

Church & State

# **An Irish History Magazine**

*And Cultural Review Of Ireland And The World*

---

**When Courts Legislate And  
Parliaments Govern . . .**

**Theodor Roosevelt And  
America's Rise To Power**

**Evocation of '*The Third Man*'**

**Orwell, Ireland and the War**

**Richard Baxter**

**The British Constitution**

**Heidegger**

## When Courts Legislate and Parliaments Govern . . .

There are reasons why British Constitutional affairs should be taken close account of by Irish historians. One reason is that a part of Ireland continues to be governed by the British jurisdiction, but governed in a provocatively abnormal method which brought about a long war and continues that war as feuding as the only possible form of politics.

Another reason is that Ireland as a whole was governed by Britain for many centuries, by the Parliamentary system freed from Monarchy for the last two of these centuries—a system which was intensely and insidiously oppressive, and it can only free its national mind by objectifying the system which oppressed it.

A third reason is that nationalist Ireland has tentatively become part of a European development—and the contribution to that development which its position in the world makes it best fitted to make is to give Europe a persuasively-objective account in an English voice of the history of English balance-of-power strategy against Europe over the past three centuries.

\*

Members of the British Parliament have appealed to the Courts to uphold its sovereignty but, in doing, they have, of course, diminished it. A sovereign body upholds its own sovereignty by its own means. If it cannot do so then it is not sovereign.

The appeal to the Courts was made on behalf of the majority in Parliament.

The proper business of a Parliamentary majority is to appoint a Government and enable it to govern. If it did so, it would have no grounds for appealing to the Courts to uphold its sovereignty against the Government. It would have been sovereign.

The reason it appealed to the Courts is that it is a majority that is incoherent. It is united as a majority on only one point: to prevent the Government from carrying out its policies.

Its requirement as an incoherent majority is to keep the minority Party in Government and prevent it from governing according to its policies, and impose other policies on it by the power of legislating against the Government which it has awarded itself.

The purpose which unites a discordant opposition into a majority in order to disable the Government is to prevent the Brexit decision of the Referendum from being implemented. The majority Opposition cannot agree on how Brexit should be prevented. It can only agree on preventing the Government from implementing it. Its reason for wanting to remain in the EU is to subvert it from within: to 'Reform' it.

The decision to hold the Referendum and give the decision on Brexit to the electorate was made by Parliament with the support of those who are now trying to prevent the implementation of that decision by any means and at whatever cost.

The purpose for which a popular majority voted for Brexit was to restore the sovereignty of the British Parliament, which had in areas subordinated itself to the European Union system.

The purpose for which the Remain alliance is disabling the Government in the name of Parliamentary Sovereignty, is to retain the state under the authority of the European Union and maintain the subordination of Parliament to a body outside the state.

The process of disabling Government within the state began with the political activism of the Commons Speaker against Brexit by breaking what was understood to be current practice on the basis of a precedent dredged up from what is time immemorial as far as current political affairs are concerned.

Prime Minister Johnson, faced with a majority in Parliament whose purpose was to prevent the Government from governing while maintaining it in Office and preventing an election, attempted to restore a degree of Government authority for a few weeks by ending a session that had continued for three years (instead of the customary single year), and preparing a Queen's Speech—a statement of policy—for a new session.

The Remain majority charged him with "*telling a lie to the Queen*" in order to get her to prorogue Parliament, when he said the prorogation was for the purpose of drawing up a Queen's speech—when the Prorogation was really for the purpose of getting momentary relief from a Parliament that was subverting government.

The prorogation obviously served both purposes. But the charge raised the very interesting question of what constitutes a lie in politics? Was the Speaker lying when he said his intention in his precedence ruling had nothing to do with Brexit? And is the practice of political opportunism, which is of the essence of British politics, a form of lying?

The appeal to the Courts to declare that the prorogation of Parliament was illegal was made in the first instance by the Scottish Nationalist Party in the Scottish Courts. The Scottish Supreme Court declared the Prorogation to be illegal. The British High Court held that it was not a matter for the Courts to decide. But the Supreme Court—an innovation made by Tony Blair and his Lord Chancellor, both of whom were lawyers—decided that it was within its authority to deal with the matter. And, once it accepted the case, it was virtually committed by circumstances to find against the Government.

Finding for the Government would have been finding against the Scottish Supreme Court, which would undoubtedly have given a strong stimulus to the Scottish Independence movement.

A famous 18th century Chief Justice made the famous statement: *Let Justice be done even though the Heavens fall*. But there is no record of such a thing ever being done by the British Courts, for which the safety of the state has always been the supreme concern.

A retired Judge, Jonathan Sumption, who was in the news because he delivered the BBC Reith lectures, was asked to comment on these matters in BBC's *Newsnight*. He said that, if the British and Scottish Supreme Courts reached different verdicts, one of them would be wrong. That is the pretentiousness of the law which sometimes likes to present itself as a detached process of logical deduction towards an inevitable conclusion.

There are areas of law where there is no right decision and wrong decision, but only a decision. A matter is put to the Courts, as part of a system of State, to decide, and what they decide becomes part of the system. The decision is right only in that sense.

Different verdicts in Scotland and London would not have been Right and Wrong verdicts. They would just have been different verdicts. If one Court was superior to the other, it would strike out the other verdict. But the matter was not so simple as between Scottish and English Courts at this juncture as Scotland is in the process of disengaging itself from the Union with England. The English Court therefore acted judiciously.

The full judgment has not been published in any medium available to us as we write, but it is reported that it took a precedent from Sir Edward Coke with regard to an action of King James the First a little over four hundred years ago, when the English state was an actual Monarchy, rather than the fictional monarchy operated by Parliament as a theatrical device of Parliamentary Government that it is now.

Coke, the Chief Justice, persuaded the King to desist from making law by Proclamation and instead to do so in conjunction with Parliament. Parliament did not seize the power of law-making from the King. That did not happen until thirty years later, when the Puritan movement gained control of a Parliament in the Parliament called for the purpose of financing war on Scotland.

The Puritan Parliament whittled away the power of the King, who was the Government, and established a system of government by Parliament—which failed. The failure of government by Parliament led to the return of monarchy in 1660. The monarchy, which had been overthrown by Parliamentary war in the 1640s, was restored peacefully in 1660, after government by Parliament had become a military dictatorship.

A part of Ireland played a constitutional part in that development. The colony in Ulster, which had been evolving in a mode of its own for about thirty years, rejected the abolition of the monarchy in 1649 and, through the Presbyterian Synod, recognised the son of the executed Charles the First as Charles the Second. It was denounced for this by the Puritan Secretary of State, John Milton.

Ten years later Milton was bewildered by the failure of Parliamentary theocracy without a King, and he saw the reviving monarchism of the popular mood as a dog returning to its vomit.

Chief Justice Coke's interaction with James the First laid the basis for the evolution of the Constitutional Monarchy on which the Belfast Presbytery took its stand against Parliament in 1649. The means by which Coke persuaded the King to adopt the line of action that opened the possibility of Constitutional Monarchy was described by Dicey—the foremost commentator on British Constitutional Law in the 20th century—as the invention of fictions which he presented as precedents. The following is from *The Law Of The Constitution* (1959 edition):

"Civilisation may rise above, but barbarism sinks below the level of legal fictions, and our respectable Saxon ancestors were... respectable barbarians. The supposition... that the cunning of lawyers has by the invention of legal fictions corrupted the fair simplicity of our original constitution, underrates the statesmanship of lawyers as

To page 4

## Contents

	Page
<b>When Courts Legislate And Parliaments Govern</b> Editorial	2
<b>Theodor Roosevelt And America's Rise To Power</b> John Minahane (Part 17, <i>Spanish Polemic On Colonisation</i> )	7
<b>The 'Third Man' In Its Context</b> Wilson John Haire (Review)	11
<b>Vox Pat</b> by Pat Maloney (Vatican Embassy; Free to . . . what? Armour Plated? The Camps; Pop Prayer! Self-Hating Jew? Juries; Disraeli; Wombs for Sale! Iona Institute; Michael Walker)	13, 32
<b>Orwell, Ireland And The War</b> (Part One: 'The View From Airstrip Two') Martin Tyrrell	14
<b>From Baxter To Boston</b> Stephen Richards (Part Three: <i>Reliquiae Baxteriana</i> )	18
<b>The British Constitution</b> Brendan Clifford	22
<b>Heidegger And The Latinisation Of Greek Philosophy</b> (Talk) Peter Brooke	25
<b>Sir Michael O'Dwyer And Amrytsar</b> (Par Three)	28
<b>The Ten Oldest Languages Still Spoken Today</b> Report	31

Some web addresses for associated sites—

**Athol Books:**

<http://www.atholbooks.org>

**The Heresiarch:**

<http://heresiarch.org>

There is a great deal of interesting reading. Go surf and see!

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

### **Church & State**

**Editor: Pat Maloney**

ISSN: 0332-3625

**All Correspondence should be sent to:**

**P. Maloney,  
26 Church Avenue, Roman Street, Cork City.  
TEL: 021-4676029**

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

ELECTRONIC SUBSCRIPTIONS: €8 (Sterling £6)

**Cheques/postal orders payable to ATHOL BOOKS please  
from**

**[athol-st@atholbooks.org](mailto:athol-st@atholbooks.org)**

much as it overrates the merits of early society. The fictions of the Courts have in the hands of lawyers such as Coke served the cause both of justice and freedom, and served it when it could have been defended by no other weapons. For there are social conditions under which legal fictions or subtleties afford the sole means of establishing that rule of equal and settled law which is the true basis of the English civilisation. Nothing can be more pedantic, nothing more artificial, nothing more unhistorical, than the reasoning by which Coke induced or compelled James to forgo the attempt to withdraw cases from the Courts for his Majesty's personal determination. But no achievements of sound argument, or stroke of enlightened statesmanship, ever established a rule more essential to the very existence of the constitution than the principle enforced by the obstinacy and the fallacies of the great Chief Justice...

"...the appeal to precedent is in the law courts merely a useful fiction by which judicial decision conceals its transformation into judicial legislation; and a fiction is none the less a fiction because it has emerged from the Courts into the field of politics or of history..." (p18-19).

The very long article on Coke in the Dictionary of National Biography (1st edition) comments: *"I am afraid", said Chief Justice Best, 'we should get rid of a good deal of what is considered law, if what Lord Coke says without authority is not law'...*"

Coke, the inventor of precedents, is cited as the authority of the Supreme Court for its decision to override the decision of the High Court that the proroguing of Parliament was political business and did not come under the competence of the Courts to deal with.

The fact that the Supreme Court decision was taken by a majority of 11 to 0 is presented in political dispute as evidence that there was a clear law which the Prime Minister broke. Gina Miller appeared on Radio Ulster the following morning. It was put to her that, if the Prime Minister had broken the law, breaking the law was a crime, and to be convicted of committing a crime deserved punishment—so how should he be punished?

She did not seem to have given the matter much thought. And, now that Parliament was sitting, what was the important business it had been prevented

from getting on with for a couple of weeks, and should now get on with? Digging for more material to use against the Government seemed to be her answer.

The unanimous verdict, on a contentious issue, which set aside the High Court finding, was not evidence that a law had been broken—a law which had somehow passed unnoticed until then. It was evidence that a law was being invented for a political purpose by a Court which was extending its reach.

Court-made law is not something new in British legal history. What is new in historical terms is mass-produced law by Parliament. It was only with the onset of the Reform Acts (1832 and after) that Parliament became a law-making machine, displacing the Judiciary in the business.

Law-making in the Judicial era presumed that something in the nature of Basic Law existed, in the culture if not in writing, and that it should be amended very cautiously as a kind of growth out of itself. That was in the era of aristocracy, ushered in by the 1688 abolition of Monarchy, which involved the abolition of a State to which all were subject. A century and a half later the Puritans, ousted from political power in 1660, and having become powerful as the pioneers of capitalist development, used their financial power to compel Parliament to let them in. They then used Parliament as a revolutionary legislative instrument.

The 'rule of law'—a term much used by the Parliamentary majority that now obstructs the Government, refuses to bring it down and itself become the Government, and refuses to allow an election to be held—took on a new meaning after Parliament became a legislating machine. It was one thing under the assumption that there was a kind of Basic Law which continues from generation to generation. It became another thing when the Government became the operator of a legislating machine which made laws as it needed them to serve its revolutionary requirements. Laws then popped up like mushrooms. And law became something that could not be relied upon.

Dacey describes how retrospective law-making functioned as part of the rule of law. When the Government, under the pressure of time (in war, for example), did things that could only be judged to be illegal under existing law, it altered the law after the event, with retrospective action, to make them legal.

'Rule of Law' in the modern sense only means the Government making laws at will, to legalise whatever it does. It reduces the term to meaninglessness.

In the present instance, the Government is unable to perform this trick because there is a majority in Parliament against it, and that majority refuses to bring it down or let it call an election, and applies to the Courts to say that the Government has broken the law.

The Opposition acts as if the Government was a Power independent of Parliament against which Parliament had no resource of its own—as was the case in the time of James I and Chief Justice Coke. In fact it knows very well that the Government is only a power of Parliament, which Parliament could get rid of overnight if it chose. Instead it chooses to keep it in being as a whipping boy and bleats about the rule of law being undermined.

\*

In 1641 Government was external to Parliament. It was the King. But there was not a fundamental antagonism between the King, as the Government, and Parliament. Parliament was an instrument by which the King governed, and it had a place in the monarchical government.

The monarchy could not maintain itself as the independent state power. It did not possess vast estates from which it could draw adequate finance, independently of supply by Parliament. It had used the plunder of the mediaeval framework which accompanied the Reformation—the withdrawal from the European constitutional consensus—to consolidate its position with relation to the Parliament which legislated the whole affair for it, by creating an extensive class of new nobles with a vested interest in the anti-Catholic system.

There could therefore not have been a major war between the Monarchy as such and the forces represented by Parliament. But there was a war which was later represented as such, and which continues to be so represented in the ideology of party conflict in recent times.

The King, who was also head of the Church with power greater than that of the Pope in the Catholic system of Europe, decided to bring about religious uniformity between England and Scotland. (He was the King of each of them independently of the other.) He called the election of an English Parliament in 1640 and it obediently voted him supplies for war on Scotland. The

supplies were used up quickly, so he called another Parliament in 1641 to give him further supplies.

In the interim, the Puritan movement of strict Biblicalist Protestantism had formed itself into a political party—the first political part of modern times. It won the election, set conditions on the voting of supplies, and before long it was in effect asserting the sovereignty of Parliament against the Government.

The immediate effect of this was the Irish rebellion against the new Protestant settlements. Puritanism was the extreme form of anti-Catholicism and the prospect of government by Parliament was horrifying. So the Irish rebelled against Parliament and declared loyalty to the Crown.

Another effect was that the Puritan insistence that Parliament should govern caused a split in Parliament which brought about the English Civil War. Leaders in the Parliament in negotiations with the King saw that government by Parliamentary Committees, without a Government which had a distinct existence of its own with discretionary powers, was not a practical possibility in the State of a large complex society. Leaders of Parliament therefore went into the service of the King in the interest of maintaining government. The '*Divine Right of Kings*' was not the issue. The issue for the Parliamentary defectors to the King was the necessity of a Government with discretionary powers.

The 1st Civil War was won by the millenarian fanaticism of Cromwell's forces in alliance with the Presbyterians. It was followed by a 2nd Civil War, fought on the divisions within the Parliamentary forces between the Presbyterian order of the Church and free-ranging Biblicalist Independency.

When the Presbyterians were defeated and the King was executed, the strict Puritans set about dealing with the Irish Royalists.

The conduct of direct government by Parliament in the 1650s proved the case of the Parliamentarians who had gone over to the Royal cause in the early 1640s. A flimsy semblance of government by Parliament was maintained by Cromwell's '*Protectorate*' until 1659. The Parliamentary leader who had gone over to the Crown, Edward Hyde, returned in 1660 from the Continent with the son of the executed King, who had managed to escape.

Events in Ireland during those twenty

years are historically intelligible only in the English context of those events.

The 1641 events were a response to the assertion of Puritan Parliamentary power against the Crown which threatened the extermination of the Irish as Catholics.

The Crown was formally Protestant in the Anglican mode devised by Henry the Eighth and Elizabeth, which was not in the grip of the Biblicalist Millenarian vision of the Puritans. Its Irish policy, as put into effect by Viceroy Thomas Wentworth, was pragmatic acceptance of a large population of Catholics in Ireland, for which some provision was made in the political system. The execution of Wentworth at the insistence of Parliament signified the end of that system and the onset of principled anti-Catholicism by a Parliamentary regime.

The Irish rising against the English Parliament in 1641 was followed by the establishment of an Irish Parliamentary body, the *Confederation of Kilkenny*, also known as the *Catholic Confederation*. As representative of the majority population in Ireland, which was marked down for extermination by the growing power of the English Parliament because it was Catholic, it could only be Catholic.

The dominant Parliamentary power in England was aggressively anti-Catholic and the popular power that arose in Ireland against it was defensively Catholic. The English Parliament had made religion the supreme issue. It was anti-Catholic in totalitarian mode. This led to a considerable degree of convergence in the Confederation of Kilkenny between the Old English who had remained Catholic and the Irish.

In the late 1640s, under the influence of the Second Civil War, there was a degree of co-operation between the Confederation and the Ulster Presbyterian community on the basis of support for the son of the executed King as Charles the Second. But this was cut short when Cromwell landed a Puritan Army in Ireland, crushed the Confederation, and set about punishing by treason-law the Irish who had remained loyal to the Crown. And then Cromwell made war on Scotland, whose different form of Protestantism had led it to recognise the son of the executed King as King.

England, Scotland and Ireland were then combined into a single state in which, awed by Puritan militarism, there was peace for a third of a century. But,

within that peace, Parliament, deprived by military success of a transcendent enemy to hate, set about governing the state, only to find that it couldn't do it. Monarchy was restored.

King Charles, chastened by the experience of Civil War and exile, and restored by General Monk who had been a Parliamentary General, and advised by Clarendon—a leader of Parliament who had gone over to the King on the issue of there being a Government and who had shepherded him in exile—temporised for 25 years. He was succeeded by his brother, James, who decided to act the part of a Monarch in earnest.

James issued a law establishing freedom of religion. This was depicted by Parliament as a deadly blow against Protestantism—the implication being that Protestantism was viable in England only when interwoven with the power of the State.

A Protestant *coup* against James was organised by the gentry, in the form of a foreign invasion from Holland. It was enacted peacefully in England. James was declared to have abdicated. William of Orange was declared King on the grounds that he was married to James's daughter. This was the 'Glorious Revolution'.

In the course of the following generation the gentry installed themselves as a ruling class with a figurehead Monarch.

\*

In the 1650s one of the Puritan Parliaments determined to abolish the Common Law. The Common Law was a kind of inert law that was lying there for use by whoever could afford it. It was law for the gentry. Cromwell, who acted dictatorially against the Parliaments of the 1650s, had decided that the gentry of England were the salt of the earth. He stamped on the Parliament that would have abolished the Common Law and established a fundamentally different kind of law, drawn from the Bible.

The gentry, having been saved by Cromwell, evolved into the ruling class which coldly made use of Biblical fanaticism to organise the invasion/coup of 1688 while preventing it from getting out of hand, as it had in 1641. The revolution was strictly contained in England, but was given its head in Ireland, which remained loyal to King James and had to be conquered through a series of major battles: '*Derry, Aughrim, Enniskillen and the 'Boyne'!*'

A Parliament was set up in Ireland

to be a Protestantising force. Catholics were excluded from politics, the professions, and landholding; and Protestants who cohabited with Catholics were penalised.

In England the ruling class which had masterminded the *coup* bided its time under William (and Mary), and Anne. Anne was the last of the Stuart dynasty who could claim the throne under 1688 rules—she was the last Stuart Protestant. When she died, a King who could not speak English was imported from a German petty kingdom and the era of effective ruling class government with a figurehead monarch began.

This was the great era the Common Law, law for the gentry, free from monarchy, with little in the way of national government, because each of the landed gentry was the governing authority in his own area.

The major political event in Ireland during the next two centuries was the abolition in 1800 of the Protestant Parliament, established in 1691. The Protestant gentry, given control of Ireland in that Parliament, failed to become a ruling class interacting with their inferiors, guiding them, and influencing them, as the gentry in England did. They acted throughout the 18th century as a mere upper class, relying on its Constitutional monopoly of political power, land and the professions to maintain itself in grandiose style.

It was uselessly parasitical. It provoked rebellion from which the British Government saved it, and it was then bribed by the Government to abolish itself as a political body by passing the Act of Union.

