then at other times the fear was that they were too assimilated and so were polluting the blood of the nation.

At times they were seen as rootless cosmopolitans with no loyalty to the states where they made their home but, when they founded their own state and took active steps to defend it, this has led to the singling out of the state of Israel as being almost uniquely evil. I say "almost" because South Africa pre-1990 competed for the prize.

I note in passing that, were it not for the undoubted boon of positive discrimination in the United States, the third-level institutions there would be dominated by Jews and by ethnic

Chinese and other East Asians, or so they say. What a disaster that would be. And within the last few weeks Kevin Myers has managed to wreck his journalistic career by pointing out what has seemed to many of us to be obvious: that Jews have often been good at promoting their own interests. They have learned by accumulated experience to make hay while the sun shines.

I've often wondered how Europe would have developed in the second half of the last century if its Jewish populations had been allowed to continue on their earlier trajectory. I think the Jews would have attained a cultural and commercial hegemony east of the Rhine, not because of some deep-dyed plot, but simply because that is the way things turn out: in the absence of persecution the Jews rise to the top. That is Europe's Jewish problem, perhaps not a bad problem to have.

I forget who it was (maybe someone can enlighten me?) who lamented that the Austro-German musical tradition was dead, and that the only life it possessed was the result of the Jews like insects crawling all over the carcass and feeding on it. It's the kind of comment that might have been made by Luther, and I'll get to him shortly. But it's perhaps not as anti-Semitic as the imagery suggests. The point forcefully made is that the Jews managed to get inside the skin of the cultures they lived among. Parasites, in a sense, yes, but they gave as much to the feast as they took from it. *A fortiori*, with all due respect to assorted Texans and Canadians, it is largely through the Jews that America, especially white America, has re-imagined itself culturally in terms of music, theatre and film.

Ethnically the Jews were alien to north-west Europe. They were Ashkenazi Jews who had migrated from the Russian steppes, forming distinct communities in the Carolingian Empire from about 900 AD. Many had settled in the Rhineland cities such as Worms, Mainz, Cologne and Speyer, and in other areas of western and southern Germany. Wherever they settled, they had thrived, as merchants and moneylenders rather than as artisans, owing to the fact that the Guilds were closed to them.

The Ashkenazim were not of course a Semitic people, having become Jews by conversion. The first persecutions in the German lands arose around the time the First Crusade was declared, in 1095. A further wave of persecution dates from

the time of the Black Death in Germany in the mid-fourteenth century. The blood libel, already well established in England and France, had by that time become a familiar theme of German anti-Semitism. Interestingly the persecution in the German lands mounted as the anti-Hussite campaign got under way, causing a large-scale Jewish exodus to Poland and Lithuania, where the community enjoyed comparative safety during the later Middle Ages.

Farewell Espana

Luther's own Jewish preoccupations can't be considered in isolation from their context: 1492 (Luther was nine at the time) vies with 1517, 1789, 1917 and no doubt 1690, as one of the pivotal years in European development. The Christian kingdoms of Castile and Aragon combined to conquer the Moorish territory of Granada in the final act of the *Reconquista*. The union of the Crowns in the marriage of Isabella of Castile with Ferdinand of Aragon brought about the Kingdom of Spain, a construct that is beginning to look a bit fragile.

And immediately life in Spain became extremely problematic for the Sephardic Jewish community, which had ironically been welcomed into the Christian kingdoms following waves of persecution in Moorish Spain, from 1066 (another significant date) onwards. From that date the Andalusian paradise, where the great Jewish merchant princes, physicians, philosophers, poets and scholars had flourished, became a cold house. The Sephardim had originally come from North Africa, and presumably before that from Egypt and Mesopotamia, but their name references their Spanish identity. Isabella herself employed Jews in high places in her administration, and had given guarantees to the wider Jewish population.

For anybody who wants to explore that whole Sephardic story, I would thoroughly recommend *Farewell Espana*, by the very readable American Jewish scholar Howard Sachar. But the point is that in 1492 there was a toxic confluence of factors for the Jews of Spain. First of all there was the deadly logic that, since the country had now been liberated from the Moorish heretics, and united, it now behoved its rulers to see to it that the even older and more contumacious heretics, the Jews, were deprived of any status they had gained, and rooted out of the body of the state.

Hubristic pre-Reformation Catholic zeal was evident here. That didn't

emanate from Rome, whose Renaissance Popes were poring over their art treasures, nor from the Jesuits, who didn't exist at that time, but from the Franciscans and Dominicans, the attack dogs (*Domini canes*: "the dogs of God") of the Church, whose Spanish activities were more or less ignored by their Roman master. Of course we remember that the latter were the prime movers in the thirteenth century Albigensian crusades. It was not until the time of Paul IV (1555-59) that the Papacy began to take its persecuting duties seriously in relation to both Protestants and Jews. But the Jesuits themselves constituted a better class of Order, refusing to stoop to such dirty work by word or deed. The Reformation weeds hardly poked their heads through the soil at all in Spain.

The new united monarchy was greatly in need of funds too, to fund its sense of Imperial mission. Just at that time Columbus came along from Genoa and, as we all know, his voyages were financed from the Spanish coffers. And that money came from pillaging the Jews. So perhaps it was the Jews who discovered America, to add to their other achievements (it has indeed been speculated that Columbus himself had Jewish origins).

During the killing times of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Iberian Jews were pursued with persevering vengeance by the authorities in Church and State. Portugal was no longer a safe haven after 1640; and those who escaped to Mexico—converts, or New Christians, as they were called, some of whom became military governors of provinces—found themselves denounced and burnt alive at religious festivals.

And this is the point: they were not even persecuted for being Jews. Converts, some of whom had risen to high office in the Church were hunted out, brought to trial, and burnt (or garrotted if they were lucky). This is where the Spanish persecutions have more in common with the Nazi race ideology than Luther's religious diatribes. The key phrase was *limpieza de sangre*, purity of blood. So, for the Nazis, it didn't matter that your family had been Christian for two generations, or that you had been awarded the Iron Cross in the Great War. If you had a Jewish grandparent it was all over for you. At the same time the Spanish kingdom was persecuting the Moriscos as well, the Christianised Moors, expelled in 1609, so the consistency is remarkable. The common factor

was race, combined with a paranoid belief that the converts had converted in order to save their skins, and remained crypto-Jews (or crypto-Muslims).

The Spanish Inquisition, whose methods had spread to Italy by the mid-sixteenth century, was far less of a threat to Protestants than to Jews, although one of its last victims was a Protestant schoolmaster, garrotted in 1826. Unlike the Russian pogroms of the 19th century it was organised methodically from the top, so it was really the prototype for the Holocaust. The Nazis, and their collaborators over large parts of Europe, brought to near-completion the task the Inquisition had set itself, so the continent rid itself of six million Jews. A couple of generations later we find that six million Jews have been replaced by thirty million Muslims: a practical example of replacement theology, maybe? Let's see how that all works out.

I labour the point about sixteenth and seventeenth century race hatred of the Jews emanating from non-Teutonic sources, not in an attempt to absolve Luther from blame for the part he played in ramping up anti-Jewish feeling among his supporters, but to try to break the causative chain that leads from Luther to the gas chambers.

A Case For The Defence

Luther, in his attitude to the Jews as in so many other areas, was complicated: far from the man of one idea lampooned by Chesterton. His output was vast and unsystematic. Carl Trueman (*Luther on the Christian Life and History and Fallacies*, Crossway, 2015 and 2010 respectively) looks at the problem in terms of early Luther (good) and late Luther (bad). So, in 1523 we have the treatise, *That Jesus Christ was born a Jew*, in which he urges his readers to form good relations with their Jewish neighbours and so commend the Gospel to them. This extract gives a flavour of it:

"...for [the Jews] have been led astray so long and so far that one must deal gently with them, as people who have been all too strongly indoctrinated to believe that God cannot be man. Therefore I would request and advise that one deal gently with them, and instruct them from Scripture; then some of them may come along... So long as we treat them like dogs, how can we expect to work any good among them? Again, when we forbid them to labour and do business and to have any human fellowship with us, thereby forcing them into usury, how is that supposed to do them any good?"

Trueman's argument is that this dates from the first new dawn, when Luther expected that his new perspective on the Church and Salvation would carry all before it, and the Jews would be swept up in the general turning to the God of the Bible:

"...by the time Luther writes his polemic against the Jews in 1543 [Of the Jews and their Lies] it is clear that the expected mass conversion will not be taking place, at least in his lifetime, and thus he reverts to the more typical idiom of Jew baiting, albeit in an extreme form, even by the exacting standards of the time" .

For Luther, even the shocking anti-Semitic Luther, the Jewish Problem was not that the Jews were Jews, but that they were not Christians. As Trueman says:

"How does a society where the state and the church are essentially two sides of the same coin assimilate those who, by their very definition, are not members of the latter? The answer is simple: either it does not assimilate them and instead persecutes them, or it tries to convert them (either by persuasion or by force) and thus make them part of the church. Once converted, the problem ceases because it is an issue of religious conviction, not one of race"

As we have seen, the Spanish Inquisition used a different logical grid. For Trueman to imply that racial identity was not a factor in the sixteenth-century outlook is perhaps simplistic, but perhaps Luther himself didn't think in those terms. If we conclude that Luther's anti-Semitism wasn't racially-driven, it doesn't make it any the less repulsive. And it didn't stop the Nazis, and some neo-Nazis, appealing to the authority of Luther.

Lyndal Roper in her 2016 biography doesn't give Luther any easy escape from the charge of being an anti-Semitic monster (though she does remark on his refusal to countenance the destruction of Jewish writings):

"Anti-Semitism was not just a product of his later years, but in fact appears time and again. All three editions of the 1519 Sermon on Usury had images of Jews on the title page".

She backs this up by reference to lectures on the Psalms dating from 1513 to 1515, which demonstrate a long-held attitude, albeit from his pre-95 Theses days. She draws examples too from his *Table Talk* in the 1530s, some of which would suggest that "*it was vain to baptise*

Jews because they are rascals". This points to an eliding of the religious and racial identities of Jews, and challenges Trueman's view that Luther was motivated solely, or mainly, by *odium theologicum*.

"Indeed [she writes] Luther's violence was sometimes too much even for his contemporaries... in early 1543 [the same year as *Of the Jews and their Lies*] he produced *Vom Schem Hamphoras und vom Geschlecht Christi* (On the Ineffable Name and the Generations of Christ) which the Swiss theologian Heinrich Bullinger condemned, while Andreas Osiander in Nuremberg wrote privately to a Jewish friend of his in Venice to express his revulsion. But it was not repudiated by Lutherans, and was reprinted in 1577 ... *Von Schem Hamphoras* appeared again in 1617, the centenary year of the Reformation, alongside *Of the Jews and their Lies*."

The *Schem Hamphoras* itself was a sculpture in the Parish Church at Wittenberg, "*which shows [presumably among other things] a sow suckling several Jews, while a rabbi lifts its tail and looks into its rear*". Luther plays on this image relentlessly, so that the Jews are described as basically eating and being nourished by the Devil's excrement, in a diabolical counterpart of the Eucharist.

According to Roper, Luther's Catholic opponents continued to be anti-Semitic in the old-fashioned way, and to perpetrate the blood libel, more or less as they had always done, while some of his followers, as well as other reformers, took a milder view, and even argued for a relaxation of anti-Jewish measures. But Luther was out on his own: in his brutal scabrous language and in the extremity of the actions he advocated.

By the 1550s, as Diarmaid Mac Culloch remarks in his *Reformation: Europe's House Divided* (Penguin, 2003), the less hard-line position on the Jews adopted by some of the Reformers may have owed something to the fact that they, like the Jews, had now perforce become exiles, so there was some fellow-feeling.

Incidentally, while the fortunes of the Jews in the Holy Roman Empire in Reformation times was subject to wide regional variations, the Anabaptists were treated equally harshly by the magisterial Reformers and by the Catholic Church, wherever they lived and wherever they turned up.

There is no discussion that I've seen

on the extent to which Luther's anti-Jewish pamphlets motivated others to take part in actual massacres of Jews in Luther's day. "What if words of mine sent out/Certain men the English shot?" wondered Yeats. The general consensus is that the poet should have entertained no uneasiness on that score. Luther's words went out there into the mix, into a milieu that was already imbued with anti-Semitic imagery. Those words undoubtedly contributed incrementally to prolong and maybe intensify the ongoing sufferings of the Jews in some regions of Germany.

There was also a lasting residue of anti-Jewish sentiment surviving in Lutheran Germany that, while not as rabid as that of the early Nazis with their South German and Austrian background, still may have provided an entry point for that ideology to permeate the wider society. McCulloch's assertion that Luther provided the blueprint for *Kristallnacht* is a case of taking too many jumps.

Steven Ozment in his competent short history of Germany, *A Mighty Fortress* (Perennial, 2005) sums it up best for me:

"The truest explanation here is probably the most historical and best documented. From his earliest writings, Luther targeted legalistic Judaism as the corruption of prophetic Judaism and early Christianity, turning original religions of faith and hope into those of ritual observance and good works. By the 1530s he feared a similar fate was befalling his own reform. Because his anti-Judaism was intertwined with a reading of the German past as a history of foreign predation, Luther, without any sense of disproportion, could place contemporary Jews in a long succession of peoples and nations who had put Germans down. That combination of history and theology also made his anti-Jewish writings especially vulnerable to co-option by the anti-Semites of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."

This extract raises a whole new aspect of the Lutheran revolution: its impact on German historical self-consciousness. He failed to see why historical studies should be limited to the classical world, from which perspective the Germans appeared as an obscure, barbarous people, with no history worth bothering about.

The School Of Hard Knocks

What distinguished anti-Jewish polemic from other types of polemical writing in the Reformation era was that

the Jews weren't in a position to argue back. Leaving that aside, the language used against them wasn't much rougher than that used in the religious disputations of the day. Sixteenth-century Europe was no place for snowflakes. Luther at his worst revelled in, almost literal, verbal diarrhea at times, as did the saintly, indeed sainted, Thomas More. The scatological tone of some of the debates does at least testify to the intense commitment of the protagonists: they really believed that the subjects under discussion were matters of life and death, so to be on the wrong side of the debate made you worthy of all the epithets that your opponent could dredge up.

The challenge in all ages, and not just for religious controversialists, is to combine the intensity of commitment with a charitableness of spirit. Not much of the latter is visible among us, when it comes to the hot button issues of our day. We only have to look at the nature of the "anti-hate" rhetoric that has been unleashed on Donald Trump, or the vilification of pro-Life advocates, indeed their expulsion from some university campuses.

Luther's Marian Side

Interestingly, one of the cruxes of Christian animosity to Jews in that era was the accusation that Jews had a tendency to insult or disrespect the Virgin Mary. This was one area where Luther and his Catholic critics spoke with one voice. Luther's Marian theology is distinguishable from that of Vatican 1, but mainly with regard to Mary's intercessory role.

Here are some Luther quotations that I have picked from a Catholic website, the aim of which is to show Luther's conformity at key points to Catholic doctrine:

"The veneration of Mary is inscribed in the very depths of the human heart"

"Mary is the highest woman and the noblest gem in Christianity after Christ. She is nobility, wisdom and holiness personified. We can never honour her enough".

"She is without all sins."

He writes of her "*unique place in the whole of mankind among whom she has no equal*".

Luther's position here was probably more "*catholic*" than that of the other Reformers, (perhaps akin to Newman's on the eve of the decisive step on his journey in the opposite direction), but it may be a matter of degree. This is a controversial field, but it has been

tenably argued that Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Bullinger and others (such as John Wesley) all held to the perpetual virginity of Mary. As for her sinless perfection, the Immaculate Conception didn't become essential Catholic teaching until more than three centuries after Luther's death. It had been part of popular piety for three centuries or so before his birth, but was certainly not uncontested territory: St. Thomas Aquinas and Bernard of Clairvaux were both unhappy about it.

"Movin' On" (Hank Snow)

Like leaving the EU, leaving the Catholic Church was a case of jumping from a moving train. Next station was Trent, not far down the track, which would provide the doctrinal underpinning for what had been hitherto more of a gut reaction type of hostility—"I do not like thee, Dr. Fell"—to the Reformers' emphases. Vatican I, three hundred years after Trent, no doubt unintentionally, gave Newman's *Development of Doctrine* argument some serious ballast (the Church was not exactly *semper eadem*), but the development was all in a direction antithetical to the Reformation.

Looked at from that standpoint, Luther was not only justified by faith, but by history *ex post facto*. Several of the charges on which Rome was arraigned by the Protestant Truth Society (PTS) *et al* were nineteenth century innovations, which only Luther's ghost could have protested against.

The Church reformed, but in the wrong direction. With regard to those debatable points that might have gone either way around 1520, the Church decided at Trent to solidify and codify its teaching by way of specific denials of the Reformers' teaching. Especially anathematised was the teaching that God "*justifies the ungodly*", which is the pivotal teaching of the Reformers. The modern Catholic Church is really the product of Trent, energised by the Reformation.

Flesh, Blood, And Spirit

The same PTS people and others have glossed over Luther's conservative side: his retention of the form of the Mass, not insisting it should be uniformly in the vernacular, and the fact that he was comfortable with pictorial art and statues, as long as there was no veneration of images. His main liturgical distinctives were communion in both kinds (which had been the death of John Hus), congregational singing, and an enhanced status for the preached word.

As for Luther and transubstantiation, Trueman writes:

"He regards this as an error rather than a heresy, because it maintains the vital truth of Christ's real presence according to both natures in the elements. The problem he has with the transubstantiation is, ironically, the very opposite that a modern evangelical Protestant would have: it is the absence of the substance of bread and wine... rather than the presence of Christ."

Luther might have been on all fours with Elizabeth Anscombe, the Catholic analytic philosopher (1919-2001), who considered that the real miracle of the Eucharist was that the body and blood of Christ were transformed into bread and wine, not vice versa. But the transubstantiation debate as far as Luther was concerned was more of a quibble. That Christ is present in the Eucharist was common cause; the precise manner was a subject for legitimate debate, not for anathemas.

The big problem with the Mass as understood by Rome is that it's a sacrifice whereby the Saviour's body and blood is offered up to God, repeatedly. It is something we do for God, to make us acceptable in his sight, whereas in the Gospel God does everything for us. It was this teaching that the Reformers uniformly saw as repugnant to Scripture.

The Boa-Constrictor

If there was a certain amount of commonality, it raises the question as to why it was necessary for the Church to spit out Luther, rather than attempt to swallow him whole. Could the Church have adopted Luther's insight about the primacy of faith in our relationship with God without tottering on its foundations?

Macaulay, in his essay on (I think) Ranke's *History of the Popes*, writes of how the Catholic Church, in contrast with the fissiparous tendency of Protestantism, has been able to absorb and be newly revived by her enthusiasts. This is only partly true, I think. The Church made no attempt to absorb the Waldensians, or the Hussites, or the followers of Wycliffe in England. There was no attempt to compromise with, or harness the energy, of those who were determined to bring out the Scriptures in the vernacular. It was a case of immediate total war on those people and their ideas.

Was the mediaeval Church wiser than it knew? This is not to suggest that its response was right or proportionate, but that it may have been understood at some visceral level that to hold a friendly

dialogue with even some of the more conservative reformers would start a process that would inevitably lead to its destruction. Think Gorbachev and *glasnost* and *perestroika*. Or just think Vatican II, which, wherever it has been taken seriously, has undermined the faith it intended to recast in a more contemporary form, so we end up with the fatuous Pope Francis.

If we can imagine such a friendly dialogue, say at Worms in 1521, what would the red line issues have been, on both sides? A possible analogy would be the Church as a Jenga Tower: what blocks can be safely removed from the structure without the whole thing collapsing? I've come across the suggestion that there is no reason why the Church should not decide to relax the rule on priestly celibacy, but it would have no power to give way on the all-male priesthood, as that is something that goes to the heart of the faith.

I don't believe that it's really viable to posit this distinction between the substance and the accidents of the faith in Catholic terms. Catholics who question some aspect or other of Church dogma usually end up becoming generally 'lapsed', or more definitely non-believers, or (especially in South America) they become evangelical Protestants. In other words, they accept the *magisterium* or they don't. They don't question it in one aspect and accept it in others.

It was interesting to hear Jacob Rees-Mogg being interviewed by the lapsed Catholic Piers Morgan on some political TV show recently. Rees-Mogg is upper-class English, conservative (in both upper and lower case, which is unusual these days), measured, articulate and with no lack of self-confidence. In short, he is a good egg. Yet even he, when pressed on same sex marriage simply fell back on the teaching of the Church, not on biblical arguments, or even Natural Law arguments.

This is why the Church couldn't sup with Luther, because he challenged the supremacy of the Pope and the infallibility of Church Councils. Peter Brooke argues accurately that all Trinitarian Protestants do, as a matter of fact, endorse the formulations arrived at in the first four Ecumenical Councils, even the Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.) which identified the Virgin Mary as *theotokos*, the God-bearer, if not precisely as the Mother of God.

But, if you once concede that Church

Councils can err and have indeed erred, then the Church ceases to be a reliable mediator of the truth of God; and if it is permitted for believers to resist Papal Bulls and pronouncements, you end up with organised chaos in the Church in the here and now. So the question boils down to one of authority. Catholics can if they so desire take some things with a pinch of salt, as long as they don't stand up and argue for contrary positions. So it didn't matter what other things Luther could endorse. His endorsements sprang from conviction, from pragmatism, or from the view that the particular issue wasn't worth creating a whole dust about. The point was that it was nothing to do with obedience to the *magisterium*.

That being the case, two could play at that game. And so Luther found himself fighting battles on more than one front, as we may find out in the next issue, when I'll look at the Zwickau Prophets and will maybe try to squeeze in some discussion of the Peasants' Revolt.

WEST CORK'S WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

**Sectarianism, the Kilmichael Ambush,
Tom Barry, and Peter Hart.**

Contents

The Outcome of the first West Cork History Festival by Jack Lane

Three Southern Star letters on West Cork History Festival

Four Southern Star letters on An Tost Fada ('The Long Silence')

History Festival to screen amended documentary (Southern Star report)

An Tost Fada – four Irish Times letters (plus two unpublished)

Fifteen Southern Star letters on Peter Hart & Kilmichael Ambush

Meda Ryan response to Eve Morrison, 2014 *History Ireland* letter

Jack Lane responds to *Sunday Independent* columnist and *An Tost Fada* scriptwriter/presenter Eoghan Harris

Pat Muldowney on exposure of Peter Hart's bogus ethnic cleansing statistics by Dundee historian, Dr. John Regan

Barry Keane on Peter Hart's Irish heritage

CENTENARY OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION 1917: WHY DID THEY DO IT?

Pat Walsh here gives a masterly exposition of behind-the-scenes British thinking in the period leading up to the declaration.

These pamphlets cost **€8, £6 each**
and are available from:

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

Review:

‘Charles Darwin: Victorian Mythmaker’ by A. N. Wilson

Darwin Has No Clothes

This is a welcome book as it is a critical biography of Darwin and some of the ideas associated with him. In the accepted wisdom of the West anybody who seriously doubts the theory of Darwinian evolution is a candidate for a visit from the people in white coats. Few ideas have retained such an unchallengeable status for so long. Critics are usually dismissed as *creationists* and no more need be said. It has become shorthand for explaining life itself and how it developed and changed on earth.

Everything, in all time in the past and in the future, has been and will be in a state of constant change. This condition is inseparable from life itself. It could almost be a definition of life, if life can be defined at all. And some people have forever and will forever be trying to make sense of it.

The Darwinian theory of evolution seeks to take ownership of this need and give this everlasting change an explanation, a meaning, a purpose, an object and it clearly satisfies this need for many people. And satisfying this need explains most of what has happened in human history.

Religions catered for this need hitherto but in the ‘modern world’ it has been done most effectively by Darwinism which was a product of British Imperial thinking at its height, when it did indeed seem that the history was going in a certain direction that was in effect the progress of that Empire.

The theory itself has colonised the Western mind and has survived the British Empire. It enhances Britain’s intellectual reputation and boosts its power in the world. After all, if you successfully control thought and the narrative of life itself, you have the ultimate power that it is possible to have in this world.

Not only was Darwinism promoted as the key to understand human history, it was also the key to understand and explain natural history, the pre-history of the world. It had it ‘*all sewn up*’ and replaced the Christian God and all other

Gods as the way of explaining the past and the future.

But, on closer examination, some of the renowned concepts become tautologies and were immediately seen as such. The *survival of the fittest* tells us that the fittest survive. And where does that leave us? What is ‘fittest’ for some situation could be most unfit, in fact disastrous, in other situations, so we need an explanation for each case and the tautology could be a positive hindrance in understanding such things.

It would make just as much sense to claim that it is a matter of the *survival of the luckiest*. In fact, that makes more sense as Darwin emphasised random variation as being crucial in his scheme of things and that means that the concept of the survival of the luckiest would be just as useful, or as useless, in explaining anything in particular.

And the particular must always be explained or nothing is explained. Concepts and theories in themselves butter no parsnips.

For example, it seemed a sensible question to ask—if we are descended from lower animals, such as monkeys or apes, why are they still about? If some evolved and others did not, then we need a natural history of this crucial development. Darwinists simply say this is silly question as there was a common ancestor but that only shifts the issue further back a few million years—which makes it clearly even more difficult to give a history of our and others’ origins. This is rationalising the problem, explaining it away rather than explaining it.

Time is the great old reliable for Darwinists, their secret weapon, as given sufficient time all sorts of possibilities can be postulated—i.e. simply imagined—but thereby made possible in the Darwinian world.

Pigs might fly and as any programme of that pop Darwinian David Attenborough, will attest: sights as strange do appear.

Understanding becomes blurred and impossible to grasp. No particular time, no more than any other particular feature that does not fit the theory, matters in the Darwinian scheme of things.

We can have theories galore to explain such things but a natural history of them is a totally different, and crucially different, issue. What sources can be used, and experiments carried out, to actually have such a history that explains and confirms such developments in pre-history? Can this evolution be observed? Clearly not. Neither can there be experimental tests. But all this would be crucial to understand what exactly made us human. In that light Darwinian certainty is absurd.

Then there is the little extra matter of consciousness that is not explained in the Darwinian world. When, where and how did matter begin to think? And why?

The natural world would get on just fine without thought. After all, we are told every day that we may be well on the way to consciously destroying the planet. Stephen Hawking says we should get off the planet within the next 50 years to survive our own destruction of human life here. So that might be our distinctive contribution to the great scheme of things.

In short, the natural history of all species, including their origin, needs to be written but can’t be.

Any farmer could write a history of species *adapting* to their environment and changing its characteristics thereby as part of our human history. But there has yet to be one species that has changed into another. Indeed, what we see is the durability of species. There are superficial changes, but each species keeps itself intact.

Writing a history of adaptation within species is a very different matter to writing the history of the origin of a species and Darwin (no more than any farmer) has not done so. The problem is that nobody expects any farmer to do so but a lot of people think Darwin did it! But he was talking about adaptation within a species—and stretching that to suggesting a possible change of species.

An obvious reality is that any living thing seeks by any and every means to *preserve* itself—to adapt in order preserve its species and not to change to something it knows not what, and cannot know. I think it worth noting the full title of Darwin’s famous book, rarely quoted: “*On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*”. Why did he not say the *evolution* rather than the *preservation* of the ‘favoured races’?

Favoured races? Not a very scientific concept I would suggest. It begs a multitude of questions, rather than providing an explanation of anything. But one thing it indicates is that Darwin himself seemed to realise, perhaps inadvertently, that *preservation* rather than *evolution* is the basic drive of living things. Natural selection to preserve species?

All cats and dogs I have known are very happy as cats and dogs. But are they evolving to a super species that will no longer be a dog or a cat, with one breed fitter than another to be the means for achieving that, or are they evolving to a new series of species jumping from the present breeds? Are we witnessing any of these roles being played out before our very eyes? How can we *know*? Can we observe or experiment to establish this scientifically either way? I doubt it, as it may take more time than humanity has available to it to be able to do so.

What happened to the dinosaurs? There is a very plausible case that they were wiped out by a meteorite that hit what is now the Gulf of Mexico and so polluted the earth that its condition destroyed them and much more besides. But there is also an equally plausible case that they evolved into birds; that our humble chicken is a devolved/evolved dinosaur. One or both theories might be true but how can we *know*? Could our chickens be evolving back to being dinosaurs, now that conditions are different to what destroyed their ancestors? How can we get beyond the plausibilities?

Wilson's book is refreshing in many ways. He reminds us that Darwin's theory did not originate in the biological world at all. It came very explicitly, as Darwin acknowledged, from the political economy of Malthus—who saw life as a struggle for existence given the difference between the rate of population growth and that of food availability. He thought that mathematical formula must inevitably produce famine and death. The geometric rise of population versus the arithmetic rise of food production. But economic development has refuted Malthus comprehensively. Yet the Darwinian '*struggle for existence*' carries on regardless.

Wilson contrasts Darwin with his contemporary Gregor Mendel, though the latter is not mentioned in reviews I

have seen. Mendel discovered genes (by another name) and laid the basis for modern genetic developments. He had no time for Darwinian evolution. He tried to find out something that could be found out—the laws or patterns of hereditary genetics as that was crucial to what was actually happening in the natural world. And he used common or garden peas—quite literally. Here was a true scientist at work. Observing, measuring, confirming by experiment and repetition to establish how something actually worked. He worked like this because he did not think life was subject to random variations and simplicities like '*survival of the fittest*'.