With close supervision by the hostile Irish Parliament removed, the national development of the Irish populace began within a few years of the passing of the Act of Union.

British politics failed in Ireland under the Union. Towards the end of the 19th century, British political parties no longer contested most Irish constituencies. The Irish Parliamentary Party (Home Rule Party) dominated representation everywhere outside a part of Ulster. It held a bloc of 80 seats in Parliament, making it difficult for either of the British parties to win an outright majority.

In 1910 British politics was deadlocked. Two General Elections were held but both returned equal numbers of Liberal and Tory MPs. The Irish Party

then made a deal with the Liberals under which it joined the Liberals to carry a contentious British Budget in return for a Liberal commitment to bring in an Irish Home Rule Bill. It also enabled the Liberals to abolish the House of Lords Veto on Commons legislation, reducing it to a two-year delay.

The Home Rule Bill was introduced in 1912. It was passed by the Commons in 1912, 1913 and 1914 and was due to be enacted in the Summer of 1914.

Both measures carried by the Liberal Government, put in power by Irish votes, were major changes to the Constitution. They were held to be unconstitutional by the Tory Party, on the ground that the Irish Party refused on principle to take part in the governing of the United Kingdom, its purpose being to leave the United Kingdom.

It was an intrusion by an external force in British affairs. The Opposition therefore warned it would not recognise the Home Rule Act as legitimate.

The Opposition was the *Unionist Party*. The Unionist Party had been created by a merger around 1890 between the Tory Party and a social reform section which had broken with the Liberal Party in 1880s. It was the Government from 1895 to 1905 and carried out extensive reform in Ireland, including a democratisation of Local Government and a Land Act providing for the phasing out of landlordism.

The Unionist Party at first objected to the whole Home Rule Bill but later reduced its demand to the exclusion of Ulster from it. The Liberals could not agree to the exclusion of Ulster because the Irish Party would not agree to it. But how could the Unionists prevent the implementation of the Home Rule Bill after the delaying power of the House of Lords ran out?

John Redmond, the Irish Party leader, had a thoroughly idealistic understanding of the British Constitution. William O'Brien—who had carried out extensive reforms in conflict with the Unionist Government, leading to collaboration with it after he had made his point and it had changed its position—had a more realistic understanding. He knew that there was no British Constitution of the kind that Redmond imagined.

The Lords Veto was abolished. The justification of the Veto was that the Lords, who were there for life, could act as a restraint on the elected parties in the

Commons, who tended to be carried away by the enthusiasm of electioneering.

With the abolition of the Lords Veto, there arose in its place an Army organised by the frustrated Opposition to prevent the imposition of the Home Rule Act in Ulster.

That was how William O'Brien understood that turn of events. The Ulster Volunteers arose to perform the function that would have been performed by the Lords Veto.

The Opposition formed a private army, and it used its influence to suborn the Army of the state. A crucial body of officers, based at the Curragh, indicated that they would resign rather than act to impose the Home Rule Act on Ulster.

How should that be described? Rebellion? Treason? Parliamentary Government?

No one was ever put on trial for the mutiny. There was no appeal by the majority in Parliament to the Courts to uphold the law. There was not even a motion of Parliamentary censure proposed. The leaders of the Unionist Party defended the Curragh Mutiny in Parliament on the grounds that the officers in an unscripted Army remain citizens with the right to exercise their judgment in constitutional affairs.

It was clearly an incident within Parliamentary Government. And, within a year, without an Election, the Unionist leaders who defended the Curragh Mutiny in Parliament were in Coalition Government with their Liberal opponents of 1914.

Of course it might be of emotional satisfaction from a certain point of view to describe those 1914 events as criminal seditious, treasonable etc., but there is no basis in the history of Parliament for describing them as such.

A few years later a book was published in Dublin that consisted largely of quotations of what eminent members of the Government had said in 1914 when they were members of the Opposition. It was called *The Grammar Of Anarchy* (see **The Grammar Of Anarchy: Force Or Law—Which?** by *J.J. Horgan. Unionism, 1910-1914*, available from Athol Books). The Government declared it to be seditious and tried to suppress it. Politics is not of a kind with mathematics. It does not deal in eternal truths. It is an art practised in very particular situations. The meaning of what was said in 1914 depended on who said it and on the circumstances in which it was said.

If the miscellaneous majority in Parliament in the Summer of 1914 (Liberal Imperialists plus Irish nationalists) had attempted to act as the miscellaneous majority now acts, and had appealed to law, it seems likely that the World War through which reconciliation was effected would not have happened! That might of course be considered a good thing. And the free conflict of two parties in the Parliament without any arbiter might have been destroyed. And that too might be considered a good thing.

The point of this account is not to make subjective judgments on Good and Bad, but to describe how Parliamentary Government functioned up to the point when the Labour Party, as part of a majority Opposition in Parliament, decided to support the bringing of the law into Parliament, instead of ousting the Johnson Government and forming another government.

[See also: *The British Constitution* on page 22]

barbarism" (*Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law*, 1890).

In the early 1890s an "export-driven" Imperialist sentiment developed, best expressed by Albert J. Beveridge, senator for Indiana:

"American factories are making more than the American people can use; American soil is producing more than they can consume. Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must and shall be ours... We will establish trading posts throughout the world as distributing points for American products... Great colonies governing themselves, flying our flag and trading with us, will grow about our posts of trade... And American law, American order, American civilization, and the American flag will plant themselves on shores hitherto bloody and benighted, but by those agencies of God henceforth to be made beautiful and bright."

But there was much resistance to these prospects in American public opinion and among leading politicians from the President down. As I noted in the last article in this series, around 1890 even the pioneering expansionist Captain Alfred Mahan thought there was no likelihood of America acquiring colonies. Within a few years, caught up in the vision of a cooperative Anglo-American project of civilising the world, he seemed to change his mind. And there was a sudden change in the nature of American power. "*In the 1890s the United States emerged as one of the great powers... an equal of Great Britain, Germany, and the rest*" (Ernest May, *From Imperialism to Isolationism 1898-1919*). That development is bound up with the political career of Theodore Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of State for the Navy (1897-8) and afterwards President (1901-9).

### **"How did America get started down this road?"**

In *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power* (1956), Howard K. Beale looked back on this from the perspective of a further half-century. By that stage the United States was the most powerful state on earth. While trying to manage the ending of the Japanese and European empires, at the same time it had to check the advance of Communism. The US had far outstripped the likes of Great Britain and Germany. It was reduced to a kind of equality only with the Soviet Union, through the latter's possession of atomic weapons. But, while it was the greatest world power, the world that it towered

## **John Minahane**

Spanish Polemic on Colonisation

Part 17

### **Theodore Roosevelt and America's Rise to Power**

"There is apparently much truth in the belief that the wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of the people, are the results of natural selection; the more energetic, restless and courageous men from all parts of Europe having emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country, and having there succeeded best. Looking to the distant future, I do not think that the Rev. Mr. Zincke takes an exaggerated view when he says: 'All other series of events—as that which resulted in the culture of mind in Greece, and that which resulted in the empire of Rome—only appear to have purpose and value when viewed in connection with, or rather as subsidiary to... the great stream of Anglo-Saxon emigration to the west'..."

This was the opinion of the original Social-Darwinist, Charles Darwin himself, as expressed in his second great work *The Descent of Man*. In the 1880s and 90s he had energetic American disciples who tried to fill out his speculative insight. One of them was the historian John Fiske. In '*Manifest Destiny*', an essay published in 1885, Fiske predicted:

"The work which the English race began when it colonized North America is destined to go on until every land on the earth's surface that is not already the seat of an old civilization shall become English in its language, in its religion, in its political habits and traditions, and to a predominant extent in the blood of its people".

Four-fifths of mankind, he thought, would ultimately trace its descent from English ancestors, as four-fifths of American whites did in 1885, and the English language would "*ultimately become the language of mankind*".

Of course, this would involve a lot more of the colonial conquest which the great States of Europe were currently engaged in. There were many Americans who hated all that and didn't want their own State interfering in the lives of foreign peoples. Countering their reluctance, America's leading political scientist, Professor John W. Burgess, offered a justification for doing just that. In his view, a special responsibility fell on the "*political nations*", among whom the Teutonic nations were outstanding (the Germans and, above all, the Anglo-Saxons, as compared with Greeks, Celts, Latins, Slavs, and so on).

"By far the larger part of the surface of the globe is inhabited by populations which have not succeeded in establishing civilized states; which have, in fact, no capacity to accomplish such a work; and which must, therefore, remain in a state of barbarism or semi-barbarism, unless the political nations undertake the work of state organization for them. This condition of things authorizes the political nations not only to answer the call of the unpolitical populations for aid and direction, but also to force organization upon them by any means necessary, in their honest judgment, to accomplish this result. There is no human right to the status of

over didn't look very promising. China had just been "lost"—that is, lost to whatever kind of democracy Woodrow Wilson was thinking of when he took the USA into World War I "to make the world safe for democracy".

Immediately after the loss of China came the Korean War, in which Communist China took part. The US Armed Forces, principally the Air Force, did enormous killing but still managed to achieve only a draw (with the Korean peninsula divided between Communism and Capitalism). General Douglas MacArthur, who proposed to take the killing to a higher level by launching nuclear attacks on up to thirty Chinese cities and thus convert the draw into a win, lost his political battle against the more cautious President Harry Truman.

The USA had come to be dangerously on the wrong side of Asian nationalism. How had this happened? Beale in his Preface posed the following questions:

"For three decades the United States and other great powers have been pursuing policies that have not led to the better world for which men and nations have hoped... There has been a certain inexorability about the sequence of events from World War I to the present. Decisions made by statesmen in each successive situation have been governed to a considerable extent by values already accepted and by decisions already made by predecessors under whom the direction foreign policy was to take had been established. Often it has seemed that what was really needed was to change the direction, to abandon the road that led to the 1950s and start out in an entirely different direction. My first question therefore was: How did America get started down this road and was there a time, perhaps before World War I, when decisions were made that account for the direction national policy has taken? What decisions so affected the nation's course?"

Closely related was a second baffling question to which historians seldom offer an answer, namely, whether individual men or only blind forces influence history..."

### **Making the Navy Strong**

Theodore Roosevelt is bound up with all of these questions. Beale creates a vivid picture of the man and the politician up to about 1910, mainly by quoting from tons of the correspondence of Roosevelt himself and other political leaders and diplomats of the time. I don't think any explicit answer is given to the third question, but the clear suggestion

is that Roosevelt's career prepared America for a pro-British intervention. The answer given to the second question is: Roosevelt mattered more than most. He was tireless, resourceful and single-minded, well-informed and daring. He stands out among all those who dragged America "into the world".

First and foremost, he built up the Navy. He campaigned relentlessly for a stronger navy and when he was in government he made it happen. Without a strong navy the US could not be a world power—in fact, it couldn't even enforce its "Monroe Doctrine", the principle that non-American Powers may not intervene in Latin America. For decades this was "Yankee bluff", as Niall Ferguson says, and the Europeans frequently called it.

In 1901-2 Britain and Germany began bombarding and threatening to occupy Venezuela, over unpaid debt. But, on this occasion, at the opportune moment, an American President was able to mobilise his fleet and threaten the hovering creditors. The very last thing on his mind was to threaten anyone, Roosevelt assured them . . . but if anything were to happen, he feared that American public opinion might force his hand! So the British and Germans quickly committed themselves to accept arbitration.

Roosevelt loved showing his fleet. Once he sent it on a world cruise, which enabled it to be shown in Tokyo. He showed it in China also. In 1898 it got battle experience and proved highly effective. That was when the United States won its Great Power status, in a war against the most decrepit of the European empires, Spain.

Spain was fighting a war against the Cuban independence movement, with great brutality. There was a policy of concentrating rural people in cities and towns, which were thereby turned into something like concentration camps, and the loss of life was high. Lurid accounts were given in the American press; religious interests began agitating for intervention. Humanitarian public opinion was used by a small group of committed expansionists, including Roosevelt, in the Government and Senate, to win over the reluctant President Mc Kinley to armed action. There was also a ship that conveniently blew up, probably by accident . . . Overall, though, it seems we should regard the Spanish-American War of 1898 as the first of the "humanitarian interventions" or

"humanitarian regime changes" carried out by the United States.

### **Taking the Philippines**

Cuba, as Captain Alfred Mahan says somewhere, was an island whose strategic significance was second only to Ireland's. On the other hand, no one appears to have thought about the Philippines until preparations were being made for war with Spain. The Spanish had some ships in Manila, and Roosevelt ordered a section of the fleet to sail to attack them once war was declared. When the ships were duly destroyed, it seemed a shame not to land an army to finish the job. . .

And then it was discovered that, whereas all were agreed that the Cubans would be "helped towards independence", the Filipinos were not capable of running their own affairs in a way that would be to America's advantage. As President McKinley later explained to a Methodist delegation at the White House,

"in answer to his earnest prayers for guidance the revelation had one night come to him that 'there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died'".

All of a sudden, the United States had become a colonial power.

The Filipino independence movement, which had fought unsuccessfully against Spain, then began a war against the new occupiers. It went on for several years, and the Americans fought it more brutally than the Spanish had. Foremost among those who were against any concession to the independence movement was Theodore Roosevelt. (A large section of American opinion was on the other side. There was an active *Anti-Imperialist League* headed by two ex-Presidents. The Democratic Party condemned the annexation, and then afterwards it had a policy of Filipino Independence.)

Roosevelt thought in terms of the "white race" and its deserved domination of the world. He used the idea of race loosely, without believing in any fixed or permanent inferiority of non-whites. Systematic race theories often left him unconvinced: reviewing Houston Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* in 1911, a book that made a powerful impression on many people at



that time, he called it "*bedlamite passion and nonsense*". But basically he agreed with the idea of John W. Burgess, whose student he had been at Columbia University, that there were "*political nations*" and "*unpolitical nations*" and the former had to take on the work of state organisation for the latter, whether they liked it or not.

The Filipinos were definitely an "*unpolitical nation*", in Roosevelt's view. He referred to them as "*Apaches*", about the worst insult he could think of. When some of his opponents compared those fighting for Filipino independence to the American rebels against Great Britain, he was scandalised. No, the Filipino fighters were traitors, because they were fighting against what was best for their own people!

Beale comments:

"The irony of it was that the group in this country that were themselves most nationalistic could not comprehend that 'backward peoples' might develop nationalist tendencies and might prefer liberty to government by a 'superior race'. Roosevelt seems not to have foreseen the possibility that the spread of civilization through expansion of the rule of 'superior races' over 'backward' ones might one day arouse nationalist aspirations that would threaten that civilization itself."

This blindness of his was most destructive in the case of China.

### **Humiliating China**

There's a marvellous French cartoon from 1898 which shows Queen Victoria, the Kaiser, the Tsar and a Japanese Prince sitting at a table, equipped with knives (and a samurai sword), ready to carve up a cake called China. Marianne of France is hovering behind the Tsar's shoulder, wanting to get in. There's no sign of America. If the cartoon had been made four or five years later, President Roosevelt would have been seated at that table.

Not that he wanted China to be America's colony, or anyone else's either. On the contrary, Roosevelt wanted to restrain the most likely colonisers, Russia and Japan. His preference was to let the weak Imperial Government continue ruling and bully it into giving the maximum privileges to merchants and developers from America. He would cooperate with other great Powers which were doing the same.

The Boxer Rebellion of 1900 aimed at expelling the communities of hugely

privileged foreigners who despised the Chinese as inferior. Several of the great Powers, including the club's new member America, sent troops to protect their expatriates and put down the rebellion. The behaviour of these troops was described by an American observer, William W. Rockhill, a friend of Roosevelt's:

"The 'disciplined armies of Europe' are everywhere conducting operations much as the Mongols must have done in the 13th century. Hardly a house remains from the seacoast to Peking which has not been looted of every moveable object it contained, and in half the cases the houses have been burned..."

The American troops were the best of them, Rockhill thought, but even they had committed many excesses.

A few years later, angered by America's anti-Chinese immigration policies, merchants, students and others organised a boycott of American goods and persons (including teachers, missionaries etc.). Roosevelt responded in two ways. Firstly, he distinguished between Chinese labourers and others (students, merchants, etc.), ruling that the labourers were to be firmly kept out but the higher-class Chinese should be treated politely and allowed in. He also introduced a visa system, which was meant to transfer the pressure point from American territory to China (since there was no point in travelling to the United States if you didn't have a visa). Secondly, he put pressure on the Chinese Government to denounce the boycott movement and suppress it.

When this was not enough and another Boxer Rebellion seemed a possibility, he activated the US fleet and prepared to invade China. He would have done that if the resistance movement hadn't petered out of its own accord.

Beale comments:

"Roosevelt and his friends could not comprehend such a movement... His habit of valuing an individual on his merits as a human being regardless of race or national culture enabled him to understand and share the indignation of educated Chinese over the treatment they received in America. But his contempt for a 'backward' cultural group and his aristocratic view of labour combined to make it impossible for him to comprehend that Chinese labourers could also resent his attitude towards them or, more important, that Chinese intellectuals, through their newly aroused nationalist feeling, could resent

his attitude towards a Chinese coolie.

The anti-American boycott in 1905 and 1906 was the first organized expression of modern Chinese nationalism. That it was directed against the United States was unfortunate but not accidental. The United States under Roosevelt's guidance seemed incapable of meeting the problem of a young and ebullient patriotism either to destroy it, or to become its friend... Indeed, Roosevelt's policy repeatedly reiterated was to have outside powers in cooperation keep order in China and make the natives behave as he assumed the responsibility for doing in Latin America, and in his mind, boycotting foreign nations, resenting their domination, or exhibiting nationalist aspirations was not behaving...

The United States missed perhaps the greatest opportunity of its twentieth-century career when the premises of world power and imperialist ideology made it fail to become the friend and guide of the "new spirit" in China."

### **Advice for the British Empire**

As leader of the new World Power, Roosevelt got involved in fixing world crises. In 1905-6 he did two of them in succession, one in Asia and one in Europe: the Russo-Japanese War and the French-German confrontation over Morocco. It has been pointed out that America got no 'pickings' from its President's huge investment of energy in settling these conflicts. There was no piece of Africa and no piece of China. But what America and Roosevelt certainly got was visibility and prestige, and practice in political dealings with Great Powers. Roosevelt himself thought that his efforts were worthwhile. In Europe he had maintained the peace, while in Asia he had maintained the balance of power.

During the last few years of his administration there was relative 'quiet'. He refused to get interested in a further European Conference on proposals for disarmament, aimed at curbing the current arms race, because he knew such proposals had no chance due to Britain's opposition. And of course there were no more conquests of colonies. From all this, Ernest R. May draws the strange conclusion that Roosevelt had become an isolationist.

"In the western hemisphere, American policy at the end of Roosevelt's administration was, in general, to obtain the co-operation of the independent Latin-American republics. In the Far East and Europe the nation's policy was that of (George Washington's) Farewell Address: 'to have... as little *political*

connection as possible'. Roosevelt's successors, Taft and Woodrow Wilson, did not materially alter these policies. After having seemed to adopt the imperialist creed of Beveridge and his like, the United States in practice reverted to isolationism."

I think this is a very one-sided view of things. As regards seeking the co-operation of the independent Latin-American republics, it is relevant that Roosevelt had given some demonstrations of what might happen to them if they did *not* cooperate. In particular, he had arranged for part of the Republic of Colombia to be lopped off so that he could build a canal. The US Marines were sent in to support Panamanian separatists in 1903:

"In essence, Roosevelt used the U.S. Navy to establish Panama as an independent state after the Colombian Senate refused to ratify an agreement leasing land for the construction of the canal. Within ninety minutes of the secessionists' coup, the United States formally recognized the Republic of Panama, which obligingly granted Washington a ten-mile-wide strip of territory through which the canal would be built" (Niall Ferguson, *Colossus*).

Certainly, there was an effective abandonment of colonial expansion after 1900. In large part, no doubt, this was because American public opinion was so bitterly divided on the Philippines. But this is not the same thing as isolationism. And, if the last three or four years of Roosevelt's presidency were less colourful, that does not mean he was minimising the political connection with Europe and Asia.

In 1910 he took it upon himself to give good advice to those running the British Empire, which he admired enormously. Speaking first in Egypt and afterwards in London, he made a dramatic criticism of current Imperial policy. Roosevelt believed that the natives, Egyptians especially, were being treated too softly and not properly kept in order.