His work was crucial because there was no other explanation as to how the so-called *fittest* passed on their fitness.

The question remains for Darwinists: *how do the unfit keep recurring*, as is clearly evident from the ever increasing medical expenditure everywhere? If that cannot be explained, nothing in the Darwinian world is explained convincingly.

And what use is there in being the 'fittest' if it's not hereditary and explicable? That's a bit of evolution that is surely explicable as it can be subjected to scientific tests. Darwin believed in the Lamarckian idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, but knew this was not convincing.

Mendel came up with the answer. He established that there were patterns to inheritance as there was to life, that it was not a random, hit and miss, process. He discovered the patterns by a massive amount of experiments over several years on the humble pea in his monastery garden. His discovery of the laws/patterns of hereditary genetics led on to the discovery of DNA which was the discovery of another genetic pattern.

Randomness is the most alien notion and the most obstructive notion imaginable to all this scientific work. But that is Darwinism which at best might be guesswork—but mostly a downright nuisance and obstruction. If Mendel had the authority and resources of a worldwide Empire behind him, rather than those of an obscure Czech Augustinian Monastery, the benign development of genetics would have developed decades earlier—he did not even have a microscope. Instead we have had the domination of Darwin and eugenics with its crudity and horrors—which resulted from the influence of him and his followers. And this mode of thought complemented and justified the needs, and even

necessitated the brutal behaviour, of the Empire they served.

As it happened, when Mendel's work was eventually appreciated, Darwinism gave itself a new lease of life as Neo-Darwinism by trying to piggy-back on Mendelian genetics. There was and is an attempt to fit genes into the struggled for existence and the survival of the fittest either within or between genes. And genes are even given human characteristics as with Dawkins' '*selfish gene*'. Is there a 'generous gene' by any chance? If there was, it would not fit the Darwinian mould, so it must not exist. Wilson's book will help throw that particular pig off Mendel's back.

Wilson explains in a review of his own book why Mendel could not be given credit:

"But the neo-Darwinians could hardly, without absurdity, make Mendel their hero since he was a Roman Catholic monk. So Darwin became the figurehead for a system of thought that (childishly) thought there was one catch-all explanation for How Things Are in nature." (Eve. Standard, 4.8.17).

Not only was he a monk, he turned his monastery into a virtual laboratory and later became its Abbot. His discoveries came because of his religious beliefs—not despite them—though God died in Europe at the time he was working.

Mendel effectively discovered genes but, even more important, he found that they are not subject to random variations: there are patterns to be discovered and genes are reshuffled endlessly to give variations. There is infinite change but no evolution in Darwinian terms because gene don't 'evolve'—they are immutable.

Wilson gives the example of the eye, which Darwin could not explain, and cites the considered views of Darwinian scientists since—who have tried to estimate how long the eye took to develop: 364,000 generations is one, maybe half a million years is another. But if eyes developed to enhance safety from predators—which is the Darwinian explanation—how did those who needed eyes survive in the meantime? (But were the predators not sightless also?).

On the other hand, there is what might be called the sight gene, Pax6, which can so "*attach*" itself to an organ in a variety of situations and has always been there!

Instead of Darwinism, what is needed is hard work to figure out what

happens in specific areas and glib mantras like ‘*random variations*’ and ‘*survival of the fittest*’ are plainly worse than useless to that work.

It’s a pity the Catholic Church doesn’t do its own Honours List—sainthood—for its scientists! There would be quite a few candidates and new types of miracles to be celebrated.

All scientists who believe that God created the world, from Copernicus to Einstein, need not concern themselves with the *why* of things but only with the *how* of things and that can make for very good science. They have a head start!

Race Science?

Pseudo-science classifying Irish people as sub-human primates was the

norm even in educated English society right up to the late nineteenth century. It strategically buttressed and ‘justified’ the continued occupation of Ireland. As recently as 1860, the Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University wrote about Irish people, in all seriousness: “*I am haunted by the human chimpanzees I saw in Ireland. (...) I don’t believe they are our fault. (...) But to see white chimpanzees is dreadful. If they were black, one would not feel it so much.*”

This charmer—one Professor Charles Kingsley—was a highly respected academic, and a national thinker. He is quoted in *Anglo-Saxons and Celts—A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* by I.P. Curtis, New York University Press, 1968, p.84.

the-century culture that is going crazy with Darwinian obsessions.

“Just now, the world is in a sort of delirium about race and the racial struggle... extraordinary intensifications of racial definitions are going on; the vileness, the inhumanity, the incompatibility of alien races is being steadily exaggerated” (p. 209).

There was a lot of discussion of how to exterminate inferior races. Wells said, OK, “*there is only one sane and logical thing to be done with a really inferior race, and that is to exterminate it*” (p. 214). But he doubted whether any really inferior race actually existed:

“Even the Australian black-fellow is, perhaps, not quite so entirely eligible for extinction as a good, wholesome, horse-racing, sheep-farming Australian white may think” (ibid.)

He himself was proposing a world government that would eliminate inferior people of all races by such means as government control of breeding. But he helpfully provided a list of the possible methods of racial extermination, should people be intent on that:

“There are various ways of exterminating a race, and most of them are cruel. You may end it with fire and sword after the old Hebrew fashion; you may enslave it and work it to death, as the Spaniards did the Caribs; you may set it boundaries and then poison it with deleterious commodities, as the Americans do with most of their Indians; you may incite it to wear clothing to which it is not accustomed and to live under new and strange conditions that will expose it to infectious diseases, to which you are immune, as the missionaries do the Polynesians; you may resort to honest simple murder, as we English did with the Tasmanians; or you can maintain such conditions as conduce to “race suicide”, as the British administration does in Fiji” (p. 214). (On the whole, he thought, the Fijian solution was the most humane. It was more like the eugenicist measures in his own Utopia.)

That’s H. G. Wells. His books are in print, no one thinks he’s a monster. That’s how he feels he has to express himself so as to win a hearing in the Darwinian English culture of 1905, to show he’s an adult and a man of the world and one whose proposals shouldn’t simply be dismissed out of hand.

John Minahane

H. G. Wells on the fashionable Darwinism, 1905

In “*Charles Darwin by A. N. Wilson (review)—how wrong can a biography be?*” (The Guardian, 30.8.2017), Kathryn Hughes says:

“All (Wilson) can muster is the whiskery argument that, because Darwin saw black and brown people (not to mention Jews, Slavs, Celts and anyone who didn’t come from his native belt of central England) as lesser, he was a proto-eugenicist. What he actually was, however, was an Englishman with the usual prejudices of his time. To blame Darwin for being racist is like accusing Freud of not being a feminist, which is to say both blindingly obvious and slightly beside the point.”

Trivial rhetoric from the university debating society!

So, Darwin was just poor Joe Soap, soaking up what was all around him? In fact, he strengthened “*the usual prejudices of his time*”, enormously.—Maybe Wilson has made this point badly, I haven’t read his book and I can’t say.

T. Desmond Williams, *The Genesis of National Socialism*, published by Athol, has a lot of interesting stuff about the legacy of Darwinism. Among other things, he mentions *A Modern Utopia*

by H.G. Wells, published in 1905, which is a blueprint for global social perfection. In the course of it Wells had occasion to complain about the enormous influence of short-sighted Darwinian racists who were currently going to wild extremes.

“We of this generation have seen a flood of reaction against universalism. The great intellectual developments that centre upon the work of Darwin have exacerbated the realisation that life is a conflict between superior and inferior types, it has underlined the idea that specific survival rates are of primary significance in the world’s development, and a swarm of inferior intelligences has applied to human problems elaborated and exaggerated versions of these generalisations. These social and political followers of Darwin have fallen into an obvious confusion between race and nationality, and with the natural trap of patriotic conceit... No generalisations about race are too extravagant for the inflamed credulity of the present time” (pp. 208-9).

(Two examples, are given by Wells, from the “*swarm of inferior intelligences*”: Rudyard Kipling; and J.H. Green, author of the *Short History of the English People*.)

What Wells describes is a turn-of-



Peter Brooke

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Dugin And The Russian Question
Part 7

The Case Of Grigori Pomeranz

In his *Sketches of Exile* (vol 1, p.393) Solzhenitsyn claims that, prior to leaving the USSR, he had no personal enemies. That might not be entirely true. In *Two Centuries Together* (Part Two, Jews and Russians during the Soviet period)¹ he tells of a confrontation with Grigori Pomeranz (also sometimes rendered as Pomerants), a specialist in oriental religion:

"To get a clearer idea of the object of our analysis it will be useful if I tell here of my exchange of letters with the Pomeranz couple in 1967. In that year my novel *The First Circle*, which was then nothing more than a forbidden manuscript, was circulated in *samizdat*. G.Pomeranz and his wife Zinaida Mirkina [a poet, particularly known for her Russian translations of Rilke] were the first to send me their objections. I had wounded them through my clumsiness and my errors in relation to the Jewish problem; in the *Circle* I had compromised the Jews, and myself as well, hopelessly. How had I compromised them? I didn't think I had depicted those cruel Jews who had hoisted themselves up to the pinnacles of power in the flames of the first Soviet years. But the Pomeranzes' letters were full of half asserted insinuations and things not stated but implied. In sum, I was accused of being insensible to the sufferings of the Jews" (p.501).

In their exchanges, according to Solzhenitsyn, the Pomeranzes argued that intellectuals should act as if "*there were on earth no particular nations*", to take no notice of nationality:

"I have noticed that Jews, more often than others, insist absolutely that one should pay no attention to national identity. What does national identity have to do with anything? they say. National characteristics. National character. Are there such things? ...

"All very well but what then do we make of what you've just been reading [a series of denunciations of the Russian national character written by Jews—PB]; of the fact that so often Jews judge Russians globally and nearly always emphasising the bad side. Pomeranz again: 'the pathological symptoms of the Russian character' which include 'internal instability' (without blushing. And if

someone dared to say 'the pathological symptoms of the Jewish character?'). 'The Russian masses allowed the horrors of the *opritchina* [Ivan the Terrible's private army—PB] to occur at their expense just as, later, they allowed the installation of the Stalinist death camps.' So it wasn't the internationalist-minded administrators in charge of the state who allowed this, oh no, they were fiercely opposed to it. It was the 'obtuse masses'. Yet more radically: 'Russian nationalism will necessarily assume an aggressive character and bring pogroms in its wake'—in other words any Russian who loves his country is a potential instigator of pogroms!"

Pomeranz, Shafarevich And Ginzburg ²

Pomeranz is a recurring name in *Russophobia* by Solzhenitsyn's friend and collaborator, Igor Shafarevich. As we have seen, Shafarevich's main argument is that a small group with a coherent will (such as the Jews) can dominate a much larger and necessarily more diffuse mass (such as the Russians). Pomeranz is, together with Richard Pipes and Alexander Yanov (both discussed in earlier articles in this series), quoted at length as a determined Jewish enemy of the revival of a Russian national consciousness. Although Pomeranz apparently wrote a great deal and is widely read in Russia, very little, it seems has been translated into English or French. He had passed time in the camps (1950-53) and been involved from the earliest days in the Dissident movement. According to a quite inadequate Russian website devoted to him "*In 1959-60, P. led a semi-secret seminar on philosophical, historical and economic issues*", which was attended by, among others, V. Osipov, later the leader of what was regarded as the extreme (more so than Solzhenitsyn) Russian patriotic tendency grouped round the *samizdat* journal *Veche*.

Another of his associates was the Jewish Dissident Alexander Ginzburg. In this early period, the fledgling Dissident movement was centred on a small group who met by the Mayakovsky monument in Moscow to read poetry. Ginzburg was, until his first arrest and

imprisonment, Editor of a shortlived *samizdat* poetry magazine, *Syntaksis*.

In 1966, it was Ginzburg who managed to publicise throughout the world the closed trial of the writers Andrei Sinyavski and Yuli Daniel, a major event in the development of the Russian dissident movement. After a further period of imprisonment, he became in the 1970s manager of the '*Russian Social Fund*' established by Solzhenitsyn out of the income generated by *The Gulag Archipelago* to help Soviet political prisoners. This led to his re-arrest in 1977. He was expelled to the USA against his will in a prisoner exchange in 1979, initially going to live with Solzhenitsyn.

Pomeranz was also associated with Andrei Sakharov and naturally took his side in the Solzhenitsyn/Sakharov (Russian patriotic/internationalist humanist) controversy. According to the Russian website:

"For many years he was involved in polemics with A.I. Solzhenitsyn. P. strongly criticised Solzhenitsyn's 'passionate narrowness', his vindictive and intolerant spirit as well as his chauvinistic Utopism [sic]. Disagreeing with Russian nationalists, P. was close to human rights activists."

'The People Versus The Intelligentsia'

His leading idea seems to have been the need for a transnational and multi-denominational intellectual élite of a religious nature. Shafarevich quotes him as saying:

"Religion is no longer, as it once was, the property of the people. It has become the distinctive characteristic of the élite. Love for the people is much more dangerous [than love for animals]: there is no barrier, there, that can't be passed, like having to clamber about on four feet [this is my interpretation of a rather convoluted French sentence—PB]. Something new will replace the people. Thus will be formed the backbone of a new people. The masses can't form a new people unless they can gather round a new intelligentsia... If I look to the intelligentsia it isn't because I think it's good... intellectual development by itself only allows the growth of a propensity to do evil... but the rest is worse' (*La Russophobia*, pp.136-7).

The argument is developed in an article that was published in an English translation in 1971, while Solzhenitsyn was still in Russia. The peasantry, he says, is no longer an important social force. There is nothing to be hoped from it:

"We eat bread harvested by people whom we by force of habit call 'peasants', but we do not live in a peasant society; we are no longer surrounded by the *narod*, 'the peasantry'. The peasants are becoming too few to be able to surround us. In the United States only seven percent of the population is engaged in agriculture. There is no need for more to provide the remaining 93 percent with bread, butter, and milk. That half of our population lives in the rural areas is, of course, a fact, but a fact more of yesterday than of today. A sort of suspended yesterday. We cannot consider as social reality that which is artificially maintained with the help of a passport system.

"Both the peasants and the artisans treasured the faith and the rituals of their fathers, thus forming a nation with its folk songs, characteristic needlework, folk customs, and superstitions. And what kind of songs do the *kolkhozniks* sing today? The very same that are sung by the working class: pitiful remnants of the peasant heritage, some melodies hammered into their heads at school, in the army, by the radio. The peasantry is disappearing. It left a deep imprint on the moral and aesthetic consciousness of humanity; it was a bridge between the tribe and some other thing that only now is being put together. But it is disappearing. In our country only traces of the *narod* remain, like traces of snow in the spring, little islands of snow in the dark corners of the forest. There are still corners where it is possible to record the Vologda wedding ritual, where one may find the re-habilitated Ivan Denisovich, and where old Matrena lives out her life. But *narod* as a great historical force, as the backbone of culture, as the source of inspiration for Pushkin and Gogol—is no more."³

The reference is of course to Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (Ivan is an uneducated peasant) and *Matryona's House*. In another essay, published in 1989, in the turmoil surrounding the fall of the Soviet Union, he complains against the "ruralist" or "village prose" writers who, as we have seen, continued in the tradition of *Matryona's House*:

"Even in such a Europeanised country as Russia, writers, who are linked with villages and who express the feelings of several tens of millions of people, are not in the least disturbed about human rights. Something else disturbs them: rumours about the extremely harmful conspiracy of Masons. They are consumed with irritation and hatred. Their goal, if one breaks through the level of words, is not peace but the search for the carriers of evil, who should be exterminated..."⁴

In his 1971 article Pomeranz is as sceptical about the proletariat as he is about the peasantry:

"The party turns to the worker only when an intellectual is to be whipped. Then newspapers publish interviews with workers which usually begin as follows: 'I have not read Pasternak, but...' The class that came to life with the first industrial revolution, rising the yeast until it reached 50 per cent of the population, created trade unions, Soviets, strikes and so on, without which we cannot imagine the twentieth century, but virtually nothing capable of leaving a solid, long-lasting footprint..." (p.221).

The only social category from which anything can be hoped is the intelligentsia:

"Where the intelligentsia is free, all have access to freedom. Where the intelligentsia is in slavery, all are slaves. For this reason, and for this reason only, I am against the excessive preoccupation with rural problems, the tragedy of the peasantry, and so on... At the present time, there is nothing more important than the production of scientific and technical information, but it would be rash to think that this is the final aim after which there will be no turning points... The increasing importance of mental work poses a new problem, namely the problem of a creative condition. It is necessary to put the brain in a state in which it can solve difficult problems playfully... It will be an extremely versatile 'industry' embracing sports, tourism, art, rituals, psycho-technics of Yoga and Zen. Let us remember the words of Aldous Huxley, one of the most thoughtful men of our century: 'To engage in mystical exercises is as useful as brushing your teeth'..." (pp.222-3).

Solzhenitsyn's Defence Of The People

Solzhenitsyn's essay, *The Smatters* in *From under the rubble* (co-edited, we remember, with Shafarevich) could be described as a response to Pomeranz, an assault on Pomeranz's hopes for salvation through the Intelligentsia, arguing as it does that there is no such thing in the Soviet Union. Solzhenitsyn nonetheless recognises a great deal of truth in what Pomeranz is saying:

"But the picture Pomeranz paints of the people is, alas, to a large extent true. Just as we are probably mortally offending him now by alleging that there is no longer an intelligentsia in our country, and that it has all disintegrated into a collection of smatters, so he too mortally wounds us by his assertion that neither is there a

people any longer:

"The people no longer exists. There is the mass, with a dim recollection that it was once the people and the bearer of God within itself, but now it is utterly empty... The people in the sense of a Chosen People, a source of spiritual values, is nonexistent. There are the neuras-thenic intellectuals—and the masses. .. What do the collective farm workers sing? Some remnants of their peasant heritage' and whatever is drilled into them 'at school, in the army and on the radio' ... Where is it, this "people"? The real native people, dancing its folk dances, narrating its folktales, weaving its folk-patterned lace? In our country all that remains are the vestiges of a people, like the vestiges of snow in spring ... The people as a great historical force, a backbone of culture, a source of inspiration for Pushkin and Goethe, no longer exists... What is usually called the people in our country is not the people at all but a petit bourgeoisie.'

[The reader will notice the resemblance to the passages from Pomeranz I've just quoted, which I think have been extracted from a much longer Russian text. Interesting that the English interpreter didn't use the highly charged phrase—used by Pomeranz with no hint of scepticism—"bearer of God"—PB.]

"Gloom and doom. And not far from the truth either.

"Indeed, how *could* the people have survived? It has been subjected to two processes both tending toward the same end and each lending impetus to the other. One is the universal process (which, if it had been postponed any longer in Russia, we might have escaped altogether) of what is fashionably known as massovization (an abominable word, but then the process is no better), a product of the new Western technology, the sickening growth of cities, and the general standardization of methods of information and education. The second is our own special Soviet process, designed to rub off the age-old face of Russia and rub on another, synthetic one, and this has had a still more decisive and irreversible effect.

"How could the people possibly have survived? Icons, obedience to elders, bread-baking and spinning wheels were all forcibly thrown out of the peasants' cottages. Then millions of cottages—as well-designed and comfortable as one could wish—were completely ravaged, pulled down or put into the wrong hands and five million hardworking, healthy families, together with infants still at the breast, were dispatched to their death on long winter journeys or on their arrival in the tundra. (And

our *intelligentsia* did not waver or cry out, and its *progressive* part even assisted in driving them out. *That* was when the intelligentsia ceased to be, in 1930; and is that the moment for which the people must beg its forgiveness?) The destruction of the remaining cottages and homesteads was less trouble after that. They took away the land which had made the peasant a peasant, de-personalized it even more than serfdom had, deprived the peasant of all incentive to work and live, packed some off to the Magnitogorsks, while the rest—a whole generation of doomed women—were forced to feed the colossus of the state before the war, for the entire duration of the war and after the war.

"All the outward, international successes of our country and the flourishing growth of the thousands of scientific research institutes that now exist have been achieved by devastating the Russian village and the traditional Russian way of life. In its place they have festooned the cottages and the ugly multistory boxes in the suburbs of our cities with loudspeakers, and even worse, have fixed them on all the telegraph poles in city centers (even today they will be blaring over the entire face of Russia from six in the morning until midnight, the supreme mark of culture, and if you go and shut them off it's an anti-Soviet act).

"And those loudspeakers have done their job well: they have driven everything individual and every bit of folklore out of people's heads and drilled in stock substitutes, they have trampled and defiled the Russian language and dinned vacuous, untalented songs (composed by the intelligentsia) into our ears. They have knocked down the last village churches, flattened and desecrated graveyards, flogged the horse to death with Komsomol zeal, and their tractors and five-ton lorries have polluted and churned up the centuries-old roads whose gentle tracery adorns our countryside. Where is there left, and who is there left to dance and weave lace? Furthermore, they have visited the village youth with specially juicy tidbits in the form of quantities of drab, idiotic films (the intellectual: 'We have to release them—they are *mass-circulation* films')—and the same rubbish is crammed into school textbooks and slightly more adult books (and you know *who* writes them, don't you?), to prevent new growth from springing up where the old timber was felled. Like tanks they have ridden roughshod over the entire historical memory of the people (they gave us back Alexander Nevsky without his cross, but anything more recent—no), so how *could* the people possibly have saved itself?

[...]

"But then the intelligentsia doesn't exist either, does it? Are the smatterers dead wood for development?"

"Have *all* the classes been replaced by inferior substitutes? And if so how can we develop?"

Where Is Hope To Be Found?

"But surely *someone* exists? And how can one deny human beings a future? Can *human beings* be prevented from going on living? We hear their weary, kindly voices sometimes without even seeing their faces—as they pass by us somewhere in the twilight, we hear them talking of their everyday concerns, which they express in authentic—and sometimes still very spontaneous—Russian speech, we catch sight of their faces, alive and eager, and their smiles, we experience their good deeds for ourselves, sometimes when we least expect them, we observe self-sacrificing families with children undergoing all kinds of hardships rather than destroy a soul—so how can one deny them all a future?"

"It is rashness to conclude that the people no longer exists. Yes, the village has been routed and its remnants choked, yes, the outlying suburbs are filled with the click of dominoes (one of the achievements of universal literacy) and broken bottles, there are no traditional costumes and no folk dances, the language has been corrupted and thoughts and ambitions even more deformed and misdirected; but why is it that not even these broken bottles, nor the litter blown back and forth by the wind in city courtyards, fills one with such despair as the careerist hypocrisy of the smatterers? It is because *the people* on the whole *takes no part in the official lie*, and this today is its most distinctive feature, allowing one to hope that it is not, as its accusers would have it, utterly devoid of God. Or at any rate, it has preserved a spot in its heart that has still not been scorched or trampled to death.

"It is also rashness to conclude that there is no intelligentsia. Each one of us is personally acquainted with at least a handful of people who have resolutely risen above both the lie and the pointless bustle of the smatterers. And I am entirely in accord with those who want to see, who want to believe that they can already see the nucleus of an intelligentsia, which is our hope for spiritual renewal" (pp.264-8).

Like Shafarevich he quotes Pomeranz saying:

"The mass can crystallize anew into something resembling a people only around a new intelligentsia... I am counting on the intelligentsia not at all because it is good... Intellectual development in itself only increases

man's capacity for evil... My chosen people are bad, this I know... but the rest are even worse."

But he continues the quotation, saying:

"True, 'before salting something you must first become the salt again', and the intelligentsia has ceased to be that salt. Ah, 'if only we possessed sufficient strength of character to give up all our laurels, our degrees and our titles ... To put an end to this cowardice and whining ... To prefer a clean conscience to a clean doorstep and to school ourselves to make do with an honest slice of bread without the caviar.' But: 'I *do believe* that the intelligentsia can change and that it can attract others to follow in its footsteps' ..."

"What is clear to us here", Solzhenitsyn complains, "is that Pomeranz distinguishes the intelligentsia and sets it apart in terms of its *intellectual development*, and only *hopes* that it will *also* possess moral qualities.

"Was this not at the heart of our old error which proved the undoing of us all—that the intelligentsia repudiated religious morality and chose for itself an atheistic humanism that supplied an easy justification both for the hastily constituted revolutionary tribunals and the rough justice meted out in the cellars of the Cheka? And did not the rebirth of a 'nucleus of the intelligentsia' after 1910 arise out of a desire to return to a religious morality—only to be cut short by the chatter of machine guns? And is not that nucleus whose beginnings we think we already discern today a repetition of the one that the revolution cut short, is it not in essence a 'latter-day *Vekhi*'? For it regards the moral doctrine of the value of the individual as the key to the solution of social problems. It was for a nucleus of this kind that Berdyaev yearned: 'An ecclesiastical intelligentsia which would combine genuine Christianity with an enlightened and clear understanding of the cultural and historical missions of the country.' So did S. Bulgakov: 'An educated class with a Russian soil, an enlightened mind and a strong will.'

"Not only is this nucleus not yet a compact mass, as a nucleus should be, but it is not even collected together, it is scattered, its components mutually unrecognizable: many of its particles have never seen one another, do not know of one another, and have no notion of one another's existence. And what links them is not membership in an intelligentsia, but a thirst for truth, a craving to cleanse their souls, and the desire of each one to preserve around him an area of purity and brightness. That is why even 'illiterate sectarians' and some obscure milkmaid down on

the collective farm are also members of this nucleus of goodness, united by a common *striving* for the pure life. And the covetousness and worldly wisdom of the cultured academician or artist steers him in exactly the opposite direction—backward into the familiar lurid darkness of this half century.

"What does an 'axis' or 'branch' for the 'crystallization' of an entire people mean? It means tens of thousands of human beings. Furthermore, it is a potential *stratum*—but it will not overflow into the future in some huge and unobstructed wave. Forming the 'backbone of a new people' is not something that can be done as safely and lightheartedly as we are promised, at weekends and in our spare time, without giving up our scientific research institutes. No, it will have to be done on weekdays, as part of the mainstream of our life, in its most dangerous sector—and by each one of us in chilling isolation [...]

"By deliberate, voluntary sacrifice.

"Times change, and scales too. A hundred years ago the Russian intelligentsia thought of sacrifice in terms of the death penalty. Nowadays it is considered a sacrifice to risk administrative punishment. And in truth this is no easier for abject, browbeaten characters to stomach [...]

"It would be better if we declared the word 'intelligentsia'—so long misconstrued and deformed—dead for the time being. Of course, Russia will be unable to manage without a substitute for the intelligentsia, but the new word will be formed not from 'understand' or 'know', but from something *spiritual*. The first tiny minority who set out to force their way through the tight holes of the filter will of their own accord find some new definition of themselves, either while they are still in the filter, or when they have come out the other side and recognize themselves and each other. It is there that the word will be recognized, it will be born of the very process of passing through. Or else the remaining majority, without resorting to a new terminology, will simply call them the *righteous*. It would not be inaccurate to call them for the moment a *sacrificial elite*. The word 'elite' here will arouse the envy of no one, election to it being an extremely unenviable honor that no one will complain of being passed over for: come and join us, we implore you!

"It is of the lone individuals who pass through (or perish on the way) that this elite to crystallize the people will be composed."

Everyday Mysticism

Since Pomeranz is also clearly arguing for a spiritual rather than an intellect-

ual elite the difference between them seems to turn mainly on where that elite is to be found. We have seen Solzhenitsyn's sympathetic interest in the development of the Russian 'ruralist' school of literature which suggests that, however debased the peasantry might be, it was still towards those who still had some connection with the soil that he looked for relief whereas Pomeranz was looking to, well, if we wanted to put it very unkindly, we might say the sort of people who would be attracted to practising yoga. But I am not so unkind, I find Pomeranz's thinking, the little I can see of it, interesting.

In an interview given in 2004 (he died in 2013), he describes an experience of the camps very different from Solzhenitsyn's:

"After the war I was arrested and spent four years in one of Stalin's camps—up to 1953. It was in the far North. I had amazing experiences there. For example the white nights. The sky was suffused with the most varied colours, colours so beautiful that I 'swam' or 'dived' into their beauty. In this sky I felt the transcendent oneness, this light that never dies, that is never extinguished. It was something real and tangible to me. Many of my friends laughed at me: I was so absorbed by the sky, I was almost unaware of the barbed wire around the camp. I was after all in prison. But the sky set me free. It was an overwhelming experience.

"In the camps we had access to books. I found support for my experiences in the literature of the great traditions. I felt most affinity with *Zen Buddhism*, which I first read about only after my internment. Because it is not related to any dogma you are expected to believe in, Zen throws the student into the same abyss that I had thrown myself into. But this is not the only path to understanding. Another path is through love for a personality who has experienced the depth and has described it in some way. How can one come to such a love? In the camp I made a discovery. One must be able to come second ... One must root out one's feeling of 'I am the most important'. One has to be ready to come second."⁵

This suggests, incidentally, that the 'Gulag archipelago' might have been a more varied phenomenon than one would think from reading Solzhenitsyn's account.

Pomeranz describes how he had been thrown out of his early sympathy with the Soviet world view (though the fact that some four years later—Pomeranz was born in 1918—his father, an enthusiastic Communist, was arrested in the

1937-8 purges might have had something to do with it):

"I first came into contact with this problem when I was 16, reading Marx, Engels and Lenin. Confronting Lenin's materialism and his 'empiriocriticism' [sic. Should presumably be 'Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*'—PB], an abyss opened up before me. I was filled with fear. Reality was presented as 'a material infinity'. The infinite existed in the external, in matter—not as an inner infinity of the soul or self. This abyss of external material infinity threatened the meaning of my existence. I pushed this problem away and it was not until four years later that I dared to confront this abyss. I studied Russian literature at Moscow University. I recognised my own problem in poets and novelists. Tjutchev, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. A poem by Tjutchev made an indelible impression on me. Translated word for word it goes like this:

Nature knows no past. Our illusory years are unknown to it. And in meeting it we acknowledge as in a fog that we ourselves are nothing but the dreams of nature. By performing its unnecessary feat, nature blesses all its children equally, with its all-engulfing and peace-bringing abyss.