"In Egypt... you are not only the guardians of your own interests; you are also the guardians of the interests of civilization; and the present condition of affairs in Egypt is a grave menace to both your Empire and the entire civilized world... Unfortunately it is necessary for all of us who have to do with uncivilized peoples, and especially with fanatical peoples, to remember that in such a situation as yours in Egypt weakness, timidity and sentimentality

may cause even more far-reaching harm than violence and injustice..."

What he had to say was widely heard. It did not sound like someone minimising his transatlantic links.

### The Balance of World Power

"Practically every American scholar who has studied the record has come to the same conclusion—that the taking of (Hawaii and the Philippines) was a result of a temporary emotional upswell among the public. Each scholar therefore explains the subsequent retreat to isolationism as, in effect, a return to normality... Political isolation was the normal condition of the United States. There had simply been a departure from this norm in 1898-1899. But after 1914 there was to be another such aberration. The country was to become involved in a great European war..."

Undoubtedly there is a sense in which the United States leaving Europe alone and leaving China alone would be what is, or what would have been, normal. And the colonial conquest of 1898-99 might be described as aberrant. However, American involvement in the European war can scarcely be called an aberration, since Roosevelt had done so much to prepare for it.

"The spread of civilization ultimately depended upon the freedom of those nations that were its guardians, above all others, Britain and the United States. Britain had always held aloof until the delicate balance of power was threatened and had then intervened. If Britain should ever prove inadequate to maintaining the balance, then, Roosevelt was convinced that the United States, for the sake of her own interests, would have to abandon her aloofness and interfere to restore the balance. In 1910 he told Hermann von Eckardstein, who had been German ambassador to the Court of St. James at the time of the Moroccan crisis, that if German armies had overrun France 'we in America would not have kept quiet'. 'I certainly would have found myself compelled to interfere,' he testified. 'As long as England succeeds in keeping 'the balance of power' in Europe, not only in principle, but in reality, well and good; should she however for some reason or other fail in doing so, the United States would be obliged to step in at least temporarily, in order to restore the balance of power in Europe, never mind against which country or group of countries our efforts may have to be directed.' 'In fact,' he concluded in 1910, 'we ourselves are becoming, owing to

our strength and geographical situation, more and more the balance of power of the whole world'..."

That was the fatal thought: *we are the balance of power of the world!* That was the idea which had sufficient purchase in American politics to make it conceivable that America would intervene in Europe, or anywhere. And it caused America to *unbalance* power, in Europe most of all.

A few final thoughts in a further issue, and then hopefully this interminable series will be ended.

## NOTES

"There is apparently much truth...": Darwin, Charles, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, Vol. 1 (New York 1871), pp. 172-3. (Chapter V)

"The work which the English...": Pratt, Julius W., *The Expansionists of 1898* (New York 1951) pp. 4-5.

"By far the larger part...": *ibid.*, p. 9.

"American factories are making...": Ferguson, Niall, *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire* (New York 2005), pp. 43-4.

"In the 1890s the United...": May, Ernest R., *From Imperialism to Isolationism 1898-1919* (New York 1964) p. 85.

"For three decades the United...": Beale, Howard K., *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power* (Baltimore 1987), pp. vii-ix.

"Yankee bluff": Ferguson, *Colossus*, p. 42.

The Spanish-American War of 1898: See e.g. Pratt, Julius W., *America's Colonial Experiment: How the United States Gained, Governed and In Part Gave Away a Colonial Empire* (New York 1950), Chapter 2.

"In answer to his earnest prayers...": *ibid.* p. 64.

"Bedlamite passion and nonsense...": Beale, *Roosevelt*, p. 28.

"The irony of it...": *ibid.* pp. 74-5.

"The 'disciplined armies of Europe'...": *ibid.* p. 187.

"Roosevelt and his friends...": *ibid.* pp. 251-2.

Roosevelt thought he had kept peace in Europe, *ibid.* p. 388; kept balance of power in Asia, *ibid.* pp. 312-3.

"In the Western Hemisphere...": May, *From Imperialism*, p. 30.

"In essence, Roosevelt used...": Ferguson, *Colossus*, p. 54.

"In Egypt... you are not...": Beale, *Roosevelt*, p. 168.

"Practically every American scholar...": May, *From Imperialism*, pp. 31-2.

"The spread of civilizations...": Beale, *Roosevelt*, p. 447.

# Wilson John Haire

Review

## The 'Third Man' In Its Context

On 29th March 1945, Soviet Commander and Marshal of the Soviet Union Fyodor Tolbukhin's troops crossed the former Austrian border at Klostermarienberg in Burgenland. On 3rd April, at the beginning of the Vienna Offensive, the Austrian politician Karl Renner, then living in southern Lower Austria, established contact with the Soviets. Joseph Stalin had already established a would-be future Austrian Cabinet from the country's Communists in exile, but Tolbukhin's telegram changed Stalin's mind in favour of Renner. The Austrian Communists had wanted eastern Austria to be cut off from the West and be included in the Soviet Block. Tolbukhin thought otherwise.

Elections were held on 25th November, 1945, which was a blow for the Communist Party of Austria which only received 5% of the vote. The coalition of Christian Democrats (OVP) and the Social Democrats (SPO), backed by 90% of the votes, assumed control over the Cabinet and offered the position of Federal Chancellor to Christian Democrat Julius Raab.

The Soviets vetoed Raab due his role in the 1930s. Instead President Karl Renner, with the consent of Parliament, appointed Leopold Figl, who was just barely acceptable to the Soviets.

Karl Renner (14 December, 1870 - 31 December, 1950) headed the Austrian Socialist Party. In 1896 he joined the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Austria. He had a very distinguished political career and was the main mover in restoring the Austrian political system after Britain's destructive WWI and which, with Britain's connivance, saw the end of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire that rendered the Jews ghettoised behind national boundaries and subjected them to severe anti-Semitism.

On 20th April 1945, the Soviets, without asking their Western allies, instructed Renner to form a Provisional Government. Seven days later Renner's Cabinet took Office, declared the independence of Austria from Nazi Germany and called for the creation of a democratic state along the lines of the First Austrian Republic. Soviet acceptance of Renner was not an isolated episode: their officers re-established district administrations and appointed local mayors, frequently following the advice of the locals, even before the

battle was over. One-third of State Chancellor Renner's Cabinet, including the crucial seats of the Secretary of State of the Interior and the Secretary of State for Education, was staffed by Austrian Communists.

Britain, in particular, was hostile to Renner's Government, calling it a puppet administration. In fact, at the 1943 Moscow Conference, the Soviet Union, the United States and the UK had jointly decided that the German annexation of Austria in 1938 would be considered null and void. The Conference declared the intent to create a free and independent Austria after the war. Austria had been designated the first victim of Nazi Germany.

Ernst Fischer, playwright, novelist and Marxist theorist was part of this Government. His book: *The Necessity Of Art* was widely acclaimed even by non-Communists throughout the world. I was myself very impressed by it after reading it in the 1950s.

Renner's Social-Democratic Government was to give expression to all participants of the Left. Renner had also appointed Karl Gruber, an anti-Communist, as Foreign Minister: he then tried to reduce Communist influence in the Renner Government. This was happening as the now most powerful army in the world, the Soviet Red Army, looked on. Without their commander Fyodor Tolbukhin and Stalin's approval this would never have happened.

This was the period when Social Democracy was thought of as a *reactionary* force, with the giant Communist Parties of Italy and France being denied their rightful representation by Social Democracy. The worst anti-Communist period in the UK was during the reign of the post-war Labour Government of Attlee, when even a May Day rally was banned as communist-inspired.

American troops crossed the Austrian border on 26th April 1945, followed by French and British troops on 29th April and May 8th respectively.

On 9th July, 1945 the Allies agreed (when the Soviets was an ally) on the borders of their occupation zones. Vorarlberg and North Tyrol were assigned to the French Zone. Salzburg and Upper Austria, south of the Danube, to the American Zone. East Tyrol, Carinthia, and Styria to the British Zone. Burgenland, Lower Austria and the Muhlvierte area of Upper Austria, north of

the Danube, to the Soviet Zone. The French and the American zones bordered those countries' zones in Germany, and the Soviet zone bordered future Warsaw Pact states.

Vienna was divided among the four allies. The historical centre of Vienna was declared an international zone in which the occupation forces changed every month.

None of this was to be the background to Graham Greene's novella *The Third Man*.

Austria, to him, was a battered and destroyed nation with very little human decency, and with the menacing presence of the Soviet authorities in being. But Greene, unfortunately, was very much part of the Cold War propaganda services, and thus he cut back on the development of this novella in which you could see the potential for a really good novel. Of course Austria, especially Vienna, was wrecked, with little food or fuel for heating homes and workplaces but it had many helpers with the Soviet drive to restore what would be Western democracy; and later it would benefit from the US Marshall Plan.

It is now difficult to describe the novella, *The Third Man*, as anything but anaemic in places through its lack of a historical foundation. The film of the novella is an improvement on it. Greene said he wrote the novella while discussing the idea of a film with Carol Reed, the Director, in order to expand his ideas. The Director most likely spread the anti-Soviet and racist nature of the novella a lot more thinly in the film, making it less obvious and concentrating on the main villain, the black marketeer, Harry Lime, and his drunken friend, pulp novelist Rollo Martins, played respectively by the talented actors Orson Welles and Joseph Cotton, both American, playing English men.

Yet this film is now being put forward as the best of the post-war films. In 1999 the British Film Institute voted it the greatest film of all time. An appalling exaggeration. But all is not lost. It does capture the uncertainty of a post-war Europe.

What impression it could make on the present generation I don't know but when I first saw the film, in Belfast, in the early 1950s, in an oppressive atmosphere, along with austerity, I kept wondering if the Belfast sewers could be used in a strike against the Stormont regime. In the old Smithfield market the various gramophone stalls were playing the vinyl that had recorded the haunting zither music that played throughout the film. Young people wanted to take up the zither and zithers appeared for sale in the *Belfast Telegraph* at exorbitant prices.

I had read most of Graham Greene's novels during the 1950s and 60s, despite the criticism of CP members who happened to be Irish and still Catholic. It was hard to know if it was his anti-Communism or his version of English Catholicism they hated.

His novels were *Brighton Rock*, *The Power and the Glory*, *The Heart of the Matter* and *The End of the Affair*, which you could call the English Catholic novel. There was also *The Confidential Agent*, *The Quiet American*, *Our Man in Havana*, and *The Human Factor*. Despite everything, I enjoyed reading them and being introduced to his mostly eccentric characters. They were easy to read and I think Greene's anxiety about his work showed in the character of Rollo Martins, the pulp novel writer of Westerns, though Greene was well above that.

Rollo Martins is collared by the British Council in Vienna, probably by mistake, to give a talk on his work as a writer. He recognises himself as 'a bad writer who drinks too much but, in giving the talk, he is mistaken for one of the great European novelists and has a hard time trying to satisfy his more intelligent audience, one of the more humorous aspects of the novella and the film.

I had not read Greene's novella, *The Third Man*, until recently and I was saddened by its anti-Soviet theme, and its racism in describing Soviet soldiers as having *Mongol features*, thereby saying there was something inherently cruel about them.

Saddened, though I was, the film created a Viennese environment and, with the haunting zither music, it was certainly Austria. There were even touches of the great Soviet film-maker Sergei Eisenstein in some scenes.

(Greene only wrote the novella as a way of expanding his thoughts on the film he had been asked to write, so you could maybe call it the bare-bones of a novel that he didn't go on to expand.)

The main theme of the *Third Man* features Harry Lime, the black marketer penicillin seller, who lives in the Soviet Zone of Vienna, as do a couple of his companions. They are therefore untouchable by the other three Powers controlling Vienna. Lime is said to give information to the Soviet authorities in exchange for his sanctuary. He creeps into the other zones to sell the penicillin by using the sewers,

The sewers are half as wide as the Thames River. They are patrolled and searched by the 'sewer police' on a regular basis but Lime knows their routine. Three of the Powers want the kiosk (covered in adverts) entrances locked, and the manhole covers throughout Vienna battened down,

as criminal elements are using them as escape routes. The Soviet authorities are against this, so the kiosks remain open and the manhole covers remain liftable. The novella doesn't explain why.

You can only guess they want them open for the use of Harry Lime. But Lime, in the novella, isn't as important as that. Lime, of course is a Catholic, a bad Catholic but a Catholic nevertheless. The American. Soldier, Pat O'Brien, who shares the four-nation jeep patrol you can guess has to be a Catholic with a name like that.

Penicillin is only supplied to the military hospitals in Vienna and some of the personnel of these hospitals are stealing it and selling it to Lime and his gang, who will sell it on to those who can afford it and who are patients in civilian hospitals. The profits are very good but Lime realises all good things must come to an end decides to bulk out the penicillin with foreign matter to make it go farther. Civilian paediatrician doctors with a social conscience are also buying it from Lime and his cohorts. The contaminated penicillin is now killing the children.

Lime, by this time, is a very wanted man by the three Powers out of the four so he somehow manages to arrange his own 'death' in a road accident while fleeing back to the Soviet Zone. Rollo Martins, through many inquiries and duplicity, manages to get into the Soviet Zone to speak to one of Lime's men, a respected lecturer, who is also on the make. The lecturer's companion promises to make contact with Lime, with a meeting arranged at the Big Ferris Wheel (the *Wiener Riesenrad*) in the centre of Vienna.

Lime and Rollo Martins, his old school friend, are in a cabin on the Wheel as it ascends over Vienna and then stops so as the view of the city can be taken in. Rollo, of course, is outraged at the criminality of his friend. Though there is no explanation of why Lime invited him to Vienna and paid for his transport and accommodation, if this is what he is going to see. But there is some vague promise of cutting him in on the spoils. But Rollo, with his moral outlook wouldn't have agreed to that.

Lime justifies his criminal activities as the Wheel reaches the top and stops for a few minutes to let its occupants look over the city. Rollo moralises, and as Lime says: "*becomes melodramatic*". Lime begins his argument thus:

"'Look down there', he went on, pointing through the window at people moving like black flies at the base of the Wheel. 'Would you really feel any pity if one of those dots stopped moving—forever? If I said you can have twenty

thousand pounds for every dot that stops, would you really, old man, tell me to keep my money—without hesitation? or would you calculate how many dots you could afford to spare? Free of income tax, old man. Free of income tax'."

Later in the conversation as Rollo is wondering how he can push him through the glass of the Great Wheel cabin to his death, Lime explains himself further:

"How much do you make a year with your Westerns, old man.'

'A thousand' (replies Rollo)

'Taxed. I earn thirty thousand free. it's the fashion. In these days, old man, nobody thinks in terms of human beings. Governments don't, so why should we? They talk of the people and the proletariat, and I talk of the mugs. It's the same thing.

They have their five-year plans and so have I'."

Rollo then says to him:

"You used to be a Catholic'."

Lime replies:

"'Oh I still *believe*, old man. In God and mercy and all that. I'm not hurting anybody's soul by what I do. The dead are happier dead. They don't miss much here, poor devils'."

The Red Army lost 17,000 troops in the taking of Vienna. Later they were accused of the wholesale rape of women and the plunder of private property while drunk. I was to hear these accusations in 1946 when working alongside newly demobbed soldiers from the British Army, now working in the Belfast shipyard. At that time they weren't anti-Soviet, even claiming the Red Army had saved their lives by bringing the war to an abrupt end. Moscow later recalled the misbehaved and replaced them with fresh, rested, troops for the occupation. British Army behaviour wasn't much better at times, as told by these newly demobbed. They were at their most radical then but in months to come most of them would have joined the B'Specials, (the Para-Military adjunct of the Royal Ulster Constabulary), as they adjusted to their Belfast environment.

The occupation of Austria ended with the Austrian State Treaty on 27th July 1955.

Greene's novella has the English soldiers as slightly eccentric but basically good chaps, with the French soldier thinking of nothing but *amour*. The American troops are fun-loving drinkers bringing US culture to Vienna, which Greene doesn't particularly approve of. Soviet troops are just Mongols.

Harry Lime, of course, has to die and

To page 13, column 1

**Vatican Embassy**

Labour back in the fold—The good news is that, after the revolutionary decision to close the Irish Embassy in the Vatican in 2011, Mr. Howlin and his six fellow TDs have gone the full circle and held their recent *"Think"-In* at the Nano Nagle centre in Cork City on the weekend of September 7-8th, 2019. The former South Presentation convent belongs to the Presentation Sisters founded by Nano Nagle in 1776.

The Irish embassy is back on track, which is more than can be said about the party that claims the title of Irish Labour.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Third Man** concluded:

he does so in the sewers, when tracked down by a British Army Major and a Sergeant. Rollo Martins, who has tempted Lime out of the Soviet Zone, is also allowed to be with the manhunt. It is he who shoots Lime with the gun dropped by the Sergeant as he dies.

Thinking again about when I saw the film back in the early 1950s, I also thought that, though Vienna was wrecked, cold and hungry, the war was over. WW2 had been an anxiety for most of us living in Northern Ireland. There had been 300,000 American troops in training, there were German air raids, threats of invasion, and at elementary school we were being turned into child soldiers—which made many of us wish for the war not to be over too soon so as we could join in. Indeed, my school, according to a survey, had a quarter of the 82 pupils joining the British Armed Forces, and the British colonial Palestine Police, post-war, up to 1950.

The *Third Man* film ended the militaristic dream of a continuing world war for me that seemed to go on in my mind after leaving school at the age of 14. Viewing it today in 2019, and reading the novella of it, shows me how history was closed down and those who died for the liberation of Austria (mostly Soviet citizens) are still abused, even when in their graves.

**Free to . . . what?**

*"I honestly don't get politics. But I believe that freedom is life. And I hope that we'll have it some day"* (Hong Kong protester). Just about sums up the treatment of demonstrations as life accessory/performance art among the fashionable youth of today's Moscow and Hong Kong. (Eamon Dyas, 10.8.2019  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Armour Plated?**

Volvo will put an armoured, bullet-proof version of the XC90 SUV on sale next year. The Swedish company is a subsidiary of the Chinese automotive company Geely. It is headquartered in Torslanda in Gothenburg, Sweden.

Called the *XC90 Armoured*, it will be offered in two versions—a lightly armoured one, designed for police forces and diplomatic corps, and a Heavy model, which offers maximum protection from bullets and explosives, and is designed for heads of state and individuals under threat of attack.

That string of numbers and letters is the security rating of the car—the BRV number is how bullet-resistant it is, the ERV one how explosives resistant. It is claimed that the *XC90 Armoured Heavy* has "360-degree protection from bullets and explosives".

The current age of political and social turmoil has apparently given the global market for such vehicles quite the boost. Volvo expects that its biggest markets will be in South America, especially Brazil, where kidnappings of high-profile individuals are more or less a daily occurrence (*Cork Ind.* 11.7.2019).  
\*\*\*\*\*

**The Camps**

The term *'concentration camp'* is generally associated with Germany and the Second World War, yet as history professor Gregory Fremont-Barnes reveals in *The Boer War*, it was the British who, when fighting the Boers in the early 1900s, *"forcibly interned tens of thousands of Boer civilians... in concentration camps between 1900 and 1902"*.

Black South Africans were also interned in separate camps. According to Fremont-Barnes, the British claimed that the camps were born out of *"military and humanitarian necessity"*. The camps consisted of rows of canvas tents with scant protection from the extreme heat. One of the few voices of dissent was English reformer and social worker Emily Hobhouse, who campaigned against this maltreatment.

On visiting the camps she described the conditions thus:

*"...We sat... inside Mrs. Botha's tent... the sun blazed through the single canvas... no chair, no table, nor any room for such... [On] wet nights, the water streams down through the canvas ... and wets their blankets as they lie on the ground."*

There were, Fremont-Barnes claims, 60,000 interned civilians living in such conditions. Hobhouse succeeded in having the issue raised in the House of Commons but later recorded that, *"No barbarity in South Africa was as severe as the bleak cruelty of an apathetic parliament"*.

In *Apartheid South Africa*, John Allen informs us that, eventually, the British Government was compelled to appoint a Ladies' Committee that would visit the camps. Emily Hobhouse was not to be included, but decided nevertheless to return to South Africa to ensure improvements were made. Fremont-Barnes reveals that Lord Kitchener, Commander-in-Chief at that stage of the South African War, "citing martial law, refused [Hobhouse] permission to land, and had 'that bloody woman' forcibly transferred to a troop-ship for deportation".

Only at the end of the war was the true scale of fatality learned. Fremont-Barnes reveals that "almost 28,000 Boers had died in 46 concentration camps". The majority of fatalities were women, who accounted for "two-thirds of the adult deaths". Children under sixteen made up "nearly 80% of the fatalities". It was estimated that 20,000 black Africans also died during internment. Emily Hobhouse gives her account of these tragic events in her evocatively titled 1902 work *The Brunt of the War and Where it Fell*.