"Reading Dostoyevsky's *Notes from Underground* I was inspired to go to the bottom of the existential problem, to throw myself into the abyss so to speak. I asked myself a question similar to a *Zen-Buddhist koan* ("riddle"), even though I had never heard of Zen:

"If infinity exists as pure materiality, then I do not exist. And if I exist, there is no such pointless infinity."

This is in response to the interviewer who has quoted Nobel Prize winner Francis Crick, who mapped the structure of the DNA-molecule. In his 1995 book *The Astonishing Hypothesis* he says:

"The Astonishing Hypothesis is that "You", your joys and sorrows, your memories and ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will, are in fact no more than the behaviour of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules. You're nothing but a pack of neurons."

A Rootless Cosmopolitan

Pomeranz gives us some idea in the interview of how he understands his trans-national, trans-denominational elite:

"One can question what is good and what is bad. I think there are many paths. The characteristic for the path of Zen is that the person is thrown into an abyss, into a state of mental shock. The student must ponder seemingly mean-

ingless paradoxes—until the mental structure falls. The enlightenment that suddenly occurs cannot be described in words. In the West we also find mystics and philosophers giving witness to similar experiences: *Meister Eckhart, Carl Gustav Jung, Erich Fromm, Heidegger and Wittgenstein*. One is thrown into an abyss and must begin to swim in that abyss. Just as in teaching a child to swim, you throw the child into the water, the child begins to move its hands and feet—and starts to swim. That is one way.

"But it is only a path for those strong enough, and it must be voluntary. Therefore it is not a path for everyone. It is for a minority. In no Buddhist country do we find a majority of Zen Buddhists!

"Another path is through the love for a person who experienced 'The Encounter', for enlightened, saint being [sic. 'or an enlightened, holy being'?—PB] in whose heart dwells God. It does not need to be a real historical person; it may very well be a mythological being. Mythology is also the discovery of something real, but not historically real. It is a constructed truth. It is about the love for a personality who has experienced the light of the eternal love. Francis of Assisi can be such a historical personality or, to mention one from the 20th century, the Trappist monk Thomas Merton. In Russia we have Antonius Sorosh (Surozhski, as mentioned before). His family, originally called Bloom, came from Scotland and were naturalised Russian during the 18th century. He said in one of his speeches: 'We need people who have experienced meeting God. Not everyone can have such strong experiences as Paul', he said, 'they can be smaller experiences, but nevertheless with a hint of the holy'. Such people are also a minority. But they can inspire others; they can give an orientation, an image for the hearts of men."

While I don't have any particular personal feeling for Jung, Wittgenstein or even Thomas Merton, I have had the inestimable privilege of attending services in the Russian Cathedral in London conducted by the late Metropolitan Anthony, Bishop of Sourozh, so I think I know something of what Pomeranz means.

Although Pomeranz is probably the first person to accuse Solzhenitsyn of anti-Semitism, or at least "*of being insensitive to the sufferings of the Jews*", he clearly does not define himself spiritually as a Jew. In the 2004 interview he says:

"Myself I do not belong to a particular confession. But I accept all great religions. As a person living in Russia where culture is related to the Orthodox Christian Church I am interested in it,

and I feel it as a kindred religion because I live in this sphere, in this culture. But generally I do not think it is important in which form or with which words a civilisation expresses itself..."

But in *Man Without An Adjective* he anticipates the idea that was to become the central theme of Yuri Slezkine's book *The Jewish Century*, that the condition of rootlessness traditionally ascribed to the Jews, has now become universal:

"We do not live in one world, but in several spiritual worlds simultaneously. Nowhere are we ever complete strangers. Everywhere we are not completely ourselves. European, Indian, Chinese concepts and notions crowd each other in our consciousness like ice floats in the Arctic. And one call to faith, to tradition, to populism anathematizes the other..."

"To be kinless, uprooted, foreign to tribal traditions, this is without fail a trait of the intellectual. The intelligentsia, as a particular layer with only a small nucleus being actually intellectual, usually takes shape in a society which has dissipated national values. Suspended in the air, a part of the intelligentsia looks for support in some symbols of nationality (romantics, Slavophiles, negritude). But what stands behind those symbols in our country after the Stalinist collectivisation which left nothing of the *narod* but empty air?... Even today the Russian idea of Mother Earth, having not yet won recognition, is becoming vulgarised and debased... The nation standing in the centre of a large system cannot keep its position with the help of *kokoshniks* (old fashioned headdress) and *sarafans* ... The superpowers cannot have progressive national goals. Their idea can be only universal, cosmopolitan. The intelligentsia has no right to patriotism here. It can lean only on the international solidarity of scientists, writers, and all people of good will (American, Japanese, Russians) over the heads of the *meshchanstvo*, the nationalistic Philistines ... In the twentieth century, some people became like 'everybody else', with their own postage stamps, but millions of intellectuals became, instead, something like 'non-Israeli Jews', having lost all roots in their daily existence..."

Nonetheless, he concludes his 2004 interview (with a Norwegian interviewer) with a remark that implies some sense of the particular destiny of particular parts of the world:

"I think that the dominance of the US as a super-power will soon come to an end. It is at its peak right now, but I think in 20 years, maybe 15, China will be as powerful as the US. Everything will be different then. I think that, on the whole, Europe should dissociate itself from

American imperialism, and seek a role as an intermediary between cultures. To be an intermediary between the great 'sub-civilisations' is a huge mission for the future. Europe is better equipped for this than America. America is highly limited intellectually with its North-American inwardness and understands very little of the world's problems, its real cultural problems. I think that Europe together with Russia, with the Nordic countries, in other words the European civilisation, has a great mission globally. But I do not know which country will come to put it into effect. One possibility is the Nordic countries because they are not burdened with a centuries-long history of imperialism. They can act more freely in the role of mediator. But up to now this has not always succeeded. The Oslo agreements, for example, were a failure. So everything is possible, decisions both good and bad."

This is something of a diversion from my main theme which, at this stage in my series of articles, is concentrated on the Jewish/Russian patriotic tension that gave rise to Solzhenitsyn's *Two Hundred Years Together*. But I would like to finish here on this (I think) rather positive note and pick up the thread again in a subsequent article.

NOTES

¹ As in previous articles in this series page references to *Sketches of Exile, Two Centuries Together* and Shafarevich's *Russophobia*, none of which have yet been published in an English translation refer to the French editions. An English translation of *Two Centuries Together* (or at least "*A Simplified Partial English Reading Copy*") is available online at <https://thechosenites.files.wordpress.com/2015/10/200-years-together.pdf>.

² *Russophobia* was briefly discussed, together with Solzhenitsyn's essay *The Smatterers* and the early twentieth century collection of essays, *Vekhi*, referred to later in the present article, in Part 5 of this series (*Church and State* 126, Jan-Mar 2017. Also available at my website www.peterbrooke.org).

³ Gregory Pomerantz & Alexis Koriakov (trans): 'Man without an adjective', *The Russian Review*, Vol 30, No 3 (July 1971), pp.220-1.

⁴ G.S.Pomerantz: 'The Liberal Democratic World Order and the traditions of "suboecumene"', *International Journal on World Peace*, Vol 6, No 3 (July-September 1989), p.54. Pomerantz contributed several articles to the 'International Journal on World Peace'. I have just, at the time of writing, discovered that this is published by the 'Professors World Peace Academy', a body established by the Korean founder of the 'Unification Church', Reverend Sun Myung Moon. Later, I think after 1992, Pomerantz was involved with the centre at Caux in Switzerland, established by Frank Buchman, founder of Moral Rearmament. He published a book on Moral Rearmament.

⁵ Egge Christian: 'Conversations in depth—Grigori Pomerantz' (*Herald of Europe*, Issue No 2, 01.02.2005. Available online).

Future Church?

FutureChurch is a website coming out of Ohio in the USA. It is devoted to stopping the decline of the Catholic Church through not having enough new priests to replace the retirees and the loss of parishes as a result, specifically in the US and Western Europe. The decline is only in these areas. The Catholic population is growing in the US.

Besides English this website can be read in French, Dutch, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese.

The latest statement from the website reads:

“There is a severe crisis looming in the US Catholic Church. In just four years, half (nearly 9000) of our diocesan will retire. New vocations will not even come close to replacing those retiring.”

According to a 2009 study conducted by the Center for Research in the Apostolate at Georgetown University (CARA), half—nearly 9000—of the 17,9000 diocesan priests currently in active ministry in the US are expected to retire by 2019. If new vocations maintain current levels—levels they have been at for decades—there will only be about 1,600 newly ordained to replace them. This is a net loss of 7400 priests.

The response of our Bishops, thus far, has been to close or merge parishes, build larger churches and import international priests.

Closing and merging parishes has resulted in the loss of 1,750 parishes over the last fifteen years while the number of Catholics has risen by 6.7 million. This means fewer and fewer parishes to serve greater and greater numbers. Further, the downsizing is debilitating. Some parishioners accept the decision of their bishops. Others fight.

Yet after long and fierce legal proceedings no real ‘winner’ ever emerges. The biggest ‘losers’ are the parishioners. Many become so disaffected that they simply walk away.

Forty percent of merged parishes report a decrease in size. (2003 study) More closures will continue to alienate Catholics while failing to meet the sacramental needs of a growing number.

Recruiting priests internationally is a questionable practice. Language

barriers and cultural differences make it difficult for these priests to effectively preach the Gospel and provide pastoral care in a culture far different from their own. More important this practice removes international priests from their homes and deprives these areas—where the Catholic population is often growing at rapid rates—of the priests they need.

In 25 years FutureChurch has educated Catholics about the priest shortage and the calamitous impact it is having on parishes and the sacramental life of the People of God.

Pope Francis has made it known that he is open to receiving proposals from national bishops’ conferences that courageously address the clergy shortage—including consideration of ordaining married men.

Following Pope Francis’s lead, FutureChurch urges the US Conference of Bishops (USCCB) to undertake a fresh examination of:

- restoring the early Church’s practice of ordaining both married and celibate priests.
- restoring our early practice of ordaining female and male deacons.
- inviting priests who left the active ministry to marry to return.

FutureChurch further urges the USCCB to petition Pope Francis to open priestly ordination to married men and restore female diaconate.

It adds that failure to act amounts to a failure of leadership and declares that now is the time to take Pope Francis at his word and propose strategies that provide access to the Eucharist for all Catholics.

This is a well-funded Catholic website. What I gather from it is that in US Catholicism the bishops seem to be standing in the way of progress despite the suggestions of Pope Francis.

Bishops can be difficult, as I have learned when living in Northern Ireland. When they are good they are very good indeed and when they are bad they are horrid.

On the side of good is the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, Daniel Mageean (6th May, 1882 -17th January,

1962) Bishop of Down and Connor 1929—1962).

He was born in the town of Saintfield, County Down, a short bus ride from my family home in Carryduff. In the 1930s he was the champion of Catholic rights, especially after the anti-Catholic riots of 1935. In that year he succeeded in getting the anti-Catholic nature of Northern Ireland raised in the House of Commons, Westminster.

But his efforts came to naught. I think it was in the journals, the *Irish Political Review* or *Church & State*, that he is mentioned as beginning to understand the deliberately dysfunctional nature of NI. It was at the dedication of the first Catholic Church in Carryduff for 300 years, in 1946 that I, aged 14, was introduced to him, along with my mother and four younger sisters.

The horrid is in the shape of Cathal Brendan Daly who was eventually to become Bishop of Down and Connor. I was well away in London during his period, when he denounced the IRA during the Long War and said little on British violence. He helped write the speech for Pope John Paul II on his visit to Drogheda. He was a relation of Paddy Daly, described as a IRA General.

The next bishop who put me out of joint was one who suddenly appeared at Sunday Mass in Camden Town. which I was attending to keep my wife company.

The local priest was a jolly wee Irishman who spoke directly to his congregation, coming off the altar to speak to the people there, sometimes to buttonhole one of two to ask them what they were up to. He had also thrown the church basement open to a number of rough sleepers, and ran regular jumble sales to buy food for them. He wasn’t against giving a few of them a tin of lager to ease their hangovers, and he was known to give the shoes off his feet to the most wretched of the demoralised and down-and-out.

Here was a bishop taking over the Mass, handing over his crozier for the priest to hold. The priest was upset and in a rebellious mood at this sudden intrusion. And sort of grimaced and threw his weight around the altar. When it came to the sermon he picked something, which I can’t particularly remember from which source but it was an angry one about oppression. I thought then this priest isn’t going to last in this church.

A few weeks later he was gone to Borehamwood, a commuter, petit-

bourgeois, one-horse town 12 miles from Central London.

I suppose priests are moved around different parishes in case they think they own what they are being employed in. Certainly this priest had a touch of that but his programme for the homeless of the streets had a severe setback.

I shall always remember him at Golders Green crematorium seeing off my friend Declan Mulholland back in 1999 with the words:

“He loved his drink, his food, his women and his jokes, and good luck to him. But why the hell did I become a priest and miss out on this life!”

No, I haven't forgotten Futher-Church. The anti-Catholic media in Britain blamed the decline in the number of priests being to do with some of the sexual aberrations of a few of the members of the Catholic Church. The same was said of the decline in Ireland. But the decline in men becoming priests in Northern Ireland was blamed on the Church's closeness to Whitehall during the war situation.

But, as FutureChurch shows, the number of Catholics in the US is up by 6.7 million. And I would think that that trend in numbers is also happening in the UK, NI and Ireland. On UK TV some time ago I listened to a priest talk on sexual abuse in the Church and go on to say that in any big corporate organisation involving hundreds of thousands you are going to get the same amount of sexual abuse by a small minority.

Taking a look at the *Orthodox-Christianity* website, the complaints are about the moving around of their priests and his family. Sometimes it is the congregation who want a change. If they make this request too often, they are called *priest-eaters*. People are writing into this website to complain. One saying about the moving of his priest and family: “*I miss him sorely. Sort of like military families, right!?*”

Another writes:

“I know that in the old country (Ukraine, in this case) the priesthood was traditionally passed from father to son. One had priestly families. I know one family in America which has five generations of priests (who often married the daughters of priests).

The priests sometimes assumed their father's parish, although that always didn't happen, they may have been assigned somewhere else.”

On another website: *People of our Everyday Life* it asks the question: “*Are Greek orthodox priests celibate?*” And goes on to say: “*The Greek Orthodox Church is one of the main Eastern Orthodox churches.*”

Along with Catholicism and Protestantism, Eastern Orthodox Churches represent one of the main Christian groups. According to the *BBC Online* series on world religion, the Orthodox Church began the split from its Western counterparts sometime after the seventh Ecumenical Council in 784 AD, and then finally split fully from Catholicism after the so-called Great Schism in 1054. Accordingly, it developed its own distinct traditions, including the ability for its priests to be married.

While the Catholic Church requires that its priests remain celibate and not marry, the Greek orthodox Church does not. A married man is allowed to become a deacon and then become a priest. Intercourse and the raising of children within this family is also deemed acceptable and even encouraged, as the priest's family can serve as a model for the community, an example that his congregation can look to for guidance.

A paragraph labelled: “*Marriage after Ordination*” says:

“However, while a married man can become a deacon and a priest in the Greek Orthodox Church, a marriage is forbidden for those already in one of these positions.

If a man chooses to become a priest while he is still single, he is expected to remain unmarried and by extension celibate throughout his entire tenure as a priest—presumably for the rest of his life. Therefore, the decision to marry or not is one that should be made prior to entering the priesthood.”

On “*Remarriage*”:

“The ban on becoming married while a priest extends to priests who become widowers. Because it views the institution of marriage as sacred. The Greek Orthodox Church forbids priests from remarrying under any circumstances. Priests whose wives die must leave the priesthood if they wish to remarry.”

On “*Premarital Sex*”:

“Single priests are expected to remain celibate as the Greek orthodox Church takes a traditional approach to the question of premarital sex,

forbidding it altogether. According to the Greek Orthodox Church of America, premarital sex is considered a sin, inappropriate both for priest and laity.”

Maybe something for the Catholic Church to study if they insist on keeping the priesthood male?

FutureChurch blog: (by Deborah Rose-Milavec):

“What Happened in Limerick Should Not Stay in Limerick: 2nd International Meeting of priest Association and Lay Reform Groups Take Up Tough Questions.

From April 13-17, 2015, thirty-eight Catholics from priest associations and church reform organization across ten countries met in Limerick, Ireland to discuss some of the most pressing issues facing the Church today and work together for a change. Travelling from Austria, Australia, Germany, India, various regions in Ireland, Italy, Slovakia, Switzerland, the UK and the United States, men and women, ordained and lay, familiar faces and new, came together around some of the most difficult and painful problems facing the Church today.

This was the second such meeting. The first meeting in Bregenz, held in November, 2013, was called by Fr. Helmut Scheuller the founder of the Pfarrer Initiative. It was the Pfarrer Initiative who issued the prophetic and controversial *Call to Disobedience* (http://www.pfarrer-initiative.at/unge_en.pdf) challenging Church leaders to halt the consolidation of parishes while calling for a “*new image of the priest*”. Many who had been in Bregenz also came to Limerick and were joined by more than twenty new participants from four new regions.

The “Limerick 38”; as I affectionately like to think of them, called on bishops to courageously support Pope Francis vision for reform. Fr. Tony Flannery conveyed the group's sense of urgency at a press conference on the final day calling this “Francis Era” our “last chance” to get renewal right.”

Further on in the blog she touches on women's rights and gender within the Catholic Church.

A few Catholic women I have talked to say *no* to a woman on the altar. “*A Holy Man, yes, but who ever heard of a Holy Woman*”, said one.

“*I suppose it would take getting used to*”, says another: “*it would be better than no church at all*”.

3 August 2017

Jules Gondon

First English Translation
by
Cathy Winch
Part 3

Biography of Daniel O'Connell (1847)

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

[Gondon takes up the *Veto controversy*. The apostolic vicar in London, Dr. Milner, campaigned against a proposed arrangement, offered by the British Government, offering admission of Catholics to Parliament in return for a veto on the nomination of Bishops. Both the English and Irish Bishops agreed to this arrangement (which was not unusual) but there was radical opposition by the middle class in Dublin, expressed through Walter Cox's *Irish Magazine*. This point seems to have been missed by Gondon.]

This was not the first, or the last, act of persecution that the venerable Apostolic Vicar had to endure. When the Catholics of England abandoned him, Ireland gave him solace. On O'Connell's proposal, a meeting of 4,000 people voted an Address in his favour. Irish Catholics thereby expressed their admiration, gratitude and sympathy for the venerable prelate who was so misunderstood in England.

At that time, all sincere friends of liberty, of all religious persuasions, had rallied to the principles of O'Connell. The Liberals in England were interested, if one can judge by an event which took place in London on 10th June 1813. Ireland had sent ten delegates to England, bearing Irish demands and petitions. They were given a Dinner by the society of *The Friends of Religious Freedom*. Among the five hundred men attending the banquet were five Dukes, of whom two were of royal blood (Kent and Sussex), five with the rank of Marquess, nineteen Counts, eight Viscounts, fifteen Lords and sixty Members of the House of Commons. These numbers show how the cause of Emancipation had progressed.

O'Connell was not part of this deputation. He remained at his post. As life and soul of the [Catholic] Committee, he wrote the resolutions, called the meetings, harangued the multitudes, gave advice, and warned of the traps laid everywhere against Catholics. As soon as detecting a danger, he published

an Address to the People. He also protected the weak and brought redress for grievances suffered by the poor.

'Signatures and money!' was his constant call. If Petitions were necessary, money was no less so, to support the activity of the movement and keep up with its demands. In spite of the personal sacrifices of its members, at the end of 1813 the Committee was 75,000 Francs in debt.

No difficulty disheartened O'Connell. He relentlessly fought all the injustices that were brought to his attention. He attacked all monopolies. He promoted Irish manufacturing, and promised that for the rest of his life he would only buy products made in Ireland. This policy, which he commended to all the Catholics of Ireland, brought on a backlash of critical articles of the kind the English press has always rained on O'Connell. But this man—strong in his conscience and with faith in the rights of his country—was impervious to the insults of the English Protestant press. After all, what could the English press do to him, after he had put up with the most *conciliatory* English Catholic of the time describing speeches made at the Dublin meetings as sometimes *disgusting* and spoiling the best of causes?

The support he received from all generous hearts compensated for his troubles. Ireland sensed that it was in her interest to identify with the man for whom she was everything. The inhabitants of the Counties of Louth, Kilkenny, Kerry, Wexford, Galway and Cork voted Addresses to "*Daniel O'Connell, who has so clearly earned our gratitude, with the eminent services he has rendered to his country*". The Catholics of Limerick, Waterford and Drogheda followed this example.

O'Connell was daring in fighting abuses and instances of tyranny. And, if the audaciousness of his attacks sometimes verged on temerity—as in his defence of John Magee, owner of

the *Dublin Evening-Post*—it was because he knew he could count on his fellow citizens, whose cause he defended.

England started to feel the power of the Dublin lawyer, who had with him and behind him the country in whose name he spoke.

The Dublin manufacturers did not remain aloof from the general sympathy for O'Connell: they presented him with a magnificent silver cup. Each attack against him brought new demonstrations of sympathy. While still successfully carrying on with his professional activities, which at the time brought him 100,000 Francs per year, he turned himself into a political leader. And this was all the easier because most of the great trials of the time were political trials.

The year 1814 is one of the most memorable in the career of the illustrious agitator because of the active part he played in the agitation against the *Veto*. We have explained that, as from 1799, England consented to grant a modicum of emancipation to Catholics, on condition that she had a right of *veto* on the nomination of their Bishops. It seems that, influenced by the promises and the flatteries that Governments are always generously giving to the Church, a very small number of Bishops approved England's scheme, an approval which they subsequently regretted and withdrew. Taking advantage of this weakness, and seizing the opportunity to exploit it, the Government had no doubt the Bill granting this privilege would be passed.

Ireland was at first saddened by this news [of a Government Veto on the appointment of Bishops], but had been reassured by the unanimous protest of her Bishops and by Doctor Milner's paper; but the calm did not last. Newspapers soon published a document signed by *Monsignor Quarantotti*, vice-Prefect of Rome, announcing that prelates in charge of the government of the Church during the captivity of the Pope had consented to the *Veto* and approved the English Government's Bill.

This news spread through Ireland like lightning. The deepest grief seized Catholics of all classes; they saw the freedom of their Church threatened, this Church so dear to their hearts, and which had cost their forebears so much blood and suffering. Poor country people met with eyes filled with tears and asked each other in their naive language: "*Is it true that the Pope has become an Orangeman?*"

This strange document provoked a general uproar. Newspapers were filled with the protests of clergy and laymen alike. All swore that any attempt "to weaken the [Catholic] Church of Ireland would be in vain and that in spite of kings, parliaments, Orangemen and quarantottis, Ireland would keep in all its purity the faith of Saint Patrick". The Dublin clergy declared, in the name of what it owed to God and to the faithful, that the edict of *Quarantotti* did not carry the authority that would make the document compulsory. *Monsignor* and his decree were the continuous target of epigrams and witticisms.

A large meeting took place in Dublin, at which O'Connell showed himself equal to the task in hand: after all, for fourteen years he had missed no opportunity to fight political power when it sought to interfere in Church matters. He made a distinction—we are just reporting what he said—between the submission that Catholics owed to the Holy See and the proposed change in the way Bishops were appointed. He pointed out the dangers for the Irish Church in making a concession which a heretical power could not fail to abuse, given that non-Protestant Governments go that way so easily. On 27th May the Irish Bishops made another protest against the Bill at a synod held in Maynooth College.

Quite apart from the unfortunate affair of the Veto, Catholics saw vexations of all sorts gather around them. Mr. Grattan, who represented their interests in the House of Commons, took it upon himself, while presenting their Petitions, to declare that he would not put their claims before the House at that session.

Seeing the Catholic cause betrayed in Rome, where the Pope was no longer resident, and abandoned in Parliament, the Ministry redoubled its efforts, in the hope of winning through by a show of force. But, despite these sad circumstances, Catholic courage did not fail: it was buttressed by O'Connell.

As though the sufferings of the Irish Church were not enough, the Jesuits came in for their share of vexation. Sir Robert Peel, then Mr. Peel, Secretary of State for Ireland, with whom negotiations had been started to obtain permission to found a Jesuit College, intimated that the Government, far from authorising such an establishment, might well take the Order's money away. Sir Robert

Peel went no further than threatening; perhaps he remembered the words of Lord Chatham, who, when during the war he was told to seize the money that the French held in English companies, said: "No, no, if the Devil himself had money here, it would still be safe".

Pius VII was returned to liberty. The trust Ireland had in him soon proved justified. While some English Catholics voted an Address to the Sovereign-Pontiff, reflecting a most deplorable spirit, Ireland learnt, to joyous acclaim, that the document signed by *Monsignor* the vice-Prefect was disavowed. The signatory and all his accomplices were removed from Office. Shortly afterwards, Mgr. Murray, coadjutor of the Archbishop of Dublin, left for Rome accompanied by Doctor Milner: these two prelates were delegated by the Bishops of Ireland.

The disappointment suffered by the English Minister in Rome made him more vexatious in Dublin. At the end of 1814, the [Catholic] Committee had to give in to his demands, and ceased to meet. While waiting to see what to do next, the leaders of the Catholic party met, in very small numbers, at the home of Lord Fingal. These private meetings were soon noticed and the home of Lord Fingal became known as the *Catholic Divan*.

O'Connell, whose story we are telling by way of the vicissitudes of the Irish Catholics, soon managed to mitigate the rigorous demands of government. He continued to be the soul of all the struggles, the spring of all movements. He seized every opportunity to repeat to his fellow-countrymen: "Now and always, will we reject any favour which we would have to buy with the sacrifice of our religion and our freedom". He exhorted Catholics to be patient and perseverant, assuring them that they would one day have "the glory of conquering their freedom without having to abandon the religion of their fathers."

O'Connell, in accordance with his principles, had obediently pronounced the dissolution of the Catholic Committee. However, he soon found a way to overcome the new obstacles put in the way of freedom of association. He simply created a *Catholic Association*, and with pomp announced its foundation in the newspapers. The Association held its first meeting in February 1815, if we are not mistaken.

Although the Sovereign-Pontiff had disavowed the document signed by the vice-Prefect of Rome regarding the *Veto*, he decided to turn his mind to the question himself. In these circumstances, Bishops, clergy and laymen did everything they could to convey their views to the Holy See. After the return of Dr. Milner and Dr. Murray, the Bishops declared at a new synod that—"they would oppose, by all means canonical and constitutional, the intervention of temporal power" [in the appointment of Bishops]. They forwarded this resolution to Rome. The faithful endorsed this document: gathered in a solemn meeting by O'Connell, they supported the opinion of the Bishops amid the most touching marks of devotion to the faith of their fathers and to the freedom of the Church. In a speech on this occasion O'Connell told the Catholics of Dublin:

"We can regard the *veto* as gone forever. But a question presents itself: will we be emancipated without the *veto*? I have been asked that question, and this is my reply: It is possible that we won't be, although the probabilities are that we will be. But if we are not, we will at least have preserved our religion and our honour. If we continue to live in a state of political inferiority, at least we will remain sincere Catholics and faithful Irishmen. It may be that our cause will not succeed; but, my friends, we will have achieved more, by making ourselves worthy of its success!"

The *Catholic Association* presented its good wishes to Rome. It sent two Bishops and an Archdeacon with the mission of presenting to the Pope a report written by O'Connell, in the name of the Catholics, on the dangers that the Church would face if the *veto* were conceded.

A few timid individuals thought O'Connell, wanting emancipation without preconditions, was too forward and too ambitious. A regrettable split broke out in the Catholic party, and O'Connell replied to the arguments of his opponents: "I am ready to do anything to bring about a reconciliation, everything, except betray the religion of my fathers and of my country."

Then, in a resolution which he had his party adopt, he said:

"Since the political and religious freedom of Ireland is the only objective of the Catholic people, we would think ourselves degraded if we stipulated, as price for the advantages which we were

to receive, a condition which would increase the influence of Her majesty's ministers to the detriment of the discipline of our Church."

The *Veto* Controversy, which was never resolved, became less burning in the years 1816, 1817 and 1818. English Catholics pursued their intrigues in Rome; O'Connell fought with indefatigable ardour against those of his compatriots who thought they must compromise by buying their emancipation at the cost of the *Veto*.

In the midst of these internal divisions, the return of peace in Europe revived the spirits of the Orangemen. The Catholics had a moment of lassitude. Their political friends seemed to abandon them in London. The sinister rumour spread that Rome, against their hopes and wishes, had just made concessions. Discouragement froze their hearts. O'Connell alone did not despair. He had faith in the wisdom of the Holy See. He had faith in the political future of his country. The indefatigable tribune prayed and waited patiently: the future belonged to him. Funds were lacking even to pay the rent of the hall where the Catholics held their meeting. O'Connell paid the arrears, and then rented less expensive premises, of which he bore the cost. England could have struck then, but she was absorbed by her own affairs. Providence was using O'Connell to look after Ireland.