In 1899, Michael Davitt resigned his seat in the British parliament for good in protest against the Boer War, visiting South Africa to lend support to the Boer cause. His experiences inspired his *Boer fight for Freedom*, published in 1902.  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Pop Prayer!

"The 'Hail Mary' has been named Ireland's favourite prayer after a landslide victory.

Visitors to this year's National Ploughing Championships [7-9.9.2019] were asked to vote for their best loved prayer and, after thousands of votes, the 'Hail Mary' came out on top.

On Tuesday, a shortlist of the five favourite prayers from the event was made: 'O Angel of God', 'Hail Mary', the 'Our Father', the 'Memorare', and the 'Decades of the Rosary' made the cut.

'Hail Mary' received 61% of the votes, while 'O Angel of God' received 39%. (*Irish Independent*-20.9.2019)

Not a mention of the Angelus Prayer?  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Anti-Semitism?

Israel's Ambassador to Ireland has accused a Fianna Fáil TD of engaging in anti-Semitic rhetoric that is "offensive to every Jew" (*Irish Independent*-12.8.2019).

Ophir Kariv criticised comments made by Niall Collins, Fianna Fáil's Foreign Affairs spokesman, on a Pakistani news channel last month, where he said that there was a "huge Jewish lobby" across America that suppresses criticism of Israeli actions in the Middle East.

Mr Kariv told *Independent.ie*:

"I think that Niall Collins's reference to a Jewish lobby is very offensive to every Jew. I mean referring to this Jewish power that moves things or prevents things or certainly, as he put it, makes problems I think it echoes things that we don't want to remember."

Mr Collins said he apologised and regretted any offence caused by the remarks. "I completely regret and apologise if I caused offence to anybody. That absolutely was not my intention", the Limerick TD said.

Speaking to *Indus News* on 4th July 2019, Mr Collins claimed there was an "effort to suppress any criticism and any speaking out against the suppressive policies of Israel".

Mr Kariv also warned the Irish Government against declaring recognition for Palestine statehood after Tánaiste Simon Coveney said last year that the Government could be forced to do so if there is no progress on peace talks in the Middle East. Mr Kariv said unilateral recognition of Palestinian statehood would be a "very, very dangerous statement".  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Self-Hating Jew?

"Once an anti-Semite was a man who hates Jews. Today an anti-Semite is a man whom the Jews hate."

(Gideon Levy)  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Juries

"It was at this time that Darrow evolved his formula for jury picking that has served succeeding generations of lawyers. 'Never take a German; they are bull-headed. Rarely take a Swede; they are stubborn. Always take an Irishman or a Jew; they are the easiest to move to emotional sympathy. Old men are generally more charitable and kindly disposed than young men; they have seen more of the world and understand it'" (*Clarence Darrow for the Defence*, Irving Stone, Four Square edn, 1966, p.168)  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Rainbow Politics

"A mayor has criticised so-called 'rainbow housing' at a leading university as an 'over-the-top retrograde step'.

Earlier this month, the University of Limerick (U.L.) unveiled plans to provide on-campus accommodation exclusively for students who identify as lesbian, gay,

bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning or intersex (LGBTQ).

The accommodation would also be open to 'allies' of the LGBTQ community. But Clare Mayor Cathal Crowe, a graduate of the university himself, and member of Fianna Fail, said he believes the idea is 'a bit daft'. (2.8.2019)

"I'm big on inclusion and equality, but I think this idea from UL is a bit daft when almost all students of the college are struggling to find affordable accommodation. On top of that, it's hugely segregationist. Why put LGBT students into separate accommodation?" he said.

However, Limerick LGBT activist Richard Lynch said: "Everyone has an opinion about these things, and if you're not an LGBT person, you probably do not understand the need for rainbow housing."

\*\*\*\*\*

Martin Tyrrell

## The View from Airstrip Two

Part 1

## Orwell, Ireland and the War

"He is a specifically English writer and a specifically English character", writes Bernard Crick in the Introduction to his 1980 biography of George Orwell. English, not British, Crick goes on to say. *The Lion and the Unicorn* is subtitled "Socialism and the English genius" and it is England that Orwell famously likens to a family with the wrong members in charge. References to Scotland or its people are, in contrast, almost always hostile: sign of a bitter grudge dating back to childhood. As for Ireland—which is to say nationalist Ireland—mentions are fewer and less rancorous, though it is clear enough he is no great expert (he conflates the Irish Civil War and the Irish War of Independence). And, although he accepts without question that incidents like the executions following the Easter Rising were "a crime and a mistake", no great fan.

Irish writers are a partial exception—Orwell's substantial and perceptive review-essay on Yeats from 1943 is generally admiring and he held a lifelong regard—almost hero-worship—for Joyce. Reading *Ulysses* in the early 1930s made him doubt his own, apprentice literary efforts. "I am so miserable, struggling in the entrails of that dreadful book and never getting any further, and

loathing the sight of what I have done", he wrote to his friend Brenda Salkeld. The "dreadful book" being *A Clergyman's Daughter* which, in its final version, is in places Joycean to the point of bad parody. Orwell's publisher, Victor Gollancz, noting the resemblance, approached Sean O'Casey for a quotation he might use for publicity. But O'Casey politely declined. It is possible that Orwell got to know of this. Certainly, years later, and more confident, he wrote a scathing review of O'Casey's *Drums under the Window*:

"...there is no real reason why Cromwell's massacres should cause us to mistake a bad or indifferent book for a good one".

And O'Casey is included on Orwell's now notorious list of suspected communists and fellow-travellers—alongside Orwell's cutting observation that the dramatist is "very stupid".

Orwell never quite gets round to saying what so irks him about (nationalist) Ireland, but it is easy enough to work out—it is Catholic, it is Separatist and, during the war, it was Neutral.

Ireland's Catholicism would have been a significant defect in Orwell's eyes.

Although he was generally respectful of individual Catholics and reviewed fairly any serious Catholic writings, he was decidedly hostile to Catholicism as a belief system. O'Brien, the Party's *agent provocateur* cum grand inquisitor in *Nineteen Eighty-four* was, according to Crick, quite deliberately given an Irish name the better to flag the regime's Catholic aspect.

It is not clear what Orwell's particular objection to Catholicism might have been. It cannot have been a general antipathy towards religious belief. Orwell, no militant secularist, had a sentimental attachment to the Church of England and asked to be buried according to its rites. Michael G. Brennan in *George Orwell and Religion* (2017) suggests that some of Orwell's hostility might date from early childhood when he attended a convent school. But I think it more likely that he simply held to the traditional Protestant view of Catholicism as something foreign, superstitious, and authoritarian—outlandish and decidedly lesser.

"One cannot really be a Catholic and be grown up", he wrote in 1949 in rough notes for an unfinished essay on Evelyn Waugh. Years earlier, he had written to his lover, Eleanor Jaques, from Hayes in Middlesex where he had a teaching job:

"[T]he [High Church Anglican] service is so popish that I don't know my way about it and feel an awful BF when I see everyone bowing and crossing themselves all round me and can't follow suit... I have promised to paint one of the church idols (a quite skittish looking BVM, half life-size) and I shall try and make her look as much like one of the illustrations in *La Vie Parisienne* as possible..."

The same year, in a letter to Dennis Collings, his friend and love rival (for Eleanor Jaques, in fact), he praises the Bible Society—"Long may they fight, I say; so long as that spirit is in the land we are safe from the RC's (sic)".

And, in a letter to Brenda Salkeld, he distinguishes Wyndham Lewis, whom he admired, from D.B. Wyndham Lewis, in Orwell's words, "a stinking RC".

In the diary Orwell kept of his visit to the north of England, the diary that would become the first section of *The Road to Wigan Pier*, Orwell alleges that Liverpool is "practically governed" by the Catholic Church (it was, in fact, Conservative up to the 1950s). And there

is no awareness on Orwell's part of the sectarian tensions that existed in Liverpool and elsewhere. (Northern Ireland is barely mentioned in Orwell's writings which extend to some twenty solid volumes.)

Orwell's hostility to Catholicism is especially apparent in *Homage to Catalonia*, his memoir of the Spanish Civil War where he seems to have enjoyed the destruction of Catholic property. His only regrets are that the early, church-burning phase of the war ever ended and that the Barcelona anarchists were unsuccessful in bombing *Sagrada Familia* Cathedral. He does not report the desecrations in the Cathedral crypt, or any of the other, numerous, desecrations that took place. And he has little to say on the killing of Catholic clergy or the general harassment of Catholics in Republican areas. To Orwell, the Catholic Church in Spain was fair game, hand in glove with the landlords—"part of the capitalist racket" as he puts it.

In his *London Letter* to the American journal *Partisan Review* in late 1941, Orwell estimates that there are around two million Catholics in England. A minority of these—the middle class intellectuals, the converts especially—he advises "are the only really conscious, logical, intelligent enemies that democracy has got in England". It is a given for Orwell that Catholicism predisposes its adherents to fascism and it is therefore for him, a worry that so many Catholics have secured positions of power and influence in the media and in government. "If anything corresponding to a Pétain government were established here", he writes, "it would have to lean largely on the Catholics".

Irish labourers, says Orwell, make up the bulk of England's Catholic population outside of this *Brideshead* elite. He claims that, though priest-ridden and anti-semitic, these Irishmen have somehow managed not to be pro-fascist. It is a safe bet, though, that Orwell knew no Irish labourers, unless you count *Paddy the* (Central Casting) *Tramp* who features in *Down and Out in Paris and London*. In fact, the Irish in Britain—many of who were third and fourth generation, were solidly Labour or even Communist. Orwell himself had previously noted, on his northern travels, that in several Catholic households he visited there was a crucifix on the wall and *The Daily Worker*—the Communist paper—on the kitchen table.

Nor does he consider that, if Ireland is Catholic, and Catholics have a tendency to fascism, how come Ireland itself isn't fascist or heading that way? In fact, why has Ireland's Government consistently opposed fascism—condemning Italy in Ethiopia, say, or Japan in Manchuria; and refusing to recognise Franco until Franco's control over Spain was a *fait accompli*?

Those two million Irish labourers might not be fascists, says Orwell, but they are, all the same, a 'drag' on Labour Party policy. He does not elaborate on this, how two million Irish migrants, with little economic power and dispersed across the bigger cities, could have had much political sway one way or another, outside of a few marginal seats where Irish votes might periodically have counted. Nor does he suggest what policies Labour had been obliged to adopt by its Catholic Irish members and supporters.

It can't have been Censorship. There was British Censorship already, and decidedly native in origin. Orwell himself was on the receiving end of it when the police came and confiscated his collection of forbidden books—Joyce, Lawrence and so forth—which he had imported from France. (In a 1945 review of Frank O'Connor's translation of Brian Merriman's *Midnight Court*, Orwell offers the interesting aside that, Ireland excepted, puritanism "is somewhat less rampant in the Catholic countries than the Protestant ones". But he does not go on to reflect why this might be so. Nor about what particular influence there might have been on Ireland that was absent in other Catholic countries like France or Italy.)

Neither can it have been those usual suspects, Contraception and Abortion. In Orwell's time, birth control and abortion were generally frowned upon, something to be used discreetly, if at all. The Catholic position on birth control and abortion in the 1930s was consistent with this, the general Establishment, stance, and with Orwell's own view. Orwell regretted, for example, that abortion was widely regarded as a 'peccadillo', and presumably thought it should be banned. But it is advocates of contraception that really work him up. In *The Road to Wigan Pier*, these "birth control fanatics" are right up there with his other assorted "cranks"—vegetarians, teetotallers, sandal wearers, fruit juice drinkers, nudists, and nature cure quacks.

In the 1930s, to promote the open and unembarrassed use of contraception was

to confront a well-established moral consensus. Consequently, the demands of birth control advocates were typically modest, focusing on contraception for use by married couples. This lobby was a mixed affair—liberals, eugenicists, anti-poverty campaigners, and neo-Malthusians who believed that population levels were rising to unsustainable levels and needed to be reduced (though Malthus himself, a clergyman in the Church of England, had been reluctant to advise contraception urging, instead, restraint and late marriage).

Orwell rejected the Malthusian view. He thought that population levels were falling to dangerously low levels, primarily on account of middle class hedonism and the vanity of "*the well-to-do women who try to stay young at forty by means of physical-jerks, cosmetics and avoidance of child-bearing*".

Orwell rants on this theme in his wartime essay *The English People*. Here hedonism and vanity (rather than the War) are blamed for there being fewer and fewer children, but proportionately more pampered dogs and cats. To address this, Orwell favoured State intervention—some fiscal manoeuvre that might make childlessness a greater financial burden than raising a family. He seems, at times, to have seen childbearing as a kind of national duty, akin to military service, and military sacrifice. High sentiments tend to win in the end, he alleges, in his superb 1941 essay, *The Art of Don McGill*:

"Women face childbed and the scrubbing brush, revolutionaries keep their mouths shut in the torture chamber, battleships go down with their guns still firing when their decks are awash".

Irish nationalism and 'political' Catholicism feature in Orwell's quasi-theoretical *Notes on Nationalism*, which first appeared in the short-lived journal *Polemic*. Early in that essay, Orwell makes clear that he is writing not only, or mainly, about loyalty to national states, but also loyalty to political and religious organisations and even racial groups. The result is an essay that is not so much about nationalism as general partisanship—especially partisanship for movements at odds with the then consensus, or with Orwell's own preferences. Where nationalism proper is mentioned, it is generally the separatist nationalism of current or recent colonies. Or small nation nationalism.

"As nearly as possible", Orwell claims, "no nationalist ever thinks, talks or writes about anything except the superiority of his own power unit. It is difficult if not impossible for any nationalist to conceal

his allegiance. The smallest slur upon his own unit, or any implied praise of a rival organisation, fills him with uneasiness which he can only relieve by making some smart retort. If the chosen unit is an actual country, such as Ireland or India, he will generally claim superiority for it not only in military power and political virtue, but in art, literature, sport, the structure of the language, the physical beauty of the inhabitants, and perhaps even in climate, scenery and cooking. He will show great sensitiveness about such things as the correct display of flags, relative size of headlines and the order in which different countries are named".

Here, Orwell writes with affected objectivity, strongly implying that this cartoon partisanship is a problem of others, not himself. And yet he had, just a few years before *Notes on Nationalism*, been himself strongly partisan, first to the Independent Labour Party (ILP) and, subsequently, to England, which is to say the British Empire. With the coming of war, he had discovered that he was, as he put it, "*a patriot after all*". The cartoon partisans he disparages in his later essay, are in the main, partisans of groups and organisations that are challenging, however feebly, Orwell's own nation—Irish nationalists, Celtic fringe nationalists, Indian nationalists, Communists, and Catholics.

Orwell became a socialist in 1936, around the time of *The Road to Wigan Pier*, without initially committing to any particular party or grouping. In Spain, however, he joined the militia of the POUM (*Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista*—the Workers' Party of Marxist Unification) which was affiliated to the ILP. (They were sister parties in the International Revolutionary Marxist Centre, the "London Bureau" or "Three and a Half International".) And, on his return from Spain, he joined the ILP itself, remaining a member until 1939. His writings from this period, notably *Homage to Catalonia* and the novel *Coming Up for Air*, show the influence of the ILP/London Bureau.

Right up to the outbreak of war, for example, Orwell would make little distinction between Liberal Democracy and Fascism, seeing both as forms of Capitalism. Regarding Spain, he argued that only a revolution could defeat Fascism, rejecting the more mainstream demand for an alliance of Communist and liberal republicans—a Popular Front. That type of arrangement, Orwell said, was akin to "*a pig with two heads or some other Barnum and Bailey monstrosity*".

Home from Spain, he argued that Anti-Fascism was bogus—Britain and Germany, whatever they might appear to be on the surface, were in essence simply rival forms of Capitalism; the imminent war between them would be entirely conventional. This is a theme of *Coming Up For Air*, Orwell's immediate post-war novel.

Orwell's prognosis in the late 1930s was that Britain would gradually ally itself with Russia with a view to attacking Germany and would, in the process, become itself a kind of fascist state. He several times likens British rule in India and elsewhere to Fascism and argues that British democracy is strictly limited—even in Britain the franchise is restricted and the vast majority of British subjects, in India, Africa, the Caribbean, are politically excluded. Orwell initially excoriates those on the left who have joined the war party—Maurice Thorez, say, the French Communist Party leader who he claims has gone from "*declaring that the French workers would never be bamboozled into fighting against their German comrades*" to "*one of the loudest-lunged patriots in France*".

"The first real threat to British interests", he says, "has turned nine out of ten British socialists into jingoes".

At the start of 1939, he is planning to sabotage any British war effort, writing to the anarchist Herbert Read with a few practical suggestions as to how this might be done. However, nine months later and just a few days into the War, he is writing to the Labour and National Service Department asking if he can join up.

This was a fundamental change of position—from anti-war to pro—but much of the time Orwell seems to have tried to skirt around the fact that he had changed at all, even writing to his publisher Victor Gollancz to say how depressed he was by those intellectuals who equated Fascism and Democracy. Only in the first half of 1940 does he begin to explain himself, in a review of Malcolm Muggeridge's *The Thirties*, published in April that year in the *New English Weekly*.

"I know well what underlies these closing chapters", writes Orwell—Muggeridge had just enlisted. "It is the emotion of the middle-class man brought up in the military tradition, who finds in the moment of crisis that he is a patriot after all. It is all very well to be 'advanced' and 'enlightened'; to snigger at Colonel Blimp and proclaim



your emancipation from all traditional loyalties, but a time comes when the sand of the desert is sodden red and what have I done for thee, England my England. As I was brought up in this tradition myself I can recognise it under strange guises, and also sympathise with it, for even at its stupidest and most sentimental it is a comelier thing than the shallow self-righteousness of the left-wing intelligentsia".

The "*desert sand*" reference is from Sir Henry Newbolt's poem *Vitai Lampada*—the torch of life. It celebrates the public school team spirit, the idea that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton and that the collective, the nation, endures beyond the lives of its individual members.

There's a breathless hush in the Close  
to-night—  
Ten to make and the match to win—  
A bumping pitch and a blinding light,  
An hour to play and the last man in.  
And it's not for the sake of a ribboned coat,  
Or the selfish hope of a season's fame,  
But his captain's hand on his shoulder smote  
"Play up! play up! and play the game!"  
The sand of the desert is sodden red,—  
Red with the wreck of a square that broke;—  
The Gatling's jammed and the Colonel dead,  
And the regiment blind with dust and smoke.  
The river of death has brimmed his banks,  
And England's far, and Honour a name,  
But the voice of a schoolboy rallies the ranks:  
"Play up! play up! and play the game!"  
This is the word that year by year,  
While in her place the school is set,  
Every one of her sons must hear,  
And none that hears it dare forget.  
This they all with a joyful mind  
Bear through life like a torch in flame,  
And falling fling to the host behind—  
"Play up! play up! and play the game!"

Newbolt himself had died the year before the war after a distinguished career as a writer and political adviser, on Ireland among other matters. (In private, however, he had lived in a *ménage à trois* with his wife and her female lover.) The poem references a particular military engagement, the Battle of Abu Klea, a British victory in the Sudan in January 1885 .

A few months after the Muggerridge review, Orwell further justified his move to the war party. In *My Country Right or Left* (September 1940), he says that, the night before the Russo-German Pact was announced, he dreamt that the war had already started and that he—

"was patriotic at heart, would not

sabotage or act against my own side, would support the war, would fight in it if possible... the long drilling in patriotism... had done its work... once England was in a serious jam it would be impossible for me to sabotage".

It is not clear what "*jam*" Orwell's England was in in September 1939. It had declared war on Germany over the matter of Poland without intervening in the actual fighting. There followed the "*phoney war*" which was still ongoing when Orwell wrote his review of Muggerridge. Only in the Summer of 1940 did hostilities begin.

By the time of *My Country, Right or Left*, France had surrendered ("*I hope the BEF [British Expeditionary Force] is cut to pieces sooner than capitulate*" Orwell wrote in his diary, hoping for some grand romantic gesture), Germany was in control of almost all of western Europe, Italy had entered the war on Germany's side and the Battle of Britain—the aerial bombardment of British cities that would result in more than 60,000 civilian deaths—had been ongoing for three months. That is possibly the "*jam*" Orwell is thinking of in *My Country, Right or Left*. It is a September 1940 jam, rather than a September 1939 one, but it is an out-working of the September 1939 declaration of war and of the dogged support for it thereafter. There was no jam—no inescapable situation—in September 1939.