We have recalled at some length the struggles of that period because, apart from the particular interest they hold for the Catholics of France, they also serve to highlight the convictions and religious devotion of O'Connell. We hope these details will not be without their uses at a time when the whole of the English press is engaged in a polemic on the character of the Liberator: Is he really devoted to his Church? Is O'Connell really the representative of Catholicism? That is what was being discussed in the London newspapers, and the *Times* considers the topic so interesting that it invited the principal Continental newspapers to take part in the discussion.

Before continuing our biography of the Irish hero, we must mention two anecdotes, one of which filled his heart with bitterness for the rest of his life. The man who understood and defended the honour and the rights of religion and country so well for once allowed himself to be led astray by the prejudices of worldly honour.

The Irish agitator always claimed that *difficulties diminish and then vanish before perseverance and energy*. This maxim supported him in his long struggles and in the war he waged against all abuses. Among the monopolies knocked down by his perseverance, that of the municipal corporations remained impervious to his blows the longest. He had found the municipalities were exclusively in the hands of Orangemen. The gates of the City remained closed to Catholics even after their emancipation. The organisation of municipalities on an exclusive principle gave rise to abuses of all sorts.

Public opinion unanimously denounced the dishonest, wasteful and disorderly way the corporations were run. Towns were crushed under the weight of taxes and the greater the sacrifices their citizens made, the more viciously they were administered. O'Connell often turned his attention to this question and from 1815 he worked assiduously to show the real character of these institutions and soon they were the butt of public contempt and animosity.

The Municipal Corporation of Dublin, summoning up its accumulated hostility to the man who was to take away its sceptre, finally made a decision to get rid of its relentless adversary. The municipality then waited for an opportunity.

It should be noted that O'Connell's personal enemies, members of the municipality he attacked the most, stayed in the background. In order to execute its homicidal designs, the Corporation chose a man with no particular political views who had no personal animosity towards O'Connell and who was one of the members of the Council least hostile to Catholics. But this gentleman, formerly an officer in the navy, was experienced in the use of pistols: it was said that he could extinguish a candle at fifteen paces.

Mr. d'Esterre seemed flattered to be singled out for preference. Certain members of the Corporation were even more delighted, because Mr. d'Esterre, in favour with the Government, and not lacking ambition, was planning to stand as a candidate for a post several of his colleagues also had an eye on.

The occasion to provoke O'Connell to a duel soon presented itself. O'Connell, who excelled in the art of bringing down men and things, had dared call the Dublin Corporation *a beggar*

Corporation. Whatever the result of a duel, either way it would be to the advantage of the members of the Corporation who encouraged Mr. d'Esterre. Supposing the outcome of the meeting was fatal to the agitator, they would be rid of their most courageous antagonist, while the death of Mr. d'Esterre would take away an importunate rival.

Mr. d'Esterre asked for an explanation. O'Connell wrote:

"Sir, in reply to your letter of yesterday, I must inform you that I do not wish either to confirm or retract the phrase regarding the corporation of Dublin which motivated your letter. I would add, knowing the way the Corporation treats the religion and the character of the Catholics of Ireland, that no phrase, however worthy of criticism, could be attributed to me that would exaggerate the feelings of contempt I feel for the Corporation as such. I do not doubt that it counts among its members several estimable persons, whom I am sorry to be obliged to include in the body to which they belong.

I only add that this letter must close our correspondence."

I am etc., Daniel O'Connell

Mr. d'Esterre sent a reply, his letter was returned unread. The parties spent two or three days observing each other. Each went out accompanied by friends for protection. The herald of the Corporation threatened to commit violence. One or the other of the adversaries was no sooner spotted that crowds started following him. O'Connell was several times obliged to take refuge in houses or shops as he walked about, to avoid the tumultuous manifestations of sympathy which broke out in the streets of Dublin in favour of the one they called the *man of the people* [in English in the original].

Finally the witnesses were chosen and the conditions of the duel decided. O'Connell, who was that day extremely cheerful, was seconded by a Protestant. He was on the spot thirty minutes before the time appointed. Mr. d'Esterre arrived thirty minutes later than arranged. Everything took place, according to the witnesses and the adversaries, with the most perfect adherence to custom and the greatest delicacy. Two shots were heard simultaneously. The finger of Providence deviated the shot of the experienced d'Esterre. O'Connell had a keener eye than his opponent, who fell

struck by a mortal blow.

The Catholics saw in this tragic result the judgment of God, and in Dublin and on the route travelled by O'Connell the people could not contain their joy in learning that *their man* was safe. Mr. d'Esterre died a few days later, and the friend who had served as his witness immediately wrote to Mr. O'Connell to assure him that neither the family nor the friends of the deceased man had any intention of bringing the affair to court. A curious aspect of the circumstances was that the unhappy victim of the Orangemen of Dublin had defended the Catholics before the Corporation in the very debate where O'Connell employed the word *beggar* to refer to it in his speech.

A few months later, the agitator mentioned the Secretary of State for Ireland, Mr. Peel, in one of his speeches. We know how the lawyer-tribune was able to attack Statesmen hostile to his country in the most expressive way. O'Connell always referred to the Secretary of State as *Orange Peel*, to great laughter and whistling. The newspapers reported that Mr. Peel had expressed himself in an inappropriate manner in the House of Commons regarding the agitator. In a speech in Ireland O'Connell pronounced the name of Peel, provoking a predictable reaction among his listeners, and continued:

"You are mistaken. I have not come today to speak to you of this famous statesman. I will only say that in my absence and in a place where he has the privilege of speaking without being contradicted, he has grossly insulted me. I said in our last meeting, when police spies were present, paid by him to take notes, that he was much too prudent to attack me in my presence. I see here today the same spies, and I give them permission to reproduce my words as faithfully as they can. I say that Mr. Peel in my presence and in a place where he would be held to account, would not dare use words injurious to my honour or my interests. That said, I have done with this man, who is good for nothing except at most to be a champion of Orangism. I have done with him, perhaps for ever."

Mr. Robert Peel saw this as a challenge and a provocation. One of his friends was asked to demand an explanation from O'Connell. A longish correspondence followed. The popular orator was soon arrested. It was a serious affair. Public interest was so strong that the friend chosen by O'Connell to lead

the negotiations had to explain the state of affairs in a letter addressed to *The People of Ireland*. The publicity given to this correspondence embittered the quarrel. Mr. Robert Peel wrote directly to O'Connell, asking him to choose a friend who would come to an understanding with Colonel Brown, his second, to arrange preliminaries. The agitator replied that he was sorry, but the duel would have to be postponed, on account that he was under arrest on bail. It seems that a fearful Mr. s. O'Connell had herself fetched the sheriff to have her husband arrested.

The encounter was becoming impossible to arrange in Ireland. They would have to go abroad; Ostend was chosen as the *rendezvous*. Mr. Peel reached that town, but O'Connell, in spite of all the precautions taken to facilitate his flight, was arrested in London, as he was getting into a carriage to go to Brighton where he was to embark. He was sentenced to pay 50,000 Francs, on top of his bail, and also prevented from leaving London for a few months.

Mr. Peel was waiting hopelessly in Ostend, when he learnt by letter that his opponent was not in a position to join him. Each soon returned to his post in Dublin. The quarrel revived for a time. The police demanded new tokens of peace from O'Connell. He had to promise that he *would at no time go on the continent, and would never again invite Mr. Peel to join him there in a fight*. The magistrate declared formally to O'Connell that, in event of a fatality resulting from an encounter, the Government was determined to prosecute and have executed which ever of the adversaries was favoured by fate.

The affair did not go any further.

The agitator received a number of provocations on other occasions and rebuffed them. Having experienced the barbarity of the duel, he swore he would never again put himself in the position where he might shed the blood of his brother man. Since then, as he often used to say, he has accepted with pride the insults of men whom he refused to fight—as an expiation for the death of d'Esterre—and he has remained true to his oath, even though this steadfastness has cost dear to a man of his character.

In 1817 O'Connell put all his energy into a scheme for establishing in Dublin a society of the *Friends of Parliamentary Reform*. The attempt, which did not in the event lead to anything, did however result in bringing together Protestants

and Catholics during meetings. We see later, in 1819, Catholics gathered at the Dublin Rotunda for the express purpose of thanking their Protestant fellow citizens for petitioning for their emancipation, and of giving them a public expression of their gratitude.

We have no important incident to report before the creation of the great Catholic Association, the germ of which was in the society of the same name, established in 1815. O'Connell alone did not despair when his fellow Catholics were weary: he constantly brought them back to a sense of their duty. From time-to-time he published Letters and Addresses to Catholics, repeating his famous refrain: *Hereditary slaves, do you not know that to be free you must strike?*

Mr. Sheil, currently a member of the Government—who already then seemed to be preparing the future—embarked on an epistolary polemic against O'Connell, which divided Catholics. Mr. Sheil already had governmental tendencies.

His British Majesty visited Ireland in 1821, in the hope of conciliating his Catholic subjects by flattery and mendacious promises. The latter voted to the King an Address of congratulations in which they alluded to the state of inferiority suffered by Ireland. The Catholics said to him:

"In other parts of the vast empire over which His Majesty reigns, he may find greater evidence of wealth, greatness and power; but in no other part will he find more sincere or deeper attachment.

We will never forget the happy time of his residence amongst us, and if the thoughts of our sovereign, amidst the worries of government, turn to Ireland, he can be sure that there he is the master of a faithful and devoted people. England gives His Majesty the contribution of her wealth and commerce, but we, in our chivalric poverty, are ready, as always, to offer him the noble tribute of our blood. He has a soldier in each one of us, and our lives are at his service for the defence of his throne and the liberties which he protects."

O'Connell did not write this Address, but on the last day of the Royal visit, he was chosen to lead a deputation of Catholics to present to the King a crown of laurels, which was gracefully received. The King made fulsome promises, and although no one was deceived, the Orangemen pretended to be alarmed at the conciliatory dispositions of his

Majesty in favour of Catholics. Protestant Ireland was soon to be appalled by the following news, given in all seriousness by the Dublin newspapers:

"Mr. O'Connell is at the present moment travelling wearing a fur cap, ornamented with a gold band, which he says is *a present from the King*. It is undeniable that His Majesty wore just such a cap when he arrived in Ireland."

The matter was so important that O'Connell had to put the record straight. He wrote:

"Since my cap must one day figure in History, I hereby formally deny any claim that it came to me from the King."

The assurance given by the travelling lawyer calmed anxieties. It was understood that the country was not in such danger as was supposed.

In 1822, the Marquess of Wellesley was sent to Ireland as Lord-Lieutenant, to the satisfaction of Catholics.

At that time the agitator made a trip to France. He came to Paris to see the general Count Daniel O'Connell, while his family went on to Pau via Bordeaux where later he went to meet them. O'Connell, leaving the capital by coach for the south of France, found himself next to a navy captain who had no sooner recognised a British subject in his travelling companion that he started telling all the anecdotes that his memory could provide against England and the English. O'Connell listened in silence and was much amused by the irritation created by his absence of reaction. The captain, who seemed determined to make the *Englishman* [in English in original] lose his *sangfroid*, turned suddenly to O'Connell and spoke to him directly:

—Do you hear me Sir? Do you understand me?

—Perfectly.

—Well then, have you nothing to say to my provocations? Do you not feel my attacks against your country and your compatriots?

—I have no reason to take offence. On the contrary, I think that the English fully deserve what you said about them.

—What, Sir, but you are an Englishman, are you not?

—No Sir, I am an Irishman, and far from being angry at what you said, I think you have not been hard enough.

The Captain, surprised and disappointed, rapidly understood that Irishmen do not have to avenge insults aimed at England, and he was, for the rest of the voyage, the pleasantest

companion to the illustrious agitator.

After this journey to the South of France, principally undertaken for the sake of his wife's health, O'Connell returned to Dublin to lay the foundations of the great Catholic Association which after six years of struggle, gained emancipation.

The story has been told that:

"two men of equal eloquence met at the home of a mutual friend. Both patriots, and both still young, they were moved to tears when they spoke of the fate of Ireland. They were Sheil and O'Connell. Supporting each other, they resolved to drag our population out of its apathy, by creating a vast Catholic association."

This is a charming tableau; but the respect we owe to History and the memory of O'Connell forces us to say that it lacks accuracy.

It is true that Mr. Sheil did render eminent service in the great struggle ahead, but he cannot claim the glory of being with O'Connell the originator of this association. The attempts previously made by the agitator prove that the idea for the scheme had been with him for a long time. He was only waiting for the right moment to implement the idea.

In the Spring of 1823, O'Connell went to visit one of his friends in Glencullen, County Wicklow, and there he met Mr. Sheil. After dinner, O'Connell explained to the assembled guests the plans for an association which he had worked out.

Mr. Sheil, far from encouraging him, said he did not think this plan could possibly succeed, and he added that anyway the moment had not yet come for the creation of a new association. Mr. O'Connell defended his plan with deep conviction, saying: "*If it doesn't work, I will make it work!*" He was as good as his word.

A few days later (May 1823) the Catholic Association held its first session, where O'Connell laid its foundations. In order that it should not fall foul of the law, it was declared that the Association would hold or exercise no delegated authority. Its members would be of two kinds. Some would pay 25 Francs a year, others would pay 1 Franc 20 centimes. Only subscribers could attend meetings and take part in deliberations. The aim of the Association was to obtain, *by all legal means*, the emancipation of Catholics.

At the start, members were quite assiduous in their attendance at meetings, but this zeal soon cooled. In 1824, about ten months after its creation, the agitator had several times to withdraw without opening the session, because the quorum of ten members necessary for the committee to deliberate was not reached. The following oft-repeated anecdote dates from this period.

The premises where the meetings took place consisted in two rooms over a bookshop. It was two minutes before three-thirty, time for the meeting to end, and only seven members were present. O'Connell hears voices in the bookshop; he rushes in and sees two theology students from the great Maynooth seminary. According to the regulations, all ecclesiastics were honorary members of the Association. O'Connell invites them to follow him, but noticing that they hesitated, he pushed them in front of him, and an eighth member arriving at that point, the agitator entered the room, saying: "We have a quorum, the session is open." He immediately started speaking to explain the improvements he thought the Association could profit from.

Soon after he developed his admirable plan of small monthly subscriptions called the Catholic rent, destined to provide secure resources for the Association. Ireland was soon covered in a sort of network. Each village priest became a tax collector. It was at the priest's house that people signed petitions and paid tax. In order to interest all Catholics without exception in the success of this gigantic enterprise, it was decided that all persons able to pay two pennies [*liards*] a week would be members of the Association. It was sufficient to put your name down on a register held by your local priest and pay this sum in full. This system seemed so ingenious that it frightened the Orangemen; it was even violently attacked by Catholics who wanted to do things on a grander scale. O'Connell held firm against the storms. He replied to the attacks of the press and to the attacks of his friends. Even schoolboys repeated the criticisms they heard at home, and John O'Connell, son of the agitator, tells that his fellow pupils made fun of him, and of the *two-penny scheme* invented by his father *to save Ireland*.