Orwell's support for the war was down to nationalism. Although he suggests that there were just two options available to Britain in September 1939—declare war or surrender—there was also the option of negotiation, which remained an option up to mid-1940 and was not out of the question after that. But Orwell was opposed to negotiation. From the start of the War, he was emphatic that that was something only the corrupt Establishment wanted.

Orwell's wartime writings include the lengthy essays, *The Lion and the Unicorn* and *The English People* as well as two substantial wartime diaries he intended for publication, many shorter essays and book reviews. There is an unusual review of *Mein Kampf*, for example, published in March 1940 and noting that the English edition of the book, published just a year before, had been edited from a pro-Hitler perspective—"For at that date, Hitler was still respectable". And, although

Orwell is not—is not at all—pro-Hitler, he gives him his due:

"I should like to put it on record that I have never been able to dislike Hitler... The fact is that there is something deeply appealing about him... He is the martyr, the victim... One feels, as with Napoleon, that he is fighting against destiny, that he can't win, and yet that he somehow deserves it".

Nazism is a genuinely revolutionary doctrine, he writes in a 1940 review of Frank Borkenau's *The Totalitarian Enemy*:

"It is... nonsense to talk about Germany "going Bolshevik" if Hitler falls. Germany is going Bolshevik because of Hitler and not in spite of him".

In *The Lion and the Unicorn* and elsewhere, Orwell argues that, if England is to win the war, it needs to pull off the same trick as Hitler, which is to marry up Nationalism and Collectivism. And in this respect, Orwell reckons, the war is good news for Socialism, a blessing in disguise. In order to win, he argues, Britain must move in the same direction as Germany, becoming more socialist while at the same time taking proper stock of what actually motivates people—

"The energy that actually shapes the world", he writes in *Wells, Hitler and the World State* (1941), "springs from emotions—racial pride, leader worship, religious belief, love of war—which liberal intellectuals mechanistically write off as anachronisms and which they have usually destroyed completely in themselves as to have lost all power of action".

Orwell shifted to a pro-war position out of patriotic sentiment, and he supported the War in its non-destructive phase when a compromise peace might have been negotiated. He seems almost content when it turns dangerous, destructive and quite possibly unwinnable. If he goes on to say that the war might stimulate an English socialist revolution, all the same it is the sentimental pull of patriotism that first drew him from the ILP's revolutionary pacifism to war. Patriotism is why Orwell supports the war—why he says clearly he supports it. His Socialism, a secondary concern, is reimagined in the light of it.

In the second part, I will look more closely at Orwell's wartime writings and where his support for the war took him politically.

## Stephen Richards

Part Two of this series, *Reliquiae Baxteriana*,  
appeared in issue 135 of *Church & State*

### From Baxter To Boston

I quite liked this title with its alliterative variation, so I'll stick with it, if only to whet everybody's appetite for the next instalment. I now realise that we won't get as far as Boston this time. Boston, by the way, isn't a place but a person: Thomas Boston.

"*I would not open windows into men's souls*" is a *bon mot* attributed to the first Elizabeth, but possibly derives from Bacon. It is said to sum up the pragmatic Elizabethan settlement. The message to those with obnoxious or heretical views was that they should observe the decencies, attend parish church, and not make an exhibition of themselves. Of course, if you wanted to matriculate at one of the English Universities or achieve any position in one of the learned professions, you had to be a confirmed member of the Church of England and attend from time to time. This was the *status quo* for nearly three centuries after the Elizabethan settlement was arrived at. But it was a porous sort of arrangement, which led to a certain amount of grumbling from the Tory squirearchy and High Church clergy, especially in the reign of Queen Anne, when the pestilence of Occasional Conformity stalked the land.

This annoyance was understandable. Ambitious, shameless, hypocritical Dissenters were climbing into positions of responsibility as Justices of the Peace and obtaining other plums and sinecures while all the time being secret snivelling Presbyterians or such like. *He that entereth not by the door into the sheep-fold but climbeth in some other way, the same is a thief and a robber* (John's Gospel, Chapter 10). The animosity of the Establishment found relief in Defoe's pamphlet, *A Short Way With Dissenters*, until it was eventually realised that the author was having a laugh, and the High Church party turned on him.

The solution was to try to test the sincerity of the false Anglicans by some means or other. But, once you start along that path, it's a short step to the process used by the early Inquisition against the Jewish *conversos* in Spain. Not even

those who had achieved high rank in the Church escaped being garroted, so what hope for the common or garden *conversos*? If you confess to being a false Christian that will the end of you, but if you deny it it's simply taken as evidence of your deep-dyed hypocrisy. The windows into men's souls don't reveal an enticing prospect.

#### An Inspector Calls

People in Baxter's day were beginning to wrestle with such perplexities. But we're blessedly free from these mediaeval dilemmas. Or so we like to think. Step forward Britain's own Occasional Conformist, the former leader of the Liberal Democrats, Tim Farron. Tim had been the very model of a modern Liberal Democrat and had never deviated from orthodoxy. He duly voted for the party line on Same Sex Marriage, but then an interviewer decided it would be fun to put him on the spot and ask him if he was personally at ease with same sex relationships, given his professed Evangelical stance, or whether he might consider that such relationships were sinful. He got himself into the most dreadful tangle in trying to distinguish between Tim the "progressive" politician and Tim the Bible-believing evangelical Christian. *Hate the sin but love the sinner* is not a maxim that currently finds much favour. From that day his demise was inevitable. In a recent newspaper interview he ruefully ruminated on this distressing period in his life, but without one word of recrimination. He has been well and truly brought to heel.

The Occasional Conformists got away with it in 1710 or so, but they don't get away with it now. Lip service to the gospel of diversity isn't enough. We all have to be whole-hearted believers. In the world of academia this is especially the case if you want to gain entry, or if you want to keep your place once you get there.

Even if you manage to avoid saying something that offends against the various extreme and often internally contradictory orthodoxies of our day, it's a fair bet it will be possible to find

something you have said fifteen years ago that disqualifies you for the society of right-thinking people. Witness the ridiculous witch-hunt against the Prince of Wokeness, Justin Trudeau, over his stage appearances as Aladdin, complete with shoe polish, back in 2001. No doubt Justin would have been the first to demonise one of his political opponents for such a transgression, but really, the guy needs a break. Incidentally, I don't know how P.G. Wodehouse would survive if he was among us now. In *Thank You Jeeves* about half the plot is taken up with Bertie Wooster's tribulations in blackface.

Interestingly it's no longer possible to gain any position within the Alliance Party in Northern Ireland unless you support abortion and same sex marriage. In former times it was a *sine qua non* for a rising Unionist politician to be in the Orange and possibly the Black, but now, if you're a conservative evangelical Christian in the Alliance Party, you have to sell your soul if you want to get on. The late Oliver Napier would not have found a home there, nor the late Seamus Close. Not only are our consciences all on parade, but they have to be the right kind of consciences.

#### Chronological Snobbery

In light of this, the words of St. Paul in Romans Ch. 3 echo down the ages, in one of the most important questions ever asked: "*Are we any better?*" A rhetorical question, because we most certainly aren't, even if we're not much worse. If you believe that the Mass is a blasphemous fable that will destroy men's souls, you will be pretty serious about wanting to eradicate it like a virus; and, contrariwise, if the Powers That Be believe that there is no salvation outside the bosom of the Church of Rome then those who beg to differ will be given a hard time. That is the natural approach.

Our so-called *toleration* comes down to this: we tolerate all manner of religious belief, and none, because we don't believe it matters all that much. "*Nothing matters very much, and most things don't matter at all*" is the typical English aphorism. But the litmus test of toleration is if we're prepared to tolerate beliefs and behaviours which we find repugnant, about things we think matter very much indeed. The transcript of the Westminster debates on the effective decriminalisation of homosexual practice in England and Wales in 1967 demonstrates this. Some of the contributors went out of their way to explain how distasteful

they found the practice: we wish with all our hearts that the world was free of these things but we can't find it in our hearts to continue to criminalise the practitioners. These poor souls, they need help. Why should we make their lot any harder than it is for them already? I suggest that these liberals of the 1960s with their plummy accents and views that would disqualify them from the public square in 2019 were the true believers in toleration. To tolerate now means to celebrate the practice that is being tolerated.

There's an echo here of Jesus' teaching in the Gospels. *"If you love them who love you, what credit is it to you? Even sinners do that!"* (Luke 6:32). If we're to be regarded as truly tolerant people, we have to stick up for the rights of those with whom we're definitely out of sympathy. If we blindly fall in behind what we believe to be the spirit of the age, what protection will there be for groups who suddenly become unfashionable when the spirit of the age moves on and leaves them behind?

### The Liberties Of The Savoy

Richard Baxter has, in sporting journalese, come in for a lot of stick, I think unfairly, for having allegedly antagonised the Restoration prelates at the Savoy Conference of 1660. According to G.N. Clark, knighted for his services to history, Baxter—

"had wonderful and commanding qualities, faith and leadership, learning and intellectual subtlety, but he tragically lacked the qualities which were needed now. He had no sense of humour. He had never had training or experience in negotiating, or in getting business through assemblies. Not a statesman, he was also not more charitable than the opponents he now met" (*The Later Stuarts*).

Interesting that they should be called "opponents"!

Years later, Baxter was accused of wading in with both feet to scupper the projected *Happy Union of Presbyterians and Independents* before it had really got off the ground, by lambasting as *Antinomian* the sermons of Tobias Crisp. Lack of sound judgment, intellectual arrogance, a failure of emotional intelligence: he may have been guilty of all of these at different times of his life. But, even if he had been an angel from heaven, he could never have managed to make a dent in the shield wall of the Caroline divines.

The Bishops had the authority of the new King behind them, and, just as important, they knew that the Puritan party had lost the force of the popular will. Dissent had become highly unfashionable, and so the Dissenters could be marginalised and then persecuted. The Prelates could afford to take a hard line, and so they did.

But Baxter and his colleagues, Calamy and Reynolds, had been previously softened up by Charles. The idea of a conference, to be held at the Bishop of London's lodgings in the Savoy, was communicated to Baxter by the Lord Broghill, the former Roger Boyle, former Comwellian commander in Ireland (the Siege of Limerick), and future Earl of Orrery, who had crept back into favour at court. First there was a presentation to Charles:

"The king gave us not only a free audience but as gracious an answer as we could expect; professing his gladness to hear our inclinations to agreement, and his resolution to do his part to bring us together; and that it must not be by bringing one party over to the other, but by abating somewhat on both sides, and meeting in the midway; and that if it were not accomplished, it should be because of ourselves and not of him. Nay, that he was resolved to see it brought to pass, and that he would draw us together himself... Insomuch that old Mr. Ash burst into tears with joy, and could not forbear expressing with gladness this promise of his majesty had put into his heart."

The prepared position of the Puritans was taken straight from Archbishop Usher's *Reduction*,

"that so they might have less to say against our offers as being our own; and that the world might see that it was Episcopacy itself which they refused... and that we pleaded not at all with them for Presbytery unless a moderate Episcopacy be Presbytery."

Good luck with that, chaps!

And the King, on hearing the papers read, *"seemed well pleased with them, and told us he was glad we were for a liturgy, and yielded to the essence of Episcopacy, and therefore he doubted not of our agreement"*,

Indeed Charles would not have had to move very far if he and his advisers had been serious about healing the vast ruptures in the Church. As at the Hampton Court Conference (when James I needlessly lambasted the

reforming wing of the Church), the actors on both sides had much of their social and theological DNA in common, even if their respective inner worlds were somewhat different. Baxter and his colleagues were moderate men with modest demands. The Church of England has traditionally been relaxed about matters indifferent, yet the King and the Bishops ultimately insisted on full episcopal supremacy and an inflexible liturgy:

"The great matter which we stopped at [i.e. would not give way on] was the word 'consent', where the bishop is to confirm by the 'consent' of the pastor of that church; and the king would by no means pass the word 'consent' either there on in the point of ordination or censures, because it gave the ministers a negative voice."

### Usher's Ulster: A Model Of Toleration?

What seems to us to be a fine distinction between this primitive episcopacy—Usher-style, on the one hand (remember that Usher was the permissive Primate of all Ireland during the brief heyday in Antrim and Down of "Prescopalianism", a term invented possibly by J.C. Beckett), and, on the other hand, the more full-blooded Caroline version of diocesan control—wasn't such small potatoes for Baxter and his colleagues. The *ante bellum* Puritan party was always content, if not ecstatically happy, with the Elizabethan Church settlement. The Puritans just wanted there to be a bit more preaching, by a more educated clergy, and no more ornate type of liturgy than that required by the 1604 *Book of Common Prayer*, a variant on Cranmer's. The vicar of each Parish Church could then order things as he pleased, in consultation no doubt with the Select Vestry or maybe the local squire. Your Bishop would then be a figure like the Superintendent of a Methodist Circuit or perhaps a Moderator of Presbytery in a local Presbyterian conclave. Except in the case of scandal or heresy, his powers of interference would be limited, and certainly wouldn't include the power to call the shots in how worship was conducted in each parish, as long as it was done decently and in order.

Baxter doesn't always make himself plain, but I think this is what the nub of the dispute was. On the criterion of who could do what to whom, whoever won the battle on the abstruse niceties of Church government would then end up winning all the other battles as well, and

each parish would reflect the image of its Bishop. And of course the Bishops were directly appointed by the King.

### Seventeenth Century Bookends

While the parameters of this controversy recall the *Hampton Court Conference*, of almost sixty years before, we can also catch an advance glimpse at the *Savoy Conference* of the storm that was to engulf James II 25 years later. After wrangling for a while over the Puritan party's response to the royal Declaration, the Bishops then played a trump card. The Lord Chancellor threw out a hint, with seeming diffidence, to the effect that the King was coming under pressure from some of the more extreme Protestant sects and from the Catholic sector, for some sort of accommodation to be made with them, whereby they would be permitted to meet for public worship as long as they didn't, in modern parlance, frighten the horses. This is definitely James II territory, and we remember how Macaulay excoriated the Quakers for being James's dupes. But here is Baxter:

"I knew if we consented to it, it would be charged on us that we spake for a toleration of Papists and sectaries. (But yet it might have lengthened out our own) [i.e. Baxter and his principled Dissenter followers might have had an easier time of it]. And if we spake against it, all sects and parties would be set against us, as the causers of their sufferings, and as a partial people that would have liberty ourselves, but would have no others have it with us. I thought our very silence would be charged on us a consent if it went on, and therefore I only said this, 'that this reverend brother... had named the Papists and the Socinians [early prototypes of what we might call Unitarians]. For our parts, we desired not favour to ourselves alone, and rigorous severity we desired against none. As we humbly thanked his majesty for his indulgence to ourselves, so we distinguish the tolerable parties from the intolerable. For the former, we humbly crave just lenity and favour; but for the latter, such as the two sorts named before by that reverend brother, for our parts we cannot make their toleration our request.' To which his majesty said that 'There were laws enough against the Papists'; and I replied that 'We understood the question to be whether those laws should be executed on them or not'. And so his majesty broke up the meeting of that day."

As I keep emphasising, and as was the case at Hampton Court in 1604, what

separated the two teams wasn't so much their formal theological differences, though these did exist, but the greater spiritual intensity of what we might call the Puritan party. With the exception of Baxter they were all university men, albeit he was perhaps the only real intellectual among them; they spoke the same language and came from similar backgrounds. But the royal party was more interested in place than in principle, more interested in place even than in working through the nuts and bolts of a compromise deal.

### Atalanta's Race

So, guided by their own principles, it wasn't surprising that the royal party should bowl a couple of googlies, or perhaps the more apt metaphor might be to say that they threw three golden apples—golden plums in this case!—across the path of their interlocutors, in the form of bishoprics: Hereford for Baxter, Lichfield and Coventry for Calamy, and Norwich for Reynolds. Of course this aroused some suspicion. The standard answer was that they were sensible of the honour etc. but could give no positive answer unless they were assured that they would not be expected to act like full-scale Diocesan Bishops.

The three of them wondered among themselves whether they (or some of them) could accept the offer without doing violence to his principles. The proper answer seems obvious to us, but how would any of us react if we were offered a job that involved high status, substantial income, job security for life, not much real work to do, and a palace to live in, all expenses paid? Sounds like a no-brainer.

If it was a golden apple, it was also a poisoned apple, but one of the three couldn't resist the lure:

"And Dr. Reynolds almost as suddenly accepted it... He read to me a profession directed to the king, which he had written, wherein he professed that he took a bishop and a presbyter to differ not in ordina but in gradu [i.e. a distinction in degree, not in kind], and that a bishop was but the chief presbyter, and that he was not to ordain or govern but with his presbyters' assistance and consent, and that thus he accepted of the place... and that he would no longer hold or exercise it than he could do it on those terms. To this sense it was; and he told me that he would offer it to the king when he accepted of the place; but whether he did or not I cannot tell. He died in the Bishopric of Norwich an. 1676."

### Crumbs From The Rich Man's Table

Such is the power of patronage, exemplified in every age. Able people have to fit in to the Procrustean bed of the prevailing ideology before the ruling class will risk putting them in positions of prominence in the worlds of government, the law, and the quangocracy. And so in our day we're force fed a wearisome diet of propaganda on racism, climate change, LGBTQ and transgender issues (to include indoctrination of six-year-olds), the evils of the patriarchy, the undoubted benefits of mass immigration, and the advantages of a globalist "marketplace" organised and run by huge corporations, with the assistance of Goldman Sachs and George Soros. And the elite which governs us takes every opportunity to trash the Christian faith, dismissing its truth-claims and underplaying and undermining the Christian foundations of our culture.

With regard to the present-day Church of England, there used to be some kind of pretence carried on that liberal Archbishops of Canterbury would alternate with those from the evangelical stable, but what this has come to mean in practice is that Anglo-Catholic liberals alternate with 'evangelical' liberals. It doesn't seem to make much difference to the terms of the discourse either way. This runs along predetermined lines, with no sense that these prelates might be the custodians of a message of eternal significance, antithetical to their whimsical prattle. These are the kind of men who think they're being sophisticated when they refer to the Old Testament as "the Hebrew scriptures", or keep repeating the word God monotonously, in case they might ever end up accidentally using a masculine pronoun.

It's not quite the BBC motto: nation shall speak peace unto nation. It's more a case of nation speaking platitudinous garbage unto nation, producing a kind of brain rot in the unfortunate listeners. At least seventeenth century England was a hotbed of debate. Debate in our day is being stifled because there are so many things we're not allowed to say. The way our cultural overlords conjugate the new reality is as follows:

*"I am a Democrat;  
You are a Populist'  
He (she) is a Fascist".*

If the voters turn aside from the instructions issued to them by their betters it's decreed that they have been

led astray by populists. If they vote consistently with these instructions, as with the recent referendums in the Republic, then it's a sign that the nation is coming of age, and we are living in a mature democracy—as opposed to these other immature democracies!

### Baxter Sees The Light

Anyway, back to Baxter, and the ongoing colloquies which went round in ever decreasing circles. Baxter must have suspected that the Puritans were being played with a long line:

"By this time, our frequent crossing of their expectations, I saw, had made some of the bishops angry... But that which displeased them most was the freedom of my speeches to them; that is, I spoke to them as on terms of equality as to the cause, yet with all honourable titles to their persons. For I perceived that they had that eminency of power and interest that the greatest lords were glad of their favour, [and they] did expect that the presence of so many of them should have awed us into such a silence, or cowardliness, as should have betrayed our cause...

"And it was one of the greatest matters of offence against me that I foreknew and foretold them what they were about to do. They said that this was but to stir up the fears of the people, and cause them to disaffect the government, by talking of silencing us and casting out the people from communion. I told them that either they do intend such a course or not. If they do, why should they think us criminal for knowing it? If not, what need had we of all these disputes with them? Which were only to persuade them not to cast out the ministers and the people on these accounts? And it was but a few weeks after this that Bishop Morley himself did silence me, forbidding me to preach in his diocese, who now took it so heinously that I did foretell it...

"And thus our dispute at the Savoy ended, and with it our endeavours for reconciliation upon the warrant of the king's Commission."

The rest of Baxter's life, really the next thirty years, consisted of a miserable round of attempting to navigate increasingly severe constraints on his ability to preach, which was the one thing he lived to do. Assurances that had been given to him turned out to be empty when put to the test. He was reduced to pleading for liberty to preach in his own home diocese of Worcester, which was denied, even though "*I offered to preach only on the Creed and the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments, and to only to such as had no preaching*".

He was cast out on the roads of the world, with no settled home, and once or twice cast into prison:

"And so vehement was the endeavor in court, city and country to make me contemptible and odious, as if the authors had thought that all the safety of church and state did lie upon it, and all would have been safe if I were but vilified and hated."

### Our Revels Now Are Ended

The date when the *Act of Uniformity* came into effect was 24th August, 1662, St. Bartholomew's Day. Whether intentional or not, this couldn't fail to awake comparisons with the massacres of Huguenots in Paris exactly 90 years before. Nobody was killed in 1662 but Baxter calculated that somewhere between 1,800 and 2,000 ministers were ejected from the Church of England at that time, in what has been called *The Great Ejection*. In 2012 we celebrated or marked the 350th anniversary—in such a subdued way that I don't think the BBC mentioned it at all.

About 7,000 clergy opted to stay on, either out of principle or the desire to avoid the Workhouse. Subscription to the revised Prayer Book of 1662 was meant to be the litmus test, but the whole event was so botched that most clergy hadn't even managed to have sight of the new book by the deadline.

Not content with depriving the dissenting ministers of their livings, the Restoration Parliament went on to pass a series of Acts collectively known as the *Clarendon Code*, after new Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Clarendon, though it's doubted if he was their instrumental framer. Even such a natural accommodator as the poet Andrew Marvell described this legislation as "*the Quintessence of Arbitrary Malice*". We had in close succession the *Corporation Act*, the *Conventicles Acts* (which resulted in about eight years in prison for Bunyan) and the *Five Mile Act* of 1665. This last was a reaction to the situation in London during the Plague Year. Probably most of the benefited clergy left the city at that time. London having been a stronghold of Puritanism, there were plenty of nonconformist ministers left in the city. Many of them stepped into the gap "*to give spiritual solace to dying, bereaved and frightened people*" (Lee Gatiss). The answer was, not to recognise or honour these men, but to drive them out of the capital altogether.

### Change And Decay

One might have thought that the evangelical cause would have been re-vivified by this intense persecution, but the opposite was the case. Whatever may have been the position among the peasantry of the west of England, Puritanism became a dwindling and dying cause among the educated classes as a result of this slow strangulation. This didn't manifest itself simply in terms of numerical weakness, but in a loss of spiritual backbone. The shining lights of mid-century Puritanism—men like Thomas Watson, Thomas Brooks, John Owen, John Flavel, Baxter himself, and many others—were in the last third or quarter of their lives, and no new generation was rising up to fill their shoes. The glory had departed. The eighteenth-century revival was mainly Anglican in origin. A functional summary of the years, from 1662 to 1689 and beyond is given by Robert Shindler, a contemporary and associate of Spurgeon's:

"The Churches [the ejected ministers] established were all Calvinistic in their faith, and such they remained for at least that generation. It is a matter of veritable history, however, that they did not all continue for any great length of time... In proportion as the ministers seceded from the old Puritan godliness of life, and the old Calvinistic form of doctrine, they commonly became less earnest and less simple in their preaching, more speculative and less spiritual in the matter of their discourses, and dwelt more on the moral teachings of the New Testament, than on the great central truths of revelation. Natural theology frequently took the place which the great truths of the gospel ought to have held, and the sermons became more and more Christless. Corresponding results in the character and life, first of the preachers and then of the people, were only too plainly apparent."

Shindler goes on to make a surprising observation:

"Some of the ministers... embraced Arminian sentiments, while others professed to take a middle path, and called themselves Baxterians. These displayed, not only less zeal for the salvation of sinners... but they adopted a different strain in preaching, dwelt more on the general truths of religion, and less on the vital truths of the gospel. Ruin by sin, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and redemption by the blood of Christ... were conspicuous chiefly by their absence".

### *Et Tu, Baxter?*

What is going on here? This is the same Baxter who lived sacrificially, preached indefatigably, and who continues to be published by evangelical and indeed Reformed publishing houses; and who refused to have any truck with the easy-going and quite formalistic spirit which characterised the leading figures in the Caroline Church. What is this thing called *Baxterianism*?

It turns out that Baxter has had a surprisingly influential afterlife, and, like St. Augustine, rival schools of thought

have squabbled over his legacy. In my next and possibly concluding piece I'd like to look at the controversies that shook Scottish Presbyterianism in the early decades of the following century, when Baxterian views came into conflict with a markedly different strand of Reformed interpretation, and some of the pamphlet wars of seventeenth century England were re-fought with redoubled vigour, north of the Tweed.

So, if my readers are agog (as I hope they are) to find out more about Baxterianism, all will be revealed.

## Brendan Clifford

### The British Constitution

England has been served by a strong national intelligentsia for centuries. The transition to democracy has not diminished the nationalism of the intelligentsia.

The Irish state, for all the nationalism that brought it into being, has got no social stratum that could be called an intelligentsia. There is an *ersatz* intelligentsia of a kind which on the whole has been subversive of the ideal of national independence, and has been strongly Anglophile in recent decades.

But Anglophile ideals have been exposed as illusions by Brexit, and hysteria has set in. On September 3rd, *Irish Times* propagandist Fintan O'Toole published a tirade of disillusionment against Britain under the suggestively Islamophobic title of *Welcome To The United Kingdom Of Absurdistan*. He began by saying that he knows—

"Two things... about revolutions. One is that they get more radical as they go along... The other is that revolutions expose the great cracks in the ancien regime that should have been obvious all along..."

There was a time when O'Toole played at revolution. He declared a revolution outside the door of the *Irish Times*—or it might have been the gates of Trinity College—but the regime somehow held firm against it. I suppose that is because his revolution consisted of bluster, make-believe and symbolic gestures.

The English—whom he does not seem to know at all, despite his long-standing Anglophilia—do not go in for empty gestures. They act rather than

blustering about action, and their bluster is a mode of concealing action rather than a substitute for it. The declared themselves an Empire, and made their Empire into the dominant World Power by the means which were necessary to the doing of it: war, conquest, genocide, plunder, and then a regular system of exploitation based on John Locke's appropriate conception of property. And then they told a children's story about how and why they did it all, which O'Toole seems to have believed.

But now "*the ancien regime of the Westminster system is having all its delusions mercilessly exposed*" to him through the Brexit process, causing him to see shadow as substance.

"One thing that still unites the warring factions in England", he says, (damning both their houses) "is the belief that Westminster is 'the mother of all parliaments'... Well, it sure looks like the mother of all something right now, but it's not parliamentary democracy..."

Well, Britain certainly was not the mother of democracy in the world, and did not claim to be. Supposing Parliamentary Government to have begun in 1688, it has been actively anti-democratic for most of its life since then. And it might be said to have been revolutionarily anti-democratic, a fact noticed by Walter Cox in his *Irish Magazine* around 1810.

Parliamentary Government from 1688 until well into the 19th century was a system of aristocratic government by

parties. It was a party-system, under a nominal monarch, based on election by a minority electorate. It was based on property ownership on both sides, with the major landowner in each locality being in effect his own government, there being very little in the way of a national apparatus of State for him to take account of.

The war against France after 1793 was a war against democracy. The people were motivated for a war against democracy as something that was likely to lead to mayhem and paper money.

But the War exerted a democratising influence and a movement for franchise reform began soon after it. The great Reformer was William Cobbett, a Kentish peasant who joined the Army, admired the gentry, served in the American War, and remained in America as a British Loyalist for a period after the war. But, after the French war, he saw that the aristocracy he had admired had declined in quality and no longer served as the "*natural representatives*" of their people. The people therefore needed to have their own representatives in Parliament.

The middle class had grown in strength during the war as the sphere of the money system expanded, and it threatened economic rebellion. The Party managers reckoned that the established Party system had got such a grip on the popular imagination that the middle class could be enfranchised into it without fear of revolution. There were further extensions of the franchise in the 1860s and 1880s, with what was later called the 'aristocracy of labour' getting the vote in the latter. The established Party system still held firm. Democratisation was completed in 1918, after women and the lower strata of the working class had demonstrated their utter loyalist support for the Imperial system in the War.

Parliamentary Democracy was a long time coming, but after it came it soon began to perform the trick of equating Parliamentary Government with Democratic Government.

The relevant relationship between Parliamentary government and democracy is that democracy, though proclaimed by the French Revolution, failed to take shape as a regular form of Government France, but was gradually installed in the British Parliamentary system after it had warded off the French Revolution by making war on it. And it was only as part of the British Parli-

amentary system, where it was in large part over-ridden by the pre-existing system of party-politics, that it maintained itself as a continuous form of government.

In Ireland it was interrupted by a kind of 'Civil War', but it was not a war brought about by internal disagreement about the mode of government. It was caused by a credible military threat by the democratic British Government that it would engage in a comprehensive Imperial re-conquest of Ireland if a substantial body of the Irish did not agree to dismantle the independent Republic, install in its place a system dependent on the British Crown, and make war on those who stood by the Republic.

British democracy came into existence within the Imperial system as something exclusively British. It became the form of government of the centre of Imperial Power without prejudicing the Imperial right to govern others against their will. But, if the maintenance of democratic government is considered the all-important thing, it must be admitted that Britain at home was the only European state that maintained it without interruption after the democratic era was proclaimed by the League of Nations in 1919.

It might be that the failure of democracy to take root in some other states was because of British interference in them, and it might be that the denial of democracy to others was a condition of maintaining it in Britain, or even that Britain made use of democratic agitation against others as a mode of subversion, but if the maintaining of a democratic regime is the supreme good, it remains the fact that it was the British state alone that maintained it continuously since the establishment of the League of Nations a hundred years ago.

(We are leaving the undemocratic enclave of Northern Ireland out of account as something which is by general consent beneath notice, even though it caused a War, which must not be recognised as a war because its cause must not be recognised.)

Here is the jaundiced description of the British democratic system by disillusioned Anglophile O'Toole, whose views must reflect the views of the *Irish Times*, a British newspaper maintained in Ireland after independence, without visible means of support, under the control of an Oath-bound secret committee (see John Martin: *Irish Times: Past And Present*, a record of the journal since 1859):

"Boris Johnson was elected leader... by 92,153 people. He was appointed prime minister by a hereditary monarch with no parliamentary involvement whatsoever... And he has now used those monarchical powers to prorogue parliament. The one virtue of Johnson's brazenness is that he has surely made obvious to his compatriots what outsiders can see—that the system in which all of this is possible is a democracy built around a solid core of feudalism".

O'Toole then quotes "*one of England's great minds, Jonathan Sumption*" as saying that what Johnson is doing "*might be considered unconstitutional*" but he doesn't think it is unlawful.

O'Toole continues:

"So what Johnson is doing is probably unconstitutional but probably not unlawful. I don't think most people in England have any idea how utterly nonsensical this seems to all the rest of us. It's like saying that a man is almost certainly dead but nonetheless is in quite good health. In any other democracy, if it's unconstitutional, it's unlawful. Only in the United Kingdom of Absurdistan can it possibly be otherwise. And at the heart of the absurdity is that great tautology, the 'unwritten constitution' [Tautology!!]. The British constitution is so fine a thing that it would be positively insulting, even dangerous, to actually write it down. The people who need to know what it is are able to divine its mysteries—ordinary subjects are not among them. Johnson, for all his habitual mendacity, is exposing the truth that this arcane system of accretions and conventions is of little use when a shameless chancer is given the keys of the kingdom. His manoeuvre is not even a coup—when you can do all this lawfully, who needs coups?" (3.9.19).

Johnson became Prime Minister by being elected leader of the Tory Party, when the previous leader stood down. There was nothing unusual in that. Teresa May also became Prime Minister, without even a Party vote, when David Cameron stood down. So did Gordon Brown when Tony Blair stood down. So did many others.

Teresa May chose to call an election after becoming Prime Minister. There was no reason for her to do so. And it was the fact that she did so that threw politics into crisis.

The crisis has been aggravated by an element of written constitution that had been introduced by Cameron as part of his

Coalition deal with the Liberal Democrats. Johnson was prevented by this measure from calling an election. It is not his doing that he is Prime Minister only by the vote of Tory Party members. Labour, Liberal etc. will not give him the two-thirds majority needed to over-ride the Fixed Terms law and go to the electorate.

As to his appointment by "*a hereditary monarch with no parliamentary involvement*": that comment is about two and a half centuries out of date. It was determined, with the aid of Burke's most influential pamphlet (*Thoughts On The Present Discontents*), that the "*hereditary monarch*" had no choice but to appoint the leader of the Party which had a majority in the Commons as Prime Minister. It had been established about half a century before that the Prime Minister was the Crown in Parliament, bearing the Royal Prerogative. It was then decided that the hereditary monarch had no choice in deciding who should be Crown authority in Parliament.

By the same token, the two-party system, which had been dominant in politics for half-a-century, was defined by Burke as an essential element of the Constitution. This was never subsequently challenged, though it existed outside the law. Party affiliations did not appear on ballot sheets until the 20th century. A pretence was kept up that voters returned a Member to Parliament, but the voters knew very well that what they were voting for was a party.

The British system of practices and understandings, with very roughly approximate representative arrangements, worked. The written Constitutions with more representative electoral arrangements all broke down.

At the outset of the democratic era, in France in the early 1790s, Danton said that a Constitution should be like a silk dress on a voluptuous woman, giving expression to every facet and movement of the body. The French never succeeded in writing a Constitution which did that. Their Constitutions always proved to be straitjackets that were cracked by movements of the body.

Written Constitutions are suitable for stable situations which want to preserve themselves as they are. The world in which such situations could exist was abolished long ago by the French Revolution and British capitalist/Imperialist globalism as continued and intensified by the United States—by

what is called *Progress*. The open British Constitution was the Constitution of *Progress*.

Jonathan Sumption, the great English mind referred to by O'Toole, replied in the *Irish Times* of September 3rd to O'Toole's praise of him, which he described as an "*ill-informed harangue against the British constitution*". He said that,

"Constitutions deserve to be judged by more than a single crisis. The flexibility of ours has allowed it to adapt over three centuries to changes which would have overwhelmed more formal arrangements: the marginalisation of the monarchy, the onset of industrialisation and mass democracy, the existential crisis of two world wars, the creation and loss of a worldwide empire and the rise of powerful modern nationalisms in Ireland, Scotland and Wales..."

Sumption's letter then descends into vulgar abuse of "*the present bunch of constitutional hoodlums*" in Downing St. But whether they are hoodlums or something entirely different depends on whether they succeed or not.

The hoodlums of 1914 were statesmen because they outlasted their opponents who adopted a high Constitutional tone, excluded the Six Counties from the Home Rule Bill, broke the Liberal/Irish Government, and became dominant in a Coalition fronted by a Liberal defector.

And Sumption proved to be wrong in his opinion that the prorogation was lawful—demonstrating that what was at issue was not the application of an existing law but whether the Court should assert its authority over Parliament and make a new law.

And there is one great event missing from his summary of what was achieved under the Constitution of Absurdistan: the construction of the vast slave trade of the 18th century, and of the great Slave Labour Camps in the British colonies in the Caribbean in which techniques later applied in wage-labour capitalism at home were pioneered. The Slave Trading system across the Atlantic (of which Britain got a virtual monopoly in its Great War against France, which was concluded by the Treaty of Utrecht), the Triangular Trade, was the nucleus of the capitalist World Market, and the profits of the Slave Labour Camps very largely fuelled the take-off of Capitalism.

British progress without that epoch of slavery is historically unimaginable.

When that Slave era had served its

purpose, it was tided away; a propaganda against continuing slavery in the United States was launched; and the idea was cultivated that what Britain had done with regard to Slavery was to abolish it.

A society which developed over the centuries through this kind of freedom felt ill at ease after it joined the EU, and EU authority began to be exerted over it.

The British State, having reduced Europe to a shambles for the second time within thirty years, gave its blessing after 1945 to the idea of a United States of Europe, confident that nothing would come of it. But, within a generation, Europe was developing strongly under the leadership of the Christian Democracy that emerged as a coherent force when the fascist system was broken up.

The Christian Democratic (essentially Catholic) revival of Europe was backed by the USA against Britain. And eastern Europe was closed off within a different system, run by the Power that had defeated Nazi Germany. Within this area, a protected Common Market was established and was economically successful.

Britain could not live at ease across the Channel from a Europe that was uniting politically while its Empire was falling apart and the United States was filching its markets. It could have no power against a United Europe. It had to gain entry to Europe in order to redirect it from within. Its first application was rejected by the European founders, who saw what its purpose was, but it was admitted by a later generation.

Brian Girvin, who was once the Editor of this journal, became a Professor in British academia and wrote a book about Ireland and the EU called *From Union To Union*. He had conceived an ideology of universalist individualism and was very hostile to Irish national protectionism. The idea of the book was that Ireland, having left the British Union and suffered from nationalist isolation, was re-entering civilisation by joining Europe.

Jack Lane pointed out that the Irish transition was from one protected market to another. Ireland benefitted greatly by the easing of British free trade pressures on it by its entry into European protectionism. For Britain, on the other hand, European protectionism was

experienced as a kind of stifling.

But Britain succeeded partly in redirecting Europe from within away from Protectionism to Free Trade. It was assisted in this by the collapse of the Soviet system and the British deliberately-advocated random EU expansion into eastern Europe, in which Europe lost much of its original coherence of outlook and purpose. It did, however, retain sufficient cohesion to establish a European currency which most of the states adopted.

The then British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, appears to have been in favour of abolishing Sterling and entering the Euro. He was prevented by his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, as the representative of traditional Labour. Browne is now vehemently, and venomously, opposed to Brexit. But Brexit sooner or later was implicit in his intransigent stance against putting Sterling into the Euro system. (He put up a number of conditions which he knew could not be met.)

If Britain had joined the Euro, Brexit would be out of the question. Because it didn't, and Europe is consolidating around the Euro, Britain is increasingly the odd man out.

There is no European Party in British politics. Labour seems to have become a Remain party, but its posters say clearly "*Remain and Reform*"—meaning: continue what was begun by Thatcher with her Bruges speech.

England took off on a course of absolute nationalism five hundred years ago and never got distracted from it. It is so ingrained that the British are not aware of their nationalism. It is amazing that Irish Anglophiles should have seen it as something else and are now disillusioned.

Britain built a World Empire but never lost in it. It flirted with the Roman ideal but never seriously considered adopted it and becoming an Empire of citizens. Its Empire was external to it—a source of plunder and cannon-fodder, a market, and a sphere of *Lebensraum*. When it lost the Empire as a consequence of the great miscalculation of two wars on Germany, it detached itself easily—fighting only a few dirty wars in distant places against foreigners. There was no complication of foreign citizenship, as between France and Algeria. It was the pioneer of absolute nationalism five hundred years ago and it is now acting *normally* as it has always acted. ✱



## Peter Brooke

Talk given to the *Hay Philosophy Café*, September 2019

# Heidegger And The 'Latinisation Of Greek Philosophy'

"Our discussions about 'the Roman' are being interpreted as stemming from an anti-Christian hostility. Let us leave it for theology to decide whether the meditation on the essence of truth we have attempted here could not, taken in context, be more fruitful for the preservation of Christianity than the aberrant desire to construct new 'scientifically' founded proofs for the existence of God and for the freedom of the will on the basis of modern atomic physics"

Heidegger: *Parmenides*, p.166

### The Meaning Of 'Wisdom'

Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Books VI and VII) outlines "five qualities through which the mind [psyche] achieves truth in affirmation or denial, namely Art or technical skill [techne], Scientific Knowledge [episteme], Prudence [phronesis], Wisdom [sophia], and Intelligence [nous]" (Loeb translation, VI.iii.1).

In 1924-5, shortly before the publication of his best known work, *Being and Time*, in 1927, Heidegger gave a lecture course on Plato's dialogue *The Sophist*. He began by discussing these five approaches to knowledge. The passage I've just quoted is rendered in the English translation of Heidegger's text:

"Hence there are five ways human *dasein* [psyche] discloses beings in affirmation and denial. And these are know-how (in taking care, manipulating, producing) [techne], science [episteme], circumspection (insight) [phronesis], understanding [sophia], and perceptual discernment [nous]" (p.15).

I'm going to simplify the argument in a manner that Heidegger would regard as quite scandalous and suggest that the problem Heidegger is facing—I'm tempted to suggest the whole problem of Heidegger's philosophy—is that in our age **techne**, **episteme** and **phronesis** have gained a monopoly of our intellectual life at the expense of **sophia** and **nous**. And this, if we agreed with him, would pose a problem for those of us who claim to be interested in 'philosophy' which is, of course, the love of **sophia**.