Here are some of the resolutions adopted by the Association. We reproduce them because they might suggest practical ideas that could be

implemented, even in a country that does not enjoy the freedom that enslaved Ireland still enjoys.

"A subscription plan called the monthly emancipation rent will be adopted.

"In each parish will be nominated at least three and at most twelve persons in charge of collecting subscriptions.

"A monthly report will be presented to the Association regarding the amount collected by subscriptions and the development of the system in the parishes.

"The names of the subscribers will be published, unless they prefer to remain anonymous.

"A committee composed of twenty-one persons will supervise the use of the funds.

"The monthly subscription can vary between two and fifty but cannot exceed the latter sum."

This plan in its simplicity fulfilled O'Connell's expectations. The Association soon became a formidable power. The poor peasant, used to being the victim of so much injustice, found himself under the strong protection of the association, which at its own expense undertook the redress of all the grievances of its members, whether against the Anglican clergy or against the landlords [in English in the original]. Then Ireland saw for the first time Orange magistrates hesitate before they pronounced an iniquitous sentence against a Catholic, because they knew that the Association was there ready to challenge them and make them account for their judgement.

Everywhere was adopted the famous motto of the agitator: "*He who commits a crime fortifies his enemy.*" The lessons of the man who was all his life possessed by a holy madness for the freedom of his country gave Ireland discipline. The genius of O'Connell had managed to legalise insurrection.

We now come to the most glorious years of the career of the agitator, and the great and solemn spectacle given by Ireland to the world in the crowning struggle that led to emancipation.

The agitator had built the foundations of the Catholic Association. He made its aims known, and started to overcome the indifference with which he was first confronted. The Association spread its influence to all the parishes and acted in the place of the legal power. The people, who up to then had only known unjust and tyrannical Government, now blessed

the protective and benevolent authority which came between them and their oppressors. The Association actually governed Ireland. Its leaders were the representatives of the country. Its orders were laws that everyone regarded as compulsory. The central committee received all complaints, investigated and prosecuted all abuses. The association collected a tax which was always paid, because it was freely given. At election time, it dealt with the revision of the electoral register, paid the fees of Catholic electors and pursued relentlessly the removal of the names of Orangemen incorrectly present on the register. It recommended candidates worthy of public confidence and encouraged electors to fulfil their duty. When a law was presented in Parliament, it assembled its own parliament. The Bill was examined, discussed, approved or rejected by the Association. In the latter case, an Address to the people pointed out its dangers, and called for the immediate sending of Petitions to demand its rejection. If a poor farmer was thrown into jail because he had not been able to pay his tithes, the Association paid his debts and set him free. If a dutiful elector was thrown out of his farm because he voted against the wishes of his landlord, the Association praised his courage, took him under its protection, gave him help, found him a farm and exposed the oppressive owner to public disgrace. The Catholic Association formed a government above the Government, because it checked the acts of political power and at the same time governed the people.

This new type of authority did not just undertake the political education of Ireland. It also taught the people regular and social habits. It taught the people their duties by making them aware of their rights. It founded schools, and welfare institutions. It recommended temperance. When, the day before an election, it made drunkenness unlawful, not a drop of whisky passed anyone's lips. The authority of the Association was such that, when a peasant, in a Waterford election, complained at the top of his voice that he had been beaten up, was asked: "*Why didn't you give blow for blow?*" replied: "*I thought the Association had forbidden that.*"

Was there ever a government that exercised such power? And this authority, which took the place of official power, did not grow in the dark, but in the broad daylight of the town square.

Its resolutions, its acts, the speeches of its members were all made in public. It replaced night meetings with meetings in broad daylight. Such was the Association which governed Ireland and which was itself governed by O'Connell. This association bore the name of *Catholic*, although *it was open* to all Protestants sincerely in favour of liberty of conscience.

We need hardly say that inside and outside Parliament the Association was the butt of unceasing attacks both by Orangemen and by some pretended friends of emancipation, who claimed they were only attacking excesses. Presenting to Parliament a petition against the Catholic Association, an Orangeman exclaimed, speaking of his members:

"They have exasperated Irish Protestants; they have scandalised all respectable Roman Catholics known for their attachment to the throne. Regarding the great topic of emancipation, the members of the Association do not give a fig about it; all they care about is to satisfy their vanity and their ambition. To flatter the first and advance the second, they would not hesitate to endanger the peace of Ireland and lose forever the cause they claim to champion. The question is this: who holds the supreme authority, the Parliament of England, or the Catholic Association?"

To be continued.

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

The Origin Of Irish Catholic-Nationalism, Selections From Walter Cox's *Irish Magazine: 1807-1815*. Introduced and Edited by *Brendan Clifford*.
136pp. **€14, £11.50**

Postfree in
Ireland and Britain

**https://
www.atholbooks-
sales.org**

Wilson John Haire

Reader's Letter in response to **On Democratic War**, Editorial in Issue 129 (Autumn 2017)

Democratic Wars

The US/UK/EU have destroyed Iraq and Libya and attempts to do the same in Syria. Afghanistan's communism, offering more liberal-democracy than communism, was also defeated. But what was the real reason for this?

I believe the Iraq/Iran war, (1980-1988, which ended in a stalemate, made Iraq a strong military nation. It was tested in battle and had a preponderance of left-over military hardware donated by the West. The West wasn't going to allow that to continue.

On 2nd August, 1990 Iraq attacked Kuwait over its stealing of Iraqi oil by dubious means. Previously there had been talks in Jeddah (Saudi Arabia) between Iraq and Kuwait. Iraq wanted \$10 billion compensation but was offered \$9 billion. Iraq refused to compromise and instead launched its battle-hardened army.

Kuwait collapsed quickly and the West probably thought Saudi Arabia was next. Some Iraqi tanks did cross into Saudi Arabia. A Soviet General said on Western TV he thought the Iraqi army was doing very well. In my opinion that decided the West to destroy Iraq..

All in all, Iraq acted recklessly, in believing, it is said, the US Ambassador's prompting that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was permissible. It is hard to find any confirmation of this.

Iraq, after the Iran adventure, was in a warlike mode and possibly felt invincible. One way or another, the leadership fell into a trap that the West had set.

In staying on in Kuwait they failed to withdraw quickly before the West had built up its forces. Staying too long in occupation resulted in their inevitable expulsion. Iraq lost huge amounts of military hardware plus personnel. Morale collapsed. The eventual invasion of Iraq by the West met with very little resistance.

I doubt if Britain took into consideration its own development of liberal-democracy over the centuries in

growing impatient at Iraq's slow crawl to a like position. The US was the main culprit in the invasion and its thoughts on the matter was probably nil with their wrath-of-God fundamentalist outlook.

Libya had become the leading African nation. Because it is North African, most people don't associate it with black Africa. But Gaddafi was creating close ties with Mali and Niger against French wishes. France has been exploiting the mineral/uranium wealth of these countries on land used by the Tuareg and giving nothing back to them but more poverty. Libya was sympathetic and supplied arms for their rebellions.

Libya also had a plan for a new currency. It was to be a single African currency. The New American magazine headlined: '*Gaddafi's Gold-Money Plan Would Have Devastated Dollar*'.

Italy is now bemoaning the influx from black Africa but it has nobody to blame but itself. It supplied bases in Southern Italy for the assault on Libya. Previously it had supplied patrol boats to Libya to help stop black Africans reaching Europe. Gaddafi called this wave *the blacking of Europe*. No one else but he could have dared say that. But Gaddafi, with his positive plans for black Africa, could.

Afghanistan with its Communist Government—which mostly had a liberal-democracy tinge—and its Soviet ally—just had to go. But not because of its liberal-democracy but obviously because of growing communist influence in that part of the world.

The West's cultivating of the Islamist didn't drive Soviet forces out but rather the Soviet Union decided, under Gorbachev, that there was stalemate and it wasn't worth losing more men over it. But the Afghan Communist Government managed to survive another three years on its own until the Taliban offensive. .

Syria leased the Soviet Union a naval base in the port city of Tartus in 1971. The West has been concerned ever since. Now Russia is said to have three bases in Syria. The West has been working to overthrow the Assad Government because of this.

I don't think this subversion has anything to do with Syria's slow-growing liberal-democracy either (which continues to develop). The West just doesn't want Russia there.

Russian influence has been building up in the area, with its agreement with

Cyprus which allows its naval ships to be repaired and replenished there. .

It's easy to forget the atmosphere of the Cold War period. The newly-elected Attlee Government played a major part in promoting it. It had introduced a Soviet-style health service with social benefits and was beginning to build hundreds of thousands of Council homes. Everyone was entitled to one so it wasn't called social housing. Major industries were nationalised and Trade Unionism encouraged. But don't be a communist!

The WEA (Workers' Educational Association) was set up mainly to combat Marxist-Leninist ideas. Anyone insisting on discussing such an ideology or having any sympathy for the Soviet Union was expelled.

The Labour Government itself banned one May Day because of its supposedly communist influence.

I think foreign policy is adjusted according to what is the most dangerous world view at the time. *Communism* was on the up and up in the Far East. China was proclaiming that the *East is Red*. The insurrection in Malaya was led by the Malaya-Chinese communist party. Communism was on the rise in Indonesia.

Attlee's Government saw its job as combatting Communism. It has been said that the best way to attack the left is from the left. The Government gave the go-ahead for one of the worse suppressions in British colonial history. The need for rubber and tin came second.

At that time, on a personal level, I noted the loathing and hatred of the Labour Government in its foreign policy and put it down to good old English Imperialism in another guise: still the warriors, still holding up the chopped-off heads of their colonial adversaries.

The Labour Government policy in Kenya was also Imperialist: in putting down the Muranga Revolt in 1947. This was to spark off the Kikuyu Revolt in 1951.

There may be no such thing as a democratic foreign policy for colonial and former colonial nations—but what of other nations? Was Northern Ireland part of foreign policy when mal-administration was allowed to be continually swept under the carpet, during the early Labour Government? It even reinforced Unionist rule with the 1948 *Ireland Act*.

12 July, 2017

V
O
X

Higgins In Australia What is 'political?'

V
O
X

President Higgins in Australia On the indigenous inhabitants:

"In making this visit as President of Ireland, I am minded of all those earlier visits by others, including my own ancestors. My grandfather's siblings came to Australia in 1862. They did not come to a *terra nullius*, and may I begin here today by acknowledging the first occupants of this land who for tens of thousands of years negotiated with its possibilities and its challenges, and developed one of the oldest cultures in the world; one that valued symmetry with nature, ancient wisdom and practical balances. I honour their elders present and past."

"If we are to be truly unblinking in our gaze, we must acknowledge that while most Irish emigrants experienced some measure, often a large measure, of prejudice and injustice, there were some among the number who inflicted injustice too".

See www.president.ie/en/media-library/speeches/speech-at-the-parliament-of-western-australia for the President's address to the Parliament of Western Australia.

On the Irish Famine:

"We have struggled to come to terms with this seismic event in our shared story. Over recent decades scholars and historians have compiled a solid exposition of the factors that contributed to the great calamity that led to so many deaths and so much dislocation. The Famine, of course, was never merely an accident of nature, nor can it be explained as merely a series of mistakes. It was not providence, as was claimed at the time. It occurred within the philosophical biases of Empire and an imbedded atmosphere of conquest and conflict. It was allowed to unfold within a prevailing mindset of economic theory, of land ownership and an emerging desire to industrialise agriculture."

See www.president.ie/en/media-library/speeches/speech-by-president-higgins-at-the-unveiling-of-an-irish-famine-memorial for the President's address at the unveiling of the Irish Famine Memorial in Perth.

On Commemorations:

"Speaking to an audience at the University of New South Wales in Sydney during an official visit to Australia, President Higgins said that over the next six years "we enter the centenary of the crucible of Irish history".

"Yet of course the most difficult commemorations for us in Ireland still lie before us... our Irish revolution, our independence struggle, our civil war and the foundation of the new independent state," he said.

The President said that, despite the difficulties posed by remembering key events in Irish history, there is "*nothing truly to be gained from amnesia*".

"For it is only by acknowledging, questioning, sometimes revising, but always remembering, in an ever more inclusive way, the events of our collective past that we can begin to build a collective future."

The incumbent of *Áras* an Uachtaráin told the audience that it was important to "*restore to our national memory*" men and women from the south who had served in British forces in the First World War.

"They shared the terrible experience of war in Europe, at Gallipoli, and in the Middle East, but the Irish returnees were remembered and treated quite differently when they returned to the south of Ireland than the Irish men who fought in the Australia and New Zealand Army Corps when they returned to their new homes," he said.

Among the upcoming anniversaries, President Higgins said the Treaty of 1921—which his father was interned for opposing—had led to "divisions that would be destructive for generations".

"Thus, families and communities were cleaved apart in a bitter war that was to cast a shadow for generations and hamper our efforts to meet the republican ideals set out in 1916," he added.

It would also be important to acknowledge that partition was a "*bitter disappointment and betrayal*" for many southern unionists, while the "*nationalist movement represented a*

plurality of opinion" in the years leading up to independence.

"These are some of the grave and difficult matters which we in Ireland will be confronting in the coming years," the President said.

"Conscious of my role as president of Ireland during this time of intense public remembering, I argued that the activity should be placed in an ethical framework."

"Our words matter and in our present circumstances when anger is the temper of our times, we need to use our words for healing rather than wounding," he said.

(JOHN MONAGHAN)

Well-Funded Lobbies Targeting Abortion Law under 'Light Touch' Regulation

Amnesty International Ireland has pinpointed liberalising abortion legislation as its top priority. The organisation now spends more on lobbying for abortion than on any other project. Originally founded to campaign for prisoners languishing in horrific conditions in jails around the world, Amnesty now places little importance on such work. It now concerns itself with the 'liberal agenda' in social affairs and interferes in many countries all over the world.

In Ireland the *Standards In Public Office Commission*, which decides whether foreign finance is permissible to particular campaigns, allowed Amnesty to receive 137,000 Euro from its American parent in November 2016 for its Abortion Campaign.

Independent TD Mattie McGrath claims that the Commission is allowing campaigning groups to decide for themselves whether the rules on funding from abroad apply to them—that is, whether their campaigns are political or not.

This is a crucial point: whether groups are campaigning for Human Rights or whether they are engaging in political activity. Foreign funding for Human Rights work is permissible, while being banned for political interventions. (See *Irish Catholic*, 12.10.17.)

But surely any legislation covering the personal lives of Irish citizens is political? Politics determines how 'Human Rights' are exercised. That must lead to the conclusion that any campaign which aims to influence the wording of the ultimate Irish law—the Constitution—is political.