So what is meant by *sophia* and *nous*? Heidegger in the *Sophist*

commentary—which, we must remember, is early Heidegger—says that the first four of these—**techne**, **episteme**, **phronesis** and **sophia**—are susceptible to the **logos**, that is to say, the word. They can be spoken about. Aristotle defines human being as the **zoon logon echon**—the living thing that has the word—that is able to speak. The **nous**, however, on this understanding of the term (it is a word with many different interpretations) is the direct perception of truth and as such is not susceptible to expression in words. Heidegger (p.41) says of it:

"On the whole Aristotle has transmitted to us very little about **nous**; it is the phenomenon which causes him the most difficulty... In anticipation, it must be said that **nous** as such is not a possibility of the Being of man—yet insofar as intending and perceiving are characteristic of human *dasein*, **nous** can still be found in man. Aristotle calls this **nous**... the 'so-called **nous**'. This **nous** in the human soul is not a **noein**, a straightforward seeing, but a **dianoein**, because the human soul is determined by **logos**."

It has to be capable of being put into words.

He goes on to say, however, that "*Aristotle is able to characterise sophia as nous kai episteme, as an unconcealing (truth) which on the one hand assumes in a certain sense the unconcealing (truth) of nous, and on the other hand has the scientific character of episteme*".

All this is of interest to me as an Orthodox Christian because, in the Orthodox Christian understanding, when humankind—Heidegger's *dasein*—

acquired "the knowledge of good and evil", we lost the "noetic faculty", the **nous**. Or at least the noetic faculty—understood as the means of direct communication with God—was damaged. Perhaps we could say now that the **noein**, direct perception, became a **dianoein**, perception dependent on words and therefore on rational interpretation.

Obviously we're talking here about a particular sort of direct perception, not just the observation of things around us: though it includes the observation of things around us.

In lectures given in 1930, published as *The Essence of Truth*, Heidegger comments (in standard phenomenological mode, the sort of thing you find in *Being and Time*) that when we see a red book we don't just see the colour 'red'; we see the book. But we cannot see a book if we don't know what a book is. We need the assistance of the word 'book'. On that modest level, the **dianoein** works perfectly well. But what of what we might call 'higher' things?

The key guide to Orthodox thinking, the *Philokalia*, sees the ascetic life as an effort to restore the noetic faculty, and what is then seen/experienced directly is the **logoi**, explained in the Palmer, Sherrard, Ware translation as the "*inner essences*" of created things:

"We practise the virtues in order to achieve contemplation of the inner essences (*logoi*) of created things, and from this we pass to contemplation of the Logos who gives them their being; and He manifests Himself when we are in a state of prayer. The state of prayer is one of dispassion, which by virtue of the most intense longing transports to the noetic realm the intellect that longs for wisdom" (Evagrius the Solitary—4th/5th century—'On Prayer', § 52&53, *Philokalia*, Vol 1, pp.61-2).

Without succumbing to the temptation (if indeed he felt it) to evoke the **Logos** as Christ, Heidegger in later writings (notably the lectures on Heraclitus, 1943-4) elaborates at some length on the Greek use of the word as he understands it. If I say that he considers "**Logos as the self-disclosing, all-uniting One... the for-gathering that dispenses the origin and thereby retains it**", that might be enough to indicate that we're talking about something different from the words we use in ordinary conversation, or even the chain of thoughts we normally associate with the word 'logic'.

In the passage Heidegger is referring to, on **sophia** combining **nous** and

**episteme**, Aristotle says (VI.vii.4-7, Loeb translation):

"These considerations therefore show that Wisdom [**sophia**] is both Scientific Knowledge [**episteme**] and Intuitive Knowledge [**nous**] as regards the things of the most exalted nature. This is why people say that men like Anaxagoras and Thales 'may be wise [**sophous**] but are not prudent [**phronimous**] when they see them display ignorance of their own interests; and while admitting them to possess a knowledge that is rare, marvellous, difficult and even superhuman, they yet declare this knowledge to be useless, because these sages do not seek to know the things that are good for human beings."

So we are talking about "*things of the most exalted nature*", that are "*rare, marvellous, difficult and even superhuman*". Aristotle talks about "*universal*" and "*unchanging*" truths. We might say "*eternal*" truths. In Heidegger's summary (Plato's Sophist, p.47):

"Because **sophia** is the most rigorous science, it pursues the... most desirable objects of knowledge, namely, that which always is, **aei**, in such a way that it thereby uncovers the **archai** (the origins, the first principles)."

### Time, Eternity And 'The Age'

"*That which always is, aei*". In the standard Liddel and Scott classical Greek dictionary **aei** is given as an adverb meaning "*ever, always, for ever*". But it also means "*or the time being*" as in **o aei kraton**—the current ruler. Heidegger follows the passage I've just quoted by saying "*The Being which in Greek understanding is genuine Being is the world, the aei*". So **aei** somehow combines the notions of 'time' and 'world', and what always is and what currently is. In the Christian doxology—"*Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, both now and ever and to the ages of ages Amen*", the word translated 'ever' or 'forever' is **aei**. Ages of ages is **tous aionas ton aionon**. This "*ages of ages*" may be taken to refer to Eternity, but we normally think of Eternity—Latin *aeternitas*—as singular. Here we have a plurality of ages, and indeed we have a plurality of ages nesting inside each other rather like the wheels within wheels of the vision of Ezekiel. I'm indulging myself here rather than paraphrasing Heidegger but I think it is relevant. His best known book is called *Being and Time* and the title immediately evokes the problem of how something that always 'is' (Being)

can relate to time. And a starting point for such consideration could be the **aion** which Heidegger also conflates with the world, *dasein* being 'being in the world'.

The age, the **aion**, is a chunk of time that has a shape to it. The shape, the form, means that, in addition to being a succession of events and therefore plural, it is also singular. A lifetime, which has a beginning, a middle and an end, is an age. It has a shape and that shape could be called its being, what 'it'—the lifetime—'is', and in that shape, all the events resonate and have their significance, their being, in relation to the whole, the whole being determined, shaped, by death.

The age, or **aion** that particularly preoccupies Heidegger, is the age of Western philosophy which he believes began with 'the Greeks' and ended with Nietzsche. It therefore has a shape and, because it has come to an end, its shape can be discerned and in Heidegger's understanding the clue to discerning that shape is found in the concept of Being, inseparable, as we have seen, from the concept of Time. We've seen that in the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle has said that **sophia** is concerned with "*things of the most exalted nature*", things that are "*rare, marvellous, difficult and even superhuman*". But the most exalted, rare, marvellous, difficult and even superhuman thing of all is Being itself, the fact that things are, ultimately the foundation on which we are all standing. This most fundamental of all things may, when perceived by the **nous**, the Intelligence, prove to be eternal and unchanging. But we have also just learned from Aristotle that this **nous**, direct perception of Being, is outside language, outside **logos** and hence inaccessible to us. We, as the **zoon logon echon**, the living thing that possesses (or is possessed by) the word, can only aspire to **sophia**, which is **nous**, our direct perception of truth, tempered by **episteme**, which is verbal knowledge.

The sense of wonder, which Aristotle says is the foundation of all philosophy and which is essentially wonder at being, at the fact that things are, is a human experience—human being is the being that is capable of posing the question of Being—and that human experience of Being changes from age to age and the principal agents of that change are the philosophers. Within the grand **aion** that stretches between 'the Greeks' and Nietzsche, all sorts of minor **aiona**, ages, have occurred, given voice by the

philosophers, but they were all determined within a framework which was first outlined by Plato and Aristotle. (It is important to note that, in Heidegger's view, the philosophers don't create anything, they say what they are told to say by the world, by **aei**, by Being). Heidegger calls this overall framework '*metaphysics*'.

But why has it come to an end with Nietzsche? Because Nietzsche finally blurted out what it was all about, what was the fundamental driving force underneath it all, namely, the Will to Power, the will to dominate, to master the earth, to master beings. And, with that, the whole gorgeous crystal structure of **sophia**—not to mention **nous**—shatters and we're left with nothing but **techné**, **episteme** and **phronesis**.

### Nietzsche And The End Of An Age

Heidegger discusses Nietzsche in seminars given in 1935 and published after the war under the title *Introduction to Metaphysics*. He quotes him (pp.39-40) as ridiculing the notion—Heidegger's own central preoccupation—of Being.

"Being remains undiscoverable, almost like Nothing, or in the end *entirely so*. The word 'Being' is then finally just an empty word. It means nothing actual, tangible, real. Its meaning is an unreal vapour. So in the end Nietzsche is entirely right when he calls the 'highest concepts' such as Being 'the final wisp of evaporating reality'."

Heidegger is quoting from the *Twilight of the Idols*. The full passage reads:

"The other characteristic of philosophers is no less dangerous; it consists in confusing the last and the first. They place that which comes at the end—unfortunately! for it ought not to come at all! namely the 'highest concepts', which means the most general, the emptiest concepts, the last smoke of evaporating reality—in the beginning, as the beginning... the higher may not grow out of the lower, may not have grown at all... Origin out of something else is considered an objection, a questioning of value... all the highest concepts, that which has being, the unconditional, the good, the true, the perfect—all these cannot have become, and must therefore be causes... thus they arrive at their stupendous concept, 'God'. That which is last, thinnest and emptiest is put first, as the cause as *ens realissimus*. Why did humanity have to take seriously the brain afflictions of these sick web-spinners? We have paid dearly for it!."

Nietzsche's argument is based on, or at least consonant with, the theory of evolution. The 'higher' develops out of the 'lower'. Consciousness develops out of unconscious matter. Human consciousness—mastery of the word, the **logos**, Aristotle's **zoon logon echon**—develops out of animal consciousness. On this understanding we, as we are, are the highest. But Nietzsche finds humanity as it is rather contemptible and mediocre—the "last men" of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. He wants to maintain a sense of adventure, of a future we can strive towards, so he envisages the Superman.

The great tragedy of Nietzsche is that he himself would have liked poetry and art to be the highest human activities. But, in excluding the "highest concepts", he has at the same time excluded **sophia** and **nous** and is left with **techne**, **episteme** and **phronesis**, human capacities that are well within the reach of the last men. The Superman could well turn out to be a *cyborg*, as envisaged in James Lovelock's recently published book *Novacene*—vastly more accomplished in the field of rational calculation than we can ever hope to be but probably not much good at poetry (though experiments are being conducted in that direction . . .).

Something of the sort was envisaged by Heidegger's contemporary, Ernst Junger, in his book, *The Worker*. Looking at an AbeBooks notice for *The Worker*, I see Heidegger quoted as saying Junger was "the only genuine follower of Nietzsche".

Illustrating what he might mean by the 'will to power' Heidegger ridicules those of us who think we can escape it by adopting some other philosophy of life taken from our vast knowledge of history:

"We could open a gallery of 'intellectual history' featuring the concept of living and everyone could then pick out, as if in a warehouse, what appeals to him and his 'life experiences'. A person could, by virtue of this magnificent presentation of intellectual history, decide—unreflectively and with a wink—upon the 'concept of living' as defined by Christianity. However, on the same day this person (who is for example a renowned researcher from Berlin) must fly on an airplane to Oslo for a lecture. Such a person finds the 'experience' wonderful, all the while utterly failing to notice and consider that this experience is the purest affirmation of the will to power, upon whose essence the possibility of an airplane and a trip

in it depends. This person, owing to the perspective of their Christian experiences, would surely find Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power horrid, even while flying merrily in the plane over the Norwegian fjords. Having arrived, this person perhaps presents a lecture against 'nihilism', one rich in intellectual history, while also flying around in an airplane, using a car and a razorblade, and finding the will to power too dreadful to bear. How is such splendid hypocrisy possible? Because this person does not think of Being for even a moment, either with his Christian standpoint or during his trip on the airplane, and is driven by this forgetfulness of Being into the purest oblivion" (*Heraclitus*, p.79).

### Parmenides And The Beginning Of An Age

Nietzsche's *Twilight of the Idols* continues the argument I've quoted by saying: "Nothing has yet possessed a more naive power of persuasion than the error concerning being, as it has been formulated by the Eleatics, for example". And this brings us back to Plato's *Sophist*.

*The Sophist* is reckoned to be among Plato's last writings and, like its contemporary, *The Statesman*, the main spokesperson is not Socrates but an anonymous figure called 'the Eleatic stranger'. The Eleatic Stranger was a disciple of Parmenides whose school was based in the town of Elea in Southern Italy in what is now Calabria, an area which had strong Greek connections right through to the Renaissance. Another of the late Platonic dialogues features a confrontation between the aged Parmenides and the young Socrates, in which Parmenides criticises, in a friendly if rather condescending manner, the young man's revolutionary notion of the 'ideas', the 'forms', which constitute the real being of worldly things. It could be suggested that at the end of his life Plato was transferring his affections from Socrates to Parmenides.

Heidegger sees Parmenides, together with Heraclitus and Anaximander, as marking the beginning of the age of Western philosophy which has come to an end with Nietzsche. He sees Plato and Aristotle as marking the end of the Greek phase. As with Heraclitus and Anaximander, only fragments of Parmenides' thought have come down to us. These take the form of extracts from a poem which begins (if it is the beginning) with a dramatic description of the first person narrator being carried in a

chariot driven by the "maiden daughters of the Sun" to "the limits of my heart's desire", a goddess who receives him kindly and sets about teaching him—

"everything—Both the steady heart of well-rounded truth and the beliefs of mortals in which there is no true trust. Still you shall learn them too, and come to see how beliefs must exist in an acceptable form, all-pervasive as they altogether are" (Translation by Robin Waterfield in *The First Philosophers*, p.57).

It is generally assumed that the lesson of the Goddess is delivered in two parts. The first deals with what is, Reality, Being, while the second deals with appearances, how we experience the world, Seeming. In the first part she describes Being, Reality, as a perfectly-formed and therefore changeless whole. This naturally evokes the idea of Eternity as a condition radically other than Time, and also the idea of an original Unity, posing the problem that obsessed philosophers from Parmenides to Nietzsche of how the One becomes, or stands in relation to, the Many. This is "the error concerning being, as it has been formulated by the Eleatics, for example" of Nietzsche's complaint. Nietzsche prefers Heraclitus and his well-known aphorism that you never step into the same river twice, meaning an acceptance that all things are in a process of constant flux.

But, in Heidegger's view, Nietzsche is the victim of a longstanding inability to understand the thought that lies at the beginning of Western philosophy, the thought of Parmenides and Heraclitus. He presents Nietzsche as "the final victim of a longstanding errancy and neglect but as this victim, the unrecognised witness to a new necessity..." (*Introduction to Metaphysics*, p.40). The necessity represented, of course, by Heidegger himself.

In 1942-3, Heidegger gave a series of seminars on Parmenides and, as we have seen, on Heraclitus, arguing that their visions were essentially the same. The seminars on Parmenides are pre-occupied, not so much with what the goddess actually says in the poem, but with the fact that she is a goddess and that what she is offering is "truth". We may remember that **nous**, the ability to see, to experience directly, is, according to Aristotle, a property of the gods, not accessible to human beings. Human beings are confined to **sophia**, which is the vision tempered by the need to experience it in words. The Greek word for truth is **aletheia**. The 'a' is a negative

prefix, signifying 'not', while *letheia* embodies ideas of concealing, hiding, preserving, forgetting.

In the Myth of Er at the end of Plato's *Republic* the dead are required to drink of the waters of *lethe* before returning to the visible world. Most people drink deeply and forget everything. The philosophers are those who haven't drunk so deeply. They have a sense, but still only a remote sense, of the reality, the totality from which beings emerge and to which they return. *Aletheia* can be translated 'unconcealing'. But the concealing itself is a necessary part of the definition. You can only reveal what is concealed. Consequently *aletheia*, the word we translate as 'truth', contains within itself an idea of conflict—or strife, *eris*, a key word in what has survived of the thinking of Heraclitus—between concealing and unconcealing.

'Truth' on the other hand, as we understand it, signifies an end to conflict, a certainty, a correct idea. With the Romans *aletheia* becomes '*adequatio*'—'Truth is the correspondence of the intellect to the thing'.

### Greeks And Romans

Nietzsche, according to Heidegger, "sees the Greek 'world' exclusively in a Roman way, that is, in a way at once modern and unGreek ... The entire thinking of the Occident from Plato to Nietzsche thinks in terms of this delimitation of truth as correctness" (Heidegger: *Parmenides*, p.43). Whereas the purpose of the word, the *logos*, in the original Greek view, was to let what is concealed appear, it now becomes the Roman *iudicium*, *veritas*, *rectitudo*, attaining certainty, what is right:

"the Latinisation occurs as a transformation of the essence of truth and Being within the essence of the Greco-Roman domain of history. This transformation is distinctive in that it remains concealed but nonetheless determines everything in advance. This transformation of the essence of truth and Being is the genuine event of history. The imperial as the mode of Being of a historical humanity is nevertheless not the basis of the essential transformation of *aletheia* into *veritas*, as *rectitudo*, but is its consequence, and as this consequence it is in turn a possible cause and occasion for the development of the true in the sense of the correct" (p.42).

So in Nietzsche, seeing things through 'Roman' eyes, the true is the right, conformity to the real, and since "*the basic feature of reality is will to*

*power, what is right must conform itself to the real, hence must express what the real says, namely, will to power*". And, Heidegger continues,

"Power can only be assured by the constant enhancement of power. Nietzsche recognised this very clearly and declared that within the realm of essence of the will to power the mere preservation of an already attained level of power already represents a decrease in the degree of power" (pp.52 and 58).

The difference here between the Greek and the Latin understandings of 'truth' corresponds to a longstanding Greek Orthodox criticism of Latin Christianity which, according to the Greeks, lays too much emphasis on the justice of God. This in turn derives from a misunderstanding of the Platonic 'ideas', according to which Justice has to be an 'eternal' absolute. Heidegger criticises this Latin version of the 'ideas' in *the Essence of Truth*, which discusses the famous cave analogy in Plato's *Republic*. No time to go into this here but briefly the Greek *idea* is something seen (Greek *ideiv*, to see)—a shape, a form. What the Romans would see as a single, absolute and eternal idea of Justice, the Greeks would see as the single shape or form of the plurality of events that constitute the *aion*, hence a story (Greek *muthos*). It is the 'Roman' view—a 'real' world of frozen absolutes—that Heidegger regards as the

'metaphysics' that has finally revealed its true content in Nietzsche's '*will to power*'.

In the *Introduction to Metaphysics* (pp.41-2) Heidegger presents Europe in general and Germany in particular as caught between two pincers—America on the one side, and Russia (at that time Bolshevik Russia) on the other, two societies given over to the Will to Power, expressed both in a desire to dominate politically and in the constant urge towards greater technological proficiency, a drive which is still going strong in our day. He was not blind to the fact that the impulse had come from Western Europe, from the whole tendency of Western thought, beginning with 'the Greeks'. He saw it as a problem of philosophy rather than of politics, or perhaps more simply he tried to approach it from within the domain of his own specialisation, which was philosophy.

I as a Christian attached to the Eastern Orthodox tradition note that, whereas according to Heidegger the Will to Power such as we experience it today developed within the context of Latin Christianity, it did not develop to anything like the same extent in the context of Greek Christianity. I find myself wondering if the Greeks might have understood their own language and culture better than Heidegger thought they did.

## Eamon Dyas

Michael O'Dwyer—an Irish Catholic in the service of the British Empire  
**Memoir of the Lieutenant General ultimately responsible for the state of  
Martial Law which made possible the Amritsar Massacre**  
Part 3

### Sir Michael O'Dwyer and Amritsar

When on leave from India, I used to spend a good deal of my leave in Ireland, especially in the hunting season, with my eldest brother. He was a keen sportsman who, in the words of a friendly critic, had the biggest heart and the ugliest seat of any man who ever rode to hounds in Tipperary or Limerick. His horses were always at my disposal, till I could secure some of my own, and among my few unpleasant recollections is the fact that I let down two of his best hunters and hopelessly blemished them. I still blush for the *faux pas* which I was not skilful enough to check; but my brother received the bad news with

sporting sang-froid.

The death of this brother last year, like that of my father forty years earlier, was hastened by the terrible events that had been going on in Ireland since the Easter Day rebellion of 1916. He was also too independent to adapt himself to the new dispensation, or to shut his eyes or his ears to the wild doings and sayings that marked the rebellion and the subsequent Civil War. The disappearance of old friends and the withdrawal of British troops had left the countryside dull and drab, and like many patriotic Irishmen he could not condone the

methods by which Ireland's political independence had been achieved. In this connection he would often quote with feeling the famous lines of Thomas Davis, the poet of the 1848 movement:

"For freedom comes from God's right hand  
And needs a Godly train,  
And righteous men must make our land  
A Nation once again."

He looked in vain for these "righteous men". Let us hope, for Ireland's sake, that they will be forthcoming.

I revisited Ireland at the end of 1923 after an interval of four and a half tragic years which covered the second phase of the Rebellion, the Truce, the Treaty, the Civil War, and the first two years of the Free State. During my brief stay I met and talked with all classes, the old Loyalists, Irish and Anglo-Irish, the Free Staters, and even some Republicans. The appalling destruction of property, public and private, both in Dublin and the countryside, in the four years of disorder was a saddening and humiliating spectacle, and little was yet being done to repair the devastation. Ireland did not seem to be much nearer to being a nation; the south was still the cockpit of the various factions of the Republican and Free State parties; the north was firmly maintaining its separate and independent status till the struggle in the south had been fought to a finish. The Catholic Church, which might have mediated between the warring factions, in politics spoke with two voices—and had unfortunately not only lost the confidence of both but much of its influence for good among the people.

Among the old Loyalists the prevailing feeling was then one of hatred to England for betraying them; among the Free Staters and Republicans there appeared to be little hatred, but much contempt, and, curiously enough, the betrayal of the Loyalists was one of the causes of this contempt.

On my way back to England I had as solitary companion in the railway compartment for an hour or two a man who appeared to be a well-to-do farmer, on his way to a coursing match or a race meeting. He took me for an Englishman, and unburdened himself to me more freely than if he had recognised me as a fellow-countryman. The conversation soon drifted into politics, and his views and outlook were unexpected and striking. I gathered from him that he had been by act and conviction a staunch

Republican both before and after the Treaty. His faith in the Republic and in de Valera was shaken, however, when, as he put it, the latter showed at Ennis (when he was captured without a blow by the Free State patrol) that he had no "spunk" in him. The substance of what followed is given in the following conversation:

*I.* Clearly there is no use in standing out for the shadow of a Republic when the British Government have given you the substance.

*He.* Devil thank *them* for it. 'Shure we frightened them into giving it.

*I.* But surely you must be grateful to them for having given up the struggle when you were nearly down and out, and letting you have almost all you asked for.

*He.* And who could have any regard for a Government that let down its own people?

*I.* Isn't that a strange argument for you to use when you were fighting those people?

*He.* It was *our* business to down them, we had taken our Gospel oath to do so. But it wasn't for their own Government to let them down. Didn't we know all the time that Lloyd George and Greenwood were talking big in Parliament about having rebellion by the throat, that they were negotiating secretly with Michael Collins and planning a surrender?

I do not claim historical accuracy for the statements of my Republican fellow-traveller. But they are interesting as showing his point of view and they help to explain the attitude of the old Loyalists. The parting impression left on me was that if this spirit was fairly general, then there was still some hope for the future of Ireland. The Irish, in the north and south, have more failings than they like to be told of. But desertion of friends is not one of them.

Politics have in many ways been the curse of Ireland, because, like Aaron's serpent, they have swallowed all the rest. Their predominance in a land where there are so many to talk, so few to act, has elbowed out or vitiated all the other factors indispensable to the ordered growth of a people in civilisation and prosperity—law and order, social and educational progress, industrial and agricultural development.

The various movements in these directions have nearly all at one time or another been killed by political or sectarian strife. One alone survives and thrives—the Co-operative movement

initiated and fostered by Sir Horace Plunkett, who wisely kept it clear of politics.

In India, to please a small but ambitious English-educated Intelligentsia—less than 1 per cent of the population—we have, in callous disregard of the welfare of the masses, in recent years let loose the demon of discord in the form of Western democratic institutions. And after a few years we are astonished and pained to find that our panacea of "self-determination", a bomb loaded with dynamite, so far from bringing about peace and harmony, has revived and exacerbated all the latent feuds and hatreds among 320 millions of heterogeneous races, sharply separated into innumerable divisions of race, religion, and caste, and grouping blindly through all stages of civilisation from the fifth to the twentieth century.

One wonders if our statesmen have ever realised how great an influence the growth and success of the separatist movement in Ireland have exerted on the similar movements in India and Egypt.

Mrs. Besant's Home Rule Movement in India, which was afterwards adopted and amplified by the Indian extremists, was started in 1916 soon after the Easter Monday rebellion in Ireland. At the time the two notorious agitators, B.G. Tilak of Bombay and B.C. Pal of Bengal, were selected to push the Home Rule propaganda in the Punjab, of which I was in charge. We were in the middle of the War. A violent agitation against the existing form of government would have produced disastrous results in the province which was the home of the best fighting races, and was supplying more fighting men to the Army than all the rest of India. I at once issued orders prohibiting Messrs. Tilak and Pal from entering the Punjab. I would have issued similar orders as regards Mrs. Besant, had not the Government of India undertaken that she would make no attempt to come there. My action was violently attacked by the Nationalists in India and their sympathisers in England. I justified it in a speech to the Punjab Legislative Council in April 1916, from which I quote the following extract as showing my attitude then—which has changed but little since—towards the Home Rule Movement in India and Ireland:

"Honourable Members will remember that some two months ago, my Government passed o r d e r s forbidding two gentlemen who were

predominantly identified with the Home Rule propaganda from entering the province. I took that action not because I desire to stop or repress any reasonable political discussion, but because I was, and am, convinced that an agitation for Home Rule in this province on the lines advocated by the leaders of the Movement, and as it would be interpreted by those to whom it would be addressed, would stir up the dying embers of the revolutionary fires which we have almost succeeded in extinguishing, and set parts of the Province in a blaze once more... Government recognises that among a large section of the community, there is a growing desire, and a natural desire, for an increased measure of self-government...

But the increasing measure of self-government by steady and orderly change for which this country will fit itself, as causes of disunion diminish, as education spreads, and as large numbers of the vast population gain some political experience, is something very different from the sudden upheaval and transfer of political authority into ignorant and inexperienced hands which the protagonists of Home Rule contemplate in their extravagant demands...

What we have to consider is not the ideal of the political philosopher in his arm-chair, of the journalist at his desk, but the ideal conveyed to the average man; and we have had positive proof based on the judicial findings of several experienced tribunals, that of the thousands of Punjabis to whom the Swaraj or Home Rule doctrine was preached in America, some hundreds at least set themselves as early as possible (on their return to the Punjab) to realise that ideal by the sword, the pistol, and the bomb...

...The case of Home Rule for Ireland is often cited as an argument in their favour by those who advocate Home Rule for India. *At the risk of entering the thorny field of Irish politics I may say there is no real analogy between the two cases.*

*The Home Rule movement in Ireland aimed at the restoration of the status—a separate legislature, and a separate executive, though with limited powers—which Ireland had enjoyed for centuries down to the Union of 1800. [O'Dwyer's emphasis—ED]*

The great majority of the Irish people supported the movement, and many of those who wished well to Ireland, even if they did not count upon any material advantages from Home Rule, were inclined to favour the scheme on sentimental and historic grounds. They looked forward to the time when the softening of racial and religious asperities would enable all classes to combine

for the restoration and the successful working of the system of self-government, which in one form or another Ireland had for centuries enjoyed.

That was a lofty and generous ideal. Unfortunately the nearer it came to realisation the greater became the practical difficulties; the old feuds and factions were revived with increasing bitterness and threatened Civil War. A year ago one section of the supporters of Irish *Swaraj*, following in the footsteps of our Punjabi *Swarajists*, allied themselves with the King's enemies and brought about an abortive rebellion. That was speedily suppressed; but it has left a fatal legacy of distrust and ill-feeling which all good Irishmen deplore; for it has prevented Ireland from bearing her full share in the defence of the Empire.

*Well, gentlemen, the conclusion I would ask you to draw is this. If the Home Rule Movement after a hundred years of agitation, has so far produced no better results among a people fairly enlightened and homogeneous, in a country no larger of more populous than a single one of the five divisions of the Punjab, what results can we expect from it in this vast continent of 315 millions, with its infinitive variety of races, creeds, and traditions, and its appalling inequalities in social and political development? What results could we expect from it even in our own Province? In the matter of Home*

*Rule, I fear the case of Ireland, in so far as it is analogous at all, conveys to us a lesson and a warning" [O'Dwyer's emphasis. ED]*

Those views were expressed before the Indian Reform Scheme was announced in Mr. Montagu's declaration of August 20, 1917, and before the recrudescence of rebellion in Ireland which led to the Treaty of 1921 and the grant of Dominion Status to the twenty-six counties. I do not think they have been falsified by the subsequent course of events in either India or Ireland.

Even now the so-called Moderates in an India which, as a result of the antagonisms revived or aroused by the Reforms, is being torn more and more by racial and sectarian hatreds, have the hardihood to argue that the remedy is to grant at once to India—a geographical expression—the full Dominion Status that has been granted to Southern Ireland. She has, at least, the traditions and many of the elements of a nation, though her government today is not a national one but that of a successful faction. Both Southern and Northern Ireland are too small for party government on English lines: India on the other hand is immeasurably too great and too divided for it.

**Next issue: Education and Oxford**

## LAUNCHES:

### **Eamon Dyas: Britain And Its War Dead**

and

Progress Report on: **The Evolution Of Britain's Strategy During WWI**

### **Jack Lane The so-called 'Treaty' and the so-called 'Civil War'**

jacklaneaubane@hotmail.com

**To be launched on  
Friday  
8th November**

at

**The Ireland Institute (Pearse House)  
27 Pearse Street  
Dublin 2  
(near Trinity College)**

**Now Available:** IRISH FOREIGN AFFAIRS, SEPTEMBER  
2019

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

## Report

### The 10 Oldest Languages Still Spoken in the World Today

#### Hebrew

Hebrew is a funny case, since it essentially fell out of common usage around 400 CE and then remained preserved as a liturgical language for Jews across the world. However, along with the rise of Zionism in the 19th and 20th centuries, Hebrew went through a revival process to become the official language of Israel. While the modern version differs from the Biblical version, native speakers of Hebrew can fully comprehend what is written in the Old Testament and its connected texts. As the earliest speakers of Modern Hebrew often had Yiddish as their native language, Modern Hebrew has in many ways been influenced by this other Jewish language.

#### Basque

The Basque language is the ultimate linguistic mystery. It is spoken natively by some of the Basque people who live in Spain and France, but it is completely unrelated to any Romance language (which French and Spanish are) or indeed any other language in the world. Linguists have postulated over the decades about what it could be related to, but none of the theories have been able to hold water. The only thing that's clear is that it existed in that area before the arrival of the Romance languages—that is, before the Romans got there with the Latin that would eventually develop into French and Spanish.

#### Tamil

Tamil, a language spoken by about 78 million people and recognized as an official language in Sri Lanka and Singapore, is the only classical language that has survived all the way through to the modern world. Forming part of the Dravidian language family, which includes a number of languages native mostly to southern and eastern India, it is also the official language of the state of Tamil Nadu. Researchers have found inscriptions in Tamil dating back to the 3rd century BCE, and it has been in continuous use ever since. Unlike Sanskrit, another ancient Indian language that fell out of common usage around 600 BCE and became mostly a liturgical language, Tamil has continued to develop and is now the 20th most commonly-spoken language in the world.

#### Lithuanian

The language family that most European languages belong to is Indo-European, but they started splitting apart from each other probably around 3500 BCE. They developed into dozens of other languages like German, Italian, and English, gradually losing the features that they had all shared. One

language, however, up in the Baltic language branch of the Indo-European family, retained more of the feature of what linguists call Proto-Indo-European (PIE), which is the language that they postulate was spoken around 3500 BCE. For whatever reason, Lithuanian has kept more of the sounds and grammar rules from PIE than any of its linguistic cousins, and can therefore be called one of the oldest languages in the world.

#### Farsi

In case you haven't heard of Farsi, it's a language spoken in modern-day Iran, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan, among other places. You've probably heard of Persian, and it's actually the same language, under a different name. Farsi is the direct descendant of Old Persian, which was the language of the Persian Empire. Modern Persian took form around 800 CE, and one of the things that differentiates it from many modern languages is that it has changed relatively little since then. Speakers of Persian today could pick up a piece of writing from 900 CE and read it with considerably less difficulty than an English speaker could read, say, Shakespeare.

#### Icelandic

Icelandic is another Indo-European language, this time from the North Germanic branch (just for comparison, English is also a Germanic language, but from the West Germanic branch). Many Germanic languages have streamlined themselves and lost some of the features that other Indo-European languages have (you've probably never heard of a case, for example, unless you've studied Latin or a Slavic language), but Icelandic has developed much more conservatively and retained many of these features. Danish governance of the country from the 14th to the 20th century also had very little effect on the Icelandic language, so it has mostly gone unchanged since Norse settlers brought it there when they came to the country, and Icelandic speakers can easily read the sagas written centuries ago.

#### Macedonian

The Slavic language family, which includes Russian, Polish, Czech, and Croatian, among others, is relatively young as far as languages go. They only started splitting off from their common ancestor, Common Slavic (or Proto-Slavic), when Cyril and Methodius standardized the language, creating what is now called Old Church Slavonic, and created an alphabet for it. They then took the language north with them in the 9th century as they went to convert the Slavs to Christianity. They came from somewhere just north of Greece, probably in what is now known as Macedonia (or the Republic of Macedonia or FYROM following Macedonian naming disputes), and Macedonian (together with its very close relative Bulgarian) is the language that is most closely related to Old Church Slavonic today.

*Following the comments concerning the intricate*

*historical relationship between Macedonia and Bulgaria, we at The Culture Trip would like indicate that, despite the complexities, the prevailing academic consensus outside of the region is that Bulgarian and the language known as Macedonian are distinct. If you don't believe us, read our article on the [history of the Macedonian language](#).*

#### Finnish

Finnish may not have been written down until the 16th century, but as with any language, it has a history that stretches back far earlier than that. It is a member of the Finno-Ugric language family, which also includes Estonian, Hungarian, and several smaller languages spoken by minority groups across Siberia. Despite that, Finnish includes many loan words, which were adopted into Finnish from other language families over the centuries. In many cases, Finnish has retained these loan words closer to their original form than the language that they came from. The word for mother, *aiti*, for example, comes from Gothic—which, of course, is no longer spoken. The word for king, *kuningas*, comes from the old Germanic word *\*kuningaz*—which no longer exists in any Germanic language.

#### Georgian

The Caucasus region is a real hotbed for linguists who seek out difficult world languages. The main languages of the three south Caucasian countries, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, come from three entirely different language families—respectively Indo-European, Turkic, and Kartvelian. Georgian is the biggest Kartvelian language, and it is the only Caucasian language with an ancient literary tradition. Its beautiful and unique alphabet is also quite old—it is thought to have been adapted from Aramaic as far back as the third century AD. While not a language island in the same sense as Basque, there are only four Kartvelian languages, all spoken by minorities within Georgia, and they are all unrelated to any other languages in the world.

#### Irish Gaelic

Although Irish Gaelic is only spoken as a native language by a small majority of Irish people nowadays, it has a long history behind it. It is a member of the Celtic branch of Indo-European languages, and it existed on the islands that are now Great Britain and Ireland well before the Germanic influences arrived. Irish Gaelic was the language from which Scottish Gaelic and Manx (which used to be spoken on the Isle of Man) arose, but the fact that really lands it on this list is that it has the oldest vernacular literature of any language in Western Europe. While the rest of Europe was speaking their own languages and writing in Latin, the Irish decided that they wanted to write in their own language instead.

Michaela Pointon/Lani Seelinger

**Culture Trip** <https://theculturetrip.com/asia/india/articles/the-10-oldest-languages-still-spoken-in-the-world-today/>

V  
O  
X

**Disraeli**  
**Wombs for Sale!**  
**Iona Institute**  
**Michael Walker**

P  
A  
T

**Disraeli:** BRITAIN'S only Jewish Prime Minister?

Until the age of thirteen Benjamin Disraeli (1804-81) was Jewish.

Described as being "of Italian-Jewish descent" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, his father, Isaac d'Israeli, quarrelled with the London Sephardi community of Bevis Marks in 1813. That led to the decision to have Benjamin and his siblings baptised as Christians four years later, at which point the young Disraeli became an Anglican.

Until 1858 followers of the Jewish faith were excluded from Parliament, and so his father's timely decision allowed Disraeli to follow a career path that would otherwise have been closed to him, and at sixty-four, he became Prime Minister.

Disraeli was "fascinated by the connection between Judaism and Christianity, and supposedly told Queen Victoria: *"I am the blank page between the Old and New Testament"*.

Technically, therefore, the honour of being Britain's first practising Jewish Prime Minister remains open.

The Roman Catholic Relief Act, 1829, permitted members of the Catholic Church to sit in the parliament at Westminster.

But it was nearly impossible for Catholics to rise to Number 10 because the same act said no Catholic could advise the British Crown in the appointment to offices in the established church - the Church of England.

Boris Johnson has become the first baptised Catholic to become Prime Minister. The 55-year-old, whose mother Charlotte Fawcett is Catholic, was baptised as a child.

His godmother is Lady Rachel Billington—daughter of the devoutly Catholic Lord Longford.

However, Mr Johnson was confirmed an Anglican while studying at Eton

as a teenager.

Tony Blair attended weekly Masses while he was in Office and occasionally took Communion until the late Cardinal Basil Hume told him to stop because he was not a Catholic.

His wife Cherie is a practising Catholic and the couple raised their children in the faith and sent them to Church schools.

The former Prime Minister formally converted to Catholicism in 2007.

Of the new British Cabinet, leader of the House of Commons Jacob Rees-Mogg is the highest-profile Catholic.

He once said: *"I take my whip from the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church rather than the Whip's Office"*.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Wombs for Sale!**

"In the Ukraine, an Irish baby is born to a surrogate every fortnight. What challenges do families face when they choose this controversial route to overcoming infertility?" (*Irish Independent*, 3.8.2019)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Iona Institute**

"The company behind Catholic advocacy group the Iona Institute spent almost €500,000 last year as it unsuccessfully campaigned against the repeal of the Eighth Amendment.

"Newly filed accounts show that Lolek Company Limited by Guarantee increased its expenditure by 125% to €498,262 in 2018, spending large amounts on items such as advertising, market research, and consultancy.

"The Iona Institute is a trading name of the company, which is a registered charity with the stated objective of promoting 'marriage and religion in society'.

"The company had an average of two employees during this time, who were paid a combined total of €95,000 in wages and salaries" (*Ir. Ind.*, 24.6.2019)

David Quinn, the Director of the Iona Institute, did not respond to a request for comment. From 1996 to 2003 he was the Editor at *The Irish Catholic*. He served as the religious and social affairs correspondent for the *Irish Independent* from 2003 to 2005.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Michael Walker**

"In the parlance of freemasonry, Michael Walker, [1936-2019] who has died aged 83, "served" no fewer than five grand masters of the order in Ireland as the Grand Secretary of the Grand Masonic Lodge of Ireland on Molesworth Street in Dublin.

"Walker inherited in 1981 the most important administrative office of an organisation which, 40 years ago, was still a relatively controversial and overwhelmingly Protestant organisation in an overwhelmingly Catholic Ireland" (*Irish Times*, 20.7.2019)

Walker's role as Grand Secretary also involved a great deal of international travel. The Irish Grand Lodge has 14 overseas "provinces" including the Grand Lodges of Jamaica, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Sri Lanka and India; it is also the Grand Lodge of one Australian Lodge and several in Africa and East Asia.

"Walker rose, in time, to the highest levels of freemasonry, becoming a knight commander of the grand council of knight masons, a prince mason and the grand general secretary of the supreme council, 33 degrees, of the ancient and accepted rite for Ireland. The significance of these three levels of freemasonry is that one has to be invited to membership of them, and canvassing for, or requesting, membership results in automatic disqualification.

"Walker was also a reflective thinker and writer on society in general. In his pamphlet *Freemasonry in Society Today and Tomorrow* (1999), he presciently foresaw, years before the advent of social media, that the pressures of rapid change in contemporary society would undermine 'our natural needs for security, control, certainty and predictability'. He trenchantly condemned 'excessive individualism', as he saw it, which [has led] 'to a false sense of freedom', leading in turn to the idea that 'one was free to insist on one's own rights, irrespective of the rights of others'..."

"It was surely significant, in this regard, that in the pamphlet Walker quotes, with approval, criticisms of modern society made by two then-serving Catholic bishops, Dr Donal Murray, Auxiliary Bishop of Dublin, and Dr William Lee of Waterford, adding that 'today's society [is] obsessed... with material success for the individual rather than his contribution to society'..." (*Ir. Times*, 20.7.2019)

The present Grand Secretary is Philip Daley.  
\*\*\*\*\